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Editor's Introduction

Lawrence Charap

The reviews contained in this publication were written for the Teachers’ Resources area of AP Central (apcentral.collegeboard.com), the College Board’s Web site for AP professionals. This ambitious project brought together experienced AP teachers and college-level faculty to write hundreds of reviews, more than 500 to date, of resources useful for the AP United States History classroom.

The successful use of a primary source, whether in a Document-Based Question or as a piece of evidence in a broader historical analysis of an event or period, is a critical student skill for the AP U.S. History course. What veteran teachers of AP and college-level survey courses also know is that using primary documents is just as critical in being able to teach history. Having the right sources can make all the difference between a vague, general lecture and an exciting and memorable classroom experience for both students and teachers. The essay that opens this collection, by history professor Tom Holt, discusses this very process, showing the critical ways that using primary sources can change the dynamics of teaching history.

Accordingly, the Teachers’ Resources reviews undertaken on AP Central have long sought to not only identify useful primary sources but also explore how they can best be used in an AP classroom. Many teachers know of speeches, sermons, films, novels, Web sites, and other texts that could potentially be used to illuminate American history, but wonder how it can be done effectively in a high school setting, with so many other topics to cover in an AP course. AP Central’s reviewers were charged with finding a solution to this dilemma for their resources. These reviews do not merely present the contents of a resource; they present practical teaching tips for effectively using the resource in the classroom.

This collection is organized alphabetically for sourcebook readers/anthologies, and chronologically for other types of resources. Publication and reference information, particularly for online locating, is presented for each resource. The reviews are by no means a comprehensive collection of all possible primary sources for the AP U.S. History course, but simply a collection of materials reviewed to date.
AP Central is a work in progress, with new reviews being added all the time and old ones being revised and updated. The information in this publication has been checked to be current as of late 2005, with notes indicating that a new edition has appeared since a review was first written. We hope that readers of this book will send us suggestions for resources to review, by going to AP Central, clicking the “Teachers’ Resources” tab, and then clicking the link for suggesting a resource to review. Teachers can also leave comments on their experience with a particular resource by clicking a button at the bottom of a current AP Central review.

We hope that you will find this collection useful in helping to teach AP U.S. History.
Contributors

Dalit Baranoff (Ph.D., Johns Hopkins University) recently defended her dissertation, “Shaped by Risk: Fire Insurance in America, 1790–1920.” She has taught American history and women’s history, and has received a number of awards, including a dissertation fellowship in Business and American Culture from the Newcomen Society of the United States, and a John E. Rovensky Fellowship in American Business and Economic History from the University of Illinois Foundation.

Lawrence Charap (Ph.D., Johns Hopkins University) is the former group head for History and Social Sciences in K–12 Professional Development at the College Board. He has published several articles on Jewish-Christian dialogue in the United States at the turn of the twentieth century. He has taught the American history survey course and a number of specialized courses in both high school and college, most recently at the University of Rhode Island.

Elizabeth Francis (Ph.D., Brown University) has taught U.S. women’s history, the U.S. history survey, American cultural history, and women’s studies at Brown University and the University of Rhode Island. She has also developed American history resources for several academic multimedia firms. Her book, The Secret Treachery of Words: Feminism and Modernism in America, was published by the University of Minnesota Press in 2002.

Jason George (Ph.D., Ohio University) is the current content advisor for AP U.S. History for the College Board’s K–12 Professional Development unit. He recently defended his dissertation on U.S.-Russian relations. He teaches upper school courses in American, world, Asian, and Baltimore history at the Bryn Mawr School for Girls in Baltimore, Maryland.

Cora Greer has taught in California, Massachusetts, and Maine—most recently at the University of Maine at Machias. She has served as Reader and Table Leader at the AP U.S. History Reading, been a consultant in AP U.S. History, Building Success, and Vertical Teams, and won the College Board New England Region’s Advanced Placement Recognition Award for Excellence in Teaching.

John Faithful Hamer is a doctoral student at Johns Hopkins University, where he is completing a dissertation on the environmental movement. He has led history courses ranging from American to European history. His research interests and publications span the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, centering on the history of American radical and reform movements.
Tom Holt is the James Westfall Thompson Professor of American and African-American History at the University of Chicago and is the author, most recently, of *The Problem of Race in the Twenty-First Century* (Harvard University Press). Holt’s essay in this volume is reprinted from *Thinking Historically: Narrative, Imagination, and Understanding*, published in 1990 by the College Board as part of its Thinking Series.

Jeff House teaches at Presentation High School in San Jose, California. He reads and lectures for the College Board, has won several grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), and has been published in the *English Journal* and elsewhere.

Tim Lehman (Ph.D., University of North Carolina) is a professor of history at Rocky Mountain College in Billings, Montana, and is author of *Public Values, Private Lands*. He also taught U.S. History for six years at the North Carolina School of Science and Mathematics in Durham.

Celia Maddox (Ph.D., Columbia University) teaches Shakespeare and courses in writing and literature in Connecticut. She writes for a variety of publications.

Renee H. Shea is director of Freshman Composition at Bowie State University, Maryland, where she teaches graduate courses in rhetoric and is a member of the Honors Faculty. She has worked with the AP English program for over 25 years as a Reader and question leader, and frequently conducts workshops for teachers.

Ron Sudol is professor of rhetoric at Oakland University in Michigan, where he also directs the Meadow Brook Writing Project. He has been a Reader of AP English Language for 15 years.

Jill Wacker holds a Ph.D. in English and taught American literature at the University of Pennsylvania. She is a freelance writer and educational consultant.
History 413: Making the Work of History Visible and Open to Students

Tom Holt

(This essay is reprinted from Thinking Historically: Narrative, Imagination, and Understanding by Tom Holt, copyright © 1990 by the College Board.)

I will try to illustrate something of what the process of teaching students to form and question historical narratives might look like by describing a moment from my own teaching experience. History 413 is a survey of the African American experience from the Civil War to the present. In the fall of 1988, I chose to emphasize the economic aspects of that experience and their consequences for race relations and ideology, culture, and social life, not only for African Americans but for the nation as a whole. This particular class enrolled 48 students, mostly juniors and seniors with a sprinkling of sophomores and graduate students; about 15 came from American minority groups, mostly African American and Asian. Although it is a single example, conducted with a college class, it shows what might be involved in making the thought behind historical narratives visible and open to a wide range of students. I am convinced, based in part on what Debbie and J.J. had to say, that even younger and less prepared students can be engaged in a more active and imaginative examination of what history offers.

The Materials of History

Any effort to teach history is shaped by the raw materials on which it draws. Consequently, it is important to look closely at the materials we typically offer beginning students—since they establish what students have in front of them. So before turning to the documents I used with my college students, let’s examine excerpts about the Reconstruction period from two typical secondary school textbooks. These selections, it should be pointed out, were chosen at random and not because they are especially egregious or blameworthy examples. In fact, they might well be taken as exemplary, on the whole: accurate, fair-minded, striving for ethnic balance, and so on. They are nonetheless presentations of history Debbie would recognize: dry assemblages of fact, in which interpretation is relatively opaque.

The Freedmen’s Bureau is established. To help the newly freed blacks realize some of the benefits of emancipation, Congress created the Freedmen’s Bureau in March, 1865. The Freedmen’s Bureau undoubtedly relieved the suffering of many Southerners displaced by the war. At times its officials were able to move people from crowded areas to other places where jobs were available. The Bureau also gave some public land to care for the ailing and aged. One of the most important contributions of the
Bureau was to arrange labor contracts between black workers and their new employers (Graff 1985, 446–447).

**Sharecropping becomes common.** Instead of selling land, many plantation owners rented their land to tenant farmers. Some tenants paid rent in cash or in crops worth the amount of their rent. But many tenants were poor whites or blacks who could furnish nothing but their labor. They became sharecroppers. The landlord provided them with food, seed, tools, and a cabin. In return, the sharecroppers gave the landowner a share of the crops raised on their plots of land. Many sharecroppers barely made a living from their share of the crops. They were often in debt to the landowner, especially when harvests were bad. (Wilder et al. 1990, 449).

In each of these passages the dryness and blandness project a specific narrative of Reconstruction, or at least aspects of a larger implied narrative, at the same time concealing or suppressing alternative narratives. In the excerpt above from *Glorious Republic* the Freedmen’s Bureau emerges as an efficient and benevolent force in the postwar adjustment process. It is not that the passage quoted is inaccurate in its facts, but the selection of facts and how they are framed tell a particular story without a hint that there might be an alternative rendition of events. Freedmen were moved from “crowded areas” to “jobs.” The “giving” of public land and health care are implicitly equated by the syntax of the sentence that describes them. And among the Bureau’s “most important contributions” was to arrange labor contracts between “black workers and their new employers.” The text is silent on the possibility of tension between the policy choices of giving “land,” moving to “jobs,” and arranging “labor contracts.” In fact, this passage leaves no space for questions that might challenge the imagination and test one’s critical skills. How did the black ex-slaves suddenly become workers, and the former slaveowners “new employers,” one might well ask? Was this the necessary or natural outcome that should have followed emancipation? The fact that Bureau agents were required to “arrange” things suggests that it was not. What would it mean to ex-slaves to be working again for their former masters? Would they freely make that choice? What would it mean to the former masters to employ rather than own their workers? How might their attitudes affect the execution of labor contracts?

In the passage above from *America’s Story* we see the ultimate outcome of the Bureau’s efforts to arrange labor contracts, the sharecropping system. But how did this become an ultimate outcome? Again, the text implies a natural process. White and African American sharecroppers were people “who could furnish nothing but their labor.” Consequently, the next sentence informs us, “They became sharecroppers.” Because their shares were too small and there were bad harvests, the sharecroppers fell into poverty and debt. Why this class of people would have “nothing but their labor” is not examined. How did their shares come to be too small? Why did they bear the brunt of bad harvests? This particular
narrative does not suggest that I such questions might even be posed. Landlessness and toollessness are merely the preexisting conditions that the planters solved by their choice to rent rather than sell their land. The croppers’ shares were small because they were poor; they were poor because their shares were small. Again the main point here is not that these narratives are necessarily inaccurate factually, but simply that they are closed, stunted versions of the history of this period. Their closure both misrepresents the dynamism of this period in “America’s story” and shuts down the learning process at the very place it might begin. Indeed, something of what students are expected to “learn” from these passages is suggested by the review questions that follow at the end of their respective chapters. “What effect did the war have on the plantation system?” Wilder asks. “Why was the Freedmen’s Bureau set up?” inquires Graff. Such questions cannot help but impress on students that history calls for cut-and-dried answers; that it cares mainly about austere processes and developments, about what J.J. calls “capital ‘P’ people” and what Debbie refers to as “someone else’s facts.” Most of all, students learn, history is something to be memorized rather than thought about or debated. They do not learn about what intervenes between the observed historical “facts” and textbook generalizations such as “they became sharecroppers.” What intervene are analysis, interpretation, and narration, all of which are shaped by the values, skills, questions, and understandings of a particular teller.

Questions for History

Contrary to what J.J. suspects, history is about people, including especially the small “p” people, like the poor white and African American sharecroppers referred to in these texts. It should raise and should be the place to examine many of the fundamental, continuing questions of everyday life. The choices and struggles faced by black ex-slaves are not mere fodder for memorization, but fields of inquiry to be examined and pondered for their larger meanings for human experience.

As I prepared to teach my class about the African American experience during Reconstruction, therefore, I pondered what question would make the relevance of that experience as explicit as possible—to this particular group of students. Even for a class that was overwhelmingly white and middle class, the struggle for black freedom had more than historical relevance, I believed. In posing to them the question of what freedom meant for former slaves, why not first ask: “What does freedom mean to you?” I instructed them to define it not in abstract terms but in terms of their own lives. Their answers were wide-ranging. Despite my instructions, a few gave rather pedantic answers, as if taking an exam, invoking everything from the Greeks to Karl Marx’s critique of “bourgeois freedom.” Others, remembering it was a history course after all, invoked the Constitution and Bill of Rights: free speech, assembly, religion, and so forth. But several answered in terms of the mundane features of everyday life. For example, one
young woman thought of being finally free of parental oversight and able to stay out late. Another, recently from a Catholic high school, savor ed the right not to have to wear uniforms. A feminist activist mentioned freedom of reproductive rights and from violence to her person. Running through all, of course, was the notion of “choice,” of self-determination, and autonomy; but these were words extracted from the discussion that ensued. This group thought in terms of what late nineteenth-century liberals called “negative freedom” rather than “positive freedom,” i.e., freedom from restraint rather than the possession of the resources necessary for self-realization. Only five of the 41 respondents added access to resources—material, educational, health, etc.—as essential components of freedom. For the most part they were closer to John Stuart Mill’s *On Liberty* than to Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s “Four Freedoms.” Nonetheless, their answers provided a place from which to open our discussion of Reconstruction.

Following this exercise, we turned to a discussion of a selection of documents, all drawn from a documentary collection of Civil War and post–Civil War letters, reports, and other sources (Berlin et al. 1986). Fresh from having posed the question of the meaning of freedom in their own lives, they were now asked to pose that same question for African Americans just emerging from slavery in 1865. First they were asked to “deconstruct” the Emancipation Proclamation by asking these questions: What were its terms? What were its limitations? What do you imagine its impact was in the context of a revolutionary conflict? Next they examined a long letter from a slaveholder to the Confederate president, surprisingly, supporting a Confederate emancipation measure, but a measure structured so as to maintain control over black laborers by depriving them of any alternative employment to working on the same plantations they had worked on as slaves.

For the next day’s discussion, they were presented a second set of documents clustered around a particular set of closely spaced events in such a way as to help them grasp the narrative aspect of history. The first was a letter written by freedmen stating in their own terms precisely what they expected freedom to mean. The second was written by a Freedmen’s Bureau agent, almost as if in reply to the first (though it was not), and represents the view of many northerners committed to the ideology of free wage labor, or at least one variant of it. The final document was a report on the views of an African American Bureau agent who articulated a more radical view of what freedom requires. Each of these documents, as part of this larger whole, was also chosen to help students understand one moment in history as the interplay of many lines of action, conflicting desires, and dramatically different conceptions of what freedom should bring.

Having worked with these and similar documents, I entered the class with a number of preconceptions about their meaning and the narrative I expected students to extract from or construct about emancipation’s aftermath. But materials like these are “live,” that is, they allow the students direct access to see and hear for themselves and thus to formulate their own questions and answers. Such questions arise in the space between the document
itself and the reader’s experience, what he or she brings to the material. Consequently, one should not be surprised when they do find new and unexpected meanings or raise fresh questions that are sometimes not immediately answerable. In fact, the most successful discussions are neither predictable, controllable, nor closable. And that is as it should be.

**The Letter from Edisto Island**

[Edisto Island. S.C. October 28?, 1865]

General—It is with painful hearts that we the Committee address you. We have thoroughly considered the order which you wished us to sign. We wish we could do so but cannot feel our rights safe if we do so.

General we want homesteads; we were promised homesteads by the government; if it does not carry out the promises its agents made to us, if the government having concluded to befriend its late enemies and to neglect to observe the principles of common faith between its self and us its allies in the war you said was over, now takes away from them all right to the soil they stand upon save such as they can get by again working for your late and their alltime enemies—if the government does so we are left in a more unpleasant condition than our former we are at the mercy of those who are combined to prevent us from getting land enough to lay our fathers bones upon. We have property in horses, cattle, carriages, & articles of furniture, but we are landless and homeless, from the homes we have lived in in the past we can only do one of three things

Step into the public road or the sea or remain on them working as in former time and subject to their will as then. We can not resist it in any way without being driven out homeless upon the road.

You will see this is not the condition of really freemen

You ask us to forgive the land owners of our island. You only lost your right arm. In war and might forgive them.
The man who tied me to a tree & gave me 39 lashes & who stripped and flogged my mother & sister & who will not let me stay In His empty Hut except I will do His planting & be Satisfied with His price & who combines with others to keep away land from me well knowing I would not Have any thing to do with Him If I Had land of my own.—that man. I cannot well forgive. Does It look as if He Has forgiven me, seeing How He tries to keep me In a Condition of Helplessness

General, we cannot remain Here In such condition and If the government permits them to come back we ask It to Help us to reach land where we shall not be slaves nor compelled to work for those who would treat us as such

we Have not been treacherous, we Have not for selfish motives allied to us those who suffered like us from a common enemy & then Haveing gained our purpose left our allies In thier Hands   There is no rights secured to us there Is no law likely to be made which our Hands can reach. The state will make laws that we shall not be able to Hold land even If we pay for It   Landless. Homeless. Voteless, we can only pray to god & Hope for His Help, your Influence & assistance   With consideration of esteem Your Obt Servts

In behalf of the people

Henry Bram

Committee Ishmael WIoultrie

yates Sampson

Note: This document is quoted in “The Terrain of Freedom: The Struggle over the Meaning of Free Labor in the U.S. South,” by Ira Berlin, Steven Hahn, Steven F. Miller, Joseph P. Reidy, and Leslie S. Rowland (History Workshop Journal, Autumn 1986, pp. 127–28). Other primary sources quoted in this article also appear there.

Interpreting the Simple Facts: The Letter from Edisto Island

During his famous “March to the Sea” from Atlanta to the South Carolina coast, General William T. Sherman found his army inundated with tens of thousands of former slave refugees who followed in the army’s track. At the suggestion of a group of African American leaders and in response to the federal government’s anxiety to address the more general problem of what to do with freed slaves, Sherman issued a military order in January 1865 that allocated thousands of acres of abandoned islands along the Atlantic coast from South Carolina to northern Florida in 40-acre plots to African American families. The Lincoln administration made a firm commitment to seek legislation during
the ensuing congressional session making freedmen’s titles to the land permanent. But in October 1865 President Andrew Johnson, pursuing a policy of reconciling the white South, pardoned former rebels and restored their property. This meant that the freedmen had to accept eviction or agree to work the land under the former slaveowners for wages. It was the first of a series of steps that squashed any hope of significant land reform in the South, thereby limiting the possible meanings freedom might come to have for black Americans. General O. O. Howard, who was generally sympathetic to the freedmen’s aspirations, journeyed to Edisto Island off the coast of South Carolina personally to inform a church filled with ex-slaves that the land was no longer theirs. The government’s promise would not be honored. In shock and disbelief the freedpeople drafted a plea to Howard asking that this fateful decision be reconsidered (see the Letter from Edisto Island).

My intent in using this document was framed by my own initial reaction upon first reading it some years ago. What I was struck by first was the clarity as well as poignancy of the freedmen’s idea of what their liberation from slavery should mean in both material and social terms. Indeed, this brief document contains a rich repository of material from which a provisional narrative of both slavery and emancipation could be constructed, from the freedmen’s perspective. What was their experience under slavery like, or at least what do they recall as most important about that experience? That is, what might their first-person narrative look like? What do they seem to value? In other words, exactly what do land, family, elders, loyalty, and honor mean to them? What is their apparent understanding of their relation to the state—federal and local—and to politics (“Landless, Homeless, Voteless”)?

My students were prepared to empathize fully with the Edisto petitioners. The freedmen’s sense of betrayal is palpable and unimpeachable. They also could see the petitioner’s crucial point that material resources, in this case land, were essential preconditions for exercising genuine self-determination or self-realization in the postwar South. They shared their anxiety that the “freedom” merely to work for those who had formerly enslaved them was suspect. No one raised the contrary argument—popular among many conservative and liberal northerners at the time and some later historians of the period as well—that no one is entitled to receive land or property they have not earned by savings from their own labor. Had they done so, it might have provided an opportunity to explore more fully the freedmen’s idea that they had already earned a right to the land, by their work and suffering as slaves (“tied me to a tree & gave me 39 lashes & who stripped and flogged my mother & sister & who will not let me stay In His empty Hut”). Clearly the land has come to mean more than a means of material support; it is a place to bury their “Fathers bones upon.”

It quickly became apparent that pursuing some of these questions called for research into other sources and documents. What was the political situation in South Carolina that the
petitioners make oblique reference to when they say “the state will make laws”? Who is this General Howard, the emissary of bad news, whom they feel free to address in trustful but reproachful tones (“You only lost your right arm”)? Posing questions that cannot be answered solely from the information supplied by the document itself and requiring students to undertake additional research was an important lesson to students about the task the historian faces. In my class student volunteers were asked to look up specific factual matters before the day of the discussion and to contribute their findings at the appropriate juncture. In some cases they identified people involved (like General Howard) or policies (Sherman’s Field Order No.15) or filled in unfamiliar background (like black military service during the war).

But I realized again in listening to my students’ information that the process of interpretation cannot be reduced to simply a matter of accumulating facts. The facts will not simply speak for themselves. The facts chosen for inclusion, the order of their presentation, the point of view adopted (Howard’s? the Edisto freedmen?)—all make for a profoundly different story. Beginning not with the eviction order but with the freedmen’s memory of slavery and their resultant sense of entitlement makes for a radically different narrative. Moreover, in the unfilled “spaces” between the facts there is room for imaginative reconstruction or inference from the known to the possible; or “to make it up,” as J.J. would say. For example, the freedmen declare that they have property: “Horses, cattle, carriages, & articles of furniture”; such a statement might be a stimulus for more research into the conditions of slavery. But it could also provide an occasion for reflection and imaginative reconstruction. People who legally belonged to others—the lowliest status possible in a free society—also owned property, valued and nurtured kinship ties, and aspired to landownership. What might all this imply about the larger political situation in the South? From this letter alone it is apparent that freedmen were capable of organizing collectively to petition the highest authorities in the land to redress their grievances. They were capable as a community of defining and articulating what is politically right and morally just. Contrary to the opinions of many of their white contemporaries and not a few historians since, such a people were “ready” for freedom. What might that “freedom” have looked like had government policies been different? Had the Bureau’s efforts “to arrange labor contracts” not been its “most important contribution”? Had the sharecroppers, white and black, not been landless and toolless?

**Soule’s Letter**

To the Freed People of Orangeburg District,

You have heard many stories about your condition as freemen. You do not know what to believe: you are talking too much; waiting too much; asking for too much. If you can find out the truth about this matter, you will settle down quietly to your work. Listen, then, and try to understand just how you are situated.
You are now free, but you must know that the only difference you can feel yet, between slavery and freedom, is that neither you nor your children can be bought or sold. You may have a harder time this year than you have ever had before; it will be the price you pay for your freedom. You will have to work hard, and get very little to eat, and very few clothes to wear. If you get through this year alive and well, you should be thankful. Do not expect to save up anything, or to have much corn or provisions ahead at the end of the year. You must not ask for more pay than free people get at the North. There, a field hand is paid in money, but has to spend all his pay every week, in buying food and clothes for his family and in paying rent for his house. You cannot be paid in money,—for there is no good money in the District,—nothing but Confederate paper. Then, what can you be paid with? Why, with food, with clothes, with the free use of your little houses and lots. You do not own a cent’s worth except yourselves. The plantation you live on is not yours, not the houses, nor the cattle, mules and horses; the seed you planted with was not yours, and the ploughs and hoes do not belong to you. Now you must get something to eat and something to wear, and houses to live in. How can you get these things? By hard work—nothing else, and it will be a good thing for you if you get them until next year, for yourselves and for your families. You must remember that your children, your old people, and the cripples, belong to you to support now, and all that is given to them is so much pay to you for your work. If you ask for anything more; if you ask for a half of the crop, or even a third, you ask too much; you wish to get more than you could get if you had been free all your lives… Do not think, because you are free you can chose your own kind of work. Every man must work under orders. The soldiers, who are free, work under officers, the officers under the general, and the general under the president. There must be a head man everywhere, and on a plantation the head man, who gives all the orders, is the owner of the place. Whatever he tells you to do you must do at once, and cheerfully. Never give him a cross word or an impudent answer . . .

There are different kinds of work. One man is a doctor, another is a minister, another a soldier. One black man may be a field hand, one a blacksmith, one a carpenter, and still another a house-servant. Every man has his own place, his own trade that he was brought up to, and he must stick to it. The house-servants must not want to go into the field, nor the field hands into the house. If a man works, no matter in what business, he is doing well. The only shame is to be idle and lazy.

You do not understand why some of the white people who used to own you do not have to work in the field. It is because they are rich. If every man were poor, and worked in his own field, there would be no big farms, and very little cotton or corn raised to sell; there would be no money, and nothing to buy. Some people must be rich, to pay the others, and they have the right to do no work except to look out after their property. It is so everywhere, and perhaps by hard work some of you may by-and-by become rich yourselves.
Remember that all your working time belongs to the man who hires you: therefore you must not leave work without his leave not even to nurse a child, or to go and visit a wife or husband. When you wish to go off the place, get a pass as you used to, and then you will run no danger of being taken up by our soldiers. If you leave work for a day, or if you are sick, you cannot expect to be paid for what you do not do, and the man who hires you must pay less at the end of the year.

Do not think of leaving the plantation where you belong. If you try to go to Charleston, or any other city, you will find no work to do, and nothing to eat. You will starve, or fall sick and die. Stay where you are, in your own homes, even if you are suffering. There is no better place for you anywhere else.

You will want to know what to do when a husband and wife live on different places. Of course they ought to be together, but this year, they have their crops planted in their own places, and they must stay to work them. At the end of the year they can live together. Until then, they must see each other only once in a while.

In every set of men there are some bad men and some fools; who have to be looked after and punished when they go wrong. The Government will punish grown people now, and punish them severely, if they steal, lie idle, or hang around a man’s place when he does not want them there, or if they are impudent. You ought to be civil to one another, and to the man you work for. Watch folks that have always been free, and you will see that the best people are the most civil.

The children have to be punished more than those who are grown up, for they are full of mischief. Fathers and mothers should punish their own children, but if they happen to be off, or if the child is caught stealing or behaving badly about the big house, the owner of the plantation must switch him, just as he should his own children.

Do not grumble if you cannot get as much pay on your place as some one else, for on one place they have more children than on others, on one place the land is poor, on another it is rich; on one place Sherman took everything, on another, perhaps, almost everything was left safe. One man can afford to pay more than another. Do not grumble, either, because the meat is gone or the salt is hard to get. Make the best of everything, and if there is anything you think is wrong, or hard to bear, try to reason it out: if you cannot, ask leave to send one man to town to see an officer. Never stop work on any account, for the whole crop must be raised and got in, or we shall starve. The old men, and the men who mean to do right, must agree to keep order on every plantation. When they see a hand getting lazy or shiftless, they must talk to him, and if talk will do no good, they must take him to the owner of the plantation.
In short, do just about what the good men among you have always done. Remember that even if you are badly off, no one can buy or sell you: remember that if you help yourselves. God will help you, and trust hopefully that next year and the year after will bring some new blessing to you.

The Question of Values: Captain Soule's Letter

Questions such as those above are more likely to develop as the examination moves through several related and contrastive documents rather than in the discussion of a single piece. In the preceding letter, Captain Charles C. Soule, a white Union officer who served with the Freedmen’s Bureau in coastal South Carolina, makes the case against black landownership and for wage labor. Like many other northerners, Soule was more concerned with sustaining the southern economy through the production of cotton and other staples than with the welfare of blacks. Or more accurately, he was convinced that the latter could only be achieved through the former policy in any case. Ex-slaves would be fitted for freedom through the discipline of wage labor. Those who adapted best to that discipline would naturally find opportunities to make their way up the agricultural ladder and become farm owners themselves. Only a few could expect to be that lucky, however; most would have to settle for the lowly but honorable subordination and dependence of working for others all their lives. The letter is a speech to freedmen that Soule had recorded and reported to his superiors.

