

Honors U.S. History

Unit 6: Power, Populism, and Progressivism

Note that all dates are due dates, with students responsible to have completed work before they have come to class; exceptions will be noted on the calendar. Tasks, readings, and projects will be collected, assessed, or discussed on the date indicated. You often have longer than one day to complete reading assignments; you are encouraged to break longer readings into smaller daily passages, according to your schedule.

Week 15: Politics in the Gilded Age

Date (Jan.)	Assignment	Documents	Text Readings (Boorstin)	Assessment
M30	Introduce Week 15 Assignment. Social Darwinism, Social Gospel, Socialism delineated.			
T31	Hayes, Garfield, Arthur admins. Daily Quiz over 463 items 1 and 5.	<i>Anything For a Vote</i> by Cummins	459-463	DQ 6.1
W1	Government and business. Daily Quiz over 468 items 4,5, and 6.	<i>The World of Fundamentalism</i> by Wuthnow	463-468	DQ 6.2
Th2	Farming and populism. Daily Quiz over 475 items 2, 5, and 6.		468-475	DQ 6.3
F3	William Jennings Bryan. Week 15 Assignment due.	"Cross of Gold" speech, excerpts	475-476	

Week 16: The United States and the World

Date	Assignment	Documents	Text Readings	Assessment
M6	World affairs and American priorities. Introduce Week 16 Assignment.		505-510	
T7	Expansionist policy. Daily Quiz over 510 items 3,4, and 5.	"Remember the Maine?" excerpts	510-514	DQ 6.4
W8	(No school)			
Th9	Expansionist policy. Daily Quiz over 518 items 5,6, and 7.	Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine	514-518	DQ 6.5
F10	Week 2 Assignment due.			

Week 17: The Progressive Era

Date	Assignment	Documents	Text Readings	Assessment
M13	Define and explain progressivism and socialism.	<i>The Jungle</i> by Upton Sinclair (excerpts)		
T14	Conditions and reformers. Daily Quiz over 527 items 2 and 3.	<i>Theory of the Leisure Class</i> by Veblen	520-527	DQ 6.6
W15	Feminism and suffrage. Daily Quiz over 531 items 1 and 4.		527-531	DQ 6.7
Th16	Roosevelt, Taft, and Wilson.		532-537	
F17	Roosevelt, Taft, and Wilson. Portfolio 6 due.			Portfolio 6
T22	Unit 6 Test.			

Second Semester: Portfolio Topics

Date Due	Tasks
Feb. 17	<p>6. City Life and Time Travel</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Read <i>Slouching Toward Utopia?</i> Chapter 2, "Wealth." (Online document pp. 10-21). Then supplement de Long's table on p. 11 with three calculations of your own based on the 1894 Sears, Roebuck catalog available in the classroom. b. View the first episode of "1900 House". Note that even though the setting here is Britain, most of the amenities and limitations shown here would have been true in American cities as well. Then speculate: Would you want to "re-enact" a lifestyle this consistently? Respond in a 5-paragraph typed essay. c. Review the selections from <i>Time and Again</i> by Jack Finney; review premise (time travel through re-creation and trance). Then write a 2-3 page short story in which you travel through time to your hometown in 1890. Draw upon available historical records and what you know about your area, citing sources as necessary in library format. Include sensory detail. Type.
Mar. 16	<p>7. The World at War</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Compare the experiences of <u>two</u> Americans who served either in public office or in the military during <u>both</u> the First World War and the Second World War. Relate your findings in a 2-3 page comparative biography. Cite sources according to library format. Type. b. Create a photo collage or PowerPoint presentation illustrating <u>two</u> of the following: The RAF Eagle Squadrons, the Harlem Hellfighters, the 442nd Regimental Combat Team, the Tuskegee Airmen, the WASPs, the WAVEs, the Kaiser shipyards, the Boeing aircraft factories, or the Manhattan Project. Provide a written script for commentary and link the two topics with a theme. Include at least 20 images.
Apr. 20	<p>8. America and the World</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Conduct an interview with someone who served in the United States military during the Second World War or the Cold War period. Follow the steps at eHow's website for preparing and conducting the interview. Type transcript and submit audio in accessible format. b. Choose a tune and compose new lyrics expressing the character of postwar America. Pay attention to rhyme, meter, and content. Performance not required, but encouraged. Type.

