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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>George Washington</td>
<td>1789-1797</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>John Adams</td>
<td>1797-1801</td>
<td>Federalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Thomas Jefferson</td>
<td>1801-1809</td>
<td>Democratic-Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>James Madison</td>
<td>1809-1817</td>
<td>Democratic-Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>James Monroe</td>
<td>1817-1825</td>
<td>Democratic-Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>John Quincy Adams</td>
<td>1825-1829</td>
<td>National-Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Andrew Jackson</td>
<td>1829-1837</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Martin Van Buren</td>
<td>1837-1841</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>William H. Harrison</td>
<td>1841 (a)</td>
<td>Whig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>John Tyler</td>
<td>1841-1845</td>
<td>Whig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>James K. Polk</td>
<td>1845-1849</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Zachary Taylor</td>
<td>1849-1850 (a)</td>
<td>Whig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Millard Fillmore</td>
<td>1850-1853</td>
<td>Whig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Franklin Pierce</td>
<td>1853-1857</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>James Buchanan</td>
<td>1857-1861</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Abraham Lincoln</td>
<td>1861-1865 (a)</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Andrew Johnson</td>
<td>1865-1869</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ulysses S. Grant</td>
<td>1869-1877</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Rutherford B. Hayes</td>
<td>1877-1881</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>James A. Garfield</td>
<td>1881 (a)</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Chester A. Arthur</td>
<td>1881-1885</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Grover Cleveland</td>
<td>1885-1889</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Benjamin Harrison</td>
<td>1889-1893</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Grover Cleveland</td>
<td>1893-1897</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>William McKinley</td>
<td>1897-1901 (a)</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Theodore Roosevelt</td>
<td>1901-1909</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>William Howard Taft</td>
<td>1909-1913</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Woodrow Wilson</td>
<td>1913-1921</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Warren G. Harding</td>
<td>1921-1923 (a)</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Calvin Coolidge</td>
<td>1923-1929</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Herbert Hoover</td>
<td>1929-1933</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Franklin D. Roosevelt</td>
<td>1933-1945 (a)</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Harry S. Truman</td>
<td>1945-1953</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Dwight D. Eisenhower</td>
<td>1953-1961</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>John F. Kennedy</td>
<td>1961-1963 (a)</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Lyndon B. Johnson</td>
<td>1963-1969</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Richard M. Nixon</td>
<td>1969-1974 (b)</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Gerald R. Ford</td>
<td>1974-1977</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Ronald Reagan</td>
<td>1981-1989</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>George Bush</td>
<td>1989-1993</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>William J. Clinton</td>
<td>1993-2001</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>George W. Bush</td>
<td>2001-2009</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Barack Obama</td>
<td>2009-2017</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Donald Trump</td>
<td>2017-</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Date Range</td>
<td>Event/Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 1</td>
<td>1740-1788</td>
<td>American Revolution, Declaration of Independence, Constitution written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 2</td>
<td>1789-1820</td>
<td>Jacksonian Democracy, expansion of west, nullification crisis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 3</td>
<td>1820-1848</td>
<td>Western Expansion, Mexican War, abolitionism, women's suffrage movement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 4</td>
<td>1848-1877</td>
<td>Civil War, Reconstruction, women's rights, labor movements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 5</td>
<td>1877-1895</td>
<td>Post-Civil War, rapid industrialization, Gilded Age, trusts and monopolies, immigration policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 6</td>
<td>1895-1914</td>
<td>World War I, industrial growth, Progressive Era, women's suffrage, labor movements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 7</td>
<td>1914-1945</td>
<td>World War II, New Deal, Cold War, civil rights movements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 8</td>
<td>1945-1980</td>
<td>Counterculture, civil rights, anti-war movements, economic growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 9</td>
<td>1980-2000</td>
<td>Reaganomics, Cold War end, globalization, digital age, terrorist attacks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Geography/Environment**
- Westward expansion, Manifest Destiny
- Industrial growth and urbanization
- Environmental changes due to industrialization

**Politics and Power**
- Presidential elections, political parties
- Constitutional amendments, civil liberties
- Legislative bodies, federalism

**Culture and Society**
- Social movements, cultural changes
- Media and communications
- Education and intellectual life

**Work, trade, exchange**
- Industrialization, labor movements
- Trade policies, international relations
- Agricultural shifts, resource management

**Migration and settlement**
- Immigration patterns, ethnic groups
- Settlement patterns, urbanization
- Migration routes, population distribution

**America in the World**
- International relations, foreign policy
- Involvement in world wars
- Global economic and cultural exchanges

---

Key terms and concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mercantilism</th>
<th>Democratic-Republican</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freedom.Liberty</td>
<td>Whig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavery/Emancipation</td>
<td>Jacksonian Democracy and the Democratic Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Crow segregation</td>
<td>Republican Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectionalism</td>
<td>Frontier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativism</td>
<td>Imperialism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federalist</td>
<td>Self-determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federalism</td>
<td>Isolationism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal/State government</td>
<td>Prohibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Federalist</td>
<td>Laissez-faire economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial review</td>
<td>Economic liberalism vs social liberalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular sovereignty</td>
<td>Progressivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution</td>
<td>Conservatism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual rights</td>
<td>Tyranny /Tyranny of the majority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1: THE ORIGINS AND UNFOLDING OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION
I. British North America
II. The Imperial Crisis and the Revolution 1754-1775
III. The Revolutionary War 1775-1783
IV. The Confederation period 1781-1787

CHAPTER 2: THE 1787 CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION
I. Federalists vs. Antifederalists
II. The meanings of tyranny: The Federalist Papers (No 10 – No 51)
III. Power and representation: debates and compromise
IV. A national and federal government

CHAPTER 3: THE CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT
I. The Constitution: The supreme law of the land
II. Founding Principles: Separation and Balance
III. The Three Branches of Government

CHAPTER 4: POLITICAL EVOLUTION
I. The emergence of political parties (the War of 1812, and the Hartford Convention 1814)
II. The Monroe Doctrine
III. Jacksonian America
IV. Sectional politics
V. Reconstruction
VI. Gilded Age politics

CHAPTER 5: TERRITORIAL CONQUEST and the DISAPPEARING OF NATIVE AMERICANS
I. The Louisiana Purchase (1803)
II. Westward Expansion, the Mexican-American War and Manifest Destiny (1830-1853)
III. Grant’s Indian policy
IV. The closing of the frontier

CHAPTER 6: SLAVERY
I. The Missouri Compromise
II. The Antebellum South (1820s-1850s)
III. The Sectional Crisis (1850’s)
IV. Civil War (1861-1865)
V. Emancipation and Reconstruction

CHAPTER 7: The Rise of Big business and mass immigration
II. The Rise of Big Business and the Global Triumph of American Capitalism
III. Mass Immigration and Urbanization

Assessment: Presence/Participation: 30%, Midterm exam: 30%, Final exam: 40%

MY EMAIL: anne-claire.merlin-faucquez@univ-paris8.fr
My BLOG: acfaucquez.wordpress.com
PRIMARY VS SECONDARY SOURCES

1. PRIMARY SOURCES = a first-hand account of a past event

- Historical newspapers
- Documentary photographs
- Works of art, literature, or music
- Eyewitness accounts or testimony
- Interviews
- Diaries, journals, or letters
- Statutes, laws, or regulations
- Speeches, legal decisions, or case law
- Archaeological or historical artifacts
- Survey research

2. SECONDARY SOURCES = A non-eyewitness record of an event written by someone without a close connection to the event

- Scholarly journal articles
- Scholarly books or monographs
- Interpretive newspaper or magazine articles and editorials
- Interpretive blog posts
- Book, art, music, or theater reviews
- Documentaries, movies

3. PRACTICE: Primary or secondary?

1. A textbook chapter on World War II and its famous battles
2. Martin Luther King’s “I Have a Dream” speech
3. A photograph of an immigrant family arriving at Ellis Island
4. A journal kept by a soldier during the American Revolution
5. A newspaper article from 1941 describing the attack on Pearl Harbor.
6. A play showing how Benjamin Franklin flew a kite during a lightning storm.
7. Anne Frank’s diary describing her life during World War 2.
8. A cartoon showing how Pocahontas met John Smith.
9. A YouTube video describing how the pyramids were built.
10. A radio broadcast from the day the Soviet Union launched Sputnik.
11. An autobiography about the 40th president, Ronald Reagan.
12. A painting of what cowboy life was probably like.
14. A website describing what the first World’s Fair was like.
15. A journal article written about how Native Americans lived.
17. A Vietnam veteran talking about the war in Vietnam
19. A writer talking about their latest book.
20. A newspaper article from 2001 describing the great depression in the 1930’s.
**SOURCES IN A BIBLIOGRAPHY: primary or secondary?**


Méthodologie du commentaire de document en histoire

Objectifs du commentaire et exigences de l’exercice

• Expliquer un document historique et le faire parler
• Montrer sa portée historique
• Éclairer ce qui n’est pas évident dans le texte (une date, un événement, un épisode, un personnage auquel le texte fait allusion)
• Faire le tri de l’information, la vérifier, la hiérarchiser, et la sélectionner selon la problématique retenue
• Exposer de manière claire et convaincante

Pour faire le commentaire d’un texte de civilisation vous devez éviter de simplement répéter le texte avec vos propres mots (= paraphrase) ou de trop vite oublier le document pour rappeler seulement des faits liés au contexte dans lequel celui-ci a été écrit (= hors sujet ou dissertation). Vous devez au contraire être sans arrêt dans un ‘va-et-vient’ entre 1) les connaissances extérieures au document et 2) les commentaires sur le texte, son interprétation.

Le document à analyser doit donc être toujours au centre de votre travail.

Travail Préliminaire

Il faut consacrer à peu près un tiers du temps imparti à l’analyse du texte qui s’opérera au fil de trois lectures :

- Une 1ère lecture afin de s’imprégner du document sans idée préconçue (faire attention au titre qui dans certains cas, peut être trompeur).
- Une 2ème lecture afin de définir la nature du document et repérer l’auteur, la date, le contexte historique, éventuellement le destinataire.
- Une 3ème lecture, pour souligner les idées et les mots importants d’où se dégagera la problématique du texte.

Tenez compte de tous les éléments « hors texte »:

• - le titre peut apporter des informations sur le contenu du texte mais aussi sur les intentions de l’auteur (attention cependant aux titres qui peuvent – ou non – correspondre au titre exact du document).
• - l’auteur : tachez de savoir qui il/elle est, quelle est sa fonction (personnage politique, militant, syndicaliste, écrivain, industriel, immigrant, journaliste…).
• - de même, la source est importante et vous n’étudierez pas de la même façon une source primaire [discours, texte de loi, lettre, récit de vie, autobiographie, sermon, rapport officiel…] qu’une source secondaire [manuel universitaire, articles de presse dans certains cas…]. Dans le cas de sources secondaires, il faut vous référer à la source primaire analysée (ex : article sur le dernier discours du président américain : voir ce discours).
• - Intéressez-vous également au lectorat : à qui s’adresse le document. Par exemple s’il s’agit d’un article tiré d’un journal, voyez si celui-ci est quotidien, hebdomadaire…, à grand tirage, avec une orientation idéologique ou politique précise, etc.
• - Tenez compte du contexte dans lequel le document a été produit. Notez la date bien sûr, mais voyez aussi dans quel climat politique ou idéologique le texte a été écrit (campagne électorale, guerre, crise économique, changements personnels pour l’auteur…). Si besoin est, examinez le lieu (une ville en particulier, une région, un quartier précis, une prison…) où a été écrit le texte.

- Different points of view/sides :
- Branches of power: executive, judicial, legislative
- Federal/state
- Political parties
- Regional interests : North/South-East/West
- Racial interests
- Gender interests
- Religious/ethnic interests
En faisant ce qui précède minutieusement, vous obtiendrez des informations supplémentaires : pourquoi l’auteur cite-t-il telle personnalité, tel événement, telle date ? Pourquoi utilise-t-il tels mots-clés, telles répétitions ? Vous verrez aussi souvent des omissions, des erreurs, des interprétations nouvelles ou tendancieuses. À vous de voir pourquoi.


Vérifiez aussi si un texte a été écrit « à chaud », c’est à dire au moment même d’événements précis (un krach boursier, une émeute, un assassinat, pendant le débat sur un projet de loi, à l’arrivée d’un immigrant sur le sol américain,… ) ou bien plus tard et quand l’auteur a, alors, davantage de recul par rapport à ces faits.

Ce travail préliminaire, fait de façon linéaire (vous lisez le texte ligne à ligne), ne doit pas effacer, dans un deuxième temps, une relecture plus globale du texte, qui fera apparaître grands themes et notions abordés par l’auteur (= les points principaux).

Par la suite, vous devez classer les informations, citations, selon les idées-phares retenues.

Organisation du commentaire

Grâce à l’analyse précédente, vous devez trouver votre propre problématique qui déterminera l’orientation du commentaire. Votre plan ne doit pas, en règle générale, suivre le texte ligne à ligne mais doit refléter les différentes idées, les points du texte. Ainsi en organisant les thèmes abordés dans le texte, leurs liens et leur agencement, vous enchaînerez vos parties successives (le plus souvent entre deux et quatre).

Rappelons qu’il n’existe pas de plan parfait applicable à tous les documents : il faut s’imprégnner du document pour savoir quel plan lui correspond le mieux.

En ce qui concerne les transitions d’une partie à l’autre, trouvez, en fin de partie, une phrase qui annonce le sujet analysé dans la suivante.

Avant chacun de vos commentaires, n’oubliez jamais le texte lui-même. Vous devez le citer régulièrement mais vos citations doivent être assez brèves. Elles vous permettent de ne pas vous éloigner du texte et d’éviter le hors sujet, mais elles doivent toujours être précédées ou suivies d’une explication et ne doivent pas se substituer à l’analyse. Attention, lorsque vous citez le texte, n’oubliez d’indiquer le(s) numéro(s) de lignes.

Vos commentaires tiendront compte des informations trouvées lors de la lecture attentive. Vous montrerez ici pourquoi l’auteur parle de tel fait ou personne, dans quel contexte, dans quel but. Voyez aussi si ses points de vue sont partagés par d’autres ou, au contraire, s’inscrivent en porte-à-faux par rapport aux discours, témoignages d’autres personnes. Citez d’autres textes et auteurs étudiés en classe ou fruits de vos lectures personnelles qui corroborent ou contredisent les idées émises par l’auteur.