What is fascinating about students’ responses to the Soule document is that although they found him distasteful, they could not completely dissociate themselves from the notion of economic justice and order that he describes. After all, they are themselves creatures of a wage-labor economy. In that light, the freedmen’s vision of a society of independent farmers and craftsmen is but a fond, nostalgic memory. With subtle prodding I could return them to our earlier discussions of freedom and ask them to reexamine their earlier definitions of freedom. How is their world different from the freedmen’s that they can feel free yet not own farms, shops, or the tools of their trade? Or is it different at all? One student, J.B. (who had earlier defined freedom as simply the right to say “No”), angered everyone by declaring bluntly that Soule was right. “Everyone has to work for someone else or starve. That’s just the way it is!” Most saw a blatant contradiction in a society that extolled the inherent value of labor, yet exempted those with property from that requirement. And Soule’s insistence that the propertyless should support the system because otherwise there would be no one to pay wages brought guffaws. My class was convinced that the freedmen of Edisto seemed perfectly capable of self-support had they been given the means to make a start.

Nonetheless, we left hanging the deeper question raised by J.B.’s rude challenge: If the freedmen were being deprived of real freedom, what about us? In this particular class I hoped to let that question simmer, returning to it in a slightly different context later in the
course. It is, however, one that might stimulate an extended, more engaged discussion than students might be accustomed to in history classes. It is an open-ended question; that is, there is no right or final answer. Indeed some may attack the validity of the question itself. Is it framed so as to presuppose that something is wrong or inadequate about the American ideal of freedom and economic opportunity? But if nothing is wrong, was the treatment of the freedmen unjust? The teacher, like the students, will bring to this discussion perspectives, political views and values, anxieties and predispositions that overdetermine their answers. But as such, these are the kind of questions that expose the “knowledge” we all bring to any act of historical interpretation. The act of interpretation cannot be value neutral or entirely objective. The “discipline” we aspire to is to bring the values and subjective influences out into the open. In other words, we must ask questions of ourselves as well as of the documents.

A Report on Major Delany

Beaufort, S.C., July 24th 1865.

[to Brev. Maj. S.M. Taylor] Major In obedience to your request, I proceeded to St Helena Island, yesterday morning, for the purpose of listening to the public delivery of a lecture by Major Delany 104th U.S. Col. Troops


The meeting was held near “Brick Church,” the congregation numbering from 500 to 600.

As introduction Maj Delaney, made them acquainted with the fact that slavery is absolutely abolished, throwing thunders of damnations and maledictions on all the former Slaveowners and People of the South, and almost condemned their souls to hell.

He says “It was only a War policy of the Government, to declare the slaves of the South free, knowing that the whole power of the South laid in the possession of Slaves.

“But I want you to understand that we would not have become free, had we not armed ourselves and fought out our independence” (this he repeated twice)

He farther says “If I had been a slave, I would have been most troublesome and not to be conquered by any threat or punishment. I would not have worked, and no one would have dared to come near me. I would have struggled for life or death, and would have thrown fire and sword between them. I know you have been good, only too good.
I was told by a friend of mine; that when owned by a man and put to work on the field, he laid quietly down, and just looked out for the overseer to come along, when he pretended to work very hard. But he confessed to me, that he never has done a fair days work for his master. And so he was right, so I would have done the same, and all of you ought to have done the same.

People say that you are too lazy to work, that you have not the intelligence to get on for yourselves without being guided and driven to the work by overseers. I say it is a lie, and a blasphemous lie, and I will prove it to be so.

Your masters who lived in opulence, kept you to hard work, by some most contemptible being—called overseer—who chastised and beat you whenever he pleased—while your master lived in Northern town or in Europe to squander away the wealth only you acquired for him. He never earned a single Dollar In his life. You men and women, every one of you around me, made thousands and thousands of dollars. Only you were the means for your masters to lead the idle and Inglorious life, and to give his children the education, which he denied you, for fear you may awake to conscience: If I look around me, I tell you, all the houses on this Island and in Beaufort, they are all familiar to my eye, they are the same structures which I have met with in Africa. They have all been made by the Negroes, you can see it by their rude exterior. I tell you they (White man) cannot teach you anything, and they could not make them because they have not the brain to do it. (After a pause) At least I mean the Southern people; “Oh the Yankees they are smart.” Now tell me from all you have heard from me, are you not worth anything? Are you those men whom they think, God only created as a curse and for a slave? Whom they do not consider their equals? As I said before the Yankees are smart—there are good ones and bad ones. The good ones, if they are good they are very good, if they are bad, they are very bad. But the worst and most contemptible, and even worse than even your masters were, are those Yankees, who hired themselves as overseers—

Believe not in these School teachers, Emissaries Ministers and agents, because they never tell you the truth, and I particularly warn you against those Cotton Agents, who come honey mouthed unto you, their only Intent being to make profit by your inexperience.

If there is a man comes to you, who will meddle with your affairs, send him to one of your more enlightened brothers, who shall ask him, who he is, what business he seeks with you etc.

Believe none but those Agents who are sent out by the Government, to enlighten and guide you.
Now I will come to the main purpose for which I have come to see you. As before the whole South depended upon you, now the whole country will depend upon you. I give you an advice how to get along. Get up a community and get all the lands you can—if you cannot get any singly. Grow as much vegetables etc. as you want for your families; on the other part of land you cultivate Rice and Cotton . . . Now you understand that I want you to be producers of this country. It is the wish of the Government for you to be so. We will send friends to you, who will further instruct you how to come to the end of our wishes. You see that by so adhering to our views, you will become a wealthy and powerful population.

Now I look around me and I notice a man, bare footed covered with rags and dirt. Now I ask, what is that man doing, for whom is he working. I hear that he works for that and that farmer “for 30 cents a day”. “I tell you that must not be.” “That would be cursed slavery over again.” “I will not have it, the Government will not have it, and the Government shall hear about it, I will tell the Government.

I tell you slavery is over, and shall never return again. We have now 200,000 of our men well drilled in arms and used to War fare, and I tell you it is with you and them that slavery shall not come back again, and if you are determined it will not return again.

Now go to work, and in a short time I will see you again, and other friends will come to show you how to begin.

Have your fields in good order and well tilled and well planted, and when I pass the fields and see a land well planted and well cared for, then I may be sure from the look of it that it belongs to a free negroe, and when I see a field thinly planted and little cared for, then I may think it belongs to some man who works it with slaves. The Government decided that you should have one third of the produce of the crops from your employer, so If he makes $3— ; you will have to get $1— out of it for your labour. The other day some plantation owners in Virginia and Maryland offered $5.— a month for your labour, but it was indignantly rejected by Genl Howard, the Commissioner for the Government.

These are the expressions, as far as I can remember, without having made notice at the time.

The excitement with the congregation was immense, groups were formed talking over, what they heard, and ever and anon cheers were given to some particular sentences of the speech.
I afterwards mingled with several groups, to hear their opinions. Some used violent
language, “saying they would get rid of the Yankee employer.” — “That is the only man
who ever told them the truth.” “That now those men have to work themselves or starve or
leave the country, we will not work for them anymore.”

Some Whites were present, and listened with horror depicted in their faces, to the whole
performance. Some said “What shall become of us now? and if such a speech should again
be given to those men, there will be open rebellion . . .

My opinion of the whole affair is, that Major Delany is a thorough hater of the White
race, and tries the colored people unnecessarily. He even tries to injure the magnanimous
conduct of the Government towards them, either intentionally or through want of
knowledge. He tells them to remember, “that they would not have become free, had they
not armed themselves and fought for their independence. This is a falsehood and a
misrepresentation.—Our President Abraham Lincoln declared the Colored race free,
before there was even an idea of arming colored men. This ids [sic] decidedly calculated
to create bad feelings against the Government.

By giving some historical facts and telling them that neither Indians nor whites could
stand the work in the country, he wants to impress the colored man with the idea, that he
is in fact superior not only in a physical view but als[o] in intelligence. He says “believe
none of the ministers, Schoolteachers, Emissaries, because they never tell you the truth.”
It is only to bring distrust against all, and gives them to understand, that they shall believe
men of their own race. He openly acts and speaks contrary to the policy of this
Government, advising them not to work for any man, but for themselves.

The intention of our Government is, that all the men shall be employed by their former
masters as far as possible, and contracts made between them, superintended by some
officer empowered by the Government.

He says it would be the old slavery over again. If a man should work for an employer, and
that it must not be. Does he not give a hint of what they shall do, by his utterings “that if
he had been a slave etc?; or by giving the narrative of the slave who did not work for his
master?—further as he says: that a field should show by its appearance by whom and for
whom it is worked?

The mention of having two hundred thousand men well drilled in arms:—does he not
hint to them what to do?—if they should be compelled to work for employers?
In my opinion by this discourse he was trying to encourage them, to break the peace of society and force their way by insurrection to a position he is ambitious they should attain to. I am, Major,
Very Respectfully Your obedt servant

Edward M. Stoeber

Interrogating the Evidence: A Report on Major Delany

Another kind of discipline we seek to develop as historians is learning how to ask the right questions of our documents. Not only what do they tell us but also can we trust what they tell us? J.J.’s question.

One of Captain Soule’s fellow Bureau agents, Edward M. Stoeber, filed the report above on the activities of another officer, Major Martin R. Delany. Of northern free African American parentage, Delany had already had a rich and distinguished career before working as a Bureau agent in South Carolina. He had edited a newspaper with Frederick Douglass, attended Harvard to work on a degree in medicine, written several books and pamphlets advocating black nationalism, worked in the abolitionist movement, and traveled widely in Africa and Europe. More recently he had recruited, organized, and commanded black soldiers for the Union Army, eventually becoming one of only two African Americans to attain the field grade rank of major. Ten years later Delany would be an unsuccessful candidate for lieutenant governor of South Carolina.

My students immediately hit upon the key question one must ask about this document: How much can it be trusted as an accurate record of the events at Brick Church? How much as a characterization of Martin Delany’s views or intent? Professional historians bring to their interpretation of documents varying degrees of background knowledge about its larger context and the people who produce it or who are implicated in it. Thus my students’ relative ignorance about Reconstruction, federal policy toward freedmen, African American contributions to the Union’s victory in the Civil War, or Martin Delany’s activities before and after 1865 differs in degree from the professional’s—but not in kind. These are all questions that can stimulate additional research. Learning to recognize and pose them is part of the process of learning about history. It is about questions as well as answers.

But a close reading of the text can produce answers and insights quite apart from the questions it raises. Something of the character of Stoeber, of Delany, and of the freed people emerges, despite our wariness of the accuracy of this report. The tension between Delany’s policy views and Stoeber’s is transparent: They advocate very different futures for the freedmen. Stoeber’s pseudo-verbatim recounting (he admits that he did not take notes at the meeting) in the body of the report contrasts sharply with his characterization at the end. Reading the words attributed to Delany, my students did not conclude that he...
was fomenting insurrection or counseling the freedmen not to work or even that they not work for whites. Indeed, he urged them to work diligently and aspire to buy farms of their own. It was his insistence that they not work for “slave-like” wages that upset Stoeber and the white employers in attendance. From this single document, then, the larger outline of the contemporaneous conflict, between the aspirations of freedmen, planters, and the federal government, emerges. When considered along with the earlier documents, a broader discussion is possible not only about the constraints on black freedom following slavery but also about competing notions regarding the meaning and substance of freedom still relevant to our own lives. Through interrogating such documents, then, one achieves the difficult balance of making history immediate, of understanding it in the terms of its historical personalities and times, at the same time making it relevant to and alive in our own time.

But the use of documents need not be confined to classroom discussions like those described here. Throughout History 413 I tried to unfold for my students the process of thinking historically with the hope that they would eventually take that process on. For me, midterms and finals were not tests in the traditional sense. Rather, they were occasions for students to perform as historians. I was much less interested in recognition knowledge than in what they could do as historians. On their take-home midterm examination, for example, I gave my students three labor contracts from different periods and asked them to act as curators preparing an annotation of the documents to accompany a display in a museum. Students were evaluated on how much information they could extract from the documents and on their skill in elaborating the historical context concisely and accurately. On their in-class final, I gave students much shorter excerpts from a variety of documents and asked them to draw on their knowledge of the relevant history and a close reading of the text to reconstruct the larger narrative of which the document was part.

The ultimate goal, however, was not to make every member of History 413 a historian, but to inculcate perspectives and develop skills that would make them better consumers of the histories written by others. The histories they read, after all, went through a similar process of analysis and interpretation of documents much like those they had examined. From their own experience working with such documents, it is hoped, they will be prepared to be active rather than passive readers of historical narratives, thinking about what is not in the historians’ texts and how what is there got there. In the end, perhaps they will be not only better students of history, but better, more critical thinkers and citizens.
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This extremely inexpensive collection of Abraham Lincoln’s speeches will give students access to many of his most important speeches and thus help them to examine many of the most crucial issues of the mid-nineteenth century.

The collection contains many of Lincoln’s classic speeches, including the 1858 “A House Divided” speech, part of his Senate campaign against Stephen Douglas, his first inaugural address, the Emancipation Proclamation, the Gettysburg Address, and his second inaugural address. Other addresses are included for certain light that they shed on Lincoln’s life and career: a January 1838 address before the Springfield, Illinois, Young Men’s Lyceum, according to the publisher, was “his first major literary effort and an expression of his basic political philosophy,” while an 1848 speech before the House of Representatives represented “a matchless example of his sarcasm and folk humor.”

Any one of Lincoln’s speeches could easily fill a lesson on a number of different topics. One area that he addresses in both of his inaugural addresses, and is crucial for students to understand in the context of the Civil War and Reconstruction, is his view of the relationship between the Southern states and the federal government. His first inaugural address, delivered in March 1861, provides a clear and common-sense explication of his view of the Constitution, which he views as perpetual. Such a state was “implied, if not expressed,” in the fundamental law of all governments, since it would be “safe to assert that no government proper ever had a provision in its organic law for its own termination.” For those who argued the compact theory of the Constitution—that it was simply a contract between sovereign states that could withdraw whenever they wanted—Lincoln replies that while one party might break a contract, all must agree to rescind it.

This view of the perpetual nature of the Constitution is crucial to understanding Lincoln’s plan for quick reconciliation between North and South at the end of the Civil War, since the Southern states had never in fact left the Union. While his second inaugural address briefly and eloquently calls for a binding of the nation’s wounds and a call to act “with malice toward none; with charity for all,” Lincoln offers a more detailed discussion of the relationship between the North and South in his last public address, delivered at the White House two days after the surrender of Lee’s army at the Appomattox Court House.
While concluding that the Southern states “are out of their proper relationship with the Union,” Lincoln argues that it would not be worthwhile to debate whether they had in fact ever left: “Finding themselves safely at home, it would be utterly immaterial whether they had ever been abroad.” Such an approach was characteristic of Lincoln’s pragmatism and ability to focus on the most important elements of a problem without getting bogged down in details.

Each speech contains a brief section of commentary by historian John Grafton that allows students to understand the context of each of Lincoln’s key addresses.
America Through the Eyes of Its People
James Kirby Martin, ed.
Allyn and Bacon/Longman, 1997
$34.40
Reviewed by Jason George

The second edition of this primary source reader from Longman publishers, issued in 1997, provides a serviceable collection of American history documents for use in high school and college classrooms.

While the reader follows many of the standard subject headings, there are several welcome additions that one does not necessarily find in the majority of primary source readers on American history. The fourth section, entitled “Uniquely American,” combines two excerpts from addresses by Jonathan Edwards with sections of Benjamin Franklin’s autobiography and Michel Guillaume Jean de Crevecoeur’s influential Letters from an American Farmer in an attempt to determine the unique elements of the American character. The diversity of the documents included in this section is indicative of its efforts to eschew a strictly chronological approach in favor of a more thematic framework—an approach that becomes increasingly necessary as United States history teachers are forced to find ways to cover greater amounts of material.

The shortcoming of this attempt at breadth is that the reader sometimes sacrifices the ability to play historical figures or issues off of one another by including competing viewpoints side-by-side. Chapter 22, for example, deals with America during World War I. This chapter contains several excellent documents, including a selection from a pamphlet by the Boy Scouts of America that encourages members of the organization to support the war effort. The patriotic call to American youth will likely resonate with teenagers who read the document. A letter by Secretary of War Newton Baker, about the near-lynching of a non-English-speaking Pole who tore up a Liberty Bond circular because he was infuriated by the picture of Kaiser Wilhelm that appeared on the document, offers a chilling reminder of the dangers of wartime patriotism.

Despite these strengths, the section on World War I fails to include any documents that deal with the reasons for American entry into the war. President Woodrow Wilson’s Fourteen Points address is included, but no response, such as Senator Henry Cabot Lodge’s reservations, is provided to balance out Wilson’s perspective. While it is impossible for a reader to cover all aspects of American history in equal detail, the use of historical counterpoints to allow students to debate issues and understand the complexities of historical events is an invaluable tool that could be used to greater effect in this collection.
The collection would perhaps be improved with a revamped layout. The typeface is small and closely spaced together, and there are no illustrations, maps, charts, or graphs to break up the text. Visual sources, such as political cartoons, lithographs, or paintings, are an invaluable way to gain a greater understanding of the past, and this collection would profit greatly by including some of these types of sources.

The reader is also badly in need of a new edition. The final section concludes with a 1991 address by then-president George Bush on the crisis in the Persian Gulf. The Clinton administration, the 2000 election, the terrorist attacks of September 11 and their aftermath, and the continuing crisis with Iraq are just a few of the topics that will need to be covered in a future edition.
First published in 1965, *The American Primer* remains a useful reference source for many of the primary documents on American politics and culture. What sets this document collection apart from others is the extensive commentary by distinguished historians that is included with each selection.

While most of the documents can be found in a number of other sources, the commentaries represent the leading historians of an earlier generation coming to terms with what they considered to be the fundamental texts of American history and identity. Teachers can find background information to stimulate classroom discussion, and students should find the book helpful in learning to answer document-based questions.

Many of the 83 documents in this collection are fairly standard, but a few represent the idiosyncratic interests of the editor, Daniel Boorstin. From the 1620 “Mayflower Compact” to Lyndon Johnson’s 1965 “Address on Voting Rights,” the book includes the usual political documents: the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, Washington’s farewell address, and presidential speeches from Jackson, Lincoln, Wilson, Roosevelt, and Kennedy. Reform movements, at least in the nineteenth century, are also well represented, with William Lloyd Garrison, the Seneca Falls “Declaration of Sentiments,” the Knights of Labor, and the Populist Party all included.

Much of the charm of the book comes from Boorstin’s inclusion of selections from American intellectual and cultural history—selections that are not as frequently included in document collections: Julia Ward Howe’s “Battle Hymn of the Republic,” Emma Lazarus on the Statue of Liberty, Thomas Edison on the research laboratory, Louis Sullivan’s aesthetic considerations of the skyscraper, and Sinclair Lewis’s “The American Fear of Literature.”

The most important value of this compilation for the history teacher might well be in its commentaries from distinguished historians. Each commentary explains the circumstances of the origins of the document, including a word about the author and a description of how the document was received by its original audience.

What I most like about the commentaries is what Boorstin calls the “afterlife” essay, which explains the changing interpretations of the document over time and suggests
possibilities for contemporary meaning. This removes a document from its static (and often irrelevant) position for students and allows them to decide for themselves what a given document might mean. For instance, the “Mayflower Compact” is often presented as a proto-constitutional document, but commentary makes clear that the Mayflower agreement was out of print and not well known by the writers of the Constitution. Even the word “compact” was not applied to it until the nineteenth century, after Locke and Rousseau had made this concept common. Similarly, John Winthrop’s famous (or notorious) “City on a Hill” sermon, which I have a hard time getting students to read, let alone appreciate, takes a different shade of meaning in a commentary that argues that the Christian community that Winthrop called for is the basis for contemporary reform movements.

Now almost 40 years old, *The American Primer* is clearly limited in some important ways. There is no recent material, and more importantly, the selection does not include racial and ethnic diversity. This is a glaring omission in a selection that claims to represent American identity.
This popular anthology of famous documents from American history makes a useful supplementary reader for students as well as a valuable resource for teachers. Editor Diane Ravitch has compiled as close to a traditional canon of primary documents as one can find in this age of diverse perspectives and competing interpretations. Many of the important documents for political history are here, but also included are a variety of songs and poems that convey a sense of the cultural life of different eras. Broadly inclusive of ethnic diversity and political opinion, Ravitch’s selection is a celebration of mainstream American pluralism.

Documents are divided into chronological sections from the colonial period through the 1960s. The first edition included selections from the recent past, but for the second edition Ravitch eliminated this material on the grounds that, in her judgment, nothing in recent years had yet proven that it has the enduring significance of the earlier documents. Each selection is introduced with a brief explanation of the author and the historical setting. Most of the documents are short, ranging from a paragraph to several pages. This, along with the fact that many of the selections were originally meant to be read to an audience, makes this a great collection for reading aloud in the classroom.

The selections in the reader are drawn from many of the members of the literary and political elite who would usually be covered in an AP U.S. History course. Speeches from presidents Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, both Roosevelts, Eisenhower, and Kennedy are mixed with social reformers and political dissenters such as Thomas Paine, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, John Brown, Eugene Debs, Woody Guthrie, and Betty Friedan. Ravitch has also selected some well-chosen popular literature, including both poetry and prose, for inclusion. While the voices are diverse, they are generally from the elite and will be familiar to history teachers. One will not find here the words of the anonymous masses or the documentary basis for social history. This is, however, an excellent source for political and cultural history that will engage students and provide important practice for interpreting primary documents.
A little gem of a text, *Classic American Autobiographies* offers five narratives that fit the title’s description in a compact, inexpensive edition. Any or all of these narratives can make excellent supplemental readings that will engage students, provide practice in interpreting primary documents, and add personality and depth to the standard historical material. Although there are no discussion questions or pedagogical apparatus, the introduction provides context and focus for the narratives:

- *A True History of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson* (1682)
- *The Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin* (1771–89)
- *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass* (1875)
- Mark Twain’s *Old Times on the Mississippi* (1876)
- Four Autobiographical Narratives of Zitkala-Sa (1900–1902)

Each of these five narratives can be used separately, and the first three are used frequently enough to merit a separate entry in the Teachers’ Resource Catalog. Rowlandson’s account of her capture by the Narrangansett Indians during King Phillip’s War (1676) provides compelling insight into colonial Puritan thinking about race, religion, and gender. Students are sometimes put off by her proud and intolerant manner, but they can be challenged to read critically in order to find the nuances of meaning as this minister’s wife transforms her private torment into a public statement.

Franklin, editor William Andrews suggests in his introduction, is “the archetypal American apostle of success” whose autobiography demonstrates that “the greatest of Americans is the self-inventor—and the self reinventor.” His longer autobiography can easily be excerpted, and students are alternately amused, appalled, and inspired by his self-education and attempts at moral perfection. If Franklin is the quintessential figure for the eighteenth-century Enlightenment in America, Douglass is the perfect entry into the worlds of nineteenth-century slavery and abolitionist reform. Most students respond positively to Douglass, but this presents another opportunity for critical interpretation of a document in order to see how he carefully constructs his narrative so as to refute the arguments of slavery advocates.
Twain’s account of his loner life as a riverboat pilot may be the least useful to the history teacher of all of these narratives, although it does present the practical education of the most rugged of individualists during the Gilded Age and is an instructive portrait of the artist in the making. Andrews links the most famous of these texts, Douglass’s narrative, with the least known, that of Zitkala-Sa, a Native American writer, through “a sense of spiritual obligation to chart the self’s quest for fulfillment in accordance with its God-given mission—to resist white America’s denial of colored America’s identity.” Her turn-of-the-century autobiographical stories, first published in the Atlantic Monthly, help to explain the appeal of both traditional and white societies for Plains Indians as well as the barriers to integration into the dominant society. These stories are deceptively easy to read and make a useful supplement for any discussion of Indian boarding schools and assimilation practices, race relations at the turn of the century, and the pluralist and/or multicultural meanings of American history.
Terry D. Bilhartz, Elliot J. Gorn, Randy Roberts, eds.
Allyn and Bacon/Longman, 2001
$45.00
Reviewed by Tim Lehman

[Note: This edition has been replaced by a new edition, ISBNs 0-321-21642-3 for volume 1 (price $49.60) and 0-321-21641-5 for volume 2 (price also $49.60).]

This original anthology of primary documents is intended to convey to students the excitement of doing hands-on history. Designed to encourage critical thinking and student discovery, each chapter brings together a cluster of documents related to a particular historical issue. The topics range widely over social and political history, with the fourth edition aiming to be more representative of diverse class, gender, and ethnic voices in American history.

The topics are thoughtfully chosen so that the text will make an ideal supplement for any AP U.S. History course. From Columbus, Las Casas, and the Spanish conquest to the election of 2000, the topics will engage student interest and spark discussion. Some of the topics are familiar, such as Jamestown, the Puritans, the Scopes trial, or the civil rights movement. Many are more original and will make a fresh addition to the standard coverage of most texts. These include chapters on Denmark Vesey’s conspiracy, the 1862 New York draft riots, the origins of the Ku Klux Klan, the 1890 Wounded Knee incident, and the spread of HIV-AIDS. In some cases, familiar topics take on an uncomfortable feel as traditional documents are juxtaposed with revealing but little-read documents. An example of this is the chapter that includes Jefferson’s Declaration of Independence, followed by his argument for the natural inferiority of African Americans from his Notes on the State of Virginia.

Most of the documents are written, but the text includes some important visual images as well. These include World War I recruiting posters, Farm Security Administration photographs from the Depression, and the most original of all, the Marvel Comics Iron Man in Vietnam. Not only does this offer insight into popular culture’s views of Vietnam, it offers an opportunity to stimulate critical thinking about how pictures and images can reflect and shape our understanding of our world.

Each chapter contains roughly five pages of historical context that sets the background and explains what is at issue with the accompanying documents. Often this includes
contemporary references, such as explaining the varieties of celebration and protest that accompanied the 500th anniversary of Columbus’s voyages. A paragraph introduces the documents, usually about 5–10 per chapter. Each chapter ends with a brief postscript, questions to probe and interpret the sources, and suggestions for further reading. The introductory context for each chapter is a model of lucid and informative prose that invites further reading, and the documents are, for the most part, intriguing and even provocative.

The weakest part of the text is the question section at the end of each chapter, which invites student into the historical debate (“Would you have supported the patriots or the Loyalists?” “Was rebellion against slavery justified?”), but often at the expense of historical complexity. The questions may spark discussion, but they are not likely to lead students to critical analysis that would increase their understanding of the complexity of the past.
This updated edition of a popular collection of primary documents is a welcome addition to any AP U.S. History classroom. Whether used as a reference work or supplemental reading, this is a useful compilation of 75 important letters, speeches, court cases, and laws from American political history.