Honors U.S. History

Week 15 Assignment

1. Create a One-Pager using excerpts from William Jennings Bryan's "Cross of Gold" speech. See rubric.
2. Construct a political cartoon stressing the differing interests of farmers and city dwellers at the end of the 19th Century.

Week 16 Assignment

1. Compare the policies of Taft, Roosevelt, and Wilson using a chart. Choose and include the same 4 categories in your analyses of these Presidents, for a total of 12 positions described.
2. Explain the origins of your first, middle, or last name in a brief paragraph. Then speculate as to whether this name ties you most closely to the decisions or characteristics of William Howard Taft, Theodore Roosevelt, or Woodrow Wilson. Respond with a form of word art (acrostic, cloud, concept web, crossword, advertising slogan, etc.) making the connections between your name and the President you chose.

Unit 6 Notes and Observations

Project Rubric

One-Pagers—10 points possible

Required elements: Two quotations from the passage, each at least one line long.
 One personal reflection.
 One visual element (design, art, organization).

Final averaged from four categories:

Required Elements

10	8	6	4	0
Contains all required elements	Missing one required element	Missing two required elements	Missing three required elements	No required elements

Reflection

10	8	6	4	0
Demonstrates understanding of passage and personal connection	Mentions main idea of passage, but offers no personal link	Very brief reflection	X	Does not demonstrate reflection

Legibility

10	8	6	4	0
All writing or printing is easily readable	Writing may be read with effort	No concern demonstrated for legibility	X	X

Presentation

10	8	6	4	0
Neat and professional presentation, demonstrates design and planning	Demonstrates some planning, but not executed neatly	No effort evident	X	X

Total _____/4= _____

Honors U.S. History

From the “Cross of Gold” speech by William Jennings Bryan, 1896

Never before in the history of this country has there been witnessed such a contest as that through which we have passed. Never before in the history of American politics has a great issue been fought out as this issue has been by the voters themselves.

On the 4th of March, 1895, a few Democrats, most of them members of Congress, issued an address to the Democrats of the nation asserting that the money question was the paramount issue of the hour; asserting also the right of a majority of the Democratic Party to control the position of the party on this paramount issue; concluding with the request that all believers in free coinage of silver in the Democratic Party should organize and take charge of and control the policy of the Democratic Party. Three months later, at Memphis, an organization was perfected, and the silver Democrats went forth openly and boldly and courageously proclaiming their belief and declaring that if successful they would crystallize in a platform the declaration which they had made; and then began the conflict with a zeal approaching the zeal which inspired the crusaders who followed Peter the Hermit. Our silver Democrats went forth from victory unto victory, until they are assembled now, not to discuss, not to debate, but to enter up the judgment rendered by the plain people of this country.

But in this contest, brother has been arrayed against brother, and father against son. The warmest ties of love and acquaintance and association have been disregarded. Old leaders have been cast aside when they refused to give expression to the sentiments of those whom they would lead, and new leaders have sprung up to give direction to this cause of freedom. Thus has the contest been waged, and we have assembled here under as binding and solemn instructions as were ever fastened upon the representatives of a people....

But we stand here representing people who are the equals before the law of the largest cities in the state of Massachusetts. When you come before us and tell us that we shall disturb your business interests, we reply that you have disturbed our business interests by your action. We say to you that you have made too limited in its application the definition of a businessman. The man who is employed for wages is as much a businessman as his employer. The attorney in a country town is as much a businessman as the corporation counsel in a great metropolis. The merchant at the crossroads store is as much a businessman as the merchant of New York. The farmer who goes forth in the morning and toils all day, begins in the spring and toils all summer, and by the application of brain and muscle to the natural resources of this country creates wealth, is as much a businessman as the man who goes upon the Board of Trade and bets upon the price of grain. The miners who go 1,000 feet into the earth or climb 2,000 feet upon the cliffs and bring forth from their hiding places the precious metals to be poured in the channels of trade are as much businessmen as the few financial magnates who in a backroom corner the money of the world.