Pensez à la conclusion et à l’introduction en dernier.
L’introduction doit :

- Rester neutre et être écrite de manière claire et concise.
- Présenter le document (date, lieu, nature, auteur, contexte historique le plus succinct possible mais qu’il est parfois nécessaire de développer pour replacer le document).
- Dégager la problématique (les idées directrices et les questions qu’elles amènent).
- Annoncer le plan.
- Éléments à inclure :
  - Phrase d’accroche (évitez alors les phrases maladroites comme “we will first analyse...”. Ne commencez pas non plus une introduction par “This text is taken from...”; avant de mentionner de quel texte vous allez parler, introduisez d’abord le contexte général)
  - Nature du document (extrait de discours, lettre, article de journal, série statistique, traité de paix, mémoires, rapport politique, diplomatique, etc.) et indiquer s’il s’agit d’une source primaire ou secondaire
  - Date (est-elle contemporaine des événements relatés)
  - Contexte historique (uniquement ce qui est utile à l’explication)
  - Auteur(s) (dire uniquement ce qui intéresse le texte, s’interroger sur la fiabilité de l’auteur, sur ses objectifs, sur le destinataire)
  - Problématique (de quoi parle le document, les idées directrices et les questions qu’elles amènent)
  - Annonce du plan (la problématique peut aussi servir à annoncer le plan)

La conclusion doit :

- Faire le bilan du document (redire ce qu’il dit mais aussi ce qu’il ne dit pas).
- Dégager la portée du document, de sa place dans la période considérée.
- Evoquer, éventuellement, la suite des événements, en prenant bien garde à ne pas déborder du sujet.

Le commentaire sera rédigé en anglais.

Références utiles


HOW TO ORGANIZE YOUR OUTLINE?

1. Select quotations from the text that seem to be especially meaningful to you after your first analysis of the document.
2. For each quotation decide what the underlying concept is. Write a table with concepts and quotations.
3. Gather and hierarchize your ideas from the most obvious, descriptive to the most interpretative
4. Your outline/three parts should answer the problematic/the question the document raises.
5. Find a suitable final controlling thesis (C.T.) for your interpretation of the document. It will be summarized in one sentence in your conclusion. All the paragraphs in your commentaire must point to this controlling thesis.
6. Do take some time to check that there are logical links throughout between each section and subsection of your outline.

It is essential at this stage to tell yourself the final commentaire mentally, or at least, a condensed version of it, to make sure that indeed there are logical links from one paragraph to the next, and that the whole outline can work.
INTRODUCTION

In your introduction you should state:
1. the nature of the document
2. the author (and what role he played in his or her time if he or she is famous and links with the text)
3. the date of the document
4. the main theme or issue dealt with in the document and the link between the historical background and this theme (2/3 lines) and how it relates to American culture and civilization.
5. A short rendering of the document (4/5 lines) using the main underlying concepts of the text should follow.
6. Then state the ensuing problematic (write one question to guide your whole interpretation of the text until the conclusion). (1/2 lines).
7. Sketch the outline of your commentaire (give the headings of main parts showing how they are elements of the answer to the problematic).

WRITING A PARAGRAPH

1. Begin the paragraph with a heading sentence inserting the concept of the quotation given later in same paragraph (1 sentence).
2. Explain what you mean in the heading sentence. (2/3 sentences).
3. Introduce and give the quotation.
4. Show how the quotation illustrates the heading sentence, and, whenever possible, how the paragraph is linked with and points to your controlling thesis. (1/2 sentences). It will help you avoid the “hors-sujet”.
5. Write a transition to proceed to next paragraph. (1 sentence).

Example: C.T.: The text—a description of the area around Jamestown as discovered in 1607—is a distorted rendering of reality to meet the high expectations of the London Virginia Company. = propaganda

A widespread myth associated with America which has somehow survived to this day is that of America as the land of plenty. It is worth mentioning here that the author of this report on the early days of Jamestown is trying to make the mythical image of America as a land of abundance and the reality of the American soil coincide. He mentions “three fertile iles, about it many of their cornfields,” most probably to comply with the views of America from Europe, and perhaps to reassure the share-holders of the Virginia Company. But here the myth of America as a land of plenty was sustained only because the earth was made fertile by the work of the Indians.

As a matter of fact, Native Americans played a key role in European colonization and their image remained ambiguous among Europeans at the time. He was seen either ...

CONCLUSION

1. In the first part of the conclusion, summarize your points briefly. (“Thus, we have seen that...”).
2. In the second paragraph clearly state your controlling thesis —use (a) (new) concept(s) that expresses the outcome of your argumentation, especially the last large section of your comments. Develop your controlling thesis (3 or more sentences).

Do/Do not
1. Always make sure that there is a logical link from one idea to the next, from one remark to the following quotation, from one paragraph to the next, from the introduction down to the controlling thesis.
2. Do not paraphrase; do not repeat the text.
3. Do quote the text at least once in each paragraph. When you quote, use quotation marks and give the quotation entirely, do not drop words!
4. Do not write whole paragraphs about the historical background of the text. It is only repeating a lesson, not casting light on the text.
5. Do not pass value judgments.
6. Do not use present tense as freely as in French. Mind your tenses (T).
7. Who are “they”? (WAT)
A LIST OF WORDS, PHRASES AND EXAMPLES FOR COMPOSITION

Introduction
Date, nature, author, historical background.

The document to be commented upon is an article entitled “Reconstruction.” It was written by Frederick Douglass (1817-1895), the best-known black abolitionist, and published in the Atlantic Monthly in 1866, at a time when the reconstruction of the South was the central issue on the American political scene.

Here, the author tackles the difficult issues of + main concepts from the text. He also deals with + concepts from the text.

Problematic
We may therefore ask ourselves if ...
It follows then that we may wonder to what extent ...
The obvious issue raised by this document is therefore to know whether ...
Sketching the outline
In order to address this question, we shall first focus on ... because .... We shall then deal with ... because .... Consequently, we shall discuss ... to see how it may lead to a tentative assessment of all these points.
In what follows, we will focus our attention first upon ... then ... then ...
Finally we will suggest that ....
As we shall see in what follows, ....

Paragraph
Heading sentence
It can safely be said that ...
The author tries to call attention to the fact that ...
Explaining the heading sentence
In other words, ....
Introducing a quotation
In the text, the author aptly points out that "........." (lines 23-25).
The author insists that "........." (lines 23-25).
The writer observes that "........." (lines 23-25).
Explaining the meaning of a quotation.
The writer here clearly points out that ...
Transition
The above leads into a related issue: ...
As we have already seen, ... but ...

Conclusion
Summary of the paragraphs
We have seen that ... In summary, ... All things considered then, ... To round things off ... What interests us about this text is the way it clearly investigates the issue of ... One is bound to conclude that... We might then say that.. We arrive at the conclusion that ...
SUMMARY VS ANALYSIS

Summary

- It allows the reader to get the "gist" of the text.
- To write a summary, you must provide the main points of a text in your own words.
- Try dividing the text into sections and writing the main idea of each section in one or two sentences. Write the main idea of the entire text in one or two sentences. Try combining your sentences into a complete paragraph.
- A summary condenses and restates the context of a text in original language. It is sometimes called the "what" of a text because it gives "just the facts."

Analysis

- An analysis breaks a text into smaller pieces in order to examine each piece. It is sometimes called the "how" of a text because it explains how the writing and argument are or aren’t effective.
- It allows the reader to determine if the text is useful and trustworthy.
- To write an analysis, you must describe a piece of the text in detail and give your interpretation of how that piece is making its point.
- Read the text with a critical eye: What is the author arguing for/against? Why are they arguing this? What evidence or solutions does she give, and are they valid? What kind of logical, ethical, or emotional appeals does she use?

Example: "Considering the numerous uncertainties surrounding e-cigarettes...the United Nations organization said it was appropriate to prohibit their use indoors ‘until exhaled vapour is proven to be not harmful to bystanders.’” – David Jolly and Katrina Travernise, The New York Times, August 26, 2014

Summary: The United Nations supports a ban on e-cigarettes being used indoors because of a lack of proof about their harmfulness.

Analysis: In citing "uncertainties" and the need for proof in its judgment of e-cigarette use indoors, the United Nations makes hard data the principal consideration in public health decisions.

Which one of these sentences are summaries or analyses?

1. A. The movie Titanic tells the story of the accident involving the ship, and it also tells the story of the love between Jack and Rose.
   1. B. Titanic’s producer uses a love story to hook viewers and keep them engaged while revisiting one of America’s most heartbreaking tragedies.

2. A. This English class leads students to become more effective learners and betters individuals by teaching them crucial tools for critical reading, writing, and thinking.
   2. B. In this English class, students learn how to annotate texts, write academic essays, and think critically.

3. A. In his book, the author discusses current societal issues and the effects of individual biases.
   3. B. His book reveals his deep concern with current societal issues, and it does an excellent job of leading the audience to question its individual biases.

4. A. Walt Disney’s adaptation of Cinderella highlights virtuosity and hard work by emphasizing the positive outcomes for someone who has such qualities.
   4. B. Walt Disney’s adaptation of Cinderella tells the story of a beautiful young girl who is good and kind, but who is treated cruelly by her stepmother and two ugly stepsisters.
Does a paper ever include both summary and analysis? Absolutely!

Sometimes, a brief summary can be used at the beginning of a paper to establish context that will allow the reader to better understand your analysis. Such a summary, if it is brief, can work in an introduction or as an opening body paragraph. If the summary is in a body paragraph, you can begin the paragraph with a more “factual” topic sentence like “Cao’s novel has an eventful plot.”

Other times, while writing your analysis, you might present factual details that we associate with summaries within a paragraph in order to support your claims. Just make sure you don’t slip entirely into summary.

Now take a look at the sample paragraphs below to see how summary and analysis can work in context.

**A sample SUMMARY of Walt Disney’s adaptation of Cinderella**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factual topic sentence (introducing a summary)</th>
<th>Details/summary of the story (NO analysis)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walt Disney’s adaptation of Cinderella tells the story of a beautiful young girl who is good and kind, but who is treated cruelly by her stepmother and two ugly stepsisters.</td>
<td>She spends her days doing chores, and she tries to do her best. The animals love her, especially two mice named Gus and Jaq. One day the king sends out an invitation to all the young women of the kingdom to attend a ball for his son, the prince, hoping to find him a wife. Cinderella hopes to go to the ball, but her stepmother gives her a long list of chores to do. She does her chores then finds that her animal friends have made a beautiful gown out of a simple dress of her mother’s. When her mean stepsisters see her in the gown, they rip off the beads and ribbons and leave Cinderella in tatters. They go to the ball, and she is left crying in the garden. Suddenly, a fairy godmother appears to Cinderella. She makes a beautiful coach out of a pumpkin and turns the mice into horses and coachmen. She also waves her wand and puts Cinderella into a fabulous gown with glass slippers. She sends her to the ball with a warning to return by midnight when the spell will be reversed. Cinderella meets Prince Charming at the ball, and he is spellbound by her beauty and grace. Hearing the clock begin to strike midnight, Cinderella runs from the prince, leaving a glass slipper behind. The next day the prince sends the grand duke throughout the kingdom with the glass slipper to find the beautiful young woman. When he arrives at Cinderella’s home, her stepmother has locked her in the attic; however, her mice friends free her. Her stepmother trips the duke when he tries to put the shoe on Cinderella, causing the shoe to shatter. Cinderella produces the other shoe from her pocket and it fits perfectly. Shortly afterwards, Prince Charming and Cinderella are married and live happily ever after.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Notice how the above paragraph (including its topic sentence) focuses on simply restating facts about the story (i.e., summarizing). One sign that the above paragraph is a summary is the frequent use of **chronological transitions**—words that signal time: *one day, suddenly, the next day, afterwards*. If you find yourself writing a paragraph with multiple words like these, you are probably summarizing as opposed to analyzing.

Now take a look at the analytical paragraph below and notice the characteristics of an analysis. **A sample ANALYSIS of Walt Disney’s adaptation of Cinderella**

**Student’s topic sentence (overall analytical claim/examination)**

The body of the paragraph mixes details/ summaries of the scene (in normal font) and the student’s analytical supporting points (in italics).

Walt Disney’s adaptation of Cinderella highlights meekness, virtuosity, and hard work by emphasizing the positive outcomes for someone who has such qualities. Although Cinderella can take little action on her own, she is rewarded for her virtue and hard work by natural and supernatural forces. Cinderella is depicted as a beautiful young woman who is kind and hardworking. She is faithful to carry out her responsibilities in the limited role that she has as the servant of the house, **but she is clearly trapped in a situation that she is powerless to get out of on her own. Her kindness to animals brings her the only comfort she gets throughout the story in her friendship with the mice, Gus and Jaq. Eventually, natural and supernatural forces come to the rescue of the virtuous young Cinderella.** The mice work together to create a beautiful gown for Cinderella while she is occupied with completing
a long list of chores, but she suffers a setback when her awful sisters tear apart her mother’s dress. In this, and in many other instances, she meekly accepts their mistreatment, never objecting or rebelling. Suddenly, larger forces come into play as she weeps in the garden. Through the supernatural world, Cinderella finds her rescue. She has her very own fairy godmother who appears to her in her darkest hour. The godmother provides a magical affirmation of Cinderella’s good qualities that help her to escape the human cruelty that she has experienced. When she steps into the ball, her beauty is clear for everyone to see, including Prince Charming, who completes her rescue. In the end, the natural and supernatural world combine to reward her for her qualities, and Cinderella lives happily ever after. In this and in many other Disney films, the expectations of women are clear: If they are conventionally beautiful, sweet, and obedient, they will be rewarded—and that reward will come in the form of marriage.

As demonstrated in the above example, summary and analysis are intertwined within the paragraph, but the summary serves mainly to provide reference and support for the analysis as opposed to making a claim in and of itself.

The analysis “frames” the above paragraph; in other words, the paragraph begins with an overall analytical claim, which helps the writer decide which details/summary to include in the paragraph to support the analytical claim(s). (Summarization in the above paragraph involves factual details from the story.)