The documents in this collection emphasize political history, beginning with Tom Paine’s *Common Sense* and concluding with Rudolph Giuliani’s and George W. Bush’s responses to September 11, 2001. The most important documents in this tradition are included: the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Emancipation Proclamation, the Gettysburg Address, William Jennings Bryan’s “Cross of Gold” speech, Woodrow Wilson’s 14 Points, Franklin Roosevelt’s Four Freedoms, and Martin Luther King, Jr.’s “I Have a Dream” speech. The collection shows a clear preference for official documents, including many court cases (Dred Scott, *Brown v. Board of Education*, and *Roe v. Wade*), presidential addresses, and public speeches. A refreshing private moment is a sampling of the correspondence between Thomas Jefferson and John Adams, in which they discuss the concept of the “natural aristocracy.”

While this is a useful source for political history, it is limited in some ways. Heffner includes almost no social or cultural history, which makes the book incomplete for most general history classes. The authors in this collection are from the political elite, most of them male and white. The collection omits many aspects of American culture and everyday life, as well as the nation’s social diversity. Those looking for a more inclusive history or a better understanding of popular culture will have to look elsewhere. Also, there is no material from the colonial era, leaving a gap for understanding the origins of American politics.

Heffner divides the documents into 31 chapters and includes a helpful introduction for each chapter. The introductions provide a historical context for each document, but, for better or worse, do not offer much guidance for interpreting the document itself. For instance, Heffner describes the political events leading to the colonies’ decision for independence, but he does not discuss how the Continental Congress changed Jefferson’s original wording of the Declaration of Independence. Nor does Heffner guide the reader with details of the circumstances under which a document was prepared, the different possible interpretations of a text, or connections among the various documents. This is in keeping with Heffner’s belief, stated in the introduction, that the documents are the “raw materials” of history and all else is “opinion.”
This entertaining collection of primary source documents provides a sometimes offbeat view of American history as told by both distinguished figures and “ordinary” Americans. While it does not provide a particularly strong analytical or thematic focus, the collection does contain documents that will engage and entertain students.

The collection includes a number of reliable standards, such as Las Casas and Christopher Columbus on the European discovery of the Western Hemisphere, John Smith’s account of his “rescue” by Pocahontas, Frederick Douglass on slavery, and Mary Boykin Chesnut’s diary on the attack on Fort Sumter. On the whole, however, editor Colbert has sought to include fresh documents that are not widely used in other collections.

For example, a number of lesser-known accounts enliven the section on colonial history. Thomas Morton, an English attorney who came to Massachusetts in the 1620s and later became the subject of stories by Nathaniel Hawthorne and others, discusses the construction of a maypole and subsequent festivities at the site of present-day Quincy, Massachusetts. Needless to say, the Pilgrim leaders of the Plymouth Colony looked with disfavor on such an enterprise.

Students will likely find surprising and illuminating a 1680 account of Harvard College by two Dutch visitors. An editorial note explains that Harvard was in a “slump” at the time due to the disruptions caused by King Philip’s War. Expecting to find “something curious” at the only existing college in the American colonies, the two men instead found a dissolute group of 8 to 10 young men crowded in a room filled with tobacco smoke and living in quarters that resembled a tavern.

In fewer than 600 pages, the collection manages to reach from the first European contacts with the New World through the early 1990s. Some of the more compelling recent documents include Ryan White’s account of his life with AIDS, the Challenger explosion, and the riots that swept Los Angeles in the wake of the trial of the police officers accused of beating motorist Rodney King.

The episodic nature of this collection makes it an unlikely candidate for adoption as a classroom resource. However, teachers may appreciate the documents for their own class preparations and could certainly share some of the excerpts profitably with their students.
Some readers may justifiably complain about the fact that the collection tends to predominately contain accounts from white males. While sources from women, African Americans, and other minority groups are included, it would seem that such voices could be heard to a greater degree. To provide an example of this trend, there are only two documents presenting Native American perspectives, while a number of other accounts present either Native Americans or westward expansion through the eyes of white Europeans.

In fairness, Colbert is seeking to present a large number of perspectives to a popular audience and to cover a great deal of ground in a relatively small amount of space. Nonetheless, the collection would be enriched if it drew on a wider variety of voices from different backgrounds.
This collection of political cartoons provides a visually appealing resource, although teachers using it will have to dig further to obtain important information about many of the images. In addition, while many of the cartoons are useful and all will be helpful in promoting class discussion, there are some curious omissions.

First created in 1975, “50 Political Cartoons for Teaching U.S. History” is in its 11th printing. Each cartoon is printed on a sturdy sheet of 8.5 by 11 stock paper, large enough to either place on a transparency or photocopy for individual student examination. The reverse side of each cartoon sheet contains background about the cartoon, suggestions for classroom use, and questions for discussion. The background sections help to provide a sense of historical context for each cartoon, although more attention could be given to explaining many of the images used in each cartoon. In addition, no date or publication information is given for many of the cartoons.

An example of the above shortcomings appears in the cartoon “Practical Illustration of the Fugitive Slave Law.” Here, Daniel Webster is being ridden by a Southern slaveholder while holding a copy of the Constitution. This is a reference to Webster’s arguments for attempting to preserve the Union during the Senate debates that produced the Compromise of 1850, something that more advanced students should understand. The author simply notes that Webster “felt the wrath of the cartoonist,” with no explanation why. William Lloyd Garrison is portrayed pointing a gun at the Southerner and protecting an escaped slave, although there is no discussion of who Garrison is. The fact that there are no dates makes it difficult to analyze the cartoons as effectively as possible. It makes a great deal of difference, for example, whether the cartoon was drawn immediately after the passage of the Fugitive Slave Law, or in 1852, following the publication of Harriet Beecher Stowe’s Uncle Tom’s Cabin, when the gulf between the two sides became even wider.

In fairness to the author, it would be extremely difficult to find a selection of 50 cartoons that would cover all aspects of U.S. history. However, the selections here seem to include some areas that are not crucial for students to understand and omit other extremely important areas. While there were relatively few political cartoons in the late eighteenth
century, the collection skips from Benjamin Franklin’s 1754 “Unite or Die” cartoon to Elkanah Tisdale’s 1812 “Gerrymander.” The latter is rather questionably described as “one of the earliest of political cartoons.” Left out are cartoons from the colonial resistance to British taxation prior to the Revolution, many of which are rich with important political symbols; the debate over the Constitution (the 1788 cartoon showing the states that had ratified the Constitution as pillars upholding the “federal edifice,” for example, would be an excellent resource); and the Federalist-Republican debates of the 1790s (a 1793 cartoon entitled “A Peep into the AntiFederal Club” can easily sustain a full class discussion). At the same time, there are five cartoons, or 10 percent of the collection, dealing with the Jacksonian period and its aftermath.
An excellent classroom resource, Letters of a Nation reflects over 350 years of American history through letters written by and to the famous (e.g., Abraham Lincoln, Albert Einstein, W. E. B. DuBois) as well as the more obscure. Many of these letters have not been published or are not otherwise readily available, so this collection offers a unique window into the personal views of many historical figures.

These letters are arranged topically (e.g., “Slavery and the Civil War,” “Love and Friendship,” “Humor and Personal Contempt”) and chronologically within each topic. The table of contents lists each letter by author and topic, making it easy to find a letter on nearly any theme or era in U.S. history. Although there are no discussion questions or teaching apparatus, each letter includes a brief introduction that sets a context. Some of the most useful letters for the history teacher are those between public figures concerning their views on controversial topics. These include Robert E. Lee’s letter to his wife explaining his opposition to both slavery and abolitionism, Benjamin Banneker’s exchange with Thomas Jefferson on the equality of blacks, Malcolm X’s letter from Mecca explaining his newfound hope for the harmony of white and black Muslims, and Ronald Reagan’s personal letter to Leonid Brezhnev expressing his hope for peace.

Many of the letters provide a more intimate glimpse of public figures, such as Frederick Douglass writing to Harriet Tubman: “I have had the applause of the crown and satisfaction that comes of being approved by the multitude, while the most that you have done has been witnessed by a few trembling, scarred, and foot-sore bondmen and women” (102). Another such glimpse comes with Rachel Carson, knowing she was about to succumb to cancer, writing a farewell to a friend.

Editor Andrew Carroll explains that these letters “explore not only the vast terrain of America’s history but the equally boundless, albeit internal expanse of the human soul.” Thus, John Winthrop writes in 1630 to his wife, still in England, about his hopes in the New World. Writer and environmentalist Wallace Stegner writes in 1960 to an official in the Wildland Research Center to argue for “the wilderness idea . . . an intangible and spiritual resource” (39). In one of the most famous and eloquent letters, Martin Luther King, Jr., writes to his “fellow clergymen” from his Birmingham jail cell to articulate his philosophy of creative nonviolence.
Perhaps most useful in the classroom are the exchanges: letters both written and answered (e.g., Abigail and John Adams, Benjamin Banneker and Thomas Jefferson). These letters (brief, as are most of the documents in this collection) provide a microcosm for analysis of an author’s biases, motives, and assumptions that can be applied to longer, more complex documents. The concept of multiple audiences is particularly fascinating, especially when famous people write personal letters with the knowledge that they will likely become public documents.

Marian Wright Edelman, founder of the Children’s Defense Fund, writes the foreword, in which she refers to the letter about the “lessons of life” that she wrote to her own children (published as *The Measure of Our Success*), and extols the virtues of letters—from the points of view of the writer, recipient, and those for whom letters become a legacy of family or national history. This foreword is itself a thought-provoking essay, one that irresistibly opens discussion of the losses and gains of email as the “letters” of the twenty-first century.
This collection of “muckraking” pieces from the turn of the twentieth century illustrates the forces that turned the American public from the excesses of the Gilded Age to the social consciousness that characterized the Progressive Era.

*The Muckrakers* collects the finest writings and most compelling pieces that influenced government policy from the 1890s until the First World War. It’s been a century since the golden age of muckraking, but as the pieces in *The Muckrakers* show, the writing remains vibrant and disarmingly relevant today. Editors Arthur and Lila Weinberg note that muckraking journalism responded to the problems of industrialism and urbanization of the late nineteenth century. The creation of pockets of wealth, together with widespread deprivation, led Mark Twain to label the period the “Gilded Age.” By the 1890s, a new journalism addressing the social problems of the era had emerged, aimed at the rising middle class. Magazines—notably *McClure’s*, *Everybody’s*, and *Collier’s*—began publishing pieces aimed at revealing social ills, political corruption, and illegal business practices.

The over two dozen selections in this volume include excerpts from Ida Tarbell’s expose of Standard Oil, Ray Stannard Baker writing on unions, Upton Sinclair addressing Chicago meatpackers, and Lincoln Steffens revealing political corruption. Other ills, from patent medicine fraud to racial tensions, prison system abuse, railroad corporation shenanigans, and stock market manipulations are all mentioned. My favorite piece is Charles Russell’s revelation that New York City’s Trinity Church, awash in money, owned many of the tenement properties where the worst housing abuses went unaddressed. Made up as it is of a range of pieces, *The Muckrakers* contains a number of articles suitable for discussions of Gilded Age excess and Progressive Era reforms.
Red Scared!: The Commie Menace in Propaganda and Popular Culture
Michael Barson and Steven Heller, eds.
Chronicle Books, 2000
ISBN 0811828875
$22.95
Reviewed by Jeff House

While the U.S. government was engaged in a technological war with the Soviet Union in the years after World War II, the American media provided the fodder for a psychological war. That is the premise of Red Scared!, a colorful collection of film posters and stills, pamphlets, posters, magazine and newspaper references, and novel summaries.

Michael Barson and Steven Heller have compiled a chronological assortment of popular media that can stimulate class discussions on how the Cold War operated. Students will be surprised at how Hollywood cooperated in the propaganda war, creating dozens of films that were high on drama and low on realism, with such titles as The Red Menace, I Married a Communist, Invasion U.S.A., Red Planet Mars, The Iron Petticoat, and The Girl in the Kremlin.

Red Scared! also tracks the coverage of communism in American magazines, from World War II pieces that saw Joseph Stalin as a friend (“The Story of Unbeatable Stalingrad,” “A Guy Named Joe,” and “Meet Mr. and Mrs. Russia at Home”) to the vilification of Stalin’s minions (“I Don’t Want My Children to Grow Up in Soviet Russia,” “How to Spot a Communist,” “We Can Lose the Next War in Seven Days,” and “Negative Neanderthal”).

The book is amusing as well as informative, but its value lies in its illustration of how media can serve government. Its colorful examples can be easily reproduced on overhead transparencies, and its many summaries can aid student projects that are in need of supplementary materials. The book’s bibliography is also helpful to students who are seeking additional resources, and its unusual collection of materials (comic books, for instance, played a vital role during the 1950s and 1960s) can spur online searches for further examples.
This collection of primary and secondary sources offers a solid, well-organized grouping of materials that can help students prepare for the AP U.S. History Exam. Some of the materials, particularly the document-based questions, are a bit on the basic side, but teachers can supplement them with more analytical assignments.

The book consists of a total of 122 documents, which are divided into nine units. Each document includes a series of review questions. A document-based question is included at the end of each unit, with both questions and more detailed directions to help students formulate their essays.

Especially given the volume’s conciseness, overall this collection includes a fairly good cross section of documents from the realms of social, political, and diplomatic history. One of the stronger features of the book is its inclusion of a number of visual documents (including cartoons and paintings), a feature that many documentary collections omit.

The breadth of the collection—which manages to cover all of U.S. history in a mere 325 pages of text (when many such readers publish two longer volumes)—obviously necessitates some selectivity in document choice. The sixth unit, for example, covers developments from 1919 to 1939 in just nine document sections. A 1920 speech by Warren G. Harding, two poems from the Harlem Renaissance, several posters and pieces from the Prohibition era, a statement by Bartolomeo Vanzetti, and Herbert Hoover’s 1928 speech on “rugged individualism” cover the 1920s. All are important, but key issues such as the Scopes trial and the emergence of technological changes—for example, the radio and the proliferation of the automobile—are left out.

The document-based question after this section demonstrates the relatively basic analytical focus of the book’s exercises. Students are asked to address the following: “The period of time between the First and Second World Wars (1919–1939) was one of conflict and national crises.” Students are then prompted to describe one conflict and one crisis during the period and explain the extent to which each was resolved. AP students should be able to offer a much deeper level of analysis. Teachers could ask students to trace or explain the root causes of the conflicts and crises of the period, or to assess how effectively the government responded to such crises, rather than simply describing them.
Particularly topical is the concluding section on American foreign policy, which manages to include both historical and more contemporary documents. For example, a 1972 statement by Richard Nixon on the ABM treaty is juxtaposed with a 2002 statement by George W. Bush to demonstrate changes in U.S.-Russian relations over the past 30 years. President Bush’s September 2001 speech on terrorism is also included (although the reader looks forward to an updated edition of this volume that covers the second Persian Gulf War as a complement to statements made by the former President Bush about the 1991 conflict in Iraq). In addition, the section on foreign policy should be commended for including environmental concerns as an element of foreign policy.
This anthology is subtitled “the definitive collection of American fiction and nonfiction on the war,” and it is. Besides offering some very fine literature and journalism of the period, it is a pleasure to use. The editor, who also teaches the American literature of the period, has organized a huge amount of material in ways that will make setting assignments a breeze. His thoughtful selections and provocative organization create wonderful opportunities for students to sharpen their analytical skills by comparing very different views of the war.

For example, 20 pages from Ron Kovic’s *Born on the Fourth of July* is back-to-back with a 20-page excerpt from *Fields of Fire* by James Webb: two entirely opposite views of U.S. involvement. The opening section, “Green,” is designed to introduce readers to portrayals of the American soldier over time. For this section, the editor has selected Robin Moore’s *The Green Berets* (in which the soldiers are exemplary and the government line is reflected) alongside sections from Tim O’Brien’s *If I Die in a Combat Zone* and *Going After Cacciato*. The editor’s preface to this section—all his introductory material provides excellent guidance—points out that Moore and O’Brien “appear to be covering completely different wars” (13).

Thirteen sections of fiction, journalism, memoir, oral history, film analysis, and song lyrics represent the “best and best-known works about the war.” The book is organized in two ways. The first “traces the tour of duty from induction all the way through returning stateside.” A second principle of organization gathers material similar in theme or genre, “thereby illustrating how trends in representing Vietnam echoed the changes in American popular culture and political culture” (2).

A map, a chronology of the war, a glossary, filmography, and bibliography, plus a fine set of reading questions on each of the sections, complete this indispensable reference work and anthology.
Although it is targeted to students at a somewhat basic level, this reference source on the Vietnam War provides a number of useful resources for use in the classroom. The book’s simple layout and clear organization make it easy to use and should facilitate student comfort with the collection, while offering relatively in-depth treatment of a key aspect of recent American history.

The work is organized into a series of 13 primary sources. Unlike many collections that seek to present as many sources as possible, this work sacrifices some degree of breadth for depth. Many of the document excerpts are four to five pages long, along with several pages of background information.

The collection does a good job balancing out various aspects of the war. The accounts of the situation in Vietnam are standards, including excerpts from Walter Cronkite’s influential editorial following the Tet Offensive in January 1968, Philip Caputo’s *A Rumor of War*, and James Stockdale’s account of his captivity in North Vietnam. While there is little that is particularly new here, it is helpful to have these sources included together in an easily accessible format.

The section on the war at home includes excerpts from Martin Luther King, Robert F. Kennedy, Tim O’Brien, Richard Nixon, and Bill Rubinstein. The issues of King’s opposition to the war and the disproportionate casualty rates among African Americans are treated in more detail than in many standard accounts of the war. For example, there is discussion of the government’s Project 100,000, a 1966 proposal aimed at getting underprivileged African Americans to enlist in the armed forces.

The collection seeks to maintain a balanced tone. For example, the introduction to Stockdale’s account notes the horrific conditions in the Hoa Lo Prison (popularly known as the “Hanoi Hilton”) and other detention centers, in which captured Americans were routinely tortured. A sidebar notes South Vietnam’s use of “tiger cages,” small cement enclosures where prisoners were kept in chains, at Con Son Prison. When this was exposed by a group of congressmen who visited the prison, many Americans questioned the morality of U.S. involvement in the conflict.
The suggested activities presented at the outset of the book vary in quality, although several of them provide thought-provoking potential projects. For example, students are given the option of writing a one-page essay responding to the statement that the Vietnam Memorial is the most appropriate way to commemorate the conflict. Why, students are asked, is a black granite wall better than a more traditional statue or patriotic portrayal?

To provide a sense of the Vietnamese perspective on the war, Ho Chi Minh’s program for a communist Vietnam is contrasted with refugee Phuong Hoang’s account of Vietnam after the North’s takeover in 1975. Students can respond to questions about the degree to which the Communists carried out their promises once they took power and consider whether or not they would have become refugees in Phuong’s position.

The collection includes a detailed timeline at the outset, along with a glossary and questions to prompt student responses to each of the primary sources.
Teachers seeking a diverse grouping of documents across American history will be well served by the second edition of this reader, which effectively combines traditional sources with less-established perspectives.

The collection contains over 230 documents, making it one of the more comprehensive primary source readers available. Both volumes include a useful brief discussion on how to analyze a primary source, mentioning issues that students should consider when reading a primary source, including historical context, the author’s thesis, perspective, audience, and significance. Several questions that follow up on these themes are included at the beginning of each document.

The authors seem to have taken pains to include fresh perspectives and lesser-known documents, while not neglecting classic sources. Chapters 14 through 17, which deal with slavery, the Civil War, and Reconstruction, provide examples of the diversity of documents that are included in the collection. Chapter 14, “Slavery and the Old South,” for example, includes Olaudah Equiano’s account of the Middle Passage, information from the trial of Denmark Vesey, an account of the Alabama Frontier, Martin Delany’s discussion of African American nationalism (a neglected topic), as well as William and Ellen Craft’s “Escape to Freedom,” an account of their 1848 escape from slavery in Georgia. While many students are likely to be exposed to valuable sources such as Frederick Douglass’s autobiography, this reader will allow them access to a richer variety of perspectives. The following chapter on the coming of the Civil War includes Charles Sumner’s 1856 speech on Kansas and the Freeport Doctrine, as well as a Southern review of *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* and an African American minister’s response to the Fugitive Slave Act.

Even the chapters covering the late twentieth century manage to synthesize many themes from the nation’s recent past. Chapter 31, which deals with the “Conservative Era” of the 1980s, provides an example of this. Excerpts from Ronald Reagan’s first inaugural address
help to establish the decade’s themes of limited government at home and activism abroad, while other documents in the chapter deal with immigration, the role of Donald Trump as an example of the culture of big business, homelessness, AIDS, Iran-Contra, and the fall of the Berlin Wall. The collection covers material through the end of the century, including Clinton’s impeachment, the murder of Mathew Shepard, and the “underside of e-commerce.”

One minor complaint is that the reader could have been put together in a more visually pleasing format. Students often find primary sources tedious, and will quickly tire of reading a series of documents without a break in the text. The inclusion of political cartoons, maps, or charts and graphs, perhaps one or two per chapter, would help to relieve the rather monotonous format of this collection (Thomas Bailey and David Kennedy’s American Spirit reader uses more visual sources to good effect). Visual sources are legitimate primary sources and often engage students who do not respond easily or quickly to the printed word. Their inclusion would only improve this already strong collection.
The World Turned Upside Down: Indian Voices from Early America
Colin Calloway, ed.
St. Martin’s Press, 1994
ISBN 0312083505
$13.95
Reviewed by Tim Lehman

Teachers looking for ways to incorporate Native American perspectives and introduce primary texts into AP U.S. History will find this anthology a valuable resource. In fewer than 200 pages, this book includes 47 hard-to-find documents (about 2–3 pages long) from Indian peoples throughout colonial North America and a skillful introduction to each document. This slim text can be used by students as a supplemental reading or as an auxiliary resource for teachers.

The book is arranged chronologically, beginning with several creation stories and including a wide variety of Indian responses to European newcomers. This variety is most useful in countering stereotypes, both positive and negative, of Native Americans. Individual Indians appear in these pages as real people, not mere foils in someone else’s morality play. Sometimes they resist white encroachment; often they accommodate white society and even pursue its material and spiritual rewards. The documents include, for example, a Micmac rejection of French “civilization” for its poverty and unceasing labors in comparison with the easy abundance of the traditional hunting and fishing cultures, as well as Samson Occam’s story of his conversion away from his “heathenish” childhood into the life of a Christian missionary. One of the most memorable stories is Mary Jemison’s captivity narrative, notable for the way she came to prefer Indian society over white society, especially for its better treatment of women.

Chapters on land, treaties, and responses to the American Revolution show Native Americans as active and subtle diplomats, negotiating to make the best in a situation of political and cultural decline. Some documents show Indians clearly being cheated; others show tribes initiating alliances with the English settlers against traditional allies, while still others show Indians seeking protection from European powers against the rapidly expanding American settlements. Students and some teachers may be surprised to find that Indians attempted to remain neutral during the Revolution and then lost land rapidly in the years immediately afterward. It is no wonder that the Mohawk Joseph Brant in 1789 could accuse the “Christians” of the new nation of being hypocritical and “tenfold more the children of cruelty” than the so-called “savages.”

This book also offers an opportunity for teaching both the promise and the pitfalls of interpreting primary documents. Most of the documents are second- or thirdhand, and sometimes both translated and interpreted before being written. What were the authors’
original motives? Has the argument been slanted to suit a particular audience, in this case even an audience of conquerors? Is any one source confirmed or contradicted by other sources? Were Indians saying what they thought whites wanted to hear? Were whites only recording what they wanted to use for their own purposes? The popular conception, reinforced by Hollywood and many U.S. history texts, is of Native Americans as obstacles to European settlement—sometimes noble, other times merely savage, and almost always the victim. This book will go a long way toward making Indians come alive as full historical actors, contributing in complex and often surprising ways to the American story.
Web Sites and Online Source Collections

Secession Era Editorials Project
http://history.furman.edu/~benson/docs
T. Lloyd Benson
Reviewed by Jason George

Although this site does not provide a great deal of background or analysis, it does provide students and teachers alike a wealth of examples of contemporary commentary on several key events that brought the nation to the brink of civil war.

The site, which was developed by T. Lloyd Benson of Furman University, focuses on providing collections of editorials dealing with four events: the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854, the caning of Massachusetts senator Charles Sumner by Representative Preston Brooks of South Carolina in 1856, the Supreme Court’s decision in the Dred Scott case of 1857, and John Brown’s Harper’s Ferry raid of 1857. The project’s editors note that while Kansas-Nebraska, Dred Scott, and Harper’s Ferry were chosen on the basis of their “universal prominence” in historical writing, the Sumner caning was included because historians have become increasingly aware of how the incident “shocked politics away from Know-Nothingsm, the so-called immigrant question, and liquor prohibition to slavery and sectionalism.”

The Kansas-Nebraska section is by far the longest, with over 100 editorials dedicated to discussion of that bill. Students will appreciate the passionate, if somewhat florid, language of the time period. The Albany, New York, Evening Journal, for example, asserted that “the crime is committed,” with the work of the Founding Fathers “flung down by the hands of an American Congress,” with the result that “Slavery crawls, like a slimy reptile over the ruins, to defile a second eden.” Not to be outdone, a Jackson Mississippi newspaper noted the “calm and equanimity” that prevailed in the South during the debates over the bill, as opposed to the North, where one heard “the sickly cant of Sumner,—the detestable demagogism of Seward,—the horrid screeching of Lucy Stone, and her unsexed compatriots,—the sacrilegious imprecations of ministers who degrade the holy calling,” among other horrors.

Students will likely be surprised by the media opinion regarding the Sumner caning. While Southern newspapers defended Brooks’ action, Northern newspapers—while deploiring the viciousness of the attack—also condemned the harshness of Sumner’s words. A Concord, New Hampshire, paper, for example, concluded that Sumner’s speech “was of such a character as to provoke the result which has followed, and it seems to have been designed for that purpose,” given his “wanton and malignant vituperation” of a number of honored members of the Senate.
Users of the site should be aware that at least some degree of prior knowledge about the events in question is required, as there is no substantive introduction to provide students with a sense of historical context. Nonetheless, this site can be used in the classroom in several different ways. First, students could use the contrasting editorials to help them to prepare for either a simulation or a more straightforward classroom debate on any of the four issues presented. In addition, students could be asked to prepare their own mock editorials using the editorials presented here as a model. Finally, they could be asked to examine editorials from each of the four events to determine whether or not the arguments made in the North and South changed over time.
This historical Web site, a comparison of Civil War documents from counties in the North and the South, is among the most teacher-friendly sites on the Internet. By allowing high school students to encounter primary sources that in the past could only be accessed by sneezing one’s way through a dusty archive, the Valley of the Shadow collection provides a wonderfully complete (if somewhat unrepresentative) world for students to explore.

Historian Edward Ayers and his team of University of Virginia collaborators have brought together all the existing Civil War–era documents for two counties, one from the North (Franklin, Pennsylvania), and one from the South (Augusta, Virginia). There are newspapers, letters, diaries, wills, photographs, maps, church records, population censuses, agricultural censuses, and military records that cover the years before, during, and after the Civil War. Letters have been scanned into the site, so that you can actually see handwriting, places where the ink ran, crossed-out words, and yellowing corners.