We come to speak for this broader class of businessmen. Ah, my friends, we say not one word against those who live upon the Atlantic Coast; but those hardy pioneers who braved all the dangers of the wilderness, who have made the desert to blossom as the rose—those pioneers away out there, rearing their children near to nature’s heart, where they can mingle their voices with the voices of the birds—out there where they have erected schoolhouses for the education of their children and churches where they praise their Creator, and the cemeteries where sleep the ashes of their dead—are as deserving of the consideration of this party as any people in this country.

It is for these that we speak. We do not come as aggressors. Our war is not a war of conquest. We are fighting in the defense of our homes, our families, and posterity. We have petitioned, and our petitions have been scorned. We have entreated, and our entreaties have been disregarded. We have begged, and they have mocked when our calamity came.

We beg no longer; we entreat no more; we petition no more. We defy them!

...They say we passed an unconstitutional law. I deny it. The income tax was not unconstitutional when it was passed. It was not unconstitutional when it went before the Supreme Court for the first time. It did not become unconstitutional until one judge changed his mind; and we cannot be expected to know when a judge will change his mind.

The income tax is a just law. It simply intends to put the burdens of government justly upon the backs of the people. I am in favor of an income tax. When I find a man who is not willing to pay his share of the burden of the government which protects him, I find a man who is unworthy to enjoy the blessings of a government like ours.

He says that we are opposing the national bank currency. It is true. If you will read what Thomas Benton said, you will find that he said that in searching history he could find but one parallel to Andrew Jackson. That was Cicero, who destroyed the conspiracies of Cataline and saved Rome. He did for Rome what Jackson did when he destroyed the bank conspiracy and saved America.

We say in our platform that we believe that the right to coin money and issue money is a function of government. We believe it. We believe it is a part of sovereignty and can no more with safety be delegated to private individuals than can the power to make penal statutes or levy laws for taxation.

...Now, my friends, let me come to the great paramount issue. If they ask us here why it is we say more on the money question than we say upon the tariff question, I reply that if protection has slain its thousands the gold standard has slain its tens of thousands. If they ask us why we did not embody all these things in our platform which we believe, we reply to them that when we have restored the money of the Constitution, all other necessary reforms will be possible, and that until that is done there is no reform that can be accomplished.

Why is it that within three months such a change has come over the sentiments of the country? Three months ago, when it was confidently asserted that those who believed in the gold standard would frame our platforms and nominate our candidates, even the advocates of the gold standard did not think that we could elect a President; but they had good reasons for the suspicion, because there is scarcely a state here today asking for the gold standard that is not within the absolute control of the Republican Party.

But note the change. Mr. McKinley was nominated at St. Louis upon a platform that declared for the maintenance of the gold standard until it should be changed into bimetallism by an international agreement. Mr. McKinley was the most popular man among the Republicans ; and everybody three months ago in the Republican Party prophesied his election. How is it today? Why, that man who used to boast that he looked like Napoleon, that man shudders today when he thinks that he was nominated on the anniversary of the Battle of Waterloo. Not only that, but as he listens he can hear with ever increasing distinctness the sound of the waves as they beat upon the lonely shores of St. Helena.

Why this change? Ah, my friends. is not the change evident to anyone who will look at the matter? It is because no private character, however pure, no personal popularity, however great, can protect from the avenging wrath of an indignant people the man who will either declare that he is in favor of fastening the gold standard upon this people, or who is willing to surrender the right of self-government and place legislative control in the hands of foreign potentates and powers. . . .

Here is the line of battle. We care not upon which issue they force the fight. We are prepared to meet them on either issue or on both. If they tell us that the gold standard is the standard of civilization, we reply to them that this, the most enlightened of all nations of the earth, has never declared for a gold standard, and both the parties this year are declaring against it. If the gold standard is the standard of civilization, why, my friends, should we not have it? So if they come to meet us on that, we can present the history of our nation. More than that, we can tell them this, that they will search the pages of history in vain to find a single instance in which the common people of any land ever declared themselves in favor of a gold standard. They can find where the holders of fixed investments have...

There are two ideas of government. There are those who believe that if you just legislate to make the well-to-do prosperous, that their prosperity will leak through on those below. The Democratic idea has been that if you legislate to make the masses prosperous their prosperity will find its way up and through every class that rests upon it.