1. Read the paragraph below and answer the questions that follow.
   (1) In Díaz’s story, Papi shows some of the aspects of masculinity and the imbalance of power present in the Dominican culture. (2) Papi arrives home and the whole family is dressed, waiting for his arrival. (3) His son Yunior comments, “He didn’t say nothing to nobody, not even my mom” (306). (4) Papi holds all the power and as Yunior comments, it doesn’t seem that strange to him that Papi doesn’t even speak to his wife, illustrating that Papi believes that he is the center of the family and the family accepts this. (5) Papi also shows his dominance through the sheer volume of his voice. (6) Yunior compares his parents’ voices: “Papi’s voice was loud and argumentative; you didn’t have to be anywhere near him to catch his drift. (7) And Mami, you had to put cups to hear hers” (311).
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   1. In the above paragraph, the student’s overall analytical claim (the topic sentence) is stated in:
      a) sentence 1
      b) sentence 2
      c) sentence 7
      d) none of the above

   2. In supporting the analytical claim that there is an imbalance of power based on gender, what are three of the supporting points the student used in the above paragraph? Write them in your own words.
Plagiarism occurs when you copy an idea you have found in a book, an article or the internet and hand it in as your own work. To plagiarize is to use someone else’s work, ideas and words as your own. It is illegal and does not do much to encourage respect for your work in university circles. Teachers somehow always know!

**Types of Plagiarism**

Hamp-Lyons & Courter (1984, pp. 161-166) distinguish between four types of plagiarism:

- **Outright copying**
- **Paraphrase plagiarism** = changing some of the words and grammar but leaving most of the original text the same.
- **Patchwork plagiarism** = when parts of the original author’s words are used and connected together in a different way.
- **Stealing an apt term** = when a short phrase from the original text has been used in the students work, possibly because it is so good.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Text</th>
<th>Student’s text 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You have to tread quite a fine line between being accused, on the one hand, of not making enough use of the writers you have been reading on the course, and, on the other, of having followed them too slavishly, to the point of plagiarising them. One of your early tasks as a student is to get a feel for how to strike the right balance. (Northedge, 1990, p. 190)</td>
<td>You have to tread quite a fine line between being accused, on the one hand, of not making enough use of the writers you have been reading on the course, and, on the other, of having followed them too slavishly, to the point of plagiarising them. One of your early tasks as a student is to get a feel for how to strike the right balance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student’s text 2</th>
<th>Student’s text 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You must be careful of being blamed for not using the information you have read on your course, and, in contrast, of having used the information too much so that it looks like you have plagiarised. One of your first jobs as a student is to learn how to balance these two extremes</td>
<td>When you are writing you need to be careful to use the information you have read well. At one extreme you may be blamed for not making enough use of the writers you have been reading on the course. While at the other extreme, you may be accused of having followed them too slavishly, to the point of plagiarising them. Early on as a student you need to balance these two extremes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student’s text 4</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When you are writing you need to be careful to use the information you have read well. However, there is a difficult area here because, as a student, when you are doing assignments, you need to use what you have read or been taught in your lectures. It is important, however, not to make too much use of this information or you may be accused of having followed them too slavishly. Early on in your life as a student, you need to balance these two extremes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXERCISE 1 – Which text is not plagiarism?**

Quotation from page 9 of an article written in 2001 by Rachel Swan which states that: ‘There is up-to-date and conclusive evidence to prove that there is a direct link between a wide range of diseases, including many cancers, and diet’.

**Student’s text 1**: In Australia a number of cancers can be traced to diet, and there is up-to-date and conclusive evidence to prove that there is a direct link between a wide range of diseases, including many cancers, and diet (Swan 2001).

**Student’s text 2**: In Australia a number of cancers can be traced to diet. In fact, according to Swan (2001, p. 9), ‘there is up-to-date and conclusive evidence to prove that there is a direct link between a wide range of diseases, including many cancers, and diet’.
Student’s text 3: In Australia, many researchers have been able to prove the connection between many diseases like cancer and the excessive habit of dieting.

HOW TO AVOID PLAGIARISM?
When you are writing about other people’s ideas or your own ideas, your readers need to know whose voice they are hearing: are they reading the original author’s actual words or your interpretation of the original source or your own viewpoint?

1. YOU MUST MAKE A CLEAR REFERENCE TO YOUR SOURCE
A. Quote the author whose information, ideas, words you need to use. Here you use the author’s exact words which are surrounded by quotation marks (“...”) and reference will be given to the author.

   - **According to** Leonardo da Vinci, “The painting is the most praiseworthy which is most like the thing represented” (L. da Vinci, Extracts from notebooks, in R. Goldwater & M. Treves (eds.), Artists on Art, New York, Pantheon Books, 1972, p.54).

   - Morelli points out asserts stresses argues that: ‘the changing nature of workplace culture means that people are now working much longer hours’ (1997, p.5).

B. The second method is to rephrase the material by putting it into your own words but following the idea closely.

   - A painting, according to da Vinci, has the most merit when it is as close as possible to that which was painted. (L. da Vinci, Extracts from notebooks, in R. Goldwater & M. Treves (eds.), Artists on Art, New York, Pantheon Books, 1972, p.54).

C. The third method is to summarize the main idea, that is putting the main points of a particular passage into your own words without interpreting or taking a position about the main points.

   - Da Vinci thought stated claimed maintained suggested that paintings had to be realistic. (L. da Vinci, Extracts from notebooks, in R. Goldwater & M. Treves (eds.), Artists on Art, New York, Pantheon Books, 1972, p.54).

2. YOU MUST EXPRESS YOUR OWN VIEWPOINT
D. Da Vinci (1972, p.54) claims that paintings had to be realistic but however we can wonder about the role of art and the use of the imagination however he does not state what is necessary to make great paintings realistic

EXERCISE 2

➢ Pretend that you are writing an essay on how the frontier experience shaped the development of the United States. While researching, you come across the following passage written by the historian Frederick Jackson Turner:

   From the conditions of frontier life came intellectual traits of profound importance. The work of travelers along each frontier from colonial days onward describe certain common traits, and these traits have, while softening down, still persisted as survivals in the place of their origin, even when a higher social organization succeeded. The result is that to the frontier the American intellect owes its striking characteristics. That coarseness and strength combined with acuteness and acquisitiveness; that practical, inventive turn of mind, quick to find expedients; that masterful grasp of material things, lacking in the artistic but powerful to effect great ends; that restless, nervous energy; that dominant individualism, working for good and for evil, and withal that buoyancy and exuberance which comes with freedom—these are traits of the frontier, or traits called out elsewhere because of the existence of the frontier. (Frederick Jackson Turner, “The Significance of the Frontier in American History,” The Frontier in American History (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1920), 37.)

➢ Quote part of the passage following the 4 methods stated above:

A.  
B.  
C.  
D.
1. ETHOS, LOGOS, PATHOS

Aristotle used these three terms to explain how rhetoric works:

"Of the modes of persuasion furnished by the spoken word there are three kinds. The first kind depends on the personal character of the speaker [ethos]; the second on putting the audience into a certain frame of mind [pathos]; the third on the proof, or apparent proof, provided by the words of the speech itself [logos]. Persuasion is achieved by the speaker’s personal character when the speech is so spoken as to make us think him credible."

Ethos (sometimes called an appeal to ethics), then, is used as a means of convincing an audience via the authority or credibility of the persuader, be it a notable or experienced figure in the field or even a popular celebrity.

Pathos (appeal to emotion) is a way of convincing an audience of an argument by creating an emotional response to an impassioned plea or a convincing story.

Logos (appeal to logic) is a way of persuading an audience with reason, using facts and figures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHOS</th>
<th>LOGOS</th>
<th>PATHOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How to develop credibility—convincing your audience you are likeable and worthy of respect</td>
<td>How to appeal to logic—giving reasons to back up your claims</td>
<td>How to appeal to emotion—showing your audience why they should care and/or how they should feel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Language appropriate to audience and subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Restrained, sincere, fair-minded presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appropriate level of vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Correct grammar</td>
<td>• Theoretical, abstract language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Literal and historical analogies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Definitions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Factual data and statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Quotations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Citations from experts and authorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Informed opinions</td>
<td>• Vivid, concrete language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Emotionally loaded language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Connotative meanings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Emotional examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Vivid descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Narratives of emotional events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Emotional tone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Figurative language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EFFECT ON AUDIENCE

Demonstrates author’s reliability, competence, and respect for the audience’s ideas and values through reliable and appropriate use of support and general accuracy.

EFFECT ON AUDIENCE

EFFECT ON AUDIENCE

Evokes a thought provoking, rationale response. In other words, your argument makes sense.

Evokes an emotional response.

2. Adjectives: These are describing words, which are most commonly used to make the audience feel a specific way regarding something.

3. Adverbs: These are the words which modifies verbs or adjectives. Just like the adjectives, they are also chosen and used to make the audience or reader feel a certain way about an issue.

4. Alliteration: Words which start from the same sound and create emphasis.

5. Appeals: Used by authors to touch different emotions like the reader’s sense of justice, patriotism and fairness.

6. Anecdotes: Short, personal stories that help to illustrate a point.
7. **Everyday language**: Writers will often use everyday language, sometimes called colloquial language, to make themselves seem down-to-earth.

8. **Cliches**: they give writers an opportunity to express an idea to their readers quickly.

9. **Connotations**

Connotations may be negative or positive. Think about the word ‘thin’. There are lots of words that share this meaning—slender, lithe, slim, skinny, lean, slight, lanky, undernourished, wasted, gangly, rake-like, anorexic, spindly. If someone was describing your body, you would probably prefer to be called ‘slender’ or ‘slim’ rather than ‘lanky’ or ‘anorexic’. When people are writing an argument, they think very carefully about the words that they select and the impact these words will have on their audience.

10. **Exaggeration**: Writers often exaggerate or overstate something to help persuade readers of their point of view.

11. **Evidence**: which might take the form of facts, figures, quotes or graphs – to help support their argument.

12. **Expert opinion** to give further weight to their argument.

13. **Inclusive language**: using the words ‘we’ or ‘us’ – is often used to get a reader onside.

14. **Imagery**: Descriptive writing can be a powerful persuasive technique. Describing something vividly can persuade readers.

15. **Metaphor/Simile**: when one thing is described as another, help to persuade by describing.

16. **Pun**: A play on words often relying on homophones, homonyms or rhymes.

17. **Repetition**: The repetition of words, phrases and ideas can be used to reinforce an argument and drive home the message to a reader.

18. **Rhetorical question**: A question where the answer is obvious, can help lead readers to a particular conclusion.

19. **Sarcasm**: A mocking tone.

**EXERCISE 1**: Decide whether these sentences evoke ethos, pathos or logos

1. "After years of this type of disrespect from your boss, countless hours wasted, birthdays missed… it’s time that you took a stand."
2. "As a doctor, I am qualified to tell you that this course of treatment will likely generate the best results."
3. "Based on the dozens of archaeological expeditions I’ve made all over the world, I am confident that those potsherds are Mesopotamian in origin."
4. "Better men than us have fought and died to preserve this great nation. Now is our turn to return the favor. For God and country, gentlemen!"
5. "Doctors all over the world recommend this type of treatment."
6. "Don’t be the last person on the block to have their lawn treated - you don’t want to be the laughing stock of your community!"
7. "He has a track record of success with this company, culminating in some of our most acclaimed architecture to date and earning us Firm of the Year nine times in a row."
8. "He is a forensics and ballistics expert for the federal government - if anyone’s qualified to determine the murder weapon, it’s him."
9. "History has shown time and again that absolute power corrupts absolutely."
10. “I’m not just invested in this community - I love every building, every business, every hard-working member of this town.”
11. “If my age doesn’t convince you that I know what I’m talking about, at least consider that I am your grandfather and I only want the best for you.”
12. “If my years as a Marine taught me anything, it’s that caution is the best policy in this sort of situation.”
13. “If we don’t move soon, we’re all going to die! Can’t you see how dangerous it would be to stay?”
14. “If you’re still unsure, please consider that my advanced degree and fieldwork speak for themselves.”
15. “It’s a matter of common sense that people deserve to be treated equally. The Constitution calls it ‘self-evident.’ Why, then, should I have been denied a seat because of my disability?”
16. “Ladies and gentlemen of the jury: we have not only the fingerprints, the lack of an alibi, a clear motive, and an expressed desire to commit the robbery… We also have video of the suspect breaking in. The case could not be more open and shut.”
17. “More than one hundred peer-reviewed studies have been conducted over the past decade, and none of them suggests that this is an effective treatment for hair loss.”
18. “My three decades of experience in public service, my tireless commitment to the people of this community, and my willingness to reach across the aisle and cooperate with the opposition, make me the ideal candidate for your mayor.”
19. “Our expertise in roofing contracting is evidenced not only by our 50 years in the business and our staff of qualified technicians, but in the decades of satisfied customers who have come to expect nothing but the best.”
20. “Private demand for the product has tapered off for the past three years, and this year’s sales figures are at an all-time low. It’s time to research other options.”
21. “Research compiled by analysts from NASA, as well as organizations from five other nations with space programs, suggests that a moon colony is viable with international support.”
22. “The algorithms have been run in a thousand different ways, and the math continues to check out.”
23. “The data is perfectly clear: this investment has consistently turned a profit year-over-year, even in spite of market declines in other areas.”
24. “There’s no price that can be placed on peace of mind. Our advanced security systems will protect the well-being of your family so that you can sleep soundly at night.”
25. “They’ve worked against everything we’ve worked so hard to build, and they don’t care who gets hurt in the process. Make no mistake, they’re the enemy, and they won’t stop until we’re all destroyed.”
26. “Veterinarians say that a German Shepherd will are the perfect match for people with active lifestyles.”
27. “Where would we be without this tradition? Ever since our forefathers landed at Plymouth Rock, we’ve celebrated Thanksgiving without fail, making more than cherished recipes. We’ve made memories.”
28. “You know me - I’ve taught Sunday School at your church for years, babysat your children, and served as a playground director for many summers - so you know I can run your preschool.”
29. “You should consider another route if you leave later. I heard that that street is far more dangerous and ominous at night than during the daytime.”
30. “You will never be satisfied in life if you don’t seize this opportunity. Do you want to live the rest of your years yearning to know what would have happened if you just jumped when you had the chance?”
31. “You won’t find any deer along this road. In 25 years of driving the same route, I haven’t seen a single one.”
32. “You’ll make the right decision because you have something that not many people do: you have heart.”