The site is exceptionally easy to use. There are subject headings and links, organized chronologically and thematically, that can lead you to, for example, all of the documents that deal with slavery, or the role of women. Moreover, the site’s creators have come up with so many essay questions and term paper topics that you could probably assign a different one to each of your students.

Nevertheless, this site represents Edward Ayers’s perspective, a fact that we forget at our peril. Franklin and Augusta are just two counties, after all. Moreover, they are anything but typical: Augusta is not the South in microcosm, nor is Franklin particularly representative of the North. Both counties straddle an oddly gray borderland between the two sides. It is obvious why a historian of Ayers’s convictions would choose to focus on them: Augusta had few fire-eating secessionists, and Franklin had few diehard abolitionists. Most of the people in these two counties favored moderation and compromise. If, like Ayers, you want to minimize the importance of slavery for the coming of the Civil War, these are precisely the kind of counties that you would want to focus attention upon. A very different picture of Civil War–era America would surely have emerged, however, had Ayers chosen to focus on two different counties.

Intelligent students know that they are on the receiving end of an argument when they read a historical monograph or a scholarly article; they know that citations are selective, and that authors choose sources that support their arguments. Even your smartest
students, however, may not realize that there is a point of view hiding behind the avalanche of information presented on this site. Indeed, the sheer brilliance of the argument is that it does not appear to be an argument. Socrates demonstrated long ago that the most effective way to advance your opinions is to hide them behind supposedly self-evident facts. Ayers is anything but disinterested here, nor should he be. What could be more boring than a historian without an opinion? That said, the nature of the Internet as a medium is such that the illusion of the real is often mesmerizing. A classroom discussion that revealed Ayers’s fingerprints on the material would provide a nice introduction to the roles of evidence and argument in the practice of history.
The Ram's Horn
http://history.osu.edu/Projects/Rams_Horn/default.htm
Reviewed by Jason George

This well-organized Web site, which is run by Ohio State University and is part of a larger collection of cartoons, allows students to use a little-known journal in order to gain significant insights into the key issues of the Gilded Age, a period that does not often come alive to students in an easy fashion.

The Ram’s Horn was a magazine devoted to spreading the ideas of the Social Gospel, particularly in the 1890s. Most of the illustrations on the site were drawn by Frank Beard (1842–1905), the journal’s main artist. One of the main pluses of the site is that the cartoons are grouped according to eight different topics: immigrants, the wealthy, smoking, the liquor trade and efforts toward prohibition, trusts, political bosses, views of America in the world, and religious issues. Each section contains two to four cartoons.

The cartoons help students to understand the mindset of much of the reform sentiment of the time period. One of the cartoons on immigration, titled “Stranger at Our Gate,” portrays Uncle Sam standing at an entrance with the Capitol behind him. A swarthy-looking immigrant approaches him, carrying bags that are marked “Poverty,” “Disease,” “Sabbath Desecration,” and “Anarchy.” Below the cartoon is a short editorial, which notes that throughout most of American history, the immigrant population was limited enough to “preserve the high character of American citizenship.” Now however, given the increasing numbers of immigrant, “it is well to put up the bars and save America, at least until she can purify the atmosphere of contagion which foreign invasion has already brought.”

While the magazine sought to promote moral reform, it also expressed a distrust of the wealthy that was typical of the Social Gospel movement. An 1896 cover cartoon shows a businessman putting down a chair marked “Endowed Professorship” (the title of the cartoon), beneath which a pig, representing labor and workers, is being crushed. Another cover from the same year, tellingly titled “A Businessman in League with the Devil,” shows a man sitting at his desk with Satan whispering conspiratorially in his ear. A figure representing Jesus, bedecked with thorns, knocks at the door, despite a sign that states “I Am Busy.” The caption, “Behold, I stand at the door and knock,” represents the journal’s view of the businessman’s potential fate.

The cartoons on political bosses, similar to those of Thomas Nast and other contemporaries, demonstrate disdain for the corruption of urban government. “Why Our Cities Are Badly Governed” shows an apelike political boss dragging several figures held by a chain marked “Party Allegiance” into a voting station.
This site is ideal for classroom use, especially since it helps to explore an era that students seldom regard with much enthusiasm. Since the cartoons are grouped according to subject, students can be organized into groups to examine each topic and make presentations to their classmates. Also, the images are relatively simple and straightforward, so that students are able to interpret them relatively easily. Perhaps the one major drawback is that there is little background explanation of the Gilded Age to help provide a greater sense of context for students.
This site, presented by a Vassar College history professor, furnishes a treasure trove of political cartoons and other primary sources on the election of 1896. By bringing the sometimes arcane debates over Populism to life for students, it can greatly assist in teaching this crucial topic to the AP U.S. History class. In fact, in its thorough coverage of many related topics, such as the tariff or antilynching campaigns, it provides a useful resource for broader discussions of the entire late nineteenth century.

The core of the site is its presentation of scores of period cartoons from a large variety of contemporary newspapers and magazines. Arranged in chronological order, the cartoons (with the exception of some with broken links) can be expanded to be more easily read by a user. Occasionally even the higher magnification fails to keep key words or details from being out of focus, ruining the cartoon’s meaning, but this problem is rarely encountered overall.

Rather than provide an explanation of the often obscure meaning of the cartoons, the site accompanies them with topical terms (“the currency issue” or “Shakespearean references”) that link to larger discussions of those topics. As the cartoons invoke a bewildering array of references, from contemporary relations with China and the Ottoman Empire to Aesop’s Fables and the Bible, this device allows users to figure out the intended meanings of the cartoons for themselves. These background essays provide excellent surveys in their own right, furnishing details on major figures such as Mark Hanna and Peter Altgeld, contemporary cultural and social developments, and the various party conventions and platforms.

What comes through in most of the cartoons is the viciousness with which pro- and anti-Populist forces portrayed one another. Populist cartoons, particularly from the Far West, often depicted their battle with wealth in crude terms, indulging in appalling anti-Semitic stereotypes as well as attacks on Chinese immigrants and African Americans. An image of the United States “in the hands of the Jews,” being crucified on a cross of gold, its draining blood being collected by the Rothschilds, vividly illuminates the darker undertones heard by some contemporaries in William Jennings Bryan’s famous “Cross of Gold” speech, even though the cartoon appeared months before it was delivered.

Anti-Populist cartoonists could be equally nasty, harping on Bryan’s youth, equating Populists with anarchists, and invoking the specter of the Civil War to condemn Democratic “rebels.” In addition to being better produced, their cartoons tended to be
more clever: one biting Harper’s print depicts as “Gold Bugs” (complete with huge insectile legs) widows, orphans, and crippled veterans—those whose fixed incomes made them stand to lose from Bryan’s inflationary agenda.

The huge number of cartoons here makes it difficult for a teacher to sort through them all in advance for classroom use. A better strategy is to choose the topics that will be stressed in class and to follow the links to specific cartoons about those themes. The discussion on “the currency issue,” for example, provides a number of cartoons that can be printed out and projected in class, dramatizing what this theory (which often frustrates AP students) meant to contemporaries. The site also contains a teacher’s guide that offers excellent ideas for fruitful discussions, student debates, and research projects.
Imperialism in the Making of America: Captain Alfred T. Mahan
www.boondocksnet.com/moa/moa_mahan.html
Jim Zwick, ed.
Reviewed by Jason George

Since few teachers or students feel the need or desire—rightfully so—to go back and read all of Alfred Thayer Mahan’s classic 1890 work *The Influence of Seapower upon History*, they may profitably use this collection of his writings to become acquainted with his arguments and with his significance to the history of American expansionism.

Mahan (1840–1914), a professor at the Naval War College and associate of political figures such as Theodore Roosevelt and Henry Cabot Lodge, was one of the first so-called strategic thinkers in America. (Given the proliferation of think tanks and policy intellectuals today, it is almost refreshing to hearken back to a day when this was a new profession.) Mahan’s major argument was that powers that were able to develop large navies, control sea lanes, and have access to bases for both defensive and trading purposes were able to achieve international primacy. One of the documents in this collection is an anonymous article from the October 1890 *Atlantic Monthly*, reviewing Mahan’s book on how naval power has influenced the development of modern history. The reviewer praises Mahan for being one of the first authors to examine the “strategic bearings” of the various naval conflicts that he wrote about, going beyond the work of other historians who were mere “annalists.”

Mahan’s interests were not, of course, purely historical, something that the reviewer clearly saw. The next article on the site, entitled “The United States Looking Outward,” published in December 1890, applies Mahan’s historical model to the America of that period. Mahan opens by noting that “indications are not wanting of an approaching change in the thoughts and policy of Americans as to their relations with those outside their own border.” One of the key indications of this, a factor later first emphasized by New Left historians and eventually generally accepted by most who study the period, was “the turning of the eyes outward, instead of inward only, to seek the welfare of the country,” particularly in terms of the search for new markets and new sources of raw materials. One of Mahan’s key proposals for the United States was the building of an isthmian canal, which would help to increase commercial activity in the Western Hemisphere and would allow the United States to project more easily its naval power in both the Atlantic and the Pacific. Finally, Mahan emphasized the importance of “a cordial understanding” with Great Britain as “one of the first of our external interests,” given Britain’s formidable naval power and the mutual interests of the two nations.
The site also contains approximately 20 additional articles on a variety of historical topics, including a series on Admiral Nelson, as well as topics of contemporary interest. Students would likely find it interesting to look at Mahan’s article “A Twentieth-Century Outlook,” published in *Harper's Weekly* in 1897, offering a summation of the past century and preview of the next in light of both the recent millennium (this easily invites comparison with many of the similar writings that appeared at the end of 1999) and of America’s changing strategic doctrine in the face of recent international events since September 11.
As one of the most prolific journalists and commentators of his day, Henry Louis Mencken commented with acid wit on virtually every issue of the early twentieth century. This Web site provides access to many of his writings.

Gibbons Burke, who assembled the site and wrote the introduction, is clearly a great fan of Mencken, noting that “his prose is as clear as an azure sky, and his rhetoric as deadly as a rifle shot.” Mencken’s writing, Burke declares, is “endearing because of its wit, its crisp style, and the obvious delight he takes in it.” While Burke addresses references to Mencken’s alleged racism and anti-Semitism, as well as his staunch anti-Prohibitionist sentiment, there is little to no analysis of what motivated Mencken to take the positions that he did.

Mencken, of course, is best known for his accounts of the 1925 Scopes Trial and his critique of the state of Tennessee’s antievolution position. One article that will likely surprise students is Mencken’s vitriolic obituary of William Jenning Bryan, in which he goes against the fact that it is the “national custom to sentimentalize the dead, as it is to sentimentalize men about to be hanged.” Here is his description of Bryan’s final argument in Dayton: “It quickly became frenzied and preposterous, and after that pathetic. All sense departed from him. He bit right and left, like a dog with rabies. He descended to demagogy so dreadful that his very associates blushed.”

Students often have difficulty understanding Mencken’s satire and determining when he is being serious and when sarcastic. In his July 1925 column “Deep in the Coca-Cola Belt,” for example, Mencken maintains that Scopes, Clarence Darrow, and others who favor the teaching of evolution are perceived in Tennessee as follows: “Scopes, though he is disguised by flannel pantaloons and a Beta Theta Pi haircut, is the harlot of Babylon. Darrow is Beelzebub in person and Malone is the Crown Prince Friedrich Wilhelm.” Even students who are able to understand all of the vocabulary in Mencken’s writings frequently believe that he is being serious in his portrayals, thus missing the point of his message.

A lesser-known, but perhaps easier to understand, target of Mencken’s pen was the New Deal. In a 1937 article entitled “A Constitution for the New Deal,” the satirist creates a new preamble to the Constitution stating that the goals of the government should be “to establish social justice, draw the fangs of privilege, effect the redistribution of property, remove the burden of liberty from ourselves and our posterity, and insure the
continuance of the New Deal.” In the new government, all power was to be vested in the president of the United States, with the legislative and the judicial branches completely subject to the president’s will. Here, students could be given a copy of Mencken’s satire and asked to identify the specific actions of Franklin D. Roosevelt to which the author is referring.

While this site does not provide particularly deep analysis of Mencken and his work, the author does include a list of links to other sites about Mencken. The Enoch Pratt Free Library site (www.pratt.lib.md.us/slrc/hum/mencken.html) explores Mencken’s early life to a much greater degree, while other articles by various authorities fill in other aspects of his work. There is also a photo gallery containing a number of visual images of Mencken.
Few periods in American history offer as rich an area for study as the 1930s, and the period has found a most thorough chronicler in the New Deal Network. Featuring a comprehensive variety of primary sources, lesson plans, and other resources, this site will provide teachers and students with numerous resources for dealing with selected aspects of this vital period.

The site, created in 1996 by the Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt Institute, focuses primarily on the public works and arts projects of the New Deal. Much of the site, its creators note, is devoted to a database of photographs, speeches, and other documents from the period. The document database is searchable by subject, author, date, and collection (users should be warned that it operates rather slowly due to its enormous size).

While the document database can be rather overwhelming due to its volume, other parts of the site are rendered in more manageable proportions. A features section, for example, contains more than 20 specialized sections, dealing with aspects of the New Deal ranging from selected works of Henry Wallace to excerpts from various publications of the period (there is even a section that allows users to “match wits” with New Deal expert “Professor Puzzler”—beware that some of the questions are not easy!).

Several of the features highlight periodicals from the New Deal period, which can be used to help students understand certain elements of the 1930s that they might not get from traditional textbook accounts. Selected articles from the social science journal *Survey Graphic*, for example, help to illustrate the New Deal’s emphasis on using rational, pragmatic methods to help solve the nation’s problems.

Students might find selections from *The Magpie*, a publication from Dewitt Clinton High School, a bit less dry than *Survey Graphic*’s discussion of farm tenancy or labor organizing. The poems, stories, and illustrations from the student publication, many written by young people who went on to have distinguished careers in various fields, help to illustrate a number of different trends from the period, including issues of race, immigration, and efforts to survive in a time of economic hardship.

Teachers will appreciate the generous collection of lesson plans that are included with the features, along with a separate lesson plan bank. A “classroom” section includes numerous links to different resources on the New Deal and the 1930s, focusing on both the local and national levels.
Many of the lesson plans allow students to use case studies to examine certain trends about the New Deal. For example, a Women and Social Movements lesson plan from SUNY Binghamton asks students to examine headlines about the 1938 pecan shellers’ strike, which highlights the plight of Mexican women workers (a doubly marginalized group during the period).

As with any collection this large and with links to so many different resources, some of the material is of varying quality. Nonetheless, teachers should be able to find much that is of use here, with particular appeal to those with an interest in visual and artistic materials.
Although this database is admittedly a work in progress and could be better organized, it provides a rich collection of editorial cartoons about Franklin D. Roosevelt and his programs. Teachers and students looking for commentary on virtually any aspect of FDR’s programs should find useful materials at this site.

Few presidents, it seems, inspired as many cartoons as FDR. This is not surprising, given the length of time he served as president, as well as the major domestic and foreign crises that the nation faced while he was in office. In addition, FDR’s jaunty manner and unique physical and other characteristics made him an irresistible subject for cartoonists.

This site, created by students at Niskayuna High School in New York, uses materials from the collection of FDR’s former law partner, Basil O’Connor, who collected more than 30,000 cartoons about Roosevelt from the period between 1932 and 1943. More than 2,400 cartoons are available on this database, although many of them are not yet indexed or sorted by category.

One of the best features of the site is the pains that the creators take to make the materials here available for classroom use. Many of the cartoons are available in both a “quick view” and a more complete format, the latter of which is recommended for teachers who want to use the cartoons for projecting in their classrooms. In addition, there are directions on how to save the cartoons for the less technologically savvy.

Cartoons that have been indexed are divided into nine different sections, the majority of which deal with various aspects of the New Deal, but some of which deal as well with foreign relations and with various aspects of World War II. The chronological beginning of the collection is March 1932, with FDR’s efforts to capture the Democratic presidential nomination against fellow New Yorker Al Smith.

An April 1932 cartoon showing FDR as a sprinter racing ahead of the pack of Democratic presidential hopefuls and posing the question of whether or not he can maintain his pace demonstrates just one of the ways that these cartoons can be used to promote discussion. Students will likely wonder whether any newspaper or other media outlet today would use an image portraying a president with a serious physical disability as a strong physical specimen in the manner that this cartoon does. This can be used to raise the larger issue of how the media has changed in its coverage of American leaders.
The collection will be drastically improved when a promised reorganization occurs (although the fact that the site has not been updated since November of 1999 makes one skeptical about this). For example, the section on foreign relations creates the expectation that the user will be able to trace FDR’s circuitous path toward greater international involvement throughout the 1930s.

Unfortunately, cartoons in this section are only indexed through the spring of 1933, dealing primarily with foreign trade issues. One can, however, search by date through the rest of the cartoons not yet included in the main sections, looking to October 1937 for commentary on FDR’s “Quarantine Speech,” to provide just one example.
The Sixties Project
Reviewed by Jason George

This opinionated Web site on the 1960s will appeal to those who want to gain an authentic sense of the spirit of social and cultural protests that suffused America during the latter half of that decade. Although it must be used with care due to its frank content and clear agenda, the site provides a wealth of resources that should help students to understand the disillusionment that many felt during this period.

The site was created by a group of scholars, primarily in the humanities, who sought to work together to ensure broad Internet access to material regarding the 1960s. According to the site’s introduction, “it’s our philosophy that revolutions are made by those who show up, so if you are interested in us and want to throw your energy into a project, we are interested in you.”

The most useful elements of the site for classroom purposes are the links to primary source materials, as well as the visual exhibits. The primary source links include both standard documents such as the Port Huron Statement and various civil rights manifestos by the Black Panthers, SNCC, and other groups, but also lesser-known documents such as the Young Lords’ (Puerto Rican nationalists) manifesto and the May 2 Movement (an antiwar group whose name derived from the first major protests on that date in 1964).

One of the more fascinating sections of the site is a series of posters from the United States, Vietnam, and Cuba, as well as a large group of buttons from the 1960s. The posters condemn American militarism and criticize the conduct of the war in Vietnam, and offer other indictments of the U.S. government. One, for example, shows an image of Adolf Hitler holding a Richard Nixon mask near his face.

The posters from Vietnam and Cuba provide an international viewpoint on American policies during the 1960s, made even more relevant by the current wave of anti-American sentiment that has arisen in the wake of the war in Iraq. The posters from Vietnam show both the hostility toward the United States that existed and the high degree of Vietnamese mobilization in the face of American military efforts there (although students should be reminded that many of these are communist government propaganda—the site does not make this clear).

Another interesting element of the site is an antiwar comic book published by civil rights leader Julian Bond in 1967, after he was expelled from the Georgia House of Representatives for his antiwar stance. Bond’s work draws links between the struggle for Vietnamese independence and the civil rights struggle in the United States in simple, stark terms that students will clearly be able to understand.
One improvement that would enhance the value of the site would be to include fuller explanatory notes for the various posters and buttons, as students will likely not be able to understand many of the references without a good deal of background on the 1960s. Teachers should also be warned that explicit language and mature material are used in some of the image and text sections.
This production of the music of Stephen Foster by Joe Weed reveals the racial and economic strains of antebellum America—a world that simultaneously cried “Progress!” while longing for simpler times. The value of Foster for teachers is the window he provides into the tumultuous years before the coming of the Civil War. Growing up in the Midwest, Foster straddled the divide between the elitist culture of the rising middle class and the folksy and colorful world of the frontier. What students hear in Foster’s music is a middle-class voice tracking the issues of his day.

Foster was fascinated by frontier musical forms, which polite society rejected. Nowhere was this more so than with minstrel shows, which he believed could find an audience in mainstream America. Foster composed dialect-based lyrics and rhythmic melodies, as in the call-and-response choruses of “Camptown Races,” the “doo-dah” lines counterpointing those of the lead singer.

A debate my students enjoy is whether Foster’s evocation of slavery was condescending or romanticized. Though not an abolitionist, Foster married into a family of antislavery activists, and his depictions of slave life received both applause and criticism from whites and blacks. Like Harriet Beecher Stowe’s *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, Foster tapped into slave culture, intending to dramatize it for white audiences. Foster’s “Old Black Joe” is the tale of a handyman Foster knew, and its African American spiritual sound earned it praise from W. E. B. DuBois. Other tunes similarly humanize black figures, as in “Angelina Baker” and “Nelly Was a Lady” (calling a black woman “a lady” was a direct challenge to racial sensibilities).

In later years, Foster songs such as “Old Folks at Home” and “My Old Kentucky Home” would be embraced by post–Civil War Southerners as paens to plantation beauty and simplicity. Yet Foster was also projecting onto Southern mythology his own—and his era’s—increasing nostalgia. Scarred by the loss of a family manor in childhood, Foster sympathized with a nation that both feared and welcomed fast-moving technological changes.
Foster rarely had recourse to topical commentary, but he tried it once in “Hard Times Come Again No More.” Written on the verge of the Panic of 1856, as his hometown of Pittsburgh was feeling the first throes, “Hard Times” is a hymn, calling for attention to the plight of the poor and indigent. Against the cold facts of economic history, it provides students with a heartfelt portrait of the devastation produced in the new democracy when the wheels came off.

Finally, seeking middle-class legitimacy, Foster composed for the parlor. Middle-class families brought the piano into the home, and sheet music—Foster’s main source of income—rose in demand. Midway through his short career, Foster left his minstrel compositions behind for more polished fare, producing such ballads as “Jeannie with the Light Brown Hair” and “Beautiful Dreamer.” The delicate beauty of these melodies contrasts with the frontier spirit of Foster’s earlier compositions, and students and I have noted how complex the world of midcentury America was as we listen to the range of compositions herein. Indeed, a mere sampling of key Foster works—“Oh Susanna,” “Camptown Races,” “Glendy Burk,” “Beautiful Dreamer,” and “Old Folks at Home”—enables students to identify and contrast the range of social issues that began shaping America as it headed for the cataclysm of 1861.

Joe Weed’s production of Foster’s work on this album serves the pieces well. In contrast to the more sedate renditions elsewhere, these arrangements—dominated by guitars, fiddles, harmonica, and mandolin—capture more of the frontier/Midwest culture Foster came from. Hearing this music evokes the conflicts and debates of a democracy going through its birth pangs.
Homespun Songs of the Union Army and Homespun Songs of the Confederate Army
Bobby Horton
$15.00
Reviewed by Jeff House

Approaching the Civil War through its music enables teachers to communicate its human element. A number of CDs contain material from the era, but these sets from Bobby Horton, a one-man band who churns out faithful renditions of Civil War songs, are among the best.

Having self-produced nearly a dozen CDs (six entitled Homespun Songs of the Union Army and five Homespun Songs of the Confederate Army), Horton’s work has provided the background for a number of Ken Burns productions, including The Civil War, Thomas Jefferson, and Lewis and Clark. Horton has a pleasant voice, complemented by simple but effective arrangements of period instruments, including guitar, banjo, violin, cornet, drums, and autoharp.

The value of Horton’s work lies in his unearthing of dozens of songs that provide historical insight into the sentiment of the war. Selections appeal to a range of emotions, as in the rousing “Battle Cry of Freedom” and “We are Coming Father Abraham,” the comical “Grafted into the Army,” the melancholic “The Vacant Chair,” and the devastating “Tenting on the Old Camp Ground,” in which a soldier laments the long sleepless night after battle as comrades slowly die nearby. Horton’s selections can also reveal bitterness, as in “I’m a Good Ol’ Rebel,” the dirgelike complaint of a defeated Confederate who reviles everything Yankee and declares unrepentantly, “I won’t be reconstructed, and I don’t give a damn.”

Horton’s work reveals the importance of song in the Civil War for soldiers needing dance tunes, marches, laments, and touches of melancholy to cope with the interminable silences between battle. Dipping into several of these CDs will also reveal how similar melodies provided emotional stimulus for both Northerners and Southerners—the same “Battle Cry of Freedom” that inspired Yankees comforted Confederates as well, albeit with a different set of lyrics. Finally, Horton has taken care to craft each CD as an entirety unto itself, running the gamut of settings and moods.
Our Daily Bread and Other Films of the Great Depression
Pare Lorentz, dir.; King Vidor, dir.; Joris Ivens, dir.
Image Entertainment, 1999
Amazon.com Search Number: 6305473188
$29.99
Reviewed by Jeff House

Our Daily Bread, made in 1934 by one of Hollywood’s most significant yet least-remembered directors, King Vidor, depicts a cooperative rural farmstead in Depression-era America. Packaged together with several other documentary films onto one DVD, it demonstrates important and provocative dissents to both mainstream film production and the gung-ho New Deal ethos of the 1930s.

Vidor made several socially conscious films that bucked the string of musicals and screwball comedies that formed the dominant Hollywood response to the Great Depression. (Indeed, other productions of the period—whether in the gangster films of Warner Brothers or the satirical strains of Max Fleischer cartoons—also contained an element of the subversive.) Our Daily Bread was rejected by mainstream studios for its socialist theme. It depicts a community of urbanites who have failed within the capitalist system. Joining ranks on a rural farmstead, the economic rejects pool their talents to create a sustainable cooperative, finding brotherhood and friendship along the way. In the film’s climax, community members divert a river of water to their crops, their combined efforts saving the day. Vidor’s script was based on an existing cooperative, depicted in The New Frontier, a government documentary included in this DVD.

The DVD also includes two hard-to-find but highly prized shorts by director Pare Lorentz: The River (1937) and The Plow That Broke the Plains (1936). Lorentz’s films were homages to the farmer and the nation’s need for connection to the earth, at a time when the Midwest was a dust bowl and displaced farmers trekked along Route 66 to California. Classical composer Virgil Thomson penned musical scores for both films that became performance pieces on their own.

This DVD also contains a number of shorts from the 1930s, the most singular being “California Elections News #1 and #2,” two ostensible newsreels released during Upton Sinclair’s 1934 California gubernatorial race. The footage was in fact fake, concocted by MGM studios as part of their campaign against Sinclair and his socialist agenda. The “candid” interviews were actually scripted performances by contracted actors.

All in all, these films and shorts are compelling testaments to 1930s radicalism, particularly the Popular Front, that socialist-based movement that saw the Depression as the inevitable failure of capitalism.
American Industrial Ballads
Pete Seeger
Smithsonian/Folkways, 1992 (1957)
www.folkways.si.edu
$15.00
Reviewed by Jeff House

Nineteenth-century laborers had less access to the public than their bosses, so they picked up guitars and sang. *American Industrial Ballads* by Pete Seeger is a collection of such pieces, covering tales about strikes, the eight-hour workday, wage hikes, child labor, ethnic discrimination, and corporate politics.

The value of such songs in the classroom lies in their emotional intensity and sense of immediacy, letting students hear directly the language and sentiment of laborers, men and women. “Hayseed Like Me,” for instance, fits nicely in any discussion of populism: the song’s lyrics first appeared in *The Farmers Alliance* in 1890 and illuminate the agrarian belief that urban America cared little for those who produced its food. Other songs from the movement and era include “Acres of Clams” and “The Farmer Is the Man.” The speeches of William Jennings Bryan and the silver and gold economic debates of the 1890s take on more depth when students hear the voices of the farmers.