You come to us and tell us that the great cities are in favor of the gold standard. I tell you that the great cities rest upon these broad and fertile prairies. Burn down your cities and leave our farms, and your cities will spring up again as if by magic. But destroy our farms and the grass will grow in the streets of every city in the country.

My friends, we shall declare that this nation is able to legislate for its own people on every question without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation on earth, and upon that issue we expect to carry every single state in the Union.

I shall not slander the fair state of Massachusetts nor the state of New York by saying that when citizens are confronted with the proposition, "Is this nation able to attend to its own business?"—I will not slander either one by saying that the people of those states will declare our helpless impotency as a nation to attend to our own business. It is the issue of 1776 over again. Our ancestors, when but 3 million, had the courage to declare their political independence of every other nation upon earth. Shall we, their descendants, when we have grown to 70 million, declare that we are less independent than our forefathers? No, my friends, it will never be the judgment of this people. Therefore, we care not upon what lines the battle is fought. If they say bimetallism is good but we cannot have it till some nation helps us, we reply that, instead of having a gold standard because England has, we shall restore bimetallism, and then let England have bimetallism because the United States have.

If they dare to come out in the open field and defend the gold standard as a good thing, we shall fight them to the uttermost, having behind us the producing masses of the nation and the world. Having behind us the commercial interests and the laboring interests and all the toiling masses, we shall answer their demands for a gold standard by saying to them, you shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns. You shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold.

Source: *Official Proceedings of the Democratic National Convention Held in Chicago, Illinois, July 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, 1896*, (Logansport, Indiana, 1896), 226–234. Reprinted in *The Annals of America, Vol. 12, 1895–1904: Populism, Imperialism, and Reform* (Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., 1968), 100–105.

Accessed at <http://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/5354>

Honors U.S. History

From *The Theory of the Leisure Class* by Thorstein Veblen (1899)

The early differentiation out of which the distinction between a leisure and a working class arises is a division maintained between men's and women's work in the lower stages of barbarism. Likewise the earliest form of ownership is an ownership of the women by the able bodied men of the community. The facts may be expressed in more general terms, and truer to the import of the barbarian theory of life, by saying that it is an ownership of the woman by the man.

There was undoubtedly some appropriation of useful articles before the custom of appropriating women arose. The usages of existing archaic communities in which there is no ownership of women is warrant for such a view. In all communities the members, both male and female, habitually appropriate to their individual use a variety of useful things; but these useful things are not thought of as owned by the person who appropriates and consumes them. The habitual appropriation and consumption of certain slight personal effects goes on without raising the question of ownership; that is to say, the question of a conventional, equitable claim to extraneous things.

The ownership of women begins in the lower barbarian stages of culture, apparently with the seizure of female captives. The original reason for the seizure and appropriation of women seems to have been their usefulness as trophies. The practice of seizing women from the enemy as trophies, gave rise to a form of ownership-marriage, resulting in a household with a male head. This was followed by an extension of slavery to other captives and inferiors, besides women, and by an extension of ownership-marriage to other women than those seized from the enemy. The outcome of emulation under the circumstances of a predatory life, therefore, has been on the one hand a form of marriage resting on coercion, and on the other hand the custom of ownership. The two institutions are not distinguishable in the initial phase of their development; both arise from the desire of the successful men to put their prowess in evidence by exhibiting some durable result of their exploits. Both also minister to that propensity for mastery which pervades all predatory communities. From the ownership of women the concept of ownership extends itself to include the products of their industry, and so there arises the ownership of things as well as of persons.

In this way a consistent system of property in goods is gradually installed. And although in the latest stages of the development, the serviceability of goods for consumption has come to be the most obtrusive element of their value, still, wealth has by no means yet lost its utility as a honorific evidence of the owner's prepotence.