**EXERCISE 2**

**Chief Joseph of the Nez Perce on his surrender to the U.S. Army in 1877**

Tell General Howard I know his heart. What he told me before, I have it in my heart. I am tired of fighting. Our Chiefs are killed; Looking Glass is dead, Tooelulhuulse is dead. The old men are all dead. It is the young men who say yes or no. He who led on the young men is dead. It is cold, and we have no blankets; the little children are freezing to death. My people, some of them, have run away to the hills, and have no blankets, no food. No one knows where they are—perhaps freezing to death. I want to have time to look for my children, and see how many of them I can find. Maybe I shall find them among the dead. Hear me, my Chiefs! I am tired; my heart is sick and sad. From where the sun now stands I will fight no more forever.
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. . . Mankind being originally equal in the order of creation, the equality could only be destroyed by some subsequent circumstance: the distinctions of rich and poor may in a great measure be accounted for, and that without having recourse to the harsh ill-sounding names of oppression and avarice. Oppression is often the consequence, but seldom or never the means of riches; and though avarice will preserve a man from being necessitously poor, it generally makes him too timorous to be wealthy.

But there is another and greater distinction for which no truly natural or religious reason can be assigned, and that is the distinction of men into KINGS and SUBJECTS. Male and female are the distinctions of nature, good and bad the distinctions of heaven; but how a race of men came into the world so exalted above the rest, and distinguished like some new species, is worth inquiring into, and whether they are the means of happiness or of misery to mankind.

In the early ages of the world, according to the scripture chronology there were no kings; the consequence of which was, there were no wars; it is the pride of kings which throws mankind into confusion. . . .

I have heard it asserted by some, that as America has flourished under her former connection with Great Britain, the same connection is necessary towards her future happiness, and will always have the same effect. Nothing can be more fallacious than this kind of argument.

I challenge the warmest advocate for reconciliation to show a single advantage that this continent can reap by being connected with Great Britain. I repeat the challenge; not a single advantage is derived. Our corn will fetch its price in any market in Europe, and our imported goods must be paid for, buy them where we will.

But the injuries and disadvantages which we sustain by that connection, are without number; and our duty to mankind at large, as well as to ourselves, instruct us to renounce the alliance: because, any submission to, or dependence on, Great Britain, tends directly to involve this continent in European wars and quarrels, and set us at variance with nations who would otherwise seek our friendship, and against whom we have neither anger nor complaint. As Europe is our market for trade, we ought to form no partial connection with any part of it. It is the true interest of America to steer clear of European contentions, which she never can do, while, by her dependence on Britain, she is made the makeweight in the scale of British politics.

The blood of the slain, the weeping voice of nature cries, ‘TIS TIME TO PART. Even the distance at which the Almighty hath placed England and America is a strong and natural proof that the authority of the one over the other, was never the design of heaven.

Small islands not capable of protecting themselves are the proper objects for government to take under their care; but there is something absurd, in supposing a Continent to be perpetually governed by an island. In no instance hath nature made the satellite larger than its primary planet; and as England and America, with respect to each other, reverse the common order of nature, it is evident that they belong to different systems. England to Europe: America to itself.

But where, say some, is the king of America? I’ll tell you, friend, he reigns above, and doth not make havoc of mankind like the royal brute of Great Britain…. in America the law is king. For as in absolute governments the king is law, so in free countries the law ought to be king; and there ought to be no other.
The Declaration of Independence, 4th July 1776

When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bonds which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature’s God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive to these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security.

Such has been the patient sufferance of these colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former systems of government. The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these states. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world.

He has refused his assent to laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.
He has forbidden his governors to pass laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operation till his assent should be obtained; and when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.
He has refused to pass other laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of representation in the legislature, a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only.
He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their public records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures.
He has dissolved representative houses repeatedly, for opposing with manly firmness his invasions on the rights of the people.
He has refused for a long time, after such dissolutions, to cause others to be elected; whereby the legislative powers, incapable of annihilation, have returned to the people at large for their exercise; the state remaining in the meantime exposed to all the dangers of invasion from without, and convulsions within.
He has endeavored to prevent the population of these states; for that purpose obstructing the laws for naturalization of foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migration hither, and raising the conditions of new appropriations of lands.
He has obstructed the administration of justice, by refusing his assent to laws for establishing judiciary powers.
He has made judges dependent on his will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.
He has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance.
He has kept among us, in times of peace, standing armies without the consent of our legislature; he has affected to render the military independent of and superior to civil power.
He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his assent to their acts of pretended legislation:
  • For quartering large bodies of armed troops among us:
  • For protecting them, by mock trial, from punishment for any murders which they should commit on the inhabitants of these states:
  • For cutting off our trade with all parts of the world:
  • For imposing taxes on us without our consent:
  • For depriving us in many cases, of the benefits of trial by jury:
  • For transporting us beyond seas to be tried for pretended offenses:
  • For abolishing the free system of English laws in a neighboring province, establishing therein an arbitrary government, and enlarging its boundaries so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule in these colonies:
  • For taking away our charters, abolishing our most valuable laws, and altering fundamentally the forms of our
governments:
• For suspending our own legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.

He has abdicated government here, by declaring us out of his protection and waging war against us. He has plundered our seas, ravaged our coasts, burned our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people. He is at this time transporting large armies of foreign mercenaries to complete the works of death, desolation and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of cruelty and perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the head of a civilized nation. He has constrained our fellow citizens taken captive on the high seas to bear arms against their country, to become the executioners of their friends and brethren, or to fall themselves by their hands. He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavored to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers, the merciless Indian savages, whose known rule of warfare, is undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes and conditions.

In Jefferson’s draft there is a part on slavery here

In every stage of these oppressions we have petitioned for redress in the most humble terms: our repeated petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A prince, whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people. Nor have we been wanting in attention to our British brethren. We have warned them from time to time of attempts by their legislature to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us. We have reminded them of the circumstances of our emigration and settlement here. We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity, and we have conjured them by the ties of our common kindred to disavow these usurpations, which, would inevitably interrupt our connections and correspondence. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity, which denounces our separation, and hold them, as we hold the rest of mankind, enemies in war, in peace friends. We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress, assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the name, and by the authority of the good people of these colonies, solemnly publish and declare, that these united colonies are, and of right ought to be free and independent states; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the state of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that as free and independent states, they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which independent states may of right do. And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor.

1. Who wrote the Declaration of Independence and when was it drafted?
2. **Paragraph #1**: How do the writers justify their need to write such a document?
3. Explain the meaning of “the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God”?
4. **Paragraph #2**: What does self-evident mean?
5. Can you define "unalienable rights"? What are they?
6. What type of government is referred to by “Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed?”
7. What do the people have the right to do against their government?
8. What should governments protect?
9. **Paragraph #3**: What is the purpose of the third paragraph?
10. Who is “He”?
### Match the quotations from the declaration to their meaning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. He has refused his Assent to Laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good</th>
<th>A. The king refused Assent to Laws regarding immigration. He hindered immigration from England and refused to cooperate in furthering the growth of the Colonies.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. “He has dissolved Representative Houses repeatedly, for opposing with manly firmness his invasions on the rights of the people.”</td>
<td>B. He continuously vetoed laws that the colonies attempted to put in place that they believed were needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. “He has endeavored to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the Laws for Naturalization of Foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migration hither, and raising the conditions of new Appropriations of Lands.”</td>
<td>C. If a Colonial Assembly did or issued something the king did not like (such as charges against him), he ordered the body dissolved and refused to acquiesce to charges or demands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. “He has obstructed the Administration of Justice, by refusing his Assent to Laws for establishing Judiciary powers.”</td>
<td>D. Without the consent of the Colonists, the king sent armies to keep order in the colonies, even though there was no war.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. “He has kept among us, in times of peace, Standing Armies without the Consent of our legislatures.”</td>
<td>E. Soldiers were not subject to civil laws. The military could make up and try their own laws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. He has affected to render the Military independent of and superior to the Civil power.”</td>
<td>F. The king had assented to multiple laws created by parliament which affected the Colonists – which they deemed illegal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. “He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his Assent to their acts of pretended legislation:”</td>
<td>G. The king would not allow courts of justice to be established; he constantly interfered and would not allow the Colonies to judge their own criminals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What the colonists considered as illegal legislation from Britain: match the quotations to their meaning:

| 1. “Quartering large bodies of armed troops among us” | A. Closing the Boston Port |
| 2. “For protecting them, by a mock Trial, from punishment for any Murders which they should commit” | B. Forced Colonists to house and pay for British troops |
| 3. “For cutting off our Trade with all parts of the world” | C. Taxing in many Acts and methods that were implemented without representation of the colonists |
| 4. “For imposing Taxes on us without our Consent” | D. In many cases there were no trials at all; the king decided they were guilty and punished them |
| 5. “For depriving us in many cases, of the benefits of Trial by Jury” | E. Immunized soldiers from Colonial Law |

11. **Paragraph #4** ("In every stage of these oppressions... in peace friends"): List the references to the colonies and to Britain: how do they differ? 12. **Paragraph #5**: what is the purpose of the fifth paragraph?
The U.S. Constitution
AMONG the numerous advantages promised by a well constructed Union, none deserves to be more accurately developed than its tendency to break and control the violence of faction. [...] Complaints are everywhere heard from our most considerate and virtuous citizens, equally the friends of public and private faith, and of public and personal liberty, that our governments are too unstable, that the public good is disregarded in the conflicts of rival parties, and that measures are too often decided, not according to the rules of justice and the rights of the minor party, but by the superior force of an interested and overbearing majority. [...] By a faction, I understand a number of citizens, whether amounting to a majority or a minority of the whole, who are united and actuated by some common impulse of passion, or of interest, adverse to the rights of other citizens, or to the permanent and aggregate interests of the community.

There are two methods of curing the mischiefs of faction: the one, by removing its causes; the other, by controlling its effects.

There are again two methods of removing the causes of faction: the one, by destroying the liberty which is essential to its existence; the other, by giving to every citizen the same opinions, the same passions, and the same interests.

The latent causes of faction are thus sown in the nature of man; and we see them everywhere brought into different degrees of activity, according to the different circumstances of civil society. A zeal for different opinions concerning religion, concerning government, and many other points, as well of speculation as of practice; an attachment to different leaders ambitiously contending for pre-eminence and power; or to persons of other descriptions whose fortunes have been interesting to the human passions, have, in turn, divided mankind into parties, inflamed them with mutual animosity, and rendered them much more disposed to vex and oppress each other than to co-operate for their common good. [...] But the most common and durable source of faction has been the various and unequal distribution of property. Those who hold and those who are without property have ever formed distinct interests in society. Those who are creditors, and those who are debtors, fall under a like discrimination. A landed interest, a manufacturing interest, a mercantile interest, a moneyed interest, with many lesser interests, grow up of necessity in civilized nations, and divide them into different classes, actuated by different sentiments and views. The regulation of these various and interfering interests forms the principal task of modern legislation, and involves the spirit of party and faction in the necessary and ordinary operations of the government. [...] Shall domestic manufactures be encouraged, and in what degree, by restrictions on foreign manufactures? are questions which would be differently decided by the landed and the manufacturing classes, and probably by neither with a sole regard to justice and the public good. The apportionment of taxes on the various descriptions of property is an act which seems to require the most exact impartiality; yet there is, perhaps, no legislative act in which greater opportunity and temptation are given to a predominant party to trample on the rules of justice. [...] It is in vain to say that enlightened statesmen will be able to adjust these clashing interests, and render them all subservient to the public good. Enlightened statesmen will not always be at the helm. Nor, in many cases, can such an adjustment be made at all without taking into view indirect and remote considerations, which will rarely prevail over the immediate interest which one party may find in disregarding the rights of another or the good of the whole.

The inference to which we are brought is, that the CAUSES of faction cannot be removed, and that relief is only to be sought in the means of controlling its EFFECTS.

[...] From this view of the subject it may be concluded that a pure democracy, by which I mean a 45 society consisting of a small number of citizens, who assemble and administer the government in person, can admit of no cure for the mischiefs of faction. [...] Hence it is that such democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention; have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property; and have in
general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths. Theoretic politicians, who have 
patronized this species of government, have erroneously supposed that by reducing mankind to a perfect equality 
in their political rights, they would, at the same time, be perfectly equalized and assimilated in their possessions, 
their opinions, and their passions.

A republic, by which I mean a government in which the scheme of representation takes place, opens a different 
prospect, and promises the cure for which we are seeking. [...] The two great points 55 of difference between a 
democracy and a republic are: first, the delegation of the government, in the latter, to a small number of citizens 
elected by the rest; secondly, the greater number of citizens, and greater sphere of country, over which the latter 
may be extended.

The effect of the first difference is, on the one hand, to refine and enlarge the public views, by passing them 
through the medium of a chosen body of citizens, whose wisdom may best discern the 60 true interest of their 
country, and whose patriotism and love of justice will be least likely to sacrifice it to temporary or partial 
considerations. Under such a regulation, it may well happen that the public voice, pronounced by the 
representatives of the people, will be more consonant to the public good than if pronounced by the people 
themselves, convened for the purpose. On the other hand, the effect may be inverted. Men of factious tempers, 
of local prejudices, or of sinister designs, may, by intrigue, by 65 corruption, or by other means, first obtain the 
suffrages, and then betray the interests, of the people. The question resulting is, whether small or extensive 
republics are more favorable to the election of proper guardians of the public weal [...].

[However small the republic may be, the representatives must be raised to a certain number, in order to guard 
against the cabals of a few; and that, however large it may be, they must be limited to a certain number, in order 
to guard against the confusion of a multitude. PUBLIUS.