Similarly, units on 1920s America tend to focus on the rise of wealth, but students would benefit by juxtaposing the riches of urban America with the struggles of factory workers, whose plight was only magnified by the 1929 Crash. “Cotton Mill Colic,” dating from the 1920s, documents the struggles of a line worker: “Twelve dollars a week is all I get / How in the heck can I live on that? / I got a wife and fourteen kids, / We all got to sleep in two bedsteads.” “Mill Mother’s Lament” recalls the textile mill strike of 1929 in Gastonia, North Carolina. The strike’s bloody battles claimed the life of Ella May Wiggins, a mother and songwriter of industrial ballads, whose life is detailed in the song. In short, any discussion of the Great Depression makes more sense when students learn labor woes didn’t arrive with the Crash—they simply widened.

This is a powerful collection of primary material, putting students in touch with voices rarely represented in historical discussions. I find my students particularly responsive to hearing firsthand accounts of these struggles; the words convey an intensity that historical fact cannot reach. When we study the Populist movement, Seeger’s renditions of Farmers Alliance songs provide a sense of the humanity in the struggle. Songs were often the only way laborers’ voices could reach a wide popular audience; decades later, students can still hear them.
Music Resources from the Great Depression

Woody Guthrie, *Dust Bowl Ballads*, FW05212
Pete Seeger and the Almanac Singers, *Talking Union and Other Union Songs*, FW05285
New Lost City Ramblers, *Songs from the Depression*, FW05264
All on Smithsonian/Folkways
$17.99 each
Reviewed by Cora Greer

An excellent way to give students a feeling for the mood of the Depression is to examine the songs of social commentary that emerged from this era. A great deal of this music was collected by Moses Asch on the Folkways label. Upon Asch’s death in 1986, these recordings were acquired by the Library of Congress. They have been reissued as cassettes and CDs.

The following collections, all available from the Library of Congress, explore three particular aspects of the Depression years: the Dust Bowl and the subsequent migration west, the unionization of the industrial worker, and songs commenting on various New Deal programs. Each recording comes with detailed program notes.

*Dust Bowl Ballads*, written and sung by Woody Guthrie, was originally recorded in the 1940s and reissued by Folkways in 1964. Guthrie, who was born in Oklahoma, followed the migrants west, and his songs mirror his empathy for them. At the same time, the songs often make their point with humor. Three selections that work very well in a classroom are “Talking Dust Bowl,” “So Long,” and “Dust Bowl Refugee.”

*Talking Union*, sung by Pete Seeger and the Almanac Singers, is a collection of labor songs, most of which were sung at meetings and mass rallies during the great organizing struggles of the CIO during the late 1930s. The “Union Maid” (written by Woody Guthrie), “Roll the Union On,” and the “Talking Union” are American labor classics. The latter, like Guthrie’s “Talking Dust Bowl,” may be seen by students as precursors of contemporary rap music. Teachers may also want to note that “We Shall Not Be Moved,” which was adapted from a popular hymn, will emerge again in the 1960s as a rallying cry of the civil rights movement.

*Songs from the Depression*, sung by the New Lost City Ramblers, was recorded in 1959. This collection of country music songs from the 1930s focuses on the hardships of the Depression and the enthusiasm many had for FDR and the New Deal. All these songs were written and recorded by such country music artists of the period as the Carter Family, Roy Acuff, and Uncle Dave Macon. “Old Age Pension Check,” “No Depression,” and “Franklin D. Roosevelt’s Back Again” are probably the pick of this excellent collection.
This music give teachers a wealth of primary source materials for classroom use. Guthrie and Seeger, in particular, are giant voices from this period, and their music is an authentic rendering of the mood of Depression America.
Primary Source Readings

The Captivity Narrative of Mary Rowlandson (1682)
Neal Salisbury, ed.
Bedford/St. Martin’s, 1997
ISBN 0312111517
$13.95
Also available online at www.gutenberg.org/etext/851
Reviewed by Tim Lehman

First published in 1682, widely read in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and frequently anthologized in recent decades, Mary Rowlandson’s captivity narrative offers a rare insight into colonial New England Puritanism, gender inequality, and race relations. A minister’s wife in Lancaster, Massachusetts, Rowlandson was captured by the Narragansetts during King Phillip’s (Metacom’s) War and held in captivity for 11 weeks. Rowlandson’s first-person account of her ordeal—part spiritual autobiography and part sermon—explains how personal loss and community disaster should be interpreted as part of a providential design for Puritan spiritual renewal. What students will probably consider most interesting in the Narrative, however, is the story of a woman finding a voice in public affairs while simultaneously contributing to the hardening of racial categories in colonial America.

Rowlandson interpreted her ordeal in keeping with Puritan theology, as divine chastisement for her and her community’s falling away from original devotion. On one level, then, her narrative is an affirmation of a providential interpretation of history and a call for community regeneration and rededication to the original Puritan faithfulness. She includes (in what may be distracting for contemporary readers but is a crucial clue to Puritan thinking) over 80 scriptural references, in the form of quotations, allusions, or paraphrases. Her “redemption” from captivity is spiritual as well as physical, as she gives up tobacco and laments previous misuse of leisure time, which she sees as time she should have spent reading the Bible.

What gives Rowlandson’s narrative its enduring interest is her subtle challenge to the sexual and racial assumptions of her day. The claim that she was an instrument of providential plans came dangerously close, in Puritan minds, to an assertion that a woman’s voice should have a broader role in contemporary society. The Captivity Narrative might thus be read as an example of how personal narrative can be subversive of dominant power structures. If it is tempting to find a proto-feminist voice here, we should remember that Rowlandson was very conscious of social status and clearly linked her success to her husband’s position of minister.
Many contemporary readers find Rowlandson’s overtly racist characterizations of her Narragansett captors more than a little jolting. She describes her captors in either demonic or animal terms and presents all Native Americans, even converted “praying Indians,” as beyond redemption. Unlike some other captives, she did not assimilate into Native American culture, and she thoroughly rejected any possibility of Indians assimilating into “Christian” ways. Rowlandson thus entered into a Puritan theological dispute that was clearly out of bounds for a woman. Yet her experiences in captivity had an unsettling effect on her racial views. Although she usually was oblivious to the suffering of Indians, she does portray some individuals, especially King Phillip (Metacom), in positive terms, and seems at times to feel respect and friendship for certain individuals. Although Rowlandson does not mention it, readers will find in her narrative a struggle between her theology and her humanity, between her stated position—that Native Americans were a lost race—and her felt experience of kindness at their hands.
Teachers and students seeking to understand the Puritan mindset and institutions can gain many insights by reading the text of John Winthrop’s famous 1630 sermon, “A Modell of Christian Charity.” Although Winthrop’s closing discussion of the Puritans’ role as a “city upon a hill” is well known, reading the sermon in its entirety will help provide an understanding of the subsequent development of the Massachusetts Bay Colony.

The Puritans, of course, were long given a rather negative image by historians and other commentators. Nineteenth-century writers, such as Nathaniel Hawthorne, portrayed the Puritans as grim and joyless, a view later reinforced by H. L. Mencken’s assertion that Puritanism was the suspicion that “someone, somewhere, was enjoying themselves.” Reading the text of this influential early document may help students achieve a more nuanced view.

Winthrop, of course, was at the head of a fleet of 11 ships containing approximately 700 people who had left England to seek religious and other opportunities in the New World. Reading Winthrop’s text will help students to go beyond the overly simplistic conclusion that the Puritans were seeking religious freedom. Instead their goal was to create an ideal commonwealth, in which all members of society were united in serving God, that could be used as a springboard to reforming the Church of England and other institutions.

The sermon opens with Winthrop’s statement that God has made mankind such that “in all times some must be rich, some poor, some high and eminent in power and dignity; others mean and in submission.” (Quotations are rendered in contemporary spelling.) Among the reasons for this is the fact that as a result of such conditions, “every man might have need of others, and from hence they might be all knit more nearly together in the bonds of brotherly affection.”

Given the difficult challenges that the Puritans faced, Winthrop’s emphasis on the need for cooperation is not surprising. Central to Puritan religious, and consequently civil, thought is the idea of a covenant. According to Winthrop, God gave the Puritans a special commission, one that should be “strictly observed in every article.” In order to fulfill God’s commission, Winthrop notes, the settlers “must be knit together, in this work, as one man.” These and other statements by Winthrop help to explain the high degree of conformity and lack of comfort with dissent that developed in Massachusetts Bay.
There was inevitably an element of Puritanism that turned ugly, particularly as conditions made unity more difficult, as during the Salem Witch Trials. Winthrop’s original intent, however, was based on the idea that his people “must delight in each other; make other’s conditions our own; rejoice together, mourn together, labor and suffer together, always having before our eyes our commission and community in the work, as members of the same body.”

Students almost invariably enjoy discussing the “city upon a hill” idea. One of the key themes in American history, of course, is the tension between acting as an example for other nations by perfecting our own society and actively spreading American ideas and institutions. Given the recent pendulum swing toward actively promoting American democracy, Winthrop’s statements will have a great deal of resonance for AP students.
“Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God” (1741)
Jonathan Edwards
Available online at www.ccel.org/e/edwards/sermons/sinners.html
Reviewed by Jason George

This sermon is likely one of the best-known documents in the history of American religion. While it makes for occasionally difficult reading, students can gain a sense of an important formative period in the development of both religion and American society as a whole.

Jonathan Edwards (1703–58), of course, was a leading figure in the religious revival known as the Great Awakening that swept the American colonies beginning in the 1730s. Concerned with the decline in piety in generations born after the settlement of Massachusetts Bay, religious leaders sought to bring many of the faithful back into the fold.

Edwards begins his sermon by noting the degree to which individuals continually stand subject to “destruction.” The key to Edwards’s message is that “there is nothing that keeps wicked men at any one moment out of hell, but the mere pleasure of God.”

Although reading the sermon in its entirety may be a bit daunting for students, the colorful language of certain sections will likely attract student attention. For example, at one point Edwards notes that “the God that holds you over the pit of hell, much as one holds a spider, or some loathsome insect over the fire, abhors you, and is dreadfully provoked.” The answer, of course, is conversion, which will allow “every one that is out of Christ, [to] awake and fly from the wrath to come.” Otherwise, “all of you that were never born again, and made new creatures, and raised from being dead in sin, to a state of new, and before altogether unexperienced light and life, are in the hands of an angry God.” Outward expressions of religious belief, notes Edwards, are not nearly as important as deep and sincere repentance and faith.

Many of the Great Awakening’s leading figures disagreed over the best way to revitalize American religion. Some, known as “Old Lights,” sought to return to more traditional ideals, while so-called “New Lights” hoped to create a more democratic, individual-centered view of religion. Edwards’s sermon can be used to probe the larger significance of the Great Awakening. Overall it was arguably one of the most influential developments in colonial America, as it was the first colonywide movement and thus served to help develop a nascent degree of unity. Although perhaps too much should not be made of this, one could argue that by undermining the power of established clergy and putting more power in the hands of the common people, the Great Awakening served as a dress rehearsal for the American Revolution.
One exercise that this reviewer frequently uses (with credit to a colleague who originally developed the idea) is to provide students with excerpts from several Old and New Light sermons (with a more traditional Puritan sermon thrown in for good measure). Students can then read and discuss the excerpts in groups and decide which sermons belong to which camp.

In addition, many students are familiar with the style of today’s evangelists, and comparisons are inevitable. Teachers can easily find online video clips of programs such as The 700 Club to show to students for such purposes.
Thomas Paine’s *Common Sense* is one of those rare documents that perfectly captures and gives voice to many of the prevailing currents of its age. Published in January 1776, the pamphlet sold several million copies and achieved an immediate response throughout the colonies, because, as Edmund S. Morgan notes, “it said superbly all the things that Americans were waiting to be told.”

Students invariably react well to Paine’s language, noting the sermonlike tone and plain language of much of his work, which they often find a welcome relief from the far more legalistic work of many of his contemporaries. This reviewer has found that one of the most effective ways to use Paine’s work is to give students three or four short paragraphs from his pamphlet and ask them to choose one that represents some type of a departure from previous discussions about the relationship between Great Britain and the United States.

One notion that Paine stressed was the universality of the colonial cause. While the degree to which the colonists were motivated by considerations of principle or self-interest has caused major historiographical battles for generations, Paine is clear: “The sun never shone on a cause of greater worth. ‘Tis not the affair of a city, a county, a province, or a kingdom; but of a continent—of at least one eighth part of the habitable globe.” This presents the opportunity to discuss with students the American tendency to see things that benefit this nation as also being beneficial to the entire world, a theme repeated on many other occasions throughout U.S. history. In a similar vein, Paine argues that the colonies are the last bastion of freedom in the world, building upon John Winthrop’s earlier characterization of America as a “City Upon a Hill” and laying the groundwork for the nation’s later self-appointed role as the both the guardian and promoter of its institutions and way of life.

Another area in which Paine helped to create a major ideological shift was in his assessment of who was to blame for the deteriorating relationship between Great Britain and the colonies. While many colonists perceived a corrupt Parliament as the body bent on subverting their liberties, Paine was adamant in singling out George III as the villain of the unfolding historical drama. While Paine saw himself as ardently hoping for reconciliation with Great Britain before the battles of Lexington and Concord, after that point he “rejected the hardened, sullen-tempered Pharoah of England for ever,” questioning how that “wretch . . . with the pretended title of FATHER OF HIS PEOPLE
can unfeelingly hear of their slaughter, and composedly sleep with their blood upon his soul.”

In addition to criticizing George III, Paine goes further, condemning hereditary monarchy as a system that elevates people to positions of leadership without regard for their abilities. Such a system inevitably produces weak leaders. It was a small leap, then, for Paine to advocate republican government as the only system that could meet the needs of the colonial population.
The Federalist Papers (1787–1788)
Alexander Hamilton, John Jay, and James Madison
Available online at www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/federal/fed.htm
Reviewed by Jason George

The Federalist Papers, among the best guides to the development of political theory and ideology in any period of American history, appear as part of the Avalon Project at Yale University in a well-organized and easily accessible format.

The general outlines of the papers can be quickly summed up for students: a series of 85 letters published under pseudonyms by James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, and John Jay as part of the New York debates over the ratification of the Constitution. By closely examining the documents, students can get a much deeper sense of the political thought of the early republic.

Undoubtedly the most famous document, Madison’s Federalist No. 10, entitled “The Union as a Safeguard Against Domestic Faction and Insurrection,” invariably provokes student discussion of a host of different issues. In particular, the idea (used by Madison as a foil) that a republic can survive only in tightly circumscribed geographic boundaries is so alien to students that they often fail to grasp immediately the revolutionary nature of Madison’s argument. Madison’s position, that the multiplying of factions in a large republic will prevent the emergence of any controlling group, provides excellent fodder for student discussion. Students look for parallels with the present, when many would argue that the proliferation of various interest groups and causes has made America extremely different to govern (students often need an explanation of the historical context behind the Founders’ fear of factions). Finally, Madison’s discussion of the difference between a democracy and a republic is crucial to understanding early American political thought and can easily be applied to issues such as the indirect election of senators and the electoral college, since students frequently fail to understand the motivation behind the latter institution.

Although it is not as well known as Federalist No. 10, Hamilton’s Federalist No. 69, entitled “The Real Character of the Executive,” allows students to understand the context behind the debates over how much power the presidency was to be given. It is telling that Hamilton, even following the difficulties that the new nation faced—due at least partly to the presence of a weak central government under the Articles of Confederation—still took such great pains to assuage his readers’ concerns that the chief executive under the proposed constitution would not resemble the British king. Hamilton argues that the president’s election at four-year intervals, the president’s limited veto power, the concurrent power in treaty making, and the lack of power to declare war were all factors that would help prevent centralized executive power in the new nation. 
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The documents are presented in a format that is easily accessible and very readable, with large print. Perhaps the only drawback is that there are no introductory materials or commentaries to help students to place the debates in their historical context. A search engine for the papers is also included, although it operates extremely slowly.
The Interesting Narrative of the Life of Olaudah Equiano or Gustavus Vassa, the African (1789)
Olaudah Equiano
Available online at http://history.hanover.edu/texts/equiano/equiano_contents.html
Reviewed by Jason George

This powerful autobiography provides an engaging and accessible account of slave life, while also exploring the horrors of the institution of slavery. It can be read at many levels, from an exciting story to a complex antislavery narrative, making it useful for both AP and regular American history survey courses.

Equiano’s account is available in a number of different formats, both in print and on the Internet. The current review deals with the online version from Hanover College, which contains the first volume of his memoirs and is perhaps the most user friendly of the various editions. The first volume of the Interesting Narrative is divided into six chapters that cover a great deal of ground. Equiano, who lived from 1745 to 1797, begins with a brief discussion of his early life in Benin, discussing the land and his tribe’s customs. In the second chapter, he provides an account of his kidnapping and subsequent experiences during the Middle Passage. In the following chapters, he recounts being sold in a West Indian slave market, his life in Virginia, his return to England and baptism, his changing his name to Gustavus Vassa, and his return to the West Indies. Chapter 6 concludes on the eve of Equiano purchasing his freedom; he subsequently took part in a large number of adventures, including an exploratory voyage to the North Pole, which are covered in the second volume of his memoir.

Equiano’s narrative provides a number of excellent opportunities for classroom discussion. This reviewer has generally used it in the first several weeks of the academic year as part of a unit on colonial America, when it provides an introduction to the use of primary sources in the study of history. Students discuss Equiano’s efforts to depict the horrors of slavery in the worst light possible, noting that after the publication of the narrative in 1789, it became a bestseller in England as campaigns to end the international slave trade gained popularity. The basis of our discussion of the book frequently focuses on the Middle Passage, and Vassa’s account often works effectively in tandem with relevant segments from the miniseries Roots or Steven Spielberg’s Amistad.

After reading excerpts from Equiano’s account, students are invariably interested in discussing African slavery, as many are relatively unaware of the role of Africans in the slave trade. The opportunity thus arises to discuss the respective roles of Europeans and Africans in African history. Students also pick up on Equiano’s frequent religious references, as he ascribes many of the occurrences in his life to Providence. Following his conversion to Christianity, he argues that whites are superior to Africans, a topic that can
lead into an exploration of the relationship between Europe and Africa. (At times, Equiano seems to be advocating an early form of the so-called “White Man’s Burden” as a cure for Africa’s ills.) Finally, as the first autobiography written by a freed slave, Equiano’s work forms an excellent introduction to the slave narrative as a literary form, which provides students with background for later discussions of Frederick Douglass, among other figures.

Although the Hanover edition does not contain commentary, there are a number of excellent supporting materials that facilitate the use of Equiano’s account in the classroom. Especially good is an online discussion guide (www.georgetown.edu/faculty/bassr/heath/syllabuild/iguide/vassa.html) edited by Angelo Costanzo, who has published a book on Equiano. A 28-minute video, Son of Africa, available through the California Newsreel Company, provides a succinct overview of his life.
Benjamin Franklin is one of the best-known Americans from the eighteenth century, but students expecting to encounter a stale account of a “dead white man” will find his Autobiography surprisingly fresh and complex. Franklin reveals himself as both an accomplished public citizen and a surprisingly complicated private individual. Franklin’s stated purpose in writing is to show how his rise to wealth and fame might be imitated, yet he combines this smug self-satisfaction with a self-deprecating wit that amuses, engages, and sometimes bewilders readers. His attempt to show that pursuit of private success and material well-being can coincide with the public good has given his narrative a lasting appeal.

Franklin’s is a classic American success story. The tenth son of a Boston candlemaker, Franklin left his family to find fame and fortune as a printer in Philadelphia. Hard work and good connections led to so much financial success and social standing that this paragon of the work ethic could retire from his trade at age 42 and pursue a life of leisure and public service. Franklin educated himself, worked long hours, and preferred bread and water to meat and beer. Yet he also knew the value of a conspicuous display of work that was necessary to establish his reputation as being industrious. For a self-made man in the new colonies, Franklin argues, the appearance of discipline and frugality is at least as important as the reality of those virtues. Franklin also recounts some of his better-known public ventures, such as starting the academy that became the University of Pennsylvania, negotiating with Indian tribes, creating a fire department and public hospital, and his experiments with electricity and an efficient wood-burning stove.

Franklin’s memoir thus serves as a study of the Enlightenment in America, almost a colonial companion to Rousseau’s more famous Confessions. Franklin’s innate intelligence and confidence in reason led him to claim—in a very un-Puritanical fashion—that he was born with a good character and needed only to develop it through education and moral effort. Although he did not reject religion, he neither attended church regularly (Sunday being his study day, as if education was his salvation) nor had much use for religious enthusiasm. Instead he advocated a public religion that, in keeping with Enlightenment tenets, supported moral behavior and was judged not so much by what was true as by what was useful.
Yet it is not Franklin as the archetype of American economic success and public service that captivates most modern readers of the Autobiography. Instead, it is the way in which he combines the economic self-made man with the personal and psychological invention of the self. The highlight of the narrative is his project to achieve moral perfection, in which he identifies 12 virtues (and adds humility after a friend “kindly” informs him that he lacks this quality) and then proceeds by sheer determination to achieve each virtue, or at least its appearance. Thus he achieves virtue not by religion or through inner integrity, but by the outward display of disciplined behavior.

Students will likely find Franklin eminently readable and will often have strong reactions to him. Some are attracted to his practical utilitarianism and business success; others are angered by his snobbishness, chauvinism, and perceived hypocrisy. Although the entire text might be too long for most AP classes, excerpts can be a useful supplement to any discussion of American identity.
George Washington’s Farewell Address (1796)
George Washington
Available online at http://usinfo.state.gov/usa/infousa/facts/democrac/49.htm
Reviewed by Jason George

Although George Washington’s 1796 Farewell Address is perhaps one of the most frequently quoted documents in American history, it repays close scrutiny, revealing a great deal about the state of the United States in the mid-1790s.

Perhaps the most misunderstood element of this document is that it was not technically an address, since it was never delivered orally, but rather published in the Philadelphia American Daily Advertiser on September 19, 1796. The address is also most widely cited for Washington’s warning against “entangling alliances,” a term that never actually appears in the article, being first used instead in Thomas Jefferson’s first inaugural address. While many diplomatic historians long maintained that Washington was arguing for American isolationism, he was in fact simply saying that the new nation must be careful to safeguard its ability to act independently in world affairs and not become too closely tied to either England or France.

Washington was in fact prescient in noting the potential power that the new republic held, as America’s “detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course” from that of conflict-ridden Europe. The president predicts that “if we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance.” American expansion in the nineteenth century, of course, would bear out Washington’s prediction.

Although it is not discussed as often as his warning against being tied too closely to other powers, Washington’s “most solemn” warning against “the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally” forms a more prominent place in his message. The introduction to the document on this site notes that two-thirds of the address is dedicated to domestic affairs, much of it dealing with the problems inherent in political parties. Washington states that the spirit of party, or “faction,” creates a “formal and permanent despotism” by causing men to seek refuge “in the absolute power of an individual, and sooner or later the chief of some prevailing faction.” Such a process “serves always to distract the public councils and enfeeble the public administration,” by arousing popular passion, while also allowing foreign influence and corruption.

This address is too long to be read in class, although it could easily be assigned for homework. Another way to approach the document in a classroom setting is to divide the students into small groups and give each a different quotation from the address. Students could analyze the specific issues in the 1790s that prompted Washington to discuss the
points raised in the quotations. The warnings against party strife, for example, were a response to the increasingly vitriolic Federalist-Republican debates. Students could also analyze Washington’s quotations in the context of the present and determine to what degree his concerns were borne out by more current events.
The Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions (1798)
Thomas Jefferson and James Madison
Available online at http://sagehistory.net/newrepublic/documents/KyVaRes.htm
Reviewed by Jason George

The Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions offer a great deal of insight into the unresolved status of the relationship between the federal government and the states amid the emerging Federalist-Republican competition in the 1790s.

These two documents helped to open up a long series of debates over states’ rights and the proper construction of the Constitution that culminated in the Civil War. The immediate event that precipitated these was the passage of the Alien and Sedition Acts by the Adams administration in 1798. The Kentucky Resolutions, written anonymously by Vice President Thomas Jefferson, and the Virginia Resolutions, written by James Madison, both provided variations on these themes.

The key aspect of the Kentucky Resolutions was their emphasis on the ability of states to nullify laws that were unconstitutional. Jefferson noted in the first of the nine resolutions that the “several states composing the United States of America are not united on the principle of unlimited submission to their general government,” but rather in the form of a compact, under which “they constituted a general government for special purposes, delegated to that government certain definite powers, reserving, each state to itself the residuary mass of right to their own self-government.” And, in perhaps the most influential part of the document, Jefferson asserted that “whenever the general government assumes undelegated powers, its acts are unauthoritative, void, and of no force.” Since the doctrine of judicial review, established in the case of Marbury v. Madison, had yet to be formulated, Jefferson argued that the states had the right to determine the constitutionality of the federal government’s actions and the extent of the powers delegated to it by the Constitution.

While the two documents are frequently linked together, Madison’s emphasis in the Virginia Resolutions is somewhat different than that of Jefferson. The Virginia Resolutions open with a commitment to “maintain and defend” both the United States and the Virginia constitutions, and asserts that the Virginia Assembly “will support the government of the United States in all measures” warranted under the federal Constitution. Madison maintains, like Jefferson, that the federal government results from a “compact to which the states are parties,” but offers more of a protest against the Alien and Sedition Acts as a threat to civil liberties. He calls upon other states to cooperate with Virginia in declaring the acts unconstitutional and “in maintaining unimpaired the authorities, rights, and liberties, reserved to the states respectively, or to the people.”
Students should not have difficulty understanding the importance of these documents, particularly the implications of the doctrine of nullification. Simply having students brainstorm a list of laws they believe states could potentially declare null and void under Jefferson’s criteria should provide an object lesson in this area. Teachers who would like further documents for a lesson in this area could look at the Rhode Island and New Hampshire responses to the resolutions (available at www.pinzler.com/ushistory/rinhrespsupp.html). Both states strongly supported the power of the federal government and noted that the Supreme Court was the ultimate arbiter in determining the constitutionality of any legislative acts—anticipating John Marshall’s ruling in the Marbury case several years later.
Thomas Jefferson’s First Inaugural Address (1801)
Thomas Jefferson
Available online at www.bartleby.com/124/pres16.html
Reviewed by Jason George

Thomas Jefferson’s first inaugural address offers students an excellent opportunity to compare the third president’s goals with his later accomplishments and to determine the degree to which his election represented a “Revolution of 1800.”

Jefferson, who took office only after 36 ballots in the House of Representatives following his tie with Aaron Burr, began with the customary declarations of his humble abilities and concerns that he would be unworthy of the magnitude of the task before him. He quickly moved toward an attempt to calm the passions that had gripped the nation in the late 1790s, with rising partisan strife over the Quasi-War with France, the Alien and Sedition Acts, and continuing competition between the Federalists and Republicans to implement their diverging visions for the new nation. Jefferson, in one of his most famous statements, noted that “every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle,” as “we are all Republicans, we are all Federalists.” Overall, Jefferson remained relatively true to his word, removing only about a quarter of the Federalist officeholders he inherited, doing so more on the basis of ability, or lack thereof, than on party affiliation.