Wherever the institution of private property is found, even in a slightly developed form, the economic process bears the character of a struggle between men for the possession of goods. It has been customary in economic theory, and especially among those economists who adhere with least faltering to the body of modernised classical doctrines, to construe this struggle for wealth as being substantially a struggle for subsistence. Such is, no doubt, its character in large part during the earlier and less efficient phases of industry. Such is also its character in all cases where the "niggardliness of nature" is so strict as to afford but a scanty livelihood to the community in return for strenuous and unremitting application to the business of getting the means of subsistence. But in all progressing communities an advance is presently made beyond this early stage of technological development. Industrial efficiency is presently carried to such a pitch as to afford something appreciably more than a bare livelihood to those engaged in the industrial process. It has not been unusual for economic theory to speak of the further struggle for wealth on this new industrial basis as a competition for an increase of the comforts of life,—primarily for an increase of the physical comforts which the consumption of goods affords.

The end of acquisition and accumulation is conventionally held to be the consumption of the goods accumulated—whether it is consumption directly by the owner of the goods or by the household attached to him and for this purpose identified with him in theory. This is at least felt to be the economically legitimate end of acquisition, which alone it is incumbent on the theory to take account of. Such consumption may of

course be conceived to serve the consumer's physical wants—his physical comfort—or his so-called higher wants—spiritual, aesthetic, intellectual, or what not; the latter class of wants being served indirectly by an expenditure of goods, after the fashion familiar to all economic readers.

But it is only when taken in a sense far removed from its naive meaning that consumption of goods can be said to afford the incentive from which accumulation invariably proceeds. The motive that lies at the root of ownership is emulation; and the same motive of emulation continues active in the further development of the institution to which it has given rise and in the development of all those features of the social structure which this institution of ownership touches. The possession of wealth confers honour; it is an invidious distinction. Nothing equally cogent can be said for the consumption of goods, nor for any other conceivable incentive to acquisition, and especially not for any incentive to accumulation of wealth...

Property set out with being booty held as trophies of the successful raid. So long as the group had departed and so long as it still stood in close contact with other hostile groups, the utility of things or persons owned lay chiefly in an invidious comparison between their possessor and the enemy from whom they were taken. The habit of distinguishing between the interests of the individual and those of the group to which he belongs is apparently a later growth. Invidious comparison between the possessor of the honorific booty and his less successful neighbours within the group was no doubt present early as an element of the utility of the things possessed, though this was not at the outset the chief element of their value. The man's prowess was still primarily the group's prowess, and the possessor of the booty felt himself to be primarily the keeper of the honour of his group. This appreciation of exploit from the communal point of view is met with also at later stages of social growth, especially as regards the laurels of war.

But as soon as the custom of individual ownership begins to gain consistency, the point of view taken in making the invidious comparison on which private property rests will begin to change. Indeed, the one change is but the reflex of the other. The initial phase of ownership, the phase of acquisition by naive seizure and conversion, begins to pass into the subsequent stage of an incipient organization of industry on the basis of private property (in slaves); the horde develops into a more or less self-sufficing industrial community; possessions then come to be valued not so much as evidence of successful foray, but rather as evidence of the prepotence of the possessor of these goods over other individuals within the community. The invidious comparison now becomes primarily a comparison of the owner with the other members of the group. Property is still of the nature of trophy, but, with the cultural advance, it becomes more and more a trophy of successes scored in the game of ownership carried on between the members of the group under the quasi-peaceable methods of nomadic life.

Gradually, as industrial activity further displaced predatory activity in the community's everyday life and in men's habits of thought, accumulated property more and more replaces trophies of predatory exploit as the conventional exponent of prepotence and success. With the growth of settled industry, therefore, the possession of wealth gains in relative importance and effectiveness as a customary basis of repute and esteem. Not that esteem ceases to be awarded on the basis of other, more direct evidence of prowess; not that successful predatory aggression or warlike exploit ceases to call out the approval and admiration of the crowd, or to stir the envy of the less successful competitors; but the opportunities for gaining distinction by means of this direct manifestation of superior force grow less available both in scope and frequency. At the same time opportunities for industrial aggression, and for the accumulation of property, increase in scope and availability. And it is even more to the point that property now becomes the most easily recognised evidence of a reputable degree of success as distinguished from heroic or signal achievement. It therefore becomes the conventional basis of esteem. Its possession in some amount becomes necessary in order to any reputable standing in the community. It becomes indispensable to accumulate, to acquire property, in order to retain one's good name. When accumulated goods have in this way once become the accepted badge of efficiency, the possession of wealth presently assumes the character of an independent and definitive basis of esteem. The possession of goods, whether acquired aggressively by one's own exertion or passively by transmission through inheritance from others, becomes a conventional basis of reputability. The possession of wealth, which was at the outset valued simply as an evidence of efficiency, becomes, in popular apprehension, itself a meritorious act. Wealth is now itself intrinsically honourable and confers honour on its possessor. By a further refinement, wealth acquired passively by transmission from ancestors