Modern Library, p. 53-59.
U.S. Constitution and Amendments (summary)

We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

ARTICLES:
1. The Legislative Branch: House of Representatives and Senate (powers: taxing and spending money, declaration of war, impeachment, counting the population —note: 3/5 compromise)
2. The Executive Branch: President and Vice-President (powers: enforcing the laws made by the Legislative Branch, or veto the same, Commander-in-Chief of Armed Forces)
3. The Judicial Branch: Supreme Court and Lower Federal Courts (powers: interpretation of this Constitution)
4. Federal Government duties vis-à-vis the States, areas of supervision and protection
5. Process for amending the Constitution (2/3 House/Senate, 3⁄4 States)
6. This Constitution shall be the Law of the Land
7. Process for Ratification (9 of the 13 existing States must pass)

AMENDMENTS: The Bill of Rights (First ten amendments passed in 1791)
1. Freedom of religion, speech, press, public gathering, petition
2. People’s right to bear arms
3. No quartering of government soldiers in private homes
4. People secure against “unreasonable search and seizure”
5. Rights of the accused, due process of law, no self-incrimination
6. Rights of the accused: access to charges, witnesses, counsel
7. Right to trial by jury
8. Prohibition of excessive bail, and “cruel and unusual” punishment
9. This Constitution cannot be used to deny the rights of the citizen
10. All other powers not here mentioned go to the States and the People

ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS:
11. (1798) Federal Judiciary cannot interfere in Citizen-vs.-State cases
12. (1804) Separate election procedure for Vice-President; further clarification of Prt election process
13. (1865) Abolition of slavery
14. (1868) Elimination of 3/5 counting; due process and legal rights for all men; rebels denied office
15. (1870) Right to vote for all men, regardless of race
16. (1913) Federal Income Tax established
17. (1913) Direct popular election of Senators
18. (1919) Prohibition
19. (1920) Right to vote for all citizens, regardless of sex
20. (1933) Establishes earlier date (after election) for new government to assume its duties
21. (1933) Repeals Amendment 18
22. (1951) Limits presidents and Vice-Presidents to two terms
24. (1964) Elimination of all “poll taxes” levied upon voters
25. (1967) Process for replacing Vice-President become President, clarifies case of replacing a president unable to carry out its duties
26. (1971) Lowers voting age to 18
27. (1992) Variance of congressional compensation (congressional salaries must not vary until end of term of office)
Amendment I
Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Amendment II
A well-regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

Amendment III
No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

Amendment IV
The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Amendment V
No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall any person be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Amendment VI
In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence.

Amendment VII
In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.

Amendment VIII
Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

Amendment IX
The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Amendment X
The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.
There is no separation of powers without divided government: Partisan loyalty has triumphed over institutional loyalty.

By Lee Drutman Jan 3, 2018, 10:50am Vox.com

A year ago, as we approached the opening days of the Trump administration, it was still possible to make a hopeful, albeit long-shot, argument that 2017 could be the year Congress finally started to reassert itself as an institution. And that the cumbersome checks-and-balances system the framers set up would finally pay off and prove its worth as a tool to limit the power of a would-be demagogue.

The rationale went something like this: Congressional leaders of both parties understood the unique dangers that a President Trump posed to the country and the world. Therefore, they would finally invest in resources and capacity to assert the authority of the first branch of government, most visibly through vigorous oversight. Party be damned — the fate of the nation was more important, and it was time for Congress to stand up as an institution!

After all, “separation of powers” was our civic religion, right? In James Madison’s famous phrase from Federalist 51, on checks and balances: “Ambition must be made to counteract ambition. The interest of the man must be connected with the constitutional rights of the place.”

Obviously, this has not happened. Yes, here and there, congressional Republicans have made a few modest attempts to challenge the president. But mostly they’ve been willing bystanders or sycophantic cheerleaders. Yes, Congress imposed sanctions on Russia for election interference. But the Trump administration has so far delayed implementing them, and there’s been no visible pushback.

With few exceptions, Republicans in Congress have made a simple political calculus. Their electoral future is tied to Trump’s success. Trump is now the face of the Republican Party. And among Republicans, he remains pretty popular. If congressional Republicans forcefully challenged Trump, they’d bring on a primary challenger, destroy the Republican brand, or both. Even if most preferred to see Mike Pence in charge, the costs of getting there are too high.

The founders’ mistake

In writing the Constitution of the United States, the framers were attempting to balance competing views. Some, most notably Alexander Hamilton, wanted a strong and energetic executive. Others, most notably Madison, wanted the legislature to be preeminent.

While the framers may have disagreed on the balance of legislative versus executive power, there was one topic they did agree on: political parties. Political parties, they all thought, were terrible, awful, divisive forces, to be avoided at all costs. If allowed to form, political parties would tear the young nation apart.

And the best way to prevent partisan majorities from forming was to divide up power across so many competing institutions that it would be impossible for partisan majorities to form. Political scientist E.E. Schattschneider puts it this way, in his classic Party Government: “The authors of the Constitution set up an elaborate division and balance of powers within an intricate governmental structure designed to make parties ineffective. It was hoped that the parties would lose and exhaust themselves in futile attempts to fight their way through the labyrinthine framework of the government.”

The president and the legislature would be separate branches. An “electoral college” would nominate multiple candidates for the presidency, and then Congress would select among those candidates. There would also be a court system, a third branch, to provide additional checks.

With the exception of the election of 1824, however, the Electoral College never worked as planned. Instead, presidential elections evolved into a single winner-take-all national plebiscite election, with two major parties competing for what was frequently a very narrow majority.
Because the president is the only actor in the system who runs for office nationally, he has historically defined the party brand. And because the electoral fate of congressional partisans is linked to the brand of the party, they have a strong interest in going easy on fellow partisan presidents, while being tough on opposing partisan presidents. As a result, separation of powers has long been a dead letter without divided government.

Think of all the important moments when Congress has meaningfully checked abuses by the executive branch: Watergate, the 1975 Church Committee on wide-ranging domestic spying abuses by the CIA and the FBI, the Iran-Contra hearings. These were all moments of divided government, with Democrats in Congress and Republicans in the White House. Also note: The only two impeachment votes taken in Congress (Andrew Johnson in 1868, Bill Clinton in 1998-'99) came when Republicans controlled Congress and Democrats controlled the White House. None of these notable separation of powers moments would have taken place under unified government.

One might partially object to the above statement, and note that the courts, the third branch, have checked some of the Trump administration’s plans, notably the travel ban. But primarily, it has been liberal justices challenging the Trump administration. The conservative Supreme Court gave the administration the thumbs-up on the ban. And if the Trump administration succeeds in its efforts to remake the courts by appointing conservative justices, does anybody expect them to challenge the administration? The courts are more polarized than ever too.

Of course, the framers never anticipated this problem. Again, they thought American government would work without parties. And yet: It took a single Congress and Madison’s Republican Party was doing battle with Hamilton’s Federalist Party, voting in predictable patterns, calling each other nasty names (like “monocrat” and “Jacobin”), and fighting over the provision of presidential furniture. Whatever barriers Madison the framer enacted to make it hard for parties to form, Madison the partisan Congress member quickly found a way around them.

Perhaps the framers should have anticipated this. But they were humans, like everyone else. They couldn’t anticipate everything. And they were optimistic that they had designed a system of government that would frustrate partisan majorities from forming, solving the complex problem of divisive factions in a new and original way.

**What if the separation of powers system really is a myth?**

Perhaps at some point, we’ll return to an era of overlapping parties and weak partisanship (like we had in the 1950s), in which it was at least conceivable that institutional loyalty would be more important than partisan branding. But in this current moment of hyperpartisanship, that seems highly unlikely. Parties have never been more divided. Looking back on 2017, one wonders: At this point, what could possibly unite congressional Democrats and congressional Republicans against a president of one of the two major parties?

Where does that leave us? For the immediate moment, anyone who believes in the importance of separation of powers should support Democrats taking back the House and the Senate in 2018.

But this is a limited answer. And perhaps conservatives might say: This is too high a price to pay for a balance of powers government, just as liberals would say the same thing if the roles were reversed. After all, divided government under high partisan polarization is really just gridlocked government, and whatever oversight comes out of it might wind up as an endless fishing expedition to find something, anything, that can bring down the opposing party’s president. But that is the system we have.

And yet ... what if the framers had admitted that parties were indeed inevitable, and would stretch across the branches of government? Would they have come up with a different design to balance powers, and to avoid the great danger of majority tyranny they were so worried about?

Certainly, we Americans tend to take great pride in our democratic institutions, and find it inconceivable that our Constitution is not perfect. But while the framers were wise and thoughtful men, they did make some mistakes. They did not anticipate political parties. They thought ambitions and loyalties would be to institutions, not to parties. But as the events of 2017 have made clear, once again, partisanship is more powerful than institutional loyalty. There is no separation of powers without divided government. It’s time to face up to this reality.
Questions:

1. What did everyone want for 2017?
2. What is the first branch of government?
3. What does the author think about the separation of powers in the USA today?
4. What is the problem with political parties?
5. What does the author mean by “There is no separation of powers without divided government”?
6. What should people do to get a balance of powers in the government?
7. What is the danger of majority tyranny?

CHECKS AND BALANCES

I - Fill in the blanks with the words legislative, executive or judicial

1. The ______________________ branch makes laws, but the _______________________ branch can veto those laws with a Presidential Veto.
2. The _____________________ branch makes laws, but the _____________________ branch can declare those laws unconstitutional.
3. The ______________________ branch, through the Federal agencies, has responsibility for day-to-day enforcement and administration of Federal laws.
4. The ________________ branch can veto a law, but the ______________________ branch can override that veto with enough votes.
5. The _______________________ branch has the power to approve Presidential nominations, control the budget, and can impeach the President and remove him or her from office.
6. The _______________________ branch can declare Executive Orders, which are like proclamations that carry the force of law, but the _______________________ branch can declare those acts unconstitutional.
7. The _______________________ branch interprets laws, but the _______________________ branch nominates Supreme Court justices, court of appeals judges, and district court judges who make the evaluations.
8. The ________________________ branch interprets laws, but the Senate in the ________________________ branch confirms the President's nominations for judicial positions, and Congress can impeach any of those judges and remove them from office.

II- Which branch has the power to check the action of another branch?

1. May override the President’s veto
2. May impeach and remove the President from office
3. May declare a law unconstitutional
4. Sets salaries of federal judges
5. Appoints federal judges
6. Recommends legislation
7. May refuse to ratify a treaty
8. Calls special sessions of Congress
9. May ratify Constitutional amendments
10. May veto bills
11. May grant reprieves and pardons
12. May rule executive orders unconstitutional
The Early Republic

The first presidents of the United States

(1) George Washington

(2) John Adams

(3) Thomas Jefferson

(4) James Madison

(5) James Monroe

(6) John Quincy Adams
George Washington’s Farewell Address (1796)

Friends and Citizens:

The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those out of whom a choice is to be made.

[...]

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the State, with particular reference to the founding of them on geographical discriminations. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally. This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind. It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but, in those of the popular form, it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy. The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge, natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and sooner or later the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purposes of his own elevation, on the ruins of public liberty. Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight), the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it. It serves always to distract the public councils and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill-founded jealousies and false alarms, kindles the animosity of one part against another, foments occasionally riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another. There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent its bursting into a flame, lest, instead of warming, it should consume.

[...] Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. [...] It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. [...] In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations, and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another a habitual hatred or a habitual fondness is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. [...] As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot.

George Washington.
Maps: The 13 colonies and Westward Expansion
## Chronological List of U.S. Expansion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Territory</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1783</td>
<td>Former 13 colonies</td>
<td>Treaty of Paris of 1783 following American Revolutionary War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>Louisiana Purchase</td>
<td>Purchased from France for $15 million, including assumed claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td>Florida (East and West)</td>
<td>Purchased from Spain for $5 million in assumed claims under Adams-Onís Treaty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Annexation of independent republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>Oregon Territory</td>
<td>The Oregon Treaty with Great Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Mexican Cession</td>
<td>Purchase from Mexico following American-Mexican War; $15 million plus 3.25 million in assumed claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Gadsden Purchase</td>
<td>Purchased from Mexico for $10 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Baker Island</td>
<td>Unincorporated territory claimed under Guano Act of 1856; under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Howland Island</td>
<td>Unincorporated territory claimed under Guano Act of 1856; under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Navassa Island</td>
<td>Unincorporated territory claimed under Guano Act of 1856; under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>Jarvis Island</td>
<td>Unincorporated territory claimed under Guano Act of 1856; under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>Johnston Atoll</td>
<td>Unincorporated territory annexed under Guano Act of 1856; under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Purchased from Russia for $7.2 million; Statehood 1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Midway Islands</td>
<td>Unincorporated territory claimed under Guano Act of 1856; under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Hawaiian Islands</td>
<td>Annexation of independent republic; Statehood 1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Palmyra Atoll</td>
<td>Acquired with Hawaii; under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Philippine Islands</td>
<td>Purchased from Spain for $20 million following Spanish-America War; fully independent in 1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>Annexed following Spanish-America War; currently a self-governing commonwealth of the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>Annexed following Spanish-America War; in 1950 became organized, unincorporated U.S. territory under jurisdiction of Office of Insular Affairs of the Dept of the Interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>Annexed in settlement with Britain and Germany; currently an unorganized, unincorporated U.S. territory under jurisdiction of Office of Insular Affairs of the Department of the Interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Wake Island</td>
<td>Annexation of unoccupied area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>U.S. Virgin Islands</td>
<td>Purchased from Denmark for $25 million, currently an organized, unincorporated U.S. territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Kingman Reef</td>
<td>Annexed 1922; later airline refueling; currently uninhabited; National Wildlife Refuge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>The Federated States of Micronesia</td>
<td>United Nations Trust Territory; in 1986 became a sovereign, self-governing republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Republic of Palau</td>
<td>United Nations Trust Territory; in 1994 became a sovereign, self-governing republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Republic of the Marshall Islands</td>
<td>United Nations Trust Territory; in 1986 became a sovereign, self-governing republic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Monroe Doctrine, 1823

The Monroe Doctrine was expressed during President Monroe’s seventh annual message to Congress, December 2, 1823

[...] the occasion has been judged proper for asserting, as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers. [...] It was stated at the commencement of the last session that a great effort was then making in Spain and Portugal to improve the condition of the people of those countries, and that it appeared to be conducted with extraordinary moderation. It need scarcely be remarked that the results have been so far very different from what was then anticipated. Of events in that quarter of the globe, with which we have so much intercourse and from which we derive our origin, we have always been anxious and interested spectators. The citizens of the United States cherish sentiments the most friendly in favor of the liberty and happiness of their fellow-men on that side of the Atlantic. In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy to do so. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defense. With the movements in this hemisphere we are of necessity more immediately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers. The political system of the allied powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. This difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective Governments; and to the defense of our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure, and matured by the wisdom of their most enlightened citizens, and under which we have enjoyed unexampled felicity, this whole nation is devoted. We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the Governments who have declared their independence and maintain it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States. In the war between those new Governments and Spain we declared our neutrality at the time of their recognition, and to this we have adhered, and shall continue to adhere, provided no change shall occur which, in the judgement of the competent authorities of this Government, shall make a corresponding change on the part of the United States indispensable to their security. [...] Our policy in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe, nevertheless remains the same, which is, not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the government de facto as the legitimate government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it, and to preserve those relations by a frank, firm, and manly policy, meeting in all instances the just claims of every power, submitting to injuries from none. But in regard to those continents circumstances are eminently and conspicuously different. It is impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness; nor can anyone believe that our southern brethren, if left to themselves, would adopt it of their own accord. It is equally impossible, therefore, that we should behold such interposition in any form with indifference. If we look to the comparative strength and resources of Spain and those new Governments, and their distance from each other, it must be obvious that she can never subdue them. It is still the true policy of the United States to leave the parties to themselves, in hope that other powers will pursue the same course. [...]