Attempting to develop his theme of limited central power, Jefferson called for “a wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another [and] shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned.” Jefferson did succeed in cutting the size of the federal government. Among the other “essential principles” of government that Jefferson outlined were “equal and exact justice to all men,” regardless of political or religious affiliation; peace and friendship with all nations and “entangling alliances with none” (a phrase usually mistakenly attributed to George Washington in his farewell address); and the support of state governments “as the most competent administrations of our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against antirepublican tendencies” (a reference to his fear of Federalist abuses of power).

Jefferson further pledged “the honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith” (he did reduce, but did not eliminate, the debt inherited by his administration) and “encouragement of agriculture, and of commerce as its handmaid,” part of his belief in a republic composed of virtuous yeoman farmers.

This reviewer has found that one of the most effective ways to deal with the Jefferson administration is simply to have students brainstorm from the goals or general principles laid out in his first inaugural and then compare them to his accomplishments in office.
Students invariably find that Jefferson represented a paradox. While he did succeed to some degrees in such areas as reducing the debt and cutting the size of the federal government, he expanded the use of federal power through such measures as the Louisiana Purchase and the Embargo Act, with his policies of “peaceable coercion” helping lead the United States into war against Great Britain. Many students argue that while he did not accomplish everything that he set out to do, he deserves credit for presenting an ambitious and positive agenda.
The Webster-Hayne Debates (1830)
Reviewed as part of the site www.earlyrepublic.net/hwdebate.htm
Reviewed by Jason George

This site provides insights into the so-called Webster-Hayne debates of 1830, one of the most explicit nineteenth-century discussions of the proper relationship between the federal government and the states and an event that helped to draw the battle lines for the emergence of the Civil War slightly more than 30 years later.

The “debates” between Daniel Webster of Massachusetts and Robert Hayne of South Carolina began in the course of a seemingly innocuous debate over federal land policy and became a discussion over nothing less than the nature of the Constitution. Author Hal Morris does a solid job in his introduction of setting the context of the debate in plain and straightforward language, noting that it grew from a conflict between the pro-states rights position of Andrew Jackson and his supporters and the “Unionist” philosophy of John Quincy Adams, Henry Clay, and many of their followers. While the latter group sought to promote the creation of an integrated national economy through Clay’s “American System,” supporters of the former position opposed the use of protective tariffs and the expansion of federal power that the Unionist program entailed.

Author Morris provides links to full texts of the speeches by both Webster and Hayne, complete with links to explanations of each paragraph. Hayne, an ardent defender of the rights of his home state, argued in the course of a long speech delivered on January 19, 1830, regarding the proper policy of the federal government toward western lands, that “the very life of our system is the independence of the states,” and that “it is only by a strict adherence to the limitations imposed by the Constitution on the federal government, that this system works well, and can answer the great ends for which it was instituted.”

Webster, in the course of an equally long reply, summarized the position of Hayne and others who argued that “the union [ought] to be preserved while it suits local and temporary purposes to preserve it; and to be sundered whenever it shall be found to thwart such purposes.” Webster, a self-described “Unionist,” argued that the framers of the Constitution had a different view of the Union, asserting that “I would strengthen the ties that hold us together.” In a wish that unfortunately proved at least temporarily in vain, Webster expressed his hope that the bonds of union would not come undone for a “very far distant” period.

The speeches by both men are long and at times complex, and author Morris provides a basic summary outline of the major arguments at the end of the site, although this gives students less incentive to read through the speeches themselves in order to grasp the
major points. Morris also offers strong biographical sketches of both Webster and Hayne that will help students to understand many of the background factors that influenced their respective positions. Although he discusses the debates and their aftermath, including the South Carolina Nullification Crisis, Morris never explicitly mentions the compact theory of the Constitution, an important idea for students to know in this context, as it provides much of the basis for the states’ rights side of this debate.
James K. Polk’s Inaugural Address (1845)

Although James K. Polk has drawn increasing attention from historians, students are still frequently surprised by the degree of successful activity in his administration. Reading and discussing his inaugural address allows students to understand many of the most important public concerns of the mid-nineteenth century.

Polk, widely considered to be the nation’s first “dark horse” president, reflected the values of his Tennessee predecessor Andrew Jackson, so much so that he was known as “Little Hickory.” In his inaugural, Polk outlined several major issues, including territorial expansion, reduced tariffs, and federal noninvolvement in internal affairs projects. Before launching his discussion of specific issues, Polk uttered the Democratic mantra of strict construction of the Constitution and committed his administration to assume no powers not expressly granted to the federal government. AP students should be able to place this within the context of debates on this issue going back to Hamilton and Jefferson.

The new president assumed Jackson’s mantle with regard to federal institutions, noting that we “need no national banks or other extraneous institutions planted around the Government to control or strengthen it in opposition to the will of its authors.” In addition, Polk asserted that the federal government was intended to be “plain and frugal” in its operations, and he sought the “strictest economy” in spending. In another Democratic article of faith, Polk offered a commitment to oppose protectionism and promote free trade. The nation’s tariff policy should be one in which “the raising of revenue should be the object and protection of the incident.” To reverse these principles “would be to inflict manifest injustice upon all other than the protected interests.”

Polk next turned his attention to the issue that defined his administration: territorial expansion. Congress had just agreed by joint resolution to allow Texas to enter the Union, an outcome that Polk wholeheartedly approved. Developing that theme even further, Polk examined the historical evolution of American views on adding new land, noting that it had been long thought that the Republic could not survive over a large expanse. However, Polk echoed Jefferson in noting that “as our boundaries have been enlarged and our agricultural population has been spread over a large surface, our federative system has acquired additional strength and security.”

The eleventh president managed to follow through on the pledges made in his inaugural to a remarkable degree. Polk restored the Independent Treasury, an institution brought about by the Van Buren administration to replace the Bank of the United States. He
vetoed a major internal improvements bill in 1846, reflecting his Jacksonian origins. The Walker Tariff of 1846 lowered duties to the lowest possible revenue-producing level. With the Mexican War and a compromise with Great Britain on the Oregon border, Polk was able to expand the nation’s territory in the West to a significant degree.

Polk’s successes, of course, helped to intensify the sectional tensions that culminated in the outbreak of the Civil War in 1861. Students who study his administration will come to the realization that he was an important transitional figure in this process.
In his 1845 article “Annexation,” published in the United States Magazine and Democratic Review to support American efforts to acquire Texas, journalist John L. O’Sullivan enunciated one of the key themes of American history and foreign policy.

The context of O’Sullivan’s famous phrase is well known: “Our manifest destiny [is] to overspread the continent allotted by Providence for the free development of our yearly multiplying millions.” One of the key changes in the American mindset that O’Sullivan introduced was that Americans not only had a right to expand, but a God-given duty to increase their landholdings. Students should be able to see how much of O’Sullivan’s rhetoric relates to other documents in American history. In particular, as many scholars have noted, the idea of Manifest Destiny, if not the term itself, was present in John Winthrop’s 1630 sermon in which he called upon the members of the Massachusetts Bay settlement to be “a city upon a hill.” In addition, the Jeffersonian vision of an ever-expanding “empire of liberty” was implicit in O’Sullivan’s writings.

Although he did not actually coin the phrase Manifest Destiny until 1845, O’Sullivan had started to develop many of the themes that comprised the idea as far back as 1839. In an article from that year entitled “The Great Nation of Futurity” (referenced at the URL at the top of this page), he argued that the United States is unique among nations: “being entirely based on the principle of human equality, these facts demonstrate at once our disconnect position as regards any other nation; that we have, in reality, but little connection with the past history of any of them, and still less with all antiquity, its glories, or its crimes.” Rather, America’s “national birth” represented “the beginning of a new history,” one that “separates us from the past and connects us with the future only.”

While students can use O’Sullivan’s writings to understand the ideology of American expansion, they can also use it as a more practical guide to the debate over whether or not Texas should join the Union. O’Sullivan addresses the threat that France and Britain posed to the Southwest, and attempted to dispel the fear of northerners that pro-annexationist forces simply sought to expand slavery.

In addition to the text of O’Sullivan’s writings, there is a wealth of other material available on the Web for more in-depth study of this topic. The PBS site on the Mexican War includes a number of short essays by various scholars on the meanings of Manifest Destiny and its application to different historical events. Sam W. Haynes of the University of Texas at Arlington is particularly effective, noting both the reasons for American
expansion in the 1830s and 1840s and the differing agendas of many of the advocates of Manifest Destiny. He concludes that “the champions of Manifest Destiny were at best a motley collection of interest groups, motivated by a number of divergent objectives, and articulating a broad range of uniquely American concerns.”
Reading Douglass should be a seminal event in the lives of young people everywhere. Readily accessible, this classic, first-person account is the perfect vehicle for introducing students to a part of history that continues to shape the contours of our social world. Yet including Douglass in an AP course presents challenges. Students will have difficulty separating the text’s rhetorical and literary strategies from its gripping historical subject matter.

The book, which became an immediate best seller upon its publication in 1845, tells the story of Frederick Douglass, a slave fathered by a plantation superintendent in rural Maryland. At the age of eight, he is sent to work for a family in Baltimore, where he teaches himself to read and write and eventually becomes a skilled maritime worker. The comparative ease of his life in Baltimore stands in stark contrast to the narrative’s central moments, when Douglass is sent back to the country to be “broken” by the notorious “Negro breaker” Covey. Still in his teens, Douglass teeters on the abyss of annihilation. Perhaps the most important moment in the narrative is Douglass’s decision to defend himself against the sadistic Covey, a rehearsal for the final escape from slavery soon to follow. In 1838, Douglass did escape slavery in Baltimore, eventually settling in New Bedford, Massachusetts, where he launched a career as an abolitionist, orator, women’s rights advocate, journalist, and newspaper editor. In addition to its lasting impact on the abolitionist movement worldwide, Douglass’s narrative has become part of the American canon, held up as a classic of nineteenth-century autobiography.

While Douglass is unquestionably the most important African American leader and intellectual of the nineteenth century, teaching his narrative raises a host of questions about self-representation within the context of slavery. Mastering the basics of the text within the context of an AP class is within reach, but equipping students to write cogently about the underpinnings of such a complicated narrative perspective is another matter. The Narrative was written, essentially, to dispel growing public doubts about the popular orator’s experiences as a slave. It was published with prefatory documents from prominent abolitionists William Lloyd Garrison and Wendell Phillips. To truly understand Douglass, students must understand the various elements that came together to make the narrative palatable for its mid-nineteenth-century audience, including the skill with which Douglass appropriated the language and symbolism of American middle-class culture and religion to denounce the evils of slavery and racism.
The Norton Critical edition reprints the 1845 first edition of Douglass’s work. Explanatory annotations and “Contexts” provide readers with contemporary perspectives, including Douglass’s account of his escape from slavery, which he chose not to include in the 1845 Narrative; samples of Douglass’s use of his slave experience in two of his most influential antislavery speeches; and reminiscences by James Monroe Gregory and Elizabeth Cady Stanton of Douglass as both orator and friend. The accompanying critical essays give readers a sense of the history of the Narrative’s reception. If time and budget permit, the Norton edition is worthwhile, because it puts some of the necessary contexts at students’ fingertips. There are, however, many fine, minimal paperback editions available, including those from Yale ($7.95), Penguin ($8.95), and Dover Thrift ($1.00).
The Seneca Falls Declaration of Sentiments and Resolutions (1848)
Elizabeth Cady Stanton, et al.
Available online at www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/Senecafalls.html
Reviewed by Jason George

Students can gain a good deal of insight into the first organized manifestation of the women’s movement, as well as the larger changes occurring in mid-nineteenth-century America, by examining the Seneca Falls Declaration of Sentiments, adopted in July 1848.

The meeting of over 100 men and women at Seneca Falls, New York, reflected the reform sentiment of the age, as the 1830s and 1840s were a period of deep social, intellectual, moral, political, and religious change in the United States. The Seneca Falls Convention had its genesis in the 1840 World Anti-Slavery Convention, where women were not allowed to be seated as official delegates on the basis of their sex. Antislavery activists Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth Cady Stanton took the lead in creating a convention that would articulate women’s grievances.

The convention’s delegates consciously modeled their Declaration of Sentiments after the Declaration of Independence. They began by asserting that “all men and women are created equal,” and then added a list of “repeated injuries and usurpations” by men against women. Among these were depriving women the right to vote, making women subject to laws that they had no part in formulating, taking away women’s property rights, framing divorce laws in such a way that they always favored the male, denying women access to higher education, giving her a subordinate position in church affairs, and providing a different code of morals for men and women.

On the basis of the grievances that the convention’s members listed, their declaration then listed a series of 12 resolutions. Among the most important was the assertion that all laws that kept women from “occupying such a station in society as her conscience shall dictate” were determined to be “contrary to the great precept of nature, and therefore of no force or authority.” (An interesting discussion topic would be to link this with the doctrine of nullification, a concept that played such a significant role in nineteenth-century politics.) Among the more controversial resolutions was the one calling on women to secure the right to vote, an issue that split the feminist movement for much of the rest of the nineteenth century (this was the only one of the resolutions not to pass unanimously).

Students can also gain a sense of contemporary opinion about the declaration from a collection of editorials from Elizabeth Cady Stanton’s scrapbook made to commemorate the event. The Recorder, a religious journal, noted that while editors “need not say we think the movement excessively silly,” it nonetheless would include excerpts from the
declaration to satisfy its readers’ curiosity. Many of the clippings are from the *National Reformer*, a paper—not surprisingly, given its title—favorable to the cause of women’s rights.

In addition to the text of the declaration itself, a Smithsonian site (www.npg.si.edu/col/seneca/senfalls1.htm) contains a short history of the convention and the events surrounding it that includes a number of interesting anecdotes and vignettes. Only one signer of the original declaration, Charlotte Woodward, for example, was alive when the Nineteenth Amendment allowing women to vote was ratified.
“On the Duty of Civil Disobedience” (1849)
Henry David Thoreau
Dover Publications, 1993
ISBN 0486275639
$1.50
Also available online at http://eserver.org/thoreau/civil1.html
Reviewed by John Faithful Hamer

This short polemical essay, a classic of American political thought, is an excellent way to address one of the most important philosophical cleavages in nineteenth-century American reform movements—between those who stressed political activism, and those who stressed individual-centered perfectionism.

In “Civil Disobedience,” Thoreau (1817–1862) maintains that the true transformation of America can only happen—one individual at a time—as a result of private (and altogether personal) practices such as introspection and civil disobedience. Against many contemporaries—who believed that if they could just seize power and change America’s institutions and laws, a better America would necessarily emerge—Thoreau argues, “Law never made men a whit more just” (3). If we are to reform America, we must first reform ourselves, Thoreau asserts; live your beliefs, and you can turn the world around.

Thoreau’s plain style is clear, engaging, and to the point. Students should not have any trouble following his argument. They may, however, need help in seeing how Thoreau’s arguments fit into the historical context of the mid-nineteenth century. I have found that students tend to read this essay as a timeless piece of political theory, and in an important sense, of course, it is. But the challenge for a history teacher using this splendid little essay is to help students move beyond merely applying Thoreau’s ideas to current events.

One good way to encourage this sort of analysis is to focus on the passages that deal directly with northern opposition to the Mexican War. You could also discuss the parts of “Civil Disobedience” that deal with abolitionism. As an antislavery tract, Thoreau’s essay is particularly interesting in that he has precious little to say about Southern slaveholders, and yet has a great deal to say about the Northerners who, he argues, aid and abet the slave system through their allegiance to the federal government.

Thoreau is not greatly moved by the sins of slaveholders, for they are clear, out in the open, and for that reason, somewhat honest. “I quarrel not with far-off foes,” he writes, “but with those who, near at home, co-operate with, and do the bidding of those far away, and without whom the latter would be harmless” (4). Thoreau is more troubled by the multifarious ways in which large structures such as the federal government succeed, through taxation and conscription, in making otherwise decent people complicit in great evils.
In teaching this essay, you might want to compare it with Martin Luther King, Jr.’s “Letter from a Birmingham Jail” (1963), which makes a similar argument and deals with many of the same themes. King was greatly inspired by Thoreau’s essay, and perhaps had him in mind when he said that Americans would “have to repent in this generation not merely for the hateful words and actions of the bad people but for the appalling silence of the good people.”
**Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl (1861)**
Harriet Jacobs
Signet Classics, 2000
ISBN 0451527526
$5.95
Available online at http://xroads.virginia.edu/~HYPER/JACOBS/hjhome.htm
Reviewed by Tim Lehman

This work is rapidly gaining acceptance as a classic woman’s slave narrative, a sort of female companion to Frederick Douglass’s better-known autobiography. It provides an accessible course supplement for the years before the Civil War, dealing with Northern prejudice against African Americans, plantation sexual and racial dynamics, religious indoctrination of slaves, and daily life in the antebellum South.

There are a number of points of similarity between Jacobs’s account and Douglass’s, including the use of personal stories to refute proslavery arguments, the unmasking of the hypocrisy of Christian slaveholders, and a carefully constructed appeal to the moral sensibilities of a nineteenth-century northern middle class. Unlike Douglass, however, Jacobs emphasizes themes of sexuality, children, and family.

Harriet Jacobs was raised by her grandmother in Edenton, North Carolina, and experienced the worst of slavery when, at the age of 15, her owner began making repeated sexual advances toward her. In order to thwart her abusive owner, she yielded instead to the advances of a white neighbor. After giving birth to two children, she decided to try to escape in order to protect the children from her master’s cruelty. After seven years of hiding in a tiny attic crawlspace, she escaped to New York, where she worked to free her children and unite her family. Jacobs’s experience makes plausible her claim that, although slavery was oppressive for men, it was worse for women: female bodies and private lives could be violated by the sexual assaults of owners, and children could be sold at any time, thus denying women the comfort of family.

Female bonds of affection play a crucial role at every stage of Jacobs’s narrative, from her close but troubled relationship with her grandmother to the slave women who assist her escape. These bonds also connect her to the white women of New York who help her evade detection, gain employment, and ultimately find a literary voice in the antislavery movement of the North. It is no wonder that she makes direct and repeated appeals to the women of the North to arouse their moral indignation at the unspeakable evils of slavery. If some of this sounds sentimental and strange to contemporary ears, students will warm to her claim that slavery inverts all principles of morality, making craftiness a virtue, honesty a vice, and theft a necessity (stealing back one’s own wages). This is the context for discussing the central moral event in the story: Jacobs’s decision to rebel against her
master by yielding to her neighbor. Under the perverted morality of the evil slave system, Jacobs argues, a sexual relationship freely given to a kind man was preferable to one forcibly required by a cruel, licentious master.

Although the entire narrative may be too long for inclusion in most AP courses, *Incidents* can be successfully excerpted. Students might be assigned readings about the above moral dilemma (chapters 5–10), the hysterically repressive reaction to Nat Turner’s rebellion (chapter 12), or the offensive way in which the Fugitive Slave Law degraded whites and terrorized blacks in the so-called “free states” (chapter 40). Isolated chapters can also be excerpted to serve as important documents in antebellum social history.
Teachers seeking a historical counterweight to the rags-to-riches tales of Morgan, Rockefeller, and Carnegie can draw on one of the original muckraking documents, Jacob Riis’s *How the Other Half Lives*. This Danish-born police photographer utilized his forays into the criminal underworld of New York City’s Lower East Side to produce a series of photographs accompanied by essays that revealed the seamy world of the immigrant experience.

I have found this work helpful when discussing the roots of progressivism and muckraking. Exposes such as Riis’s provided encouragement for New York City and other urban centers to improve working, housing, and communal conditions, and students get firsthand accounts and visuals of the slums that helped promulgate change.

Thanks to a number of online sites, teachers can find resources for making lesson plans or direct students to do their own research. A Web site provided by Yale University (www.cis.yale.edu/amstud/inforev/riis/title.html) contains the complete text and accompanying photos of Riis’s work. Photos can also be downloaded from the Museum of the City of New York (www.mcny.org/Exhibitions/riis/riis.htm) and converted to transparencies or projected onto a computer screen. Additionally, Life.com (www.life.com/Life/heroes/newsletters/nlriis.html) offers a short biography on Riis and additional links about his life and work. Finally, because Riis’s work was so bound up with the immigrant experience, the Lower East Side Tenement Museum’s site (www.tenement.org) is helpful in showing how families in New York’s slums lived before and after the city instituted housing standards.

Because of the difficulty of providing class copies of *How the Other Half Lives*, I rely heavily on student use of these sites. Their own research can make for supplementary materials for class discussions on America’s turn-of-the-century urban crises.
Frederick Jackson Turner’s 1893 address to the American Historical Society, while often challenged by many more recent historians, nonetheless provides students with a host of issues to discuss in the AP U.S. History classroom.

Turner’s thesis is clear: “The existence of an area of free land, its continuous recession, and the advance of American settlement westward, explain American development.” One of Turner’s major efforts is to put to rest the “germ theory” of national development, which posited that American democracy resulted from the transplantation of European ideas and institutions. Instead, he argues that the “frontier is the line of the most rapid and effective Americanization.” This occurs because while the frontier and its environment initially overcome the settler, he is gradually able to transform the wilderness, resulting in a “new product” that is distinctly “American.”

One of Turner’s more initially surprising conclusions is his discussion of the “nationalizing tendency” of the West, which “transformed the democracy of Jefferson into the national republicanism of Monroe and the democracy of Andrew Jackson.” While this may seem at odds with Turner’s later discussion of the degree to which the frontier promotes individualism, he convincingly argues that “mobility of population is death to localism, and the western frontier irresistibly in unsettling population,” noting that expansionists such as Henry Clay, William Henry Harrison, Thomas Hart Benton, and Andrew Jackson all represented the West.

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of Turner’s address, and the one to which students invariably relate, is his discussion of American characteristics, which he sees as having been molded by the nation’s frontier experience. These include individualism, distrust of authority, love of democracy, inquisitiveness, practicality, energy, and the “buoyancy and exuberance which comes from freedom.” The timing of Turner’s thesis was such that it can easily be taught at the beginning of the second semester of U.S. History, when students have sufficient background to analyze the author’s list of American characteristics. This reviewer has found that students, either before or after reading Turner, are able to brainstorm their own list of American characteristics and then determine how many of them derived from the frontier and how many of them were the result of European influences.
Equally important, of course, is Turner’s prognosis following the 1890 census, which concluded that the frontier era in American history had come to an end. Turner, in his address, is unclear about what the next period of American history holds. While Peter Noble and others have pointed out that Turner believed in many of the reforms that later manifested themselves during the Progressive Era, he did not want to speak out publicly on these matters for fear of losing the appearance of objectivity in his writings.

Turner, of course, leaves a great deal out. Even the most fleeting familiarity with the “New Western History” will alert the reader that white conflict with Native Americans plays almost no role in the West’s development, while women and minorities play no role in Turner’s story. Nonetheless, students should not leave U.S. History without being exposed to Turner and his argument.
The Atlanta Compromise Speech (1895)
Booker T. Washington
Available online at www.africawithin.com/bios/booker/atlanta_compromise.htm
Reviewed by Jason George

The civil rights movement has frequently faced debate over how best to combat the deep and continuing tradition of racial discrimination in the United States. One of the more controversial elements in this continuing debate was Booker T. Washington’s 1895 Atlanta Compromise Speech, a reading of which can help students understand one side of this key issue.

Washington, of course, was an ex-slave who headed the Tuskegee Institute in Alabama and advocated a course of industrial education to help African Americans gain the skills they would need to obtain jobs and thus improve their economic status. His prestige, as well as the possible perception that he was a moderate on many issues, gave him access to many members of the nation’s white political establishment.

Although Washington advocated civil rights in a behind-the-scenes manner, younger intellectuals and activists such as W. E. B. DuBois criticized Washington’s public emphasis on vocational education and on economic opportunities over social advancement and political rights. When Washington died in 1915 during the controversy over D. W. Griffith’s film *Birth of a Nation*, having initially urged African Americans not to protest the opening of the film, he appeared to be a figure who was outpaced by events.

Washington’s most famous public address, delivered at the Cotton States Exposition in Atlanta, must be understood in the context of the New South. Many southern leaders sought to lift their region out of the economic disruption caused by the Civil War by attracting northern capital to create an industrial base as an engine for the New South’s prosperity.

The goal of Washington’s address was to convince the southern economic elite that African Americans were indispensable to the South’s efforts to enter the modern era. Because one-third of the southern population was African American, no “enterprise seeking the material, civil, or moral welfare of this section can disregard this element of our population and reach the highest success.”

In the period immediately following the Civil War, Washington noted, many African Americans had believed “that a seat in Congress or the state legislature” was more attractive “than real estate or industrial skill.” Washington most famously urged African Americans to “cast down your bucket where you are,” meaning that they should seek “friendly relations with the Southern white man, who is their next-door neighbor.”
Similarly, the white leaders of the South were urged to “cast down their buckets” close to home, using African Americans as alternatives to immigrant labor in southern factories. Southern whites were urged to depend upon African Americans “whose habits you know, whose fidelity and love you have tested in days when to have proved treacherous meant the ruin of your firesides.”

Washington’s more controversial statements included his assertion that the “wisest among my race” believed that “agitation of questions of social equality is the extremist folly,” with progress having to come from “severe and constant struggle rather than of artificial forcing.”

While much of Washington’s approach appears outdated in today’s context, his efforts to have African Americans adopt the quintessential American values of hard work and belief in social mobility will continue to have resonance for many as long as discussions on racial issues continue, as they undoubtedly will for decades to come.
The emergence of the United States as a world power arguably began with the Spanish-American War, a “Splendid Little War” that ended up providing America with a far-flung empire. Studying President William McKinley’s war message provides some degree of insight into the nation’s motives for entering the conflict as well as a way to study his leadership.

In order to best understand McKinley’s war message, students will need to understand the historical and historiographical context. The traditional interpretation of the Spanish-American War is that McKinley was a weak president (“with the spine of a chocolate eclair,” in the supposed words of Theodore Roosevelt) who was goaded into war by an outraged public. The public had been whipped into a frenzy by the “yellow journalism” of the Hearst and Pulitzer papers, which had capitalized on such events as the cruelties of the Spanish government toward Cuba and the explosion of the USS Maine in Havana Harbor. However, like Dwight Eisenhower, McKinley’s reputation has improved with the passage of time, with a number of historians portraying him as a shrewd politician who had a keen grasp of events and was able to manipulate them to his advantage, rather than vice versa.

In his message to Congress, delivered on April 11, 1898, McKinley unambiguously laid responsibility for the problems in Cuba at the door of Spain. A series of Cuban insurrections forced the United States to exercise its neutrality at “great effort and expense,” and to lose numerous economic opportunities. In addition, the Cuban revolts had “caused irritation, annoyance, and disturbance among our citizens,” while Spain “by the exercise of cruel, barbarous, and uncivilized practices of warfare, shocked the sensibilities and offended the humane sympathies of our people.” McKinley offered a detailed criticism of Spain’s “reconcentration” policy, which he called something “happily unprecedented in the modern history of civilized Christian peoples.”

Given Spain’s unwillingness to compromise, as well as the determined resistance of the Cuban people, McKinley concluded that “short of subjugation or extermination, a final military victory for either side seems impracticable.” Despite the president’s willingness to act as a mediator, Spain would not agree to all of the conditions that he set forth, leaving him with no recourse but to seek a declaration of war against Spain. After offering a detailed historical justification for the precedent of recognizing the Cuban insurgency, McKinley recapitulated his reasons for asking Congress to approve the commencement of hostilities toward Spain. While he noted that America had a duty to put an end to the
bloodshed occurring in Cuba for humanitarian reasons, the most important reason for intervening was that the United States could not afford to have continued strife and disorder on its doorstep.

In addition to the text of McKinley’s war message, teachers can find extensive material about the McKinley Era through the Ohio State University's Gilded Age resources project (www.cohums.ohio-state.edu/history/projects/McKinley/). The site contains biographical information presented through primary sources, as well as a large number of political cartoons about McKinley and his presidency.
America’s late-nineteenth-century choice between remaining true to its ideals of freedom, democracy, and humanity and embarking on a path of militarism and imperialism is the subject of Charles Eliot Norton’s address “True Patriotism,” given before the Men’s Club of the Prospect Street Congregational Church in June 1898.

Norton, who served as the vice president of the New England Anti-Imperialist League, had an impressive career as a Harvard historian and translator of Dante, as well as an editor of the influential North American Review and as a founder of the Nation. In his address, Norton went to great lengths to stress the positive elements of the nation’s history, noting that “millions upon millions of men have lived here with more comfort, with less fear, than any such numbers elsewhere in any age have lived.” Not only has America provided great material benefits to its citizens, but in addition, the “conditions which have prevailed in America have, if broadly considered, tended steadily and strongly to certain good results in the national character; not, indeed, to unmixed good, but to a preponderance of good.” Indeed, today’s students will likely react with well-founded skepticism to many of Norton’s claims about the nation’s history and present.

However, the nation’s direction over the 30 years prior to 1898, including “the apparent decline in power to control the direction of public and private conduct,” referring to the abuses arising from the nation’s rapid industrialization and the rapid descent into war, “should bring home to every man the question whether or not the nation is true to one of the chief of ideals to which it has professed allegiance,” that of being a peace-loving nation. Norton then goes on to cite the malign effects of war, quoting Benjamin Franklin’s statement, “There never was a good war.”

Referring specifically to the Spanish-American War, Norton has little patience for those who claim that humanitarian concerns for Cuba’s well-being motivated the war effort against Spain. Replacing Spanish rule by force “means either practical anarchy or the substitution of the authority of the United States for that of Spain.” Attempting to relieve the Cubans’ suffering by waging war “is fighting the devil with his own arms.” Norton concludes by calling upon his audience to oppose the war on moral grounds, raising the images of James Russell Lowell and his opposition to the Mexican War and John Bright and his denunciation of the Crimean War.
Norton’s speech would work most effectively in conjunction with a pro-imperialist document such as President William McKinley’s war message or Albert Beveridge’s “The March of the Flag” speech (www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1898beveridge.html), given in September 1898, in which the Indiana senator stressed the benefits of annexing the Philippines. The latter, in particular, would allow students to see the ways in which equally patriotic Americans each took different approaches to the issue of imperialism.

Norton’s speech occurs in the early stages of the emerging debate over America’s new world role, and many of the later anti-imperialist arguments he mentions have yet to be developed. Yet as an early voice commenting on a major national turning point, albeit on the losing side, Norton deserves to be heard by students.
Booker T. Washington’s ideas may be deservedly unpopular these days, but his autobiography makes surprisingly good reading. As a supplemental text, Washington’s story can provoke discussion of a number of important Gilded Age themes, especially industrial values and race relations.

A real-life Horatio Alger, Washington was born in slavery and worked his way to national prominence. In this sense his autobiography invites comparisons with other classic American success stories, such as the autobiographies of Benjamin Franklin and Frederick Douglass. Like these predecessors, Washington saw the value of education and learned to read on his own. Through a combination of hard work and good luck, he achieved success, first at Hampton Institute, then as founder of Tuskegee Institute, and ultimately as one of the most recognized leaders of his day. Reading his autobiography makes clear how the values he championed—education, industry, and property—grew naturally out of his own experiences.

Washington’s role as a Gilded Age archetype, almost an African American Andrew Carnegie, is often overshadowed by his well-known accommodationist positions on race relations. Some of Washington’s claims on race strike modern ears as outrageous and dreadfully wrong: that many slaves had a deep attachment for their masters, that merit will always be rewarded, that African Americans who survived slavery were often better off than Africans still in Africa, or that Reconstruction encouraged among blacks an unhealthy dependence on the federal government. Students may want to argue with these claims, but they should also be encouraged to understand how these ideas grew out of Washington’s own experiences and how and why they were so eagerly accepted by white society.

In this context, Washington’s 1895 Atlanta Exposition Address, the “Atlanta Compromise,” deserves special attention. The speech by itself is worth reading even if students do not read the full autobiography. The language is accessible, the images vivid, and the meaning clear: African Americans, indeed everyone, should start at the bottom; labor will be rewarded; the franchise will come with patience rather than “political forcing;” and racial and sectional reconciliation (rather than “agitation”) will lead to equality. An analysis of audience is crucial for understanding the importance of this
speech. With a South implementing a vicious Jim Crow segregation and a nation hoping to forget the Civil War in favor of nationalist glory, it should be easy to see how white Americans would gladly crown Washington the “spokesman” for black society.

Whether one uses the full autobiography or simply the Atlanta Exposition speech, it is probably best to pair it with W. E. B. DuBois’s essay “Of Mr. Booker T. Washington and Others,” which is a chapter of *The Souls of Black Folk* and widely excerpted elsewhere. DuBois attributes Washington’s popularity to his ability to express “the speech and thought of triumphant commercialism,” and goes on with a withering attack on Washington’s compromise. With enough background, students might also be encouraged to see how Frederick Douglass, 60 years earlier, and Martin Luther King, Jr., 60 years later, met and refuted arguments similar to Washington’s. Approached carefully and comparatively, *Up from Slavery* can provide grist for lively debate and provocative student writing.
Though W. E. B. DuBois was not the first African American to rise to international prominence, his writings were the most influential in changing white America’s perceptions about the intellectual capacities of blacks. A discussion of his argument and influence is essential to the AP U.S. History course.

The product of a Massachusetts upbringing and a science-based education, DuBois was a pioneer in applying research to examine the plight of urban blacks (as in his studies of Philadelphia) and rural, postslavery culture. The culmination of years of fieldwork, *The Souls of Black Folk* (1902) was a formidable mix of statistics, anecdotes, journalism, and observations that delineated the past and the possibilities of black life in America. It is the opening lines of chapter 2 that succinctly state the issue as DuBois saw it: “The problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color line.” As *The Souls of Black Folk* demonstrates, DuBois saw the only possible solution to that problem in allowing blacks to embrace their past while looking forward to a future of true equality in America.

Of the work’s fourteen chapters, teachers may find “Of Our Spiritual Strivings,” “Of Mr. Booker T. Washington and Others,” and “The Sorrow Songs” the most instructive for students. The latter was one of the first analyses of the history and purpose of spirituals and blues, a lesson which can be supplemented by audio clips available at [http://jefferson.village.virginia.edu/utc/christn/chsohp.html](http://jefferson.village.virginia.edu/utc/christn/chsohp.html).

What sets the book apart from the work of apologists such as Booker T. Washington was DuBois’s doctrine of “the talented tenth,” that portion of black culture that would eschew Washington’s emphasis on trade schools, envisioning instead an intellectual and artistic flowering that would reach its apex two decades later in the Harlem Renaissance. Historian Margaret Washington delineates the boundaries of this debate between Washington and DuBois in a recent American Experience documentary, *America 1900*. A text and audio clip of her comments can be found at the companion Web site ([www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/1900/filmmore/reference/interview/washing_bookertdubois.html](http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/1900/filmmore/reference/interview/washing_bookertdubois.html)).
Given the long and often difficult history of United States relations with Latin America throughout the twentieth century, students can profitably look back to Theodore Roosevelt’s 1904 and 1905 addresses, which laid the groundwork for much of American involvement in the region.

The context in which Roosevelt delivered his address involved the inability of many Latin American nations, particularly Venezuela and the Dominican Republic, to fulfill their obligations to European creditors. The United States, sparked by the activist diplomacy of McKinley and his successor, Roosevelt, sought a canal through Central America to help facilitate a greater regional and world role. Fearing European, especially German, intervention as a threat to the canal and to America’s growing prestige, Roosevelt in December 1904 issued a statement that arrogated “international police power” in the region to the United States.

Few topics are as reliable for engaging student debate and discussion as the issue of American intervention abroad, especially since the nation’s world role has come into sharper focus since September 11. Roosevelt’s statements are couched in terms that many students will likely find arrogant and overbearing by today’s standards. He begins by denying any selfish motive for American interest in the region. The only thing that the United States hopes for “is to see the neighboring countries stable, orderly, and prosperous.” Those countries that “conduct themselves well can count upon our hearty friendship.” The definition of “good conduct” is of course left ambiguous, and could easily be paired with Woodrow Wilson’s statement that he planned “to teach the South American republics to elect good men.” Both statements reflect the American belief that it had a duty to determine what was “good” or “right” for Latin America.

However, in the Western Hemisphere, several nations demonstrated a tendency toward “chronic wrongdoing, or an impotence which results in a general loosening of the ties of civilized society.” With regard to these nations, the United States would be forced, “however reluctantly, in flagrant cases of such wrongdoing or impotence, to the exercise of an international police power.” Roosevelt’s emphasis on civilization was a core component of his foreign policy, and can be discussed not only in reference to Latin America but other regions as well. During the Russo-Japanese War, he favored the Japanese because he saw them as a modernizing power, as opposed to declining Russia. Students may be tempted to view Roosevelt’s statements about and actions toward Latin
America as racist, but should be cautioned that his views were more complex than a simple belief in white superiority. He saw modernization, not color, as the central test of a nation’s fitness.

Those seeking more context about Roosevelt’s message may go to the PBS American Experience site (www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/presidents/nf/featured/tr/lafecoro.html) to read or hear an audio clip of historian Walter LaFeber addressing the topic. LaFeber, who has written several books dealing with U.S.–Latin American relations, stresses the degree to which the Roosevelt Corollary laid the groundwork for a series of approximately a dozen U.S. interventions in the region over the next two decades.
Plunkitt of Tammany Hall (1905)
William L. Riordon
Signet, 1995
ISBN 0451526201
$5.95
Also available online at www.gutenberg.org/etext/2810 or
www.blackmask.com/olbooks/plnth.htm
Reviewed by Dalit Baranoff

Plunkitt of Tammany Hall is a classic account of machine politics at the turn of the
twentieth century. In this slim volume, George Washington Plunkitt, a ward boss in New
York’s Tammany organization, explains machine politics to the public. The short,
engaging segments are ideal primary sources for the classroom.

Plunkitt was part of Tammany Hall, the Democratic Party machine that controlled New
York City during the second half of the nineteenth century and the first third of the
twentieth. As its subtitle announces, this book consists of “a series of very plain talks on
very practical politics.” To understand what Plunkitt is referring to in his talks, students
should be familiar with the history of machine politics, particularly in New York City.
The work consists of 23 short chapters. In chapter 1, “Honest Graft and Dishonest Graft,”
Plunkitt explains how he has made money off of municipal improvement projects. His
matter-of-fact description of insider deals gives a clear picture of how political graft
works. If you only assign students one chapter to read, this should be the one.

Chapter 2, “How to Become a Statesman,” is also useful. In this “talk,” Plunkitt explains
how he rose in the ranks of the Tammany organization by getting people behind him.
Other chapters explaining what is necessary to succeed in his world include “To Hold
Your District: Study Human Nature and Act Accordin’,” “Tammany Leaders Not
Bookworms,” “On the Use of Money in Politics,” and “Bosses Preserve the Nation.”

In other chapters, Plunkitt decries civil service reform, scoffs at political reformers, and
derides the upstate “Hayseeds” who tax New York City. Overall, this book, in part or in
its entirety, could profitably be paired with the work of an urban reformer, such as
Lincoln Steffens (The Shame of the Cities) or Jane Addams (Twenty Years at Hull House).

Originally recorded by New York Evening Post reporter William Riordon, Plunkitt’s talks
were first published together in 1905. Reprinted in 1963 and in numerous editions during
the 1990s, the text is also available at a number of online sites. The advantage of most
print editions is that they provide important background information on both Plunkitt
and Tammany Hall. The advantage of the online editions is that they are free. All the
online editions contain the text in is entirety.
The e-text version available through Project Gutenberg contains minimal formatting, making it difficult to read, but it can be downloaded to a disk for free. (All e-texts on the Project Gutenberg site are in the public domain and can be reproduced at no cost.) It is best to access the text through one of Project Gutenberg’s mirror sites (University of Pennsylvania or University of Maryland), because the Project Gutenberg site is painfully slow. Another alternative, Blackmask.com, provides a more browser-friendly version of the text.
Twenty Years at Hull-House (1910)
Jane Addams
Available online at http://xroads.virginia.edu/~HYPER/ADDAMS/title.html
Reviewed by Jeff House

Jane Addams’s life embodied two themes of the late nineteenth century: progressivism and the women’s movement. As such, a study of her Twenty Years at Hull-House enables students to see the roots of these factors, which played such a prominent role in twentieth-century U.S. history.

Influenced by the moral climate that directed Christian piety toward the solution of social ills, Addams embodied the social gospel ethic that sought to use morally grounded action to combat the excesses of the Gilded Age. Inspired by social settlements she’d visited in England, Addams planned Hull House as an educational center that would give Chicago’s burgeoning immigrant class the skills to navigate the economic milieu of America. On these issues, chapters 8 (“Problems of Poverty”) and 11 (“Immigrants and Their Children”) provide examples of Addams’s direct action involvement in the community that surrounded Hull House. Teachers focusing on this aspect of progressivism will find much material for student discussion in Addams’s first-person accounts, showing how reformers moved from proselytizing among the poor to addressing poverty and ignorance firsthand.

In this, Addams’s behavior paralleled the lives of other women who found in social action a life more valid than that offered by the progenitors of “domestic science.” I have taught the work of Addams in a larger unit on such women that includes Nellie Bly (whose journalistic adventures are captured wonderfully in an American Experience video, Around the World in 72 Days, and its companion site at www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/world/index.html) and Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony (also documented movingly in a PBS video, Not By Ourselves, Alone, with its own companion site at www.pbs.org/stantonanthony/). Decades before the success of the suffragettes, such women fought the restrictions of their culture.

Twenty Years at Hull-House is available for free online in the fine edition under review from the University of Virginia, as well as at a number of other Web sites.
Wilson’s Fourteen Points Speech (1918)
Woodrow Wilson
Available online at http://usinfo.state.gov/usa/infousa/facts/democrac/51.htm
Reviewed by Jason George

Few documents in the history of American foreign policy have had a more lasting impact than Woodrow Wilson’s Fourteen Points speech, delivered in January 1918 as part of his effort to outline American war aims. In so doing, Wilson also laid out a blueprint for much of America’s approach to international relations for the rest of the century.

The introduction to the document, part of the United States Information Agency’s useful “Basic Readings in American Democracy” series, neatly summarizes the significance of Wilson’s speech. Much of what Wilson proposed, including free trade, open diplomacy, democracy, and self-determination, reflected the goals that American progressive reformers were attempting to accomplish on the home front. This presents the opportunity to open a discussion with students about the degree to which the United States has sought to project its domestic agenda and institutions to other nations. In addition, the introduction notes, Wilson’s speech was the only clear statement of Allied war aims.

Perhaps most importantly, Wilson’s Fourteen Points presented an alternative to the realist vision of diplomacy that had guided international relations since the emergence of the modern nation-state system in the seventeenth century. Wilson “argued that morality and ethics had to be the basis for the foreign policy of a democratic society.” This explanation, of course, fails to account for the interpretation held by many historians: that Wilson sought to create a stable world capitalist order that would allow for American trade and investment abroad.

The first of Wilson’s points calls for “open covenants, openly arrived at,” a hope in which Wilson proved vainly disappointed, particularly when it was learned that the British and the French had already divided much of the Middle East between them in 1916. Next, Wilson called for free trade and freedom of the seas. The fourth and fifth points call for disarmament and for the “free, open-minded, and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims” on a basis that allowed the equal participation of all the parties to any territorial changes made.

While most of the remaining points deal with specific territorial questions outstanding at the time, the final point was to prove the most contentious. Here Wilson calls for a “general association of nations . . . formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike.” The U.S. Senate, of course, refused to ratify the Treaty of Versailles and allow American participation in the League of Nations.
In addition to a study of the Fourteen Points themselves, students may also profitably analyze Wilson’s discussion of America’s motives for entering the war, which he argued occurred “because violations of right had occurred which touched us to the quick and made the life of our own people impossible unless they were corrected and the world secured once for all against their recurrence.” Thus, the United States entered without hope of gain for itself. Students can discuss these statements in conjunction with statistics showing the rapid growth of American trade with England and France, and corresponding decline with Germany, after 1914.
A classic contribution to the genre of the immigrant novel, *Bread Givers* tells the story of a young Jewish girl who grows up in poverty on the Lower East Side of New York City, the neighborhood made famous by the Progressive photographer Jacob Riis in *How the Other Half Lives*. The novel is an outstanding primary text to give U.S. History students to read, because it brings to life topics of immigration, poverty, and Progressivism so important to understanding the early twentieth century.

*Bread Givers* was written by Anzia Yezierska, who immigrated with her family from a Russian-Polish village in the 1890s and was nurtured as a writer by the Progressive educator John Dewey. The main character, Sara Smolinsky, is a scrappy girl who watches each of her older sisters enter into oppressive marriages under pressure from their tyrannical father. Sara embarks on a different path by educating herself, eventually graduating from college and becoming a teacher in her old ghetto neighborhood. Though it is a tale of the immigrant who assimilates into dominant American society through education, *Bread Givers* is remarkable for its Yiddish cadence and representation of Jewish life and culture in the desperate ghetto conditions of the New World. Further, it portrays both the limited opportunities for and the resourcefulness and pluck of poor women.

*Bread Givers* also references and critiques the Progressive tendency to control and to impose dominant Anglo-Saxon values upon the immigrant ghetto dwellers who were the object of their reform. Even as Sara succeeds in school by working hard, she articulates an acute sense of being an outsider and criticizes the lack of understanding on the part of settlement house educators. She eventually comes to value the Jewish heritage against which she had so vehemently rebelled. The novel thus portrays an identity struggle in the Jewish community and among immigrant groups more broadly—to assimilate or to retain religious traditions and ethnic heritage, especially in an anti-Semitic society.

*Bread Givers* was originally published in 1925, but the novel fell into obscurity until the 1970s, when it was rediscovered by social historians and pioneers in women’s history. The novel is worth assigning as a whole; it reads quickly, generates enthusiastic discussions, and awakens students’ interest with its portrayal of generational conflict and the value of education. Questions could include how the novel expresses key aspects of Progressivism, whether assimilation is a vehicle of progress for young immigrant women, and how the novel portrays the mythology of America as a land of plenty.
Herbert Hoover’s Inaugural Address (1929)
Herbert Hoover
Available online at www.bartleby.com/124/pres48.html
Reviewed by Jason George

One of the inevitable developments in the study of past leaders is that they will undergo the process of historical reevaluation. Few, it would seem, have undergone such wide swings in public opinion as Herbert Hoover, who took office as a representative of the prosperity of the 1920s and ended his term linked to the horrors of the Great Depression. This address gives critical insights into his thinking.

Hoover’s lack of charisma and seemingly uncompassionate response to the human suffering of the nation’s economic crisis made him an easy target for contemporary observers, whose accounts influenced subsequent historical accounts. He was thus portrayed as a symbol of the failure of laissez-faire. However, Hoover lived into the 1960s, remaining involved in public affairs for several decades after he left office. His warnings against the evils of big government and widespread foreign commitment appeared increasingly prescient in the face of American involvement in Vietnam and the failure of many of the nation’s domestic Great Society programs.

The reevaluation of Hoover included greater respect for his response to the Depression, noting that he expanded the role of the federal government to a heretofore unprecedented degree and laid the groundwork for the New Deal. At the same time, Hoover’s commitment to maintaining a balanced budget, and his fear that direct government aid to the unemployed would sap American initiative, kept him from advocating efforts that went as far as his successors.

The key to Hoover’s conception of the proper role of government lies in what some historians have termed the idea of “voluntarism,” which the new president outlined in his inaugural address. According to Hoover, the focus of American economic thought “should be to establish more firmly stability and security of business and employment and thereby remove poverty still further from our borders.”

Such a vision would be enacted through progress “born of cooperation in the community—not from governmental restraints.” Hoover’s defeat of Democrat Al Smith confirmed “the determination of the American people that regulation of private enterprise and not Government ownership or operation is the course rightly to be pursued in our relation to business.”
Hoover’s voluntarist vision for Americans focused a great deal on the ideal of what he termed self-government, an ideal that “does not and should not imply the use of political agencies alone.” Hoover had experienced great success during the 1920s as secretary of commerce in getting business to work together with the government to meet goals that he considered to be in the public interest, an approach that was notably less successful during the Depression.

Hoover’s presidency and that of his successor, Franklin D. Roosevelt, helped to bring about a dramatic realignment of the nation’s two major political parties. The Republican Party, previously that of activist government and reform, became committed to a view that emphasized local and individual initiative. The Democrats, by contrast, went from a party largely dominated by states’ rights activists from the South to one that sought to use the power of the federal government to help the disadvantaged. For better or worse, Hoover played a central role in this important process.
One of the central historiographical debates about the New Deal is whether it was a continuation of earlier American reform traditions or represented a drastic departure in terms of introducing new ideas and programs. Students should be able to find evidence for both positions in FDR’s first inaugural address and will likely be able to engage in lively debate on the basis of this document.

With the possible exception of Abraham Lincoln, no president took office facing such dire domestic and foreign crises as Franklin D. Roosevelt. Indeed, Roosevelt’s response to the Great Depression and resulting expansion of presidential leadership have provided a template by which all subsequent presidents have been judged. Roosevelt in many ways epitomizes an American style of leadership that eschews rigid ideological formulas for a more pragmatic approach to problems. As a result, Roosevelt’s New Deal policies drew from America’s Progressive Era reform programs, the experience of government mobilization during World War I, and a host of other ideas provided by his advisors.

FDR’s first inaugural address forthrightly lays out the nation’s myriad problems and notes the need for solution, without committing him to any specific course of action. Some, particularly radical historians, have criticized Roosevelt for failing to provide a comprehensive blueprint for solving unemployment and inequality. On the other hand, Roosevelt’s flexibility allowed him to respond to problems as they arose and to discard programs that proved unsuccessful.

One way to use this document in the classroom would be to give students a copy of the address and have them research the solutions that Roosevelt attempted for each of the problems that he laid out. Students could also be asked to identify the sources of many of Roosevelt’s ideas based on their study of earlier periods of American history.

The gravest problem that the United States faced in 1933 was unemployment (which had reached nearly 25 percent when FDR took office). Roosevelt stated that this deep problem could be addressed, among other means, through “direct recruiting by the Government itself, treating the task as we would treat the emergency of war.” (The use of war analogies throughout American history would provide fodder for an entire classroom discussion of its own.)
The chronic weakness of the nation’s agricultural centers offered another significant problem for the new president. Roosevelt noted that solving this required “definite efforts to raise the values of agricultural products and with this the power to purchase the output of our cities.” This can be used as an introduction to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and subsequent efforts to improve America’s rural plight.

Inadequate regulation of the nation’s financial sector, of course, contributed both to the onset and the depth of the Depression. FDR proposed “strict supervision of all banking and credits and investments” to provide “an end to speculation with other people’s money” (such rhetoric was clearly in the Populist-Progressive reform tradition).

The new president called for “broad Executive power” to meet the Depression, “as great as the power that would be given to me if we were in fact invaded by a foreign foe.” While FDR’s expansion of the power of his office allowed for the government to expand its conception of the public welfare, it arguably ushered in the so-called “imperial presidency” that culminated in Watergate and other excesses in the 1960s and 1970s.
The “Quarantine” Speech (1937)
Franklin Roosevelt
Available online at http://academic.brooklyn.cuny.edu/history/johnson/quarantine.htm
Reviewed by Jason George

Studying Franklin Roosevelt’s “Quarantine Speech” of 1937 and its historical context provides some insights into his seeming shifts of attitude and opinion on foreign policy issues. It may help students to use a case study to achieve a better understanding of his overall foreign policy goals and objectives.

AP students often have difficulty completely grasping Roosevelt’s character—but they are far from alone in this. Historian Warren Kimball called him “The Juggler,” an apt description of a president who was able to hold seemingly incompatible opinions at the same time or who was famous (or infamous, as the case may be) for telling different people what they wanted to hear. Historians often cite the anecdote about Roosevelt’s reaction to being presented with two speeches on tariff policy, one advocating free trade and another advocating protectionism, and simply telling his advisors to weave the two together.

Despite Roosevelt’s zigs and zags, the seemingly dominant historiographical perspective, expressed by Robert Dallek in his voluminous 1979 book Franklin D. Roosevelt and American Foreign Policy, 1932–1945, is that the president was at heart an internationalist. Dallek, for example, cites such factors as Roosevelt’s cosmopolitan background, his ties to his activist cousin Theodore Roosevelt, his position as assistant secretary of the navy, and his support for the League of Nations as the Democratic vice presidential candidate in 1920. However, notes Dallek, Roosevelt was also keenly aware—perhaps even too aware—of the mood of the electorate, and he moved at an excruciatingly slow pace in increasing American involvement in world affairs during the growing international crisis of the late 1930s for fear of arousing isolationist opposition.

The “Quarantine Speech” was delivered on October 5, 1937, in Chicago, a bastion of isolationist sentiment. The immediate precipitating event for the speech was Japan’s invasion of China. The world political situation, declared Roosevelt, had grown “progressively worse” in recent years, with the idealistic hopes of world peace, so prevalent in the 1920s, having “of late given way to a haunting fear of calamity,” with the emergence of a “reign of terror and international lawlessness.” Roosevelt sought to link the situation abroad with America’s domestic welfare, calling the world situation one of “definite national importance” for the United States. Near the conclusion, Roosevelt reached the best-known part of his speech: “When an epidemic of physical disease starts to spread, the community approves and joins in a quarantine of the patients in order to protect the health of the community against the spread of the disease.”
Roosevelt never mentioned any of the aggressor nations by name, nor did he offer any specific proposal regarding the ways that the United States and other “peace-loving” nations could work to contain aggression. By remaining vague, Roosevelt had the advantage of not committing himself to a specific policy or set of actions. Public reception of the speech was at best less than uniformly enthusiastic, and Roosevelt did little openly to follow up on his statements. Instead, he continued to work within the constraints imposed on him to help resist the rise of aggression until the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor brought the United States into World War II. Students studying his speech and its aftermath should see Roosevelt as someone who understood the art of the possible—perhaps too well.
Few documents have proven more influential for modern American foreign policy than the Truman Doctrine, which—depending upon one’s perspective—either allowed the United States to play a role in protecting democracy and freedom throughout the world, or committed the nation to a costly policy in which it strained its resources in an effort to extend power to far-flung corners of the world.