Jacksonian Democracy and Westward Expansion

John Gast, “American Progress”, c.1873
President Andrew Jackson’s Message to Congress ‘On Indian Removal’ (1830)

It gives me pleasure to announce to Congress that the benevolent policy of the Government, steadily pursued for nearly thirty years, in relation to the removal of the Indians beyond the white settlements is approaching to a happy consummation. Two important tribes have accepted the provision made for their removal at the last session of Congress, and it is believed that their example will induce the remaining tribes also to seek the same obvious advantages.

The consequences of a speedy removal will be important to the United States, to individual States, and to the Indians themselves. The pecuniary advantages which it promises to the Government are the least of its recommendations. It puts an end to all possible danger of collision between the authorities of the General and State Governments on account of the Indians. It will place a dense and civilized population in large tracts of country now occupied by a few savage hunters. By opening the whole territory between Tennessee on the north and Louisiana on the south to the settlement of the whites it will incalculably strengthen the southwestern frontier and render the adjacent States strong enough to repel future invasions without remote aid. It will relieve the whole State of Mississippi and the western part of Alabama of Indian occupancy, and enable those States to advance rapidly in population, wealth, and power. It will separate the Indians from immediate contact with settlements of whites; free them from the power of the States; enable them to pursue happiness in their own way and under their own rude institutions; will retard the progress of decay, which is lessening their numbers, and perhaps cause them gradually, under the protection of the Government and through the influence of good counsels, to cast off their savage habits and become an interesting, civilized, and Christian community.

What good man would prefer a country covered with forests and ranged by a few thousand savages to our extensive Republic, studded with cities, towns, and prosperous farms embellished with all the improvements which art can devise or industry execute, occupied by more than 12,000,000 happy people, and filled with all the blessings of liberty, civilization and religion?

The present policy of the Government is but a continuation of the same progressive change by a milder process. The tribes which occupied the countries now constituting the Eastern States were annihilated or have melted away to make room for the whites. The waves of population and civilization are rolling to the westward, and we now propose to acquire the countries occupied by the red men of the South and West by a fair exchange, and, at the expense of the United States, to send them to land where their existence may be prolonged and perhaps made perpetual. Doubtless it will be painful to leave the graves of their fathers; but what do they more than our ancestors did or than our children are now doing? To better their condition in an unknown land our forefathers left all that was dear in earthly objects. Our children by thousands yearly leave the land of their birth to seek new homes in distant regions. Does Humanity weep at these painful separations from everything, animate and inanimate, with which the young heart has become entwined? Far from it. It is rather a source of joy that our country affords scope where our young population may range unconstrained in body or in mind, developing the power and facilities of man in their highest perfection. These remove hundreds and almost thousands of miles at their own expense, purchase the lands they occupy, and support themselves at their new homes from the moment of their arrival. Can it be cruel in this Government when, by events which it can not control, the Indian is made discontented in his ancient home to purchase his lands, to give him a new and extensive territory, to pay the expense of his removal, and support him a year in his new abode? How many thousands of our own people would gladly embrace the opportunity of removing to the West on such conditions! If the offers made to the Indians were extended to them, they would be hailed with gratitude and joy.

And is it supposed that the wandering savage has a stronger attachment to his home than the settled, civilized Christian? Is it more afflicting to him to leave the graves of his fathers than it is to our brothers and children? Rightly considered, the policy of the General Government toward the red man is not only liberal, but generous. He is unwilling to submit to the laws of the States and mingle with their population. To save him from this alternative, or perhaps utter annihilation, the General Government kindly offers him a new home, and proposes to pay the whole expense of his removal and settlement.
John O'Sullivan, "Annexation"

Congress had voted the annexation on February 28 1845, but Texas had yet to accept, and opponents were still hoping to block the annexation.

It is now time for the opposition to the Annexation of Texas to cease,... It is time for the common duty of Patriotism to the Country to succeed; ... Texas is now ours. ... Her star and her stripe may already be said to have taken their place in the glorious blazon of our common nationality; and the sweep of our eagle's wing already includes within its circuit the wide extent of her fair and fertile land.

... Why, were other reasoning wanting, in favor of now elevating this question of the reception of Texas into the Union, out of the lower region of our past party dissensions, up to its proper level of a high and broad nationality, it surely is to be found, found abundantly, in the manner in which other nations have undertaken to intrude themselves into it, between us and the proper parties to the case, in a spirit of hostile interference against us, for the avowed object of thwarting our policy and hampering our power, limiting our greatness and checking the fulfilment of our manifest destiny to overspread the continent allotted by Providence for the free development of our yearly multiplying millions. This we have seen done by England, our old rival and enemy, and by France, strangely coupled with her against us,... We are only astonished that ... the burst of indignation against this unauthorized, insolent and hostile interference against us, has not been more general even among the party before opposed to Annexation, and has not rallied the national spirit and national pride unanimously upon that policy. ...

It is wholly untrue, and unjust to ourselves, the pretence that the Annexation has been a measure of spoliation, unrightful and unrighteous--of military conquest under forms of peace and law--of territorial aggrandizement at the expense of justice, and justice due by a double sanctity to the weak. This view of the question is wholly unfounded ... The independence of Texas was complete and absolute. It was an independence, not only in fact, but of right. ... If Texas became peopled with an American population; it was by no contrivance of our government, but on the express invitation of that of Mexico herself, accompanied with such guaranties of State independence, and the maintenance of a federal system analogous to our own. ... She was released, rightfully and absolutely released, from all Mexican allegiance, or duty of cohesion to the Mexican political body, by the acts and fault of Mexico herself, and Mexico alone. There never was a clearer case. .... What then can be more preposterous than all this clamor by Mexico and the Mexican interest, against Annexation, as a violation of any rights of hers, any duties of ours?

... Nor is there any just foundation for the charge that Annexation is a great pro-slavery measure--calculated to increase and perpetuate that institution. Slavery had nothing to do with it. Opinions were and are greatly divided, both at the North and South, as to the influence to be exerted by it on Slavery and the Slave States. ... No--Mr. Clay was right when he declared that Annexation was a question with which slavery had nothing to do. [Texas] happens to be ... a slave country. But a similar process might have taken place in proximity to a different section of our Union; ... Texas has been absorbed into the Union in the inevitable fulfilment of the general law which is rolling our population westward; the connexion of which with that ratio of growth in population which is destined within a hundred years to swell our numbers to the enormous population of two hundred and fifty millions (if not more), is too evident to leave us in doubt of the manifest design of Providence in regard to the occupation of this continent.

... California will, probably, next fall away from the loose adhesion which, in such a country as Mexico, holds a remote province in a slight equivocal kind of dependence on the metropolis. Imbecile and distracted, Mexico never can exert any real governmental authority over such a country,...; unless, by stunting the province of all natural growth, and forbidding that immigration which can alone develop its capabilities and fulfil the purposes of its creation, tyranny may retain a military dominion, which is no government in the legitimate sense of the term. In the case of California this is now impossible. The Anglo-Saxon foot is already on its borders. ... A population will soon be in actual occupation of California, over which it will be idle for Mexico to dream of dominion. They will necessarily become independent. All this without agency of our government, without responsibility of our people--in the natural flow of events, the spontaneous working of principles, and the adaptation of the tendencies and wants of the human race to the elemental circumstances in the midst of which they find themselves placed. And they will have a right to independence--to self-government--to the possession of the homes conquered from the wilderness by their own labors and dangers, sufferings and sacrifices-a better and a truer right than the artificial
tide of sovereignty in Mexico, a thousand miles distant, inheriting from Spain a title good only against those who have none better.

United States Magazine and Democratic Review 17, no.1 (July-August 1845): 5-10

1. Introduce the text, the author and explain all the relevant context.
2. Which event was John O’ Sullivan defending? To which critics was he responding? Why was it a controversial issue in the US at the time? How was he justifying it? Analyze his arguments and rhetoric.
3. What was he foreseeing? How did he present it? How true was it?
Declaration of Sentiments.

Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Seneca Falls Convention, Seneca Falls, NY July 19, 1848

When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one portion of the family of man to assume among the people of the earth a position different from that which they have hitherto occupied, but one to which the laws of nature and of nature’s God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes that impel them to such a course.

We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men and women are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. Whenever any form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of those who suffer from it to refuse allegiance to it, and to insist upon the institution of a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly, all experience hath shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their duty to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security. Such has been the patient sufferance of the women under this government, and such is now the necessity which constrains them to demand the equal station to which they are entitled.

The history of mankind is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations on the part of man toward woman, having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over her. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world.

He has never permitted her to exercise her inalienable right to the elective franchise.

He has compelled her to submit to laws, in the formation of which she had no voice.

He has withheld from her rights which are given to the most ignorant and degraded men—both natives and foreigners.

Having deprived her of this first right of a citizen, the elective franchise, thereby leaving her without representation in the halls of legislation, he has oppressed her on all sides.

He has made her, if married, in the eye of the law, civilly dead.

He has taken from her all right in property, even to the wages she earns.

He has made her, morally, an irresponsible being, as she can commit many crimes with impunity, provided they be done in the presence of her husband. In the covenant of marriage, she is compelled to promise obedience to her husband, he becoming, to all intents and purposes, her master—-the law giving him power to deprive her of her liberty, and to administer chastisement.

He has so framed the laws of divorce, as to what shall be the proper causes of divorce; in case of separation, to whom the guardianship of the children shall be given; as to be wholly regardless of the happiness of women—the law, in all cases, going upon the false supposition of the supremacy of man, and giving all power into his hands.

After depriving her of all rights as a married woman, if single and the owner of property, he has taxed her to support a government which recognizes her only when her property can be made profitable to it.

He has monopolized nearly all the profitable employments, and from those she is permitted to follow, she receives but a scanty remuneration.

He closes against her all the avenues to wealth and distinction, which he considers most honorable to himself.

As a teacher of theology, medicine, or law, she is not known.

He has denied her the facilities for obtaining a thorough education—all colleges being closed against her.

He allows her in Church as well as State, but a subordinate position, claiming Apostolic authority for her exclusion from the ministry, and, with some exceptions, from any public participation in the affairs of the Church.

He has created a false public sentiment, by giving to the world a different code of morals for men and women, by which moral delinquencies which exclude women from society, are not only tolerated but deemed of little account in man.

He has usurped the prerogative of Jehovah himself, claiming it as his right to assign for her a sphere of action, when that belongs to her conscience and her God.
He has endeavored, in every way that he could to destroy her confidence in her own powers, to lessen her self-respect, and to make her willing to lead a dependent and abject life.

Now, in view of this entire disfranchisement of one-half the people of this country, their social and religious degradation,—in view of the unjust laws above mentioned, and because women do feel themselves aggrieved, oppressed, and fraudulently deprived of their most sacred rights, we insist that they have immediate admission to all the rights and privileges which belong to them as citizens of these United States.

In entering upon the great work before us, we anticipate no small amount of misconception, misrepresentation, and ridicule; but we shall use every instrumentality within our power to effect our object. We shall employ agents, circulate tracts, petition the State and national Legislatures, and endeavor to enlist the pulpit and the press in our behalf. We hope this Convention will be followed by a series of Conventions, embracing every part of the country.

Firmly relying upon the final triumph of the Right and the True, we do this day affix our signatures to this declaration.

At the appointed hour the meeting convened. The minutes having been read, the resolutions of the day before were read and taken up separately. Some, from their self-evident truth, elicited but little remark; others, after some criticism, much debate, and some slight alterations, were finally passed by a large majority.

[At an evening session] Lucretia Mott offered and spoke to the following resolution:

Resolved, That the speedy success of our cause depends upon the zealous and untiring efforts of both men and women, for the overthrow of the monopoly of the pulpit, and for the securing to woman an equal participation with men in the various trades, professions and commerce.

The Resolution was adopted.

Map: Territorial Growth of the United States


Map: Territorial Acquisitions and Dates of Entries into the Union.

Sectional Conflict and the Civil War

Abraham Lincoln

Jefferson Davis
The fact is, ladies and gentlemen, the distance between this platform and the slave plantation, from which I escaped, is considerable—and the difficulties to be overcome in getting from the latter to the former, are by no means slight. That I am here to-day is, to me, a matter of astonishment as well as of gratitude. You will not, therefore, be surprised, if in what I have to say, I evince no elaborate preparation, nor grace my speech with any high sounding exordium. With little experience and with less learning, I have been able to throw my thoughts hasty and imperfectly together; and trusting to your patient and generous indulgence, I will proceed to lay them before you. This, for the purpose of this celebration, is the 4th of July. It is the birthday of your National Independence, and of your political freedom ... There is consolation in the thought, that America is young.—Great streams are not easily turned from channels, worn deep in the course of ages. They may sometimes rise in quiet and stately majesty, and inundate the land, refreshing and fertilizing the earth with their mysterious properties. They may also rise in wrath and fury, and bear away, on their angry waves, the accumulated wealth of years of toil and hardship. They, however, gradually flow back to the same old channel, and flow on as serenely as ever. But, while the river may not be turned aside, it may dry up, and leave nothing behind but the withered branch, and the unsightly rock, to howl in the abyss-sweeping wind, the sad tale of departed glory. As with rivers so with nations.

... The simple story of it is, that, 76 years ago, the people of this country were British subjects ... You were under the British Crown ... But, your fathers ... They went so far in their excitement as to pronounce the measures of government unjust, unreasonable, and oppressive, and altogether such as ought not to be quietly submitted to ... To say now that America was right, and England wrong, is exceedingly easy ... but there was a time when to pronounce against England, and in favor of the cause of the colonies, tried men's souls ... On the 2d of July, 1776, the old Continental Congress, to the dismay of the lovers of ease, and the worshippers of property ... in the form of a resolution ... it may refresh your minds and help my story if I read it. “Resolved, That these united colonies are, and of right, ought to be free and Independent States; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown; and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain is, and ought to be, dissolved.” Citizens, your fathers made good that resolution. They succeeded; and to-day you reap the fruits of their success. The freedom gained is yours; and you, therefore, may properly celebrate this anniversary. The 4th
of July is the first great fact in your nation’s history—the very ring-bolt in the chain of your yet undeveloped destiny ...

What, to the American slave, is your 4th of July? I answer: a day that reveals to him, more than all other days in the year, the gross injustice and cruelty to which he is the constant victim. To him, your celebration is a sham; your boasted liberty, an unholy license; your national greatness, swelling vanity; your sounds of rejoicing are empty and heartless; your denunciations of tyrants, brass fronted impudence; your shouts of liberty and equality, hollow mockery; your prayers and hymns, your sermons and thanksgivings, with all your religious parade, and solemnity, are, to him, mere bombast, fraud, deception, impiety, and hypocrisy—a thin veil to cover up crimes which would disgrace a nation of savages. There is not a nation on the earth guilty of practices, more shocking and bloody, than are the people of these United States, at this very hour. Go where you may, search where you will, roam through all the monarchies and despotisms of the old world, travel through South America, search out every abuse, and when you have found the last, lay your facts by the side of the every day practices of this nation, and you will say with me, that, for revolting barbarity and shameless hypocrisy, America reigns without a rival ...

Behold the practical operation of this internal slave-trade, the American slave-trade, sustained by American politics and American religion ... Fellow-citizens, this murderous traffic is, to-day, in active operation in this boasted republic ... I see the bleeding footsteps ... on the way to the slave-markets, where the victims are to be sold like horses, sheep, and swine ... My soul sickens at the sight ... But a still more inhuman, disgraceful, and scandalous state of things remains to be presented. By an act of the American Congress ... slavery has been nationalized in its most horrible and revolting form ... The Fugitive Slave Law makes MERCY TO THEM, A CRIME; and bribes the judge who tries them. An American JUDGE GETS TEN DOLLARS FOR EVERY VICTIM HE CONSIGNS to slavery, and five, when he fails to do so ... Let this damning fact be perpetually told ... that, in tyrant-killing, king-hating, people-loving, democratic, Christian America, the seats of justice are filled with judges, who hold their offices under an open and palpable bribe ... I take this law to be one of the grossest infringements of Christian Liberty, and, if the churches and ministers of our country were not stupidly blind, or most wickedly indifferent, they, too, would so regard it ... they are utterly silent in respect to a law which robs religion of its chief significance, and makes it utterly worthless to a world lying in wickedness ... Allow me to say, in conclusion ... I do not despair of this country. There are forces in operation, which must inevitably, work the downfall of slavery. “The arm of the Lord is not shortened,” and the doom of slavery is certain. I, therefore, leave off where I began, with hope.
George Fitzhugh’s Defense of Slavery Excerpts from Sociology of the South: or, the Failure of Free Society, 1854.

He [the negro] is but a grown up child, and must be governed as a child, not as a lunatic or criminal. The master occupies towards him the place of parent or guardian. We shall not dwell on this view, for no one will differ with us who thinks as we do of the negro’s capacity, and we might argue till dooms-day, in vain, with those who have a high opinion of the negro’s moral and intellectual capacity. Secondly. The negro is improvident; will not lay up in summer for the wants of winter; will not accumulate in youth for the exigencies of age. He would become an insufferable burden to society. Society has the right to prevent this, and can only do so by subjecting him to domestic slavery.

In the last place, the negro race is inferior to the white race, and living in their midst, they would be far outstripped or outwitted in the chase of free competition. Gradual but certain extermination would be their fate. We presume the maddest abolitionist does not think the negro’s providence of habits and money-making capacity at all to compare to those of the whites. This defect of character would alone justify enslaving him, if he is to remain here. In Africa or the West Indies, he would become idolatrous, savage and cannibal, or be devoured by savages and cannibals. At the North he would freeze or starve. We would remind those who deprecate and sympathize with negro slavery, that his slavery here relieves him from a far mere cruel slavery in Africa, or from idolatry and cannibalism, and every brutal vice and crime that can disgrace humanity; and that it christianizes, protects, supports and civilizes him; that it governs him far better than free laborers at the North are governed. There, wife-murder has become a mere holiday pastime; and where so many wives are murdered, almost all must be brutally treated. Nay, more: men who kill their wives or treat them brutally, must be ready for all kinds of crime, and the calendar of crime at the North proves the inference to be correct. Negroes never kill their wives. If it be objected that legally they have no wives, then we reply, that in an experience of more than forty years, we never yet heard of a negro man killing a negro woman. Our negroes are not only better off as to physical comfort than free laborers, but their moral condition is better.

Excerpts from Cannibals All! or, Slaves without Masters, 1857.

The negro slaves of the South are the happiest, and, in some sense, the freest people in the world. The children and the aged and infirm work not at all, and yet have all the comforts and necessaries of life provided for them. They enjoy liberty, because they are oppressed neither by care nor labor. The women do little hard work, and are protected from the despotism of their husbands by their masters. The negro men and stout boys “work, on the average, in good weather, not more than nine hours a day. The balance of their time is spent in perfect abandon. Besides, they have their Sabbaths and holidays. White men, with so much of license and liberty, would die of ennui; but negroes luxuriate in corporeal and mental repose. With their faces upturned to the sun, they can sleep at any hour; and quiet sleep is the greatest of human enjoyments. “Blessed be the man who invented sleep. ” ’Tis happiness in itself—and results from contentment with the present, and confident assurance of the future. We do not know whether free laborers ever sleep. They are fools to do so; for, whilst they sleep, the wily and watchful capitalist is devising means to ensnare and exploitate them. The free laborer must work or starve. He is more of a slave than the negro, because he works longer and harder for less allowance than the slave, and has no holiday, because the cares of life with him begin when its labors end. He has no liberty, and not a single right.
Scott vs Sandford, 1853

The question is simply this: can a negro whose ancestors were imported into this country and sold as slaves become a member of the political community formed and brought into existence by the Constitution of the United States, and as such become entitled to all the rights, and privileges, and immunities, guarantied by that instrument to the citizen, one of which rights is the privilege of suing in a court of the United States in the cases specified in the Constitution?

The words "people of the United States" and "citizens" are synonymous terms, and mean the same thing. They both describe the political body who, according to our republican institutions, form the sovereignty and who hold the power and conduct the Government through their representatives. They are what we familiarly call the "sovereign people," and every citizen is one of this people, and a constituent member of this sovereignty. The question before us is whether the class of persons described in the plea in abatement compose a portion of this people, and are constituent members of this sovereignty? We think they are not, and that they are not included, and were not intended to be included, under the word "citizens" in the Constitution, and can therefore claim none of the rights and privileges which that instrument provides for and secures to citizens of the United States. On the contrary, they were at that time considered as a subordinate and inferior class of beings who had been subjugated by the dominant race, and, whether emancipated or not, yet remained subject to their authority, and had no rights or privileges but such as those who held the power and the Government might choose to grant them. ...

In the opinion of the court, the legislation and histories of the times, and the language used in the Declaration of Independence, show that neither the class of persons who had been imported as slaves nor their descendants, whether they had become free or not, were then acknowledged as a part of the people, nor intended to be included in the general words used in that memorable instrument.

Now, as we have already said in an earlier part of this opinion upon a different point, the right of property in a slave is distinctly and expressly affirmed in the Constitution. The right to traffic in it, like an ordinary article of merchandise and property, was guarantied to the citizens of the United States in every State that might desire it for twenty years. And the Government in express terms is pledged to protect it in all future time if the slave escapes from his owner. This is done in plain words -- too plain to be misunderstood. And no word can be found in the Constitution which gives Congress a greater power over slave property or which entitles property of that kind to less protection that property of any other description. The only power conferred is the power coupled with the duty of guarding and protecting the owner in his rights.

Upon these considerations, it is the opinion of the court that the act of Congress which prohibited a citizen from holding and owning property of this kind in the territory of the United States north of the line therein mentioned is not warranted by the Constitution, and is therefore void, and that neither Dred Scott himself nor any of his family were made free by being carried into this territory, even if they had been carried there by the owner with the intention of becoming a permanent resident.
President Lincoln delivered the 272 word Gettysburg Address on November 19, 1863 on the battlefield near Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.

"Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth, on this continent, a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived, and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting-place for those who here gave their lives, that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this. But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they here gave the last full measure of devotion— that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Source: http://rmc.library.cornell.edu/gettysburg/good_cause/transcript.htm

The Emancipation Proclamation, January 1, 1863

"That on the first day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, all persons held as slaves within any State or designated part of a State, the people whereof shall then be in rebellion against the United States, shall be then, thenceforward, and forever free; and the Executive Government of the United States, including the military and naval authority thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of such persons, and will do no act or acts to repress such persons, or any of them, in any efforts they may make for their actual freedom…. Now, therefore I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, by virtue of the power in me vested as Commander-in-Chief, of the Army and Navy of the United States in time of actual armed rebellion against the authority and government of the United States, and as a fit and necessary war measure for suppressing said rebellion, do, on this first day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, and in accordance with my purpose so to do publicly proclaimed for the full period of one hundred days, from the day first above mentioned, order and designate as the States and parts of States wherein the people thereof respectively, are this day in rebellion against the United States, the following, to wit: Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana, (except the Parishes of St. Bernard, Plaquemines, Jefferson, St. John, St. Charles, St. James Ascension, Assumption, Terrebonne, Lafourche, St. Mary, St. Martin, and Orleans, including the City of New Orleans) Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia, (except the forty-eight counties designated as West Virginia, and also the counties of Berkley, Accomac, Northampton, Elizabeth City, York, Princess Ann, and Norfolk, including the cities of Norfolk and Portsmouth[]), and which excepted parts, are for the present, left precisely as if this proclamation were not issued.

And by virtue of the power, and for the purpose aforesaid, I do order and declare that all persons held as slaves within said designated States, and parts of States, are, and henceforward shall be free; and that the Executive government of the United States, including the military and naval authorities thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of said persons.

And I hereby enjoin upon the people so declared to be free to abstain from all violence, unless in necessary self-defence; and I recommend to them that, in all cases when allowed, they labor faithfully for reasonable wages.

And I further declare and make known, that such persons of suitable condition, will be received into the armed service of the United States to garrison forts, positions, stations, and other places, and to man vessels of all sorts in said service. …

By the President: Abraham Lincoln, William H. Seward, Secretary of State.
Reconstruction
Abraham Lincoln, Second inaugural address, Saturday, March 4, 1865

Fellow-Countrymen:

At this second appearing to take the oath of the Presidential office there is less occasion for an extended address than there was at the first. Then a statement somewhat in detail of a course to be pursued seemed fitting and proper. Now, at the expiration of four years, during which public declarations have been constantly called forth on every point and phase of the great contest which still absorbs the attention and engrosses the energies of the nation, little that is new could be presented. The progress of our arms, upon which all else chiefly depends, is as well known to the public as to myself, and it is, I trust, reasonably satisfactory and encouraging to all. With high hope for the future, no prediction in regard to it is ventured.

On the occasion corresponding to this four years ago all thoughts were anxiously directed to an impending civil war. All dreaded it, all sought to avert it. While the inaugural address was being delivered from this place, devoted altogether to 'saving' the Union without war, urgent agents were in the city seeking to 'destroy' it without war--seeking to dissolve the Union and divide effects by negotiation. Both parties deprecated war, but one of them would 'make' war rather than let the nation survive, and the other would 'accept' war rather than let it perish, and the war came.

One-eighth of the whole population were colored slaves, not distributed generally over the Union, but localized in the southern part of it. These slaves constituted a peculiar and powerful interest. All knew that this interest was somehow the cause of the war. To strengthen, perpetuate, and extend this interest was the object for which the insurgents would rend the Union even by war, while the Government claimed no right to do more than to restrict the territorial enlargement of it. Neither party expected for the war the magnitude or the duration which it has already attained. Neither anticipated that the 'cause' of the conflict might cease with or even before the conflict itself should cease. Each looked for an easier triumph, and a result less fundamental and astounding. Both read the same Bible and pray to the same God, and each invokes His aid against the other. It may seem strange that any men should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men's faces, but let us judge not, that we be not judged. The prayers of both could not be answered. That of neither has been answered fully. The Almighty has His own purposes. "Woe unto the world because of offenses; for it must needs be that offenses come, but woe to that man by whom the offense cometh." If we shall suppose that American slavery is one of those offenses which, in the providence of God, must needs come, but which, having continued through His appointed time, He now wills to remove, and that He gives to both North and South this terrible war as the woe due to those by whom the offense came, shall we discern therein any departure from those divine attributes which the believers in a living God always ascribe to Him? Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondsman's two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said three thousand years ago, so still it must be said "the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

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

AMENDMENT XIII  
Passed by Congress January 31, 1865. Ratified December 6, 1865. 

Note: A portion of Article IV, section 2, of the Constitution was superseded by Amendment XIII.

Section 1. 
Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

Section 2. 
Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

AMENDMENT XIV  
Passed by Congress June 13, 1866. Ratified July 9, 1868. 

Note: Article I, section 2, of the Constitution was modified by section 2 of Amendment XIV.

Section 1. 
All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Section 2. 
Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age,* and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

Section 3. 
No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice-President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.

Section 4. 
The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.

Section 5. 
The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article. 

*Changed by section 1 of Amendment XXVI.

AMENDMENT XV  Passed by Congress February 26, 1869. Ratified February 3, 1870. 

Section 1. 
The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude--

Section 2. 
The Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.
An Act to provide for the more efficient Government of the Rebel States [Passed over President Johnson's veto March 2, 1867]

Whereas no legal State governments or adequate protection for life or property now exists in the rebel States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, Florida, Texas, and Arkansas; and whereas it is necessary that peace and good order should be enforced in said States until loyal and republican State governments can be legally established: Therefore,

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That said rebel States shall be divided into military districts and made subject to the military authority of the United States as hereinafter prescribed, and for that purpose Virginia shall constitute the first district; North Carolina and South Carolina the second district; Georgia, Alabama and Florida the third district; Mississippi and Arkansas the fourth district; and Louisiana and Texas the fifth district.

Sec. 2 And be it further enacted, That it shall be the duty of the President to assign to the command of each of the said districts an officer of the army, not below the rank of brigadier-general, and to detail a sufficient military force to enable such officer to perform his duties and enforce his authority within the district to which he is assigned.