The context in which the Truman Doctrine was issued in March 1947 is well known. The British government, exhausted by World War II, had informed American leaders that it would no longer be able to maintain its commitments in the Mediterranean. Truman had to find a way to convince the American people to support a program of aid to Greece and Turkey, and—in the words of Michigan senator Arthur Vandenberg—would have to “scare hell out of” them in order to accomplish this. (Some historians have blamed Truman’s alarmist rhetoric for creating an atmosphere of hysteria that prevented a rational debate about the communist threat and thus contributed to such excesses as the House Un-American Activities Committee hearings and McCarthyism.)

Because of the need to mobilize popular and congressional support, Truman’s address is clear and easy to follow. He outlines Greece’s plight, noting that because of the destruction caused by World War II, “a militant minority, exploiting human want and misery, was able to create political chaos which, until now, has made economic recovery impossible.” Similarly, Turkey—while it was spared the destruction suffered by Greece—needed American aid in order to maintain order and stability in the Middle East.

Perhaps the most important part of the speech is Truman’s effort to outline for the American people the implications of a policy of aid to Greece and Turkey. The major goal of U.S. foreign policy was to promote “the creation of conditions in which we and other nations will be able to work out a way of life free from coercion.” However, the world situation had become one in which people had to choose between two ways of life, one “based upon the will of the majority” and distinguished by such characteristics as free institutions, representative government, and free elections and another “based upon the will of a minority forcibly imposed upon the majority.” In his most famous line, Truman—not naming the Soviet Union—asserted that “it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.”
The Truman Library Web site (www.trumanlibrary.org/teacher/doctrine.htm) has a lesson plan section of 10 activities related to the doctrine. While some of these are rather basic, they do touch upon areas that are normally skimmed over in textbook and monographic accounts of the early Cold War, particularly focusing on events “on the ground” in Turkey and Greece. More advanced students could benefit from using the Library’s “digital archive,” which has a “Truman Doctrine Study Section” (www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/doctrine/large/doctrine.htm) containing seven folders’ worth of scanned documents dealing with various aspects of the doctrine. This could provide rich opportunities for student research projects of any degree of length or complexity.
Certain speeches sometimes become inextricably tied with memorable phrases or ideas that remain lodged in the public mind. Such is the case with President Dwight D. Eisenhower’s farewell address, with his warnings against the rise of the so-called “military-industrial complex,” which perhaps runs a close second to Washington’s Farewell Address as the most famous such document in U.S. history.

Eisenhower, of course, has undergone drastic fluctuations in historical interpretation. Contemporary observers perceived the president as an amiable, grandfatherly figure who preferred spending time on the golf course to attending to national affairs. Beginning in the 1970s, historians and political scientists with access to Ike’s private papers realized that he was in fact much more active and engaged than his public image would indicate. Princeton scholar Fred Greenstein coined the term “hidden-hand presidency” to describe Eisenhower’s ability to manipulate events without taking a high public profile that would associate him with unpopular or unsuccessful policies. In addition to gaining a greater appreciation for Eisenhower’s leadership, biographers such as Stephen Ambrose and historians including John Lewis Gaddis contrasted the former general’s ability to balance American resources and commitments favorably with more charismatic leaders such as his successor, John F. Kennedy.

To obtain this balance between resources and commitments, Eisenhower’s “New Look” defense policy relied less upon costly conventional forces than upon nuclear weapons (along with covert actions) to preserve American security. Central to Eisenhower’s quest to balance ends and means was his not always successful effort to hold down defense spending, which was particularly difficult in the wake of the Soviet launching of Sputnik in October 1957 and consequent fears that America would fall behind the USSR in the space and missile races.

Eisenhower’s budgetary efforts were part of a larger ideology that believed maintaining the vitality of the American free enterprise system was a key element in the Cold War. To meet the Soviet threat, Eisenhower noted in his address, the United States did not need “the emotional and transitory sacrifices of crisis.” Instead the situation called for “those [sacrifices] which enable us to carry forward steadily, surely, and without complaint the burdens of a prolonged and complex struggle—with liberty at stake.”
Eisenhower was more successful in theory than in practice, as defense spending rose toward the end of the 1950s. His fears of the rise of the so-called “garrison state” (a phrase he used with some variations in other contexts) may have failed to acknowledge the resiliency of the American economy. On the other hand, the disastrous American involvement in Vietnam and the related economic troubles of the 1970s, coupled with the budget deficits resulting from Ronald Reagan’s defense buildups in the 1980s, provide support for those who would advocate cautious leadership in husbanding the nation’s resources and limiting commitments.

AP students will profit from reading and studying Eisenhower’s address in the light of the post-9/11 atmosphere, one in which American leaders have been forced to respond to a series of threats that they have chosen to perceive as part of a worldwide struggle against terrorism.
John F. Kennedy’s Inaugural Address (1961)

John F. Kennedy
Available online at www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/presiden/inaug/kennedy.htm
Reviewed by Jason George

Few recent political leaders have captured the public’s attention to the degree that John F. Kennedy has. Studying his inaugural address can help AP students gain deeper insights into JFK’s goals as president and serve as a jumping-off point for examining how successful he was in accomplishing them before his untimely death in November 1963.

Kennedy, for course, has undergone wide swings in historical interpretation. In the years following his death, aides such as Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., and Theodore Sorenson published accounts that stressed the degree to which Kennedy’s death cut short a promising administration on both the foreign and domestic fronts. More recent accounts have stressed both Kennedy’s potentially dangerous aggression in foreign affairs and his relative indifference to pressing domestic issues such as poverty and civil rights.

A close reading of Kennedy’s address could offer support for both views. The best-known sections of the address, of course, are Kennedy’s exhortations to his countrymen to “ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man.” Equally well known is his assertion that the United States “shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty.”

The statements above, of course, can be seen in several lights. Kennedy’s call for sacrifice helped to bring many idealistic young people into public service through such agencies as the Peace Corps. On the other hand, Kennedy’s statement of American resolve had the potential to involve the United States in costly foreign adventures (as ultimately occurred in Vietnam).

Kennedy’s address, however, should be seen as more than a clarion call in the Cold War conflict with the Soviet Union. Kennedy acknowledged the changes occurring in the world, especially the challenges of decolonization sweeping Africa and Asia. Helping these nations was the “right” thing to do, because “if a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich.”

Many Kennedy biographers have argued that the Cuban Missile Crisis alerted the president to the dangers of the Cold War and made him more strongly committed to reducing international tension in the period before his death. Yet it should be pointed out that Kennedy, while stressing the need for the United States to achieve a position of strength, believed that the nation should “never fear to negotiate.”
The parents of most students (if not their grandparents) remember Kennedy, and it is a useful exercise to have them ask questions of their older family members. The mother of one student, having grown up in Venezuela, recalled her optimism upon hearing of Kennedy’s plans for the Alliance for Progress, which helped provoke an interesting discussion on the appropriate role of the United States in other nations.

Finally, it is difficult to avoid drawing parallels between the Cold War context of Kennedy’s speech and the current war against terrorism. Kennedy’s speech is dominated completely by foreign policy, as are many of those by George W. Bush. Similarly, both tend to express a deep faith, for better or worse, that the United States has the resources, the will, and the ability to influence events throughout the world.
Rachel Carson was named one of the 100 most important women of the second millennium, and her 1962 best seller *Silent Spring* is often cited as having launched the modern environmental movement. Carson’s work challenged the Cold War alliance of corporate science, modern industry, and government bureaucracy that dominated the 1950s and brought ecological thinking and citizen action into the mainstream of public life during the 1960s. That she was a woman taking on a predominantly male scientific establishment also makes her a proto-feminist of sorts, although she herself did not accept that term.

Because *Silent Spring* is so clear and accessible, excerpts from the book can be easily integrated into the history classroom as primary documents for analysis and interpretation. Carson combines a variety of roles to make a persuasive argument for a mainstream audience in the still conservative early 1960s, and students should be challenged to sort out these different voices in the text. Carson is not only a scientist, but knows how to play the role of scientist in order to be effective with her target readers. But her voice is not always scientific. We hear the rabble-rouser, the activist, the poet, the earth mother, the preacher, the investigative reporter, and the populist citizen.

The historical importance of Carson’s work lies not only in its specific attack on DDT and chemical pesticides more broadly, but even more in her habits of thought, which have become commonplace during the late twentieth century. Indeed, Carson, more than any other person, gave the word “environment” its current meaning by associating it with words and phrases such as “pollution,” “ecology,” “the web of life,” and “the balance of nature.” Students will need to remember the context of the 1940s and 1950s in order to appreciate fully the significance of this change—a context in which science promised the mastery of natural forces, agriculture boosted by chemicals could produce ever more food supplies, industrial production benignly supplied increasing consumer demand, and government effectively watched out for the public health of society. Once the historical and social contexts are clarified, students can better understand how our contemporary notions of environmental protection and ecological balance hardly existed outside the scientific community until Carson published her book.
Reading the whole book is probably not necessary; from the standpoint of science, it has long since become outdated. However, close reading of some excerpts, especially from the earlier chapters, will help students sharpen their analytical skills. They need to analyze the situation, audience, purpose, persona, and design of the book, and they will need your help doing so.
The Port Huron Statement (1962)
Tom Hayden, et al.
Available online at http://coursesa.matrix.msu.edu/~hst306/documents/huron.html
Reviewed by Jason George

Few primary source documents provide as in-depth a view of the forces and issues that precipitated the rise of the student protest movements as the Port Huron Statement, issued by the organization Students for a Democratic Society (SDS).

Reflecting the activism of the early stages of widespread white involvement in the civil rights movement and the growing concern about the nation’s values and direction, a group of approximately 60 or so students came to the University of Michigan in the late spring of 1962 to chart a course. Twenty-two-year-old activist Tom Hayden, the statement’s author, began by noting their unease with the paradoxes America faced at the time, a theme of increasing concern since John Kenneth Galbraith had articulated the shameful coexistence of “private wealth and public squalor” in his 1958 book The Affluent Society.

Hayden and his contemporaries were “bred in at least modest comfort, housed now in universities, looking uncomfortably to the world we inherit.” While the United States was the world’s wealthiest and most powerful nation in their early youth, their initial complacency was “penetrated by events too troubling to dismiss,” particularly the “permeating and victimizing fact of human degradation, symbolized by the Southern struggle against racial bigotry,” and the “enclosing fact of the Cold War,” which was symbolized by the possibility of atomic destruction at the hands of the Soviet Union.

The answer that SDS developed to address the nation’s ills was a system of so-called participatory democracy, in which the individual would be given a role in the decisions that would affect the quality and direction of his life and in which society was “organized to encourage independence in men and provide the media for their common participation.” The document goes on to list a number of other political and economic principles to guide the system, all of which shared the common element of increasing human dignity and self-worth.

One of the most lasting expressions from the Port Huron Statement was the degree to which students felt disconnected from the key institutions of American life. The most obvious area for them to express their feelings was the university, with the Berkeley Free Speech Movement of 1964 and the Columbia protests of 1968 just two examples of student dissatisfaction with the then-dominant values and goals of higher education. In American universities, noted Hayden, people cared about "social status," in the form of “the quality of shirt collars, meeting people, getting wives or husbands, making solid
contacts for later on” and “academic status” in the form of “grades, honors, the med
school rat-race.” Little attention, however, was paid to “real intellectual status, the
personal cultivation of the mind.” The apathy among college students was further
perpetuated by a “cumbersome academic bureaucracy” that created a sense of “outer
complexity and inner powerlessness” that young people were unable to break through.

This document is quite long (approximately 36 single-spaced pages), so it would have to
be assigned either for homework or in very short excerpts in class. However, the
statement’s diagnosis of American society at the very beginning of a tumultuous decade
makes it a worthwhile subject for detailed analysis.
“Letter from a Birmingham Jail” (1963)
Martin Luther King, Jr.
Available online at
www.sas.upenn.edu/African_Studies/Articles_Gen/Letter_Birmingham.html
Reviewed by Jason George

Martin Luther King, Jr.’s “Letter from a Birmingham Jail,” while a challenging read, raises a host of issues for students to discuss, revealing a great deal about the civil rights leader’s commitment to nonviolent protest and civil disobedience.

The events that precipitated King’s letter occurred in the spring of 1963, when he was jailed following his efforts to help promote the desegregation of Birmingham, widely considered one of the South’s most segregated cities. The confrontations in Birmingham, particularly the actions of Public Safety Commissioner Eugene “Bull” Connor, helped to focus much of the nation’s attention on the need for civil rights legislation. At the same time, eight Alabama clergymen published a letter criticizing King for his actions. Because, as King himself wrote, he had little else to do “other than write long letters, think long thoughts, and pray long prayers,” his reply offers an extremely detailed exposition and justification of his philosophies of nonviolence.

King begins by responding to the clergy’s assertion that demonstrations should not have taken place in Birmingham, a circumstance that King blames on the actions of the city’s white power structure, which made the protests necessary. In a very significant section, King then presents the steps taken in a nonviolent campaign: “collection of the facts to determine whether injustices exist; negotiation; self-purification; and direct action.” In response to the question of why he chose direct action rather than negotiation, King replies that tension must be created to “help men rise from the dark depths of prejudice and racism to the majestic heights of understanding and brotherhood.” Sounding a theme that he later took up to a greater degree after 1965, King links the African American civil rights struggle to that of the nations of Asia and Africa, “moving with jetlike speed toward gaining political independence” while African Americans “creep at horse-and-buggy pace toward gaining a cup of coffee at a lunch counter.”

Another issue that King raises that will likely spark student interest is his discussion of the difference between just and unjust laws. The former “is a man-made code that squares with the moral law of God,” while the latter “is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law.” Laws inflicted on a minority without that group’s consent, such as Alabama’s segregation statutes, were unjust. Such laws called forth the need for civil disobedience. King takes pains to distinguish civil disobedience from the wanton disregard for law advocated by segregationists, arguing that an individual who breaks such an unjust law with full acceptance of imprisonment or other punishment in fact demonstrates “the highest respect for law.”
The version of the letter under review includes a list of over 20 discussion questions and activities to use to follow up a reading of King’s letter. A version available at the King Center (www.thekingcenter.org/non/letter.html) also includes a complete audio recording of the letter that runs for approximately one hour.
“The Great Society” (1964)
Lyndon Johnson
Available online at http://coursesa.matrix.msu.edu/~hst306/documents/great.html
Reviewed by Jason George

Given the attention surrounding the third installment in Robert Caro’s epic four-volume biography of Lyndon Johnson (which has yet to reach the period of his presidency), as well as the continuing debate over the future of America’s social programs, students will likely have little difficulty in seeing the relevance of the speech that launched the Great Society.

More than anything else, students will likely be struck by the great degree of optimism and sense of America’s unlimited resources that the speech reflects. Delivered in May 1964, before the large-scale escalation of the U.S. war effort in Vietnam and the domestic upheavals that resulted, the speech outlines Johnson’s plan to use America’s wealth “to enrich and elevate our national life, and to advance the quality of our American civilization.” In his most famous rhetorical flourish, Johnson states that “we have the opportunity to move not only toward the rich society and the powerful society, but upward to the Great Society.” This would involve “an end to poverty and racial injustice,” towering goals that the president calls “just the beginning.”

In order to accomplish his vision, Johnson pledges work in three areas: cities, the countryside, and the nation’s classrooms. Projecting that the nation’s urban population would double in the remainder of the twentieth century, Johnson states that “we must rebuild the entire urban United States.” The growth of cities worked to “erode the precious and time honored values of community with neighbors and communion with nature.” To help the American countryside, Johnson argues that Americans “must act to prevent an ugly America.” Finally, given the large number of Americans who were unable to even finish high school, the president promises to work to improve American education.

Students can assess this speech and the overall Johnson presidency by looking at both his accomplishments in office and the legacy of the Great Society. Given the persistence of urban problems of crime, drug usage, and abandoned housing (to name just three of the most prominent), coupled with the federal government’s persistent inattention to cities, Johnson seems to have failed here. The record on the environment and education is more mixed, allowing students to offer argue either positively or negatively. While debate continues over the proper direction for the nation’s public schools, and news of poor test scores and other negative indicators continue to cast doubt on the American educational system, Johnson did provide federal aid to public schools for the first time and opened higher education to many Americans through the provision of financial aid.
The other question that students must come to grips with is how a president who had among the most ambitious domestic agendas of the twentieth century, was unparalleled in his ability to deal with Congress, succeeded a revered president, and was elected in his own right by a landslide in 1964, declined to run for reelection in 1968 after nearly being defeated by a virtual unknown in the New Hampshire primary. The answer, of course, was Vietnam. Discussing the relationship between Johnson’s desire to promote his Great Society and contain communism abroad will help students to solve the riddle of Johnson’s presidency.
Stokely Carmichael’s 1966 position paper, “The Basis of Black Power,” offers a manifesto that clearly explains his disenchantment with the mainstream of the civil rights movement and offers a more radical program for achieving black equality.

Frustrated after having been arrested in Greenwood, Mississippi, during 1966 for the twenty-seventh time, Carmichael began to express his calls for a reliance on “Black Power.” The author’s overall position is expressed very clearly at the outset—white people, no matter how well-intentioned, cannot relate to black life and to the black experience, because American society has so thoroughly inculcated its white population, even at the most subconscious level, with a sense of black inferiority. In addition, white involvement in the civil rights movement is harmful, because it changes the character of any meeting in which people of both races are involved. African Americans “feel intimidated by the presence of whites, because of their knowledge of the power that whites have over their lives.” Thus, whites have no place in black organizations.

That does not mean, according to Carmichael, that whites have no role to play in improving the racial situation in the country. However, the place that they should do this is in the white communities, “where the whites have created power for the express purpose of denying black human dignity and self-determination.” Unfortunately, Carmichael concludes, most white radicals “have sought to escape the horrible reality of America by going into the black community and attempting to organize black people while neglecting the organization of their own people’s racist communities.”

In addition to his discussion of the role of whites in the civil rights movement, Carmichael also offers an agenda to help blacks improve their situation. To achieve “true liberation,” blacks “must cut ourselves off from white people.” To do this, blacks “must form our own institutions, credit unions, co-ops, political parties, write our own histories.” In addition, Carmichael called upon blacks to go even further and to stop allowing “white people to interpret the importance and meaning of the cultural aspects of our society.” Whites, rather than blacks, are responsible for colonialism and for the “genocidal” Vietnam War, and thus they “must try to raise themselves to our humanistic level.” In short, African Americans should “reject the American dream as defined by white people and must work to construct an American reality defined by Afro-Americans.”
For more extensive background and commentary on the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, students and teachers can consult the Web site “SNCC, 1960-1966: Six Years of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee” (www.ibiblio.org/sncc/index.html), a fairly extensive project done by students at the University of North Carolina. In addition, Michael Kaufman’s 1998 obituary of Carmichael (www.interchange.org/Kwameture/nytimes111698.html) (he died of prostate cancer at age 57), who later changed his name to Kwame Ture to honor several African leaders who gave him sanctuary after he left the United States, offers a fascinating discussion of the origins of Black Power and other aspects of Carmichael’s life and career.
Anne Moody’s autobiography *Coming of Age in Mississippi* is a powerful statement about what it meant to be an activist in the civil rights movement in the United States, and is a significant text in the canon of African American autobiography. The book can be assigned as a whole or in parts as a primary source on the civil rights movement in the AP U.S. History survey.

*Coming of Age in Mississippi* was published in 1968, when tensions between black nationalists and more traditional civil rights activists were running high. Moody’s book made both a political statement about the movement and a social statement about what it was like to grow up poor, black, and female in a region that made those facts oppressive.

As a political statement, the autobiography encourages readers to consider the possibilities—and impossibilities—of transforming race relations in the United States in terms of both the philosophy of nonviolence and strategies of militant resistance. Moody presents a series of life experiences that led her to reject passive acceptance and accommodation to the rituals and violent enforcement of segregation. She eventually attended Tougaloo College in Jackson, one of the epicenters of civil rights activism. As a member of the student movement, Moody was involved in acts of resistance to segregation such as lunch counter sit-ins, projects to help southern black people achieve economic independence and development, and calls to organize national demonstrations. *Coming of Age* is often gripping to read, for example, as Moody recounts long nights of bracing for violent white reaction to local activism.

As a social statement, Moody’s book recounts fundamental experiences, such as going to the “colored” section of the local movie house, working as a domestic servant in white homes, and attending a church that counseled accommodation rather than resistance to racism. Generational conflict is also a theme—Moody writes that her mother feared for her daughter’s life and the family’s survival when she became involved in the civil rights movement. This fear was certainly justified, as violent white reprisal was common, but Moody believed that change would only come when African Americans focused on the higher need for self-development and political challenges to the status quo of segregation. Moody’s emphasis on her love of learning and her growing sense of pride in herself as a young woman reinforces the theme of the individual preconditions for making political change. Her text can be read alongside such autobiographies as Frederick Douglass’s *Narrative* and Richard Wright’s *Black Boy.*
The unfolding relationship between social context, individual development, and political consciousness and activism and its clear prose style make *Coming of Age* a good text to read as a whole. At close to 400 pages, it may be too long for some high-school classes; representative excerpts are chapters 3–5, 10, 13, 20–22, 25, and 30. Questions for discussion and writing include studying how the book portrays African American lives under segregation, asking students to make the link between individual experience and political commitment, and evaluating the strategies of the civil rights movement and Moody’s ambivalent conclusion, “I wonder. I really wonder.”
This is one of the earliest—and still one of the best—of the large number of Vietnam memoirs from American soldiers. Most readers find Caputo’s story absolutely riveting and disturbingly honest. Its value for an AP classroom is enhanced because of how Caputo’s experience mirrored the national experience, moving from the confident idealism of the early 1960s to profound disillusionment about the war and all other patriotic ventures by the 1970s.

One of the first Marines to land in Danang in 1965, Caputo arrived flush with the idealism of the Kennedy Cold War years. He was motivated, he tells us, not only by the perceived glamour of counterinsurgency warfare but also by his boredom with a nation of suburbs and shopping malls. Hoping to find the “romantic flavor of Kipling’s colonial wars,” Caputo found instead frustration and despair. The Marines’ defensive mission gradually, inevitably, became a jungle war against a “formless enemy” who could not be pinned down. Caputo’s ideals melted away and his platoon fought merely to stay alive as “a callus began to grow around our hearts.” Finally Caputo leads us into the horror and the absurdity of the war: the horror of watching his platoon go from “disciplined soldiers into an incendiary mob” as they lay waste to a village and the absurdity of being court-martialed later for killing the wrong person.

Caputo writes with a clarity and directness that will draw students into his world and let them feel his emotions. As he moves deeper into the morally ambiguous world of a war of attrition against a national liberation movement (“America could not intervene in a people’s war without killing some of the people”), Caputo creates for readers a sympathetic understanding of the American soldier in Vietnam. Reading Caputo, students can see how a Vietnamese village could be a Viet Cong staging area one day and an innocent collection of seemingly harmless peasants the next, or how a soldier could watch his friends killed beside him until he finally explodes in blind fury.

Not only does Caputo create this sympathetic understanding of the soldiers’ situation, he also raises most of the important interpretive issues that might come up in a history class about the American war in Vietnam. He tells of exaggerated body counts, of bombing raids that destroyed sites from a safe distance, of the incompetence of the South Vietnamese government and army, of the bureaucratic ineptitude of the U.S. military, and of the atrocities of combat on all sides. Not everyone will agree with his conclusions,
especially that this was a war “we could not win,” but nearly everyone will be moved by his experiences.

A teaching guide in PDF is available for this resource from the Henry Holt Web site (www.henryholt.com). Search for “Caputo” and then scroll to the bottom of the resource page.
An American Requiem: God, My Father, and the War That Came Between Us (1996)
James Carroll
Houghton Mifflin, 1996
$14.00
Reviewed by Jason George

James Carroll’s powerful memoir delves into the ways in which the Vietnam War tore apart an American family. As such, it can provide students with a well-written window into the domestic impacts of the conflict, as shown by the book’s widespread use in college courses on Vietnam and the contemporary United States.

Author Carroll has written nine novels and is now a columnist with the Boston Globe. This book focuses primarily on Carroll’s complicated relationship with his father. The elder Carroll followed an unorthodox career path, abandoning the seminary and joining the FBI after going to law school at night while working in the Chicago stockyards by day. He enjoyed a meteoric rise through the Bureau, working during World War II to catch draft dodgers.

The success that Carroll’s father experienced led to his being appointed the head of the Air Force’s Office of Special Investigations and, despite never having served in the military, being commissioned a brigadier general. He later became head of the Defense Intelligence Agency and rose to the rank of lieutenant general, achieving great prominence for his role in uncovering the presence of Soviet missiles during the Cuban Missile Crisis.

The younger Carroll thus grew up in an atmosphere that combined patriotism and military service with great devotion to the Catholic church. The military and the church became the twin pillars of James Carroll’s life, and he harbored hopes of becoming a priest. Carroll eventually attended seminary at St. Paul’s College in Washington, D.C., and was ordained in the Paulist order, developing his skills as a poet and writer while in seminary.

Carroll came only gradually to question the values in which he had been raised. Ironically, it was while working as a summer intern at the FBI that he heard a talk from Attorney General Robert Kennedy, who stressed his passionate commitment to racial equality. This helped Carroll to become a strong supporter of Martin Luther King, Jr.’s crusade for racial justice, despite his father’s suspicions of the civil rights leader’s Communist connections.
The self-immolations of Quaker Norman Morrison and Catholic worker Roger Laporte in 1965 began Carroll’s gradual movement to complete opposition to the Vietnam War and the ultimate break with his father. Carroll eventually became a chaplain at Boston University and played a growing role in the antiwar movement, culminating in a tense appearance on the Dick Cavett show as a stand-in for Daniel Berrigan in the early 1970s.

Carroll’s book could be used in the classroom in a number of different contexts. It could be used as a summer reading book, as the engaging writing and themes of family relationships will undoubtedly attract student interest and attention. Its could also be used at the conclusion of the U.S. History survey course, as it would allow for discussion of the Vietnam War, civil rights, the questioning of the Cold War consensus, and the generational divide that split the United States in the late 1960s and the early 1970s.

Discussion questions are available via the publisher’s Web site. To access this, search for An American Requiem and click on the Reader’s Guide.
Publishers and Contact Information

Allyn/Bacon/Longman
c/o Pearson Education
One Lake Street
Upper Saddle River, NJ 07458
800 666-9433
www.ablongman.com

Anchor Books
Random House, Inc.
1745 Broadway
New York, NY 10019
800 733-3000
www.randomhouse.com/anchor

AMSCO School Publications
315 Hudson Street
New York, NY 10013-1085
800 969-8398
www.amscopub.com

Bedford/St. Martin’s
Sales Support
HPHLP
4B Cedarbrook Drive
Cranbury NJ 08512
800 446-8923
www.bedfordstmartins.com

Broadway Books
Random House, Inc.
1745 Broadway
New York, NY 10019
800 733-3000
www.randomhouse.com/broadway

Chronicle Books
85 Second Street, Sixth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105
800 722-6657
www.chroniclebooks.com