Sec. 3 And be it further enacted, That it shall be the duty of each officer assigned as aforesaid, to protect all persons in their rights of person and property, to suppress insurrection, disorder, and violence, and to punish, or cause to be punished, all disturbers of the public peace and criminals; and to this end he may allow local civil tribunals to take jurisdiction of and to try offenders, or, when in his judgment it may be necessary for the trial of offenders, he shall have power to organize military commissions or tribunals for that purpose, and all interference under color of State authority with the exercise of military authority under this act, shall be null and void.

[...] Sec. 5 And be it further enacted, That when the people of any one of said rebel States shall have formed a constitution of government in conformity with the Constitution of the United States in all respects, framed by a convention of delegates elected by the male citizens of said State, twenty-one years old and upward, of whatever race, color, or previous condition, who have been resident in said State for one year previous to the day of such election, except such as may be disfranchised for participation in the rebellion or for felony at common law, and when such constitution shall provide that the elective franchise shall be enjoyed by all such persons as have the qualifications herein stated for electors of delegates, and when such constitution shall be ratified by a majority of the persons voting on the question of ratification who are qualified as electors for delegates, and when such constitution shall have been submitted to Congress for examination and approval, and Congress shall have approved the same, and when said State, by a vote of its legislature elected under said constitution, shall have adopted the amendment to the Constitution of the United States, proposed by the Thirty-ninth Congress, and known as article fourteen, and when such article shall have become a part of the Constitution of the United States, said State shall be declared entitled to representation in Congress, and senators and representatives shall be admitted therefrom on their taking the oath prescribed by law, and then and thereafter the preceding sections of this act shall be inoperative in said State: Provided, That no person excluded from the privilege of holding office by said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, shall be eligible to election as a member of the convention to frame a constitution for any of said rebel States, nor shall any such person vote for members of such convention.

Sec. 6 And be it further enacted, That, until the people of said rebel States shall be by law admitted to representation in the Congress of the United States, any civil governments which may exist therein shall be deemed provisional only, and in all respects subject to the paramount authority of the United States at any time to abolish, modify, control, or supersede the same; and in all elections to any office under such provisional governments all persons shall be entitled to vote, and none others, who are entitled to vote under the provisions of the fifth section of this act; and no person shall be eligible to any office under any provisional governments who would be disqualified from holding office under the provisions of the third article of said constitutional amendment.
1. Present the context of the document: why are the States called the “rebels states”?
2. What was the aim of Congress in implementing the Reconstruction Acts?
3. Under which conditions could the “rebels states” be reintegrated in the Union?
4. How successful were the Reconstruction Acts?

PLESSY VS FERGUSON, 1896

In 1896, the Supreme Court issued its decision in Plessy v. Ferguson. Justice Henry Brown of Michigan delivered the majority opinion, which sustained the constitutionality of Louisiana’s Jim Crow law. In part, he said:

“We consider the underlying fallacy of the plaintiff’s argument to consist in the assumption that the enforced separation of the two races stamps the colored race with a badge of inferiority. If this be so, it is not by reason of anything found in the act, but solely because the colored race chooses to put that construction upon it… The argument also assumes that social prejudice may be overcome by legislation, and that equal rights cannot be secured except by an enforced commingling of the two races… If the civil and political rights of both races be equal, one cannot be inferior to the other civilly or politically. If one race be inferior to the other socially, the Constitution of the United States cannot put them upon the same plane.”

In a powerful dissent, conservation Kentuckian John Marshall Harlan wrote:

“I am of the opinion that the statute of Louisiana is inconsistent with the personal liberties of citizens, white and black, in that State, and hostile to both the spirit and the letter of the Constitution of the United States. If laws of like character should be enacted in the several States of the Union, the effect would be in the highest degree mischievous. Slavery as an institution tolerated by law would, it is true, have disappeared from our country, but there would remain a power in the States, by sinister legislation, to interfere with the blessings of freedom; to regulate civil rights common to all citizens, upon the basis of race; and to place in a condition of legal inferiority a large body of American citizens, now constituting a part of the political community, called the people of the United States, for whom an by whom, through representatives, our government is administrated. Such a system is inconsistent with the guarantee given by the Constitution to each State of a republican form of government, and may be stricken down by congressional action, or by the courts in the discharge of their solemn duty to maintain the supreme law of the land, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.”

Source: https://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?flash=false&doc=52
“KU-KLUXISM”

Harper's Weekly, December 19, 1868, pp.813-814

When Senator Sumner made his celebrated argument in Congress over ten years ago, insisting upon the “barbarism of slavery,” his oration was denounced as declamatory and extravagant. But scarcely had the voice of the orator ceased to echo in the chamber where it was uttered before the full evidence of its bitter truth was furnished by the cowardly assault of a South Carolina Congressman upon his person. The rebellion which soon followed convinced the North that even the Senator from Massachusetts had not adequately appreciated the barbarism which he denounced; for suddenly elements were evolved from the peculiar civilization of the slaveholding States which threatened and actually attempted the disruption and ruin of the country. The war itself, and considered apart from its original cause, afforded in its successive stage accumulative evidence of the barbarism generated by a system of legalized injustice. The scalping of our dead soldiers upon the battle-field of Pea Ridge by the savage allies of the Confederacy; the inhuman butchery of national negro soldiers at Fort Pillow; the denial of the common courtesies of war to our captured negro soldiers by an attempt to make the axioms of slavery as potent on the battle-field as on the plantation; and the barbarities inflicted upon our brave youth at Belle Isle, Andersonville, Salisbury, and Millen—all these enormities illustrated the depravity possible even to a Christian community which adopts and persistently cherishes a monstrous wrong.

All this we should willingly leave to the historian but for the unfortunate development of the same barbarism since the close of the war. The confession of defeat does not prove the annihilation of wrong. The very first attempt made by the Southern Legislatures, assembled under President Johnson's provisional governments, was to revive a system of partial slavery by a continuance of the old slave code. That attempt was baffled by the passage of the Civil Rights Bill. Disappointed here, the Southern Legislatures attempted, through the defeat of the Fourteenth Amendment, to retain for the whites of the South the disproportionate representation which slavery had given them, while denying suffrage to the colored race. Here again they were thwarted by the establishment over them of a military government.

Then it was that the Ku-Klux organization sprang into being. The object of this secret society was the accomplishment by intimidation and murder of that which open war first and unjust legislation afterward had failed to secure. The logic of the new order was that of the old "Regulators" under the slave system; it was the argument of the New Orleans riot. It has been only too successful in its operations; its members, in ceremonial disguise, wearing sepulchral masks, and courting the aid of darkness, have murdered without stint, and where they have not murdered they have used intimidation. They have been aided by the proscription of Union men, and by the denial of labor to negroes who refused to vote the Democratic ticket. The result of these violent means of exercising political power are plainly evident in the late election returns of the Southern States. But, for all that, the Ku-Klux organization has failed.

One of the most important of the advantages gained for freedom by the election of General Grant is the certain defeat of political violence in the South. But the evil can only be completely eradicated by the co-operation of Southern citizens, and by efforts on their part to advance educational interest, and to diffuse Christianizing and humanizing influences, throughout the territory so long blasted by the curse of slavery.

http://education.harpweek.com/KKKHearings/Article14.htm

1. Present the document (type, context)
2. To which events/periods of American history does it allude to?
3. According to this article, what was the origin of the formation of the Ku-Klux Klan?
4. Analyse the tone of the text: how is it depicting the South? Who, do you think, is the readership of this magazine?
5. Do you agree that “the election of General Grant [was] the certain defeat of political violence in the South”?
Waves and Peaks of U.S. Immigration

The century following 1820 can be divided into 3 great periods of immigration, or "waves." These three have immigrants coming from primarily three different regions.

- 1820-1860, Great Britain, Ireland, and Western Germany.
- 1860-1890, The above countries continued to provide, as well as Scandinavian Nations.
- 1890-1910, The majority was Austria, Hungary, Italy, and Russia, up until World War 1.

From 1905 until 1914, an average of more than a million aliens yearly entered the U.S. With the outbreak of World War 1, the number declined sharply. In 1921 the number again rose, but only for a short time until changing conditions in Europe as well as new U.S. Laws governing Immigration were established.

1607-1830 The slaves trade thrived through the 18th century. Africa thus made a substantial addition to the American population. There were about 500,000 African Americans here by the time of the American Revolution. The great majority were slaves. The unique quality of this migration had planted the seeds of difficulty that would permanently mark the nation.

1830-1890

- In the decade preceding the election of Lincoln, 2,598,214 immigrants came to U.S. mainly from Great Britain, Ireland, and Germany with few from Norway, Sweden, and the Netherlands
- After the panic of 1857 and out break of the Civil War, immigration declined, but after collapse of Confederacy, immigration assumed a huge volume again
- Not until the 1840’s did wave after wave of immigration was deposited on American shores from practically every country of Europe
- This is where Irish immigration began its wave, especially after the potato crop failure
- This “Era of Mass Immigration” was initially from northern and western Europe
- The 1830’s was a surge of German immigrants
- In 1848, with the discovery of Gold, there was a spur of Chinese and Latin American immigrants to the west coast
- In the 1870’s large number of Scandinavians, Chinese, and Canadians immigrated to the U.S.
- 1840’s and 1850’s - 1.5 million immigrants
- 1840’s - 1880’s (Germans) - 4 million immigrants
- Total number of immigrants in this wave is about 7.5 million

1890-1924

- In 1907 Japanese immigration was limited
- Chinese immigration was stopped in 1992 & 1902

Source: http://sites.bergen.org/BCA/immigration/waves_of_immigration.html
Emma Lazarus, “The New Colossus,” 1883

[The final lines of Lazarus’s poem were engraved in the pedestal of the Statue of Liberty in 1903.]

The New Colossus

Not like the brazen giant of Greek fame,  
With conquering limbs astride from land to land;  
Here at our sea-washed, sunset gates shall stand  
A mighty woman with a torch, whose flame  
Is the imprisoned lightning, and her name  
Mother of Exiles. From her beacon-hand  
Glows world-wide welcome; her mild eyes command  
The air-bridged harbor that twin cities frame.  
“Keep ancient lands, your storied pomp!” cries she  
With silent lips, “Give me your tired, your poor,  
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,  
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.  
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,  
I lift my lamp beside the golden door!”

* * *

Map: Indian Land Cessions


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

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

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

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

The price which society pays for the law of competition, like the price it pays for cheap comforts and luxuries, is also great; but the advantage of this law are also greater still, for it is to this law that we owe our wonderful material development, which brings improved conditions in its train. But, whether the law be benign or not, we must say of it, as we say of the change in the conditions of men to which we have referred: It is here; we cannot evade it; what were the luxuries have become the necessaries of life. The laborer has now more comforts than the landlord had a few generations ago. The farmer has more luxuries than the landlord had, and is more richly clad and better housed. The landlord has books and pictures rarer, and appointments more artistic, than the King could then obtain.

Objections to the foundations upon which society is based are not in order, because the condition of the race is better with these than it has been with any others which have been tried. Of the effect of any new substitutes proposed we cannot be sure. The Socialist or Anarchist who seeks to overturn present conditions is to be regarded as attacking the foundation upon which civilization itself rests, for civilization took its start from the day that the capable, industrious workman said to his incompetent and lazy fellow, "If thou dost net sow, thou shalt net reap," and thus ended primitive Communism by separating the drones from the bees. One who studies this subject will soon be brought face to face with the conclusion that upon the sacredness of property civilization itself depends—the right of the laborer to his hundred dollars in the savings bank, and equally the legal right of the millionaire to his millions. To these who propose to substitute Communism for this intense Individualism the answer, therefore,
is: The race has tried that. All progress from that barbarous day to the present time has resulted from its displacement. Not evil, but good, has come to the race from the accumulation of wealth by those who have the ability and energy that produce it. But even if we admit for a moment that it might be better for the race to discard its present foundation, Individualism,—that it is a nobler ideal that man should labor, not for himself alone, but in and for a brotherhood of his fellows, and share with them all in common, realizing Swedenborg’s idea of Heaven, where, as he says, the angels derive their happiness, not from laboring for self, but for each other,—even admit all this, and a sufficient answer is, This is not evolution, but revolution. It necessitates the changing of human nature itself a work of oeons, even if it were good to change it, which we cannot know. It is not practicable in our day or in our age. Even if desirable theoretically, it belongs to another and long-succeeding sociological stratum. Our duty is with what is practicable now; with the next step possible in our day and generation. It is criminal to waste our energies in endeavoring to uproot, when all we can profitably or possibly accomplish is to bend the universal tree of humanity a little in the direction most favorable to the production of good fruit under existing circumstances. We might as well urge the destruction of the highest existing type of man because he failed to reach our ideal as favor the destruction of Individualism, Private Property, the Law of Accumulation of Wealth, and the Law of Competition; for these are the highest results of human experience, the soil in which society so far has produced the best fruit. Unequally or unjustly, perhaps, as these laws sometimes operate, and imperfect as they appear to the Idealist, they are, nevertheless, like the highest type of man, the best and most valuable of all that humanity has yet accomplished.
Frederick Jackson Turner, “The Significance of the American Frontier in American History”, 1893

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

Behind institutions, behind constitutional forms and modifications, lie the vital forces that call these organs into life and shape them to meet changing conditions. The peculiarity of American institutions is, the fact that they have been compelled to adapt themselves to the changes of an expanding people to the changes involved in crossing a continent, in winning a wilderness, and in developing at each area of this progress out of the primitive economic and political conditions of the frontier into the complexity of city life. ... Thus American development has exhibited not merely advance along a single line, but a return to primitive conditions on a continually advancing frontier line, and a new development for that area. American social development has been continually beginning over again on the frontier. This perennial rebirth, this fluidity of American life, this expansion westward with its new opportunities, its continuous touch with the simplicity of primitive society, furnish the forces dominating American character. The true point of view in the history of this nation is not the Atlantic coast, it is the Great West.

The fact is, that here is a new product that is American. At first, the frontier was the Atlantic coast. It was the frontier of Europe in a very real sense. Moving westward, the frontier became more and more American. As successive terminal moraines result from successive each frontier leaves its traces behind it, and when it becomes a settled area the region still partakes of the frontier characteristics. Thus the advance of the frontier has meant a steady movement away from the influence of Europe, a steady growth of independence on American lines. And to study this advance, the men who grew up under these conditions, and the political, economic, and social results of it, is to study the really American part of our history. . . .

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

Source : Frederick Jackson Turner, The Frontier in American History, 1893