or other antecedents presently becomes even more honorific than wealth acquired by the possessor's own effort; but this distinction belongs at a later stage in the evolution of the pecuniary culture and will be spoken of in its place.

Prowess and exploit may still remain the basis of award of the highest popular esteem, although the possession of wealth has become the basis of common place reputability and of a blameless social standing. The predatory instinct and the consequent approbation of predatory efficiency are deeply ingrained in the habits of thought of those peoples who have passed under the discipline of a protracted predatory culture. According to popular award, the highest honours within human reach may, even yet, be those gained by an unfolding of extraordinary predatory efficiency in war, or by a quasi-predatory efficiency in statecraft; but for the purposes of a commonplace decent standing in the community these means of repute have been replaced by the acquisition and accumulation of goods. In order to stand well in the eyes of the community, it is necessary to come up to a certain, somewhat indefinite, conventional standard of wealth; just as in the earlier predatory stage it is necessary for the barbarian man to come up to the tribe's standard of physical endurance, cunning, and skill at arms. A certain standard of wealth in the one case, and of prowess in the other, is a necessary condition of reputability, and anything in excess of this normal amount is meritorious.

Those members of the community who fall short of this, somewhat indefinite, normal degree of prowess or of property suffer in the esteem of their fellow-men; and consequently they suffer also in their own esteem, since the usual basis of self-respect is the respect accorded by one's neighbours. Only individuals with an aberrant temperament can in the long run retain their self-esteem in the face of the disesteem of their fellows. Apparent exceptions to the rule are met with, especially among people with strong religious convictions. But these apparent exceptions are scarcely real exceptions, since such persons commonly fall back on the putative approbation of some supernatural witness of their deeds.

So soon as the possession of property becomes the basis of popular esteem, therefore, it becomes also a requisite to the complacency which we call self-respect. In any community where goods are held in severalty it is necessary, in order to his own peace of mind, that an individual should possess as large a portion of goods as others with whom he is accustomed to class himself; and it is extremely gratifying to possess something more than others. But as fast as a person makes new acquisitions, and becomes accustomed to the resulting new standard of wealth, the new standard forthwith ceases to afford appreciably greater satisfaction than the earlier standard did. The tendency in any case is constantly to make the present pecuniary standard the point of departure for a fresh increase of wealth; and this in turn gives rise to a new standard of sufficiency and a new pecuniary classification of one's self as compared with one's neighbours. So far as concerns the present question, the end sought by accumulation is to rank high in comparison with the rest of the community in point of pecuniary strength. So long as the comparison is distinctly unfavourable to himself, the normal, average individual will live in chronic dissatisfaction with his present lot; and when he has reached what may be called the normal pecuniary standard of the community, or of his class in the community, this chronic dissatisfaction will give place to a restless straining to place a wider and ever-widening pecuniary interval between himself and this average standard. The invidious comparison can never become so favourable to the individual making it that he would not gladly rate himself still higher relatively to his competitors in the struggle for pecuniary reputability.

In the nature of the case, the desire for wealth can scarcely be satiated in any individual instance, and evidently a satiation of the average or general desire for wealth is out of the question. However widely, or equally, or "fairly", it may be distributed, no general increase of the community's wealth can make any approach to satiating this need, the ground of which is the desire of every one to excel every one else in the accumulation of goods. If, as is sometimes assumed, the incentive to accumulation were the want of subsistence or of physical comfort, then the aggregate economic wants of a community might conceivably be satisfied at some point in the advance of industrial efficiency; but since the struggle is substantially a race for reputability on the basis of an invidious comparison, no approach to a definitive attainment is possible.

Honors U.S. History

From *The Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine* by Theodore Roosevelt, 1904-1905

-1904-

...It is not true that the United States feels any land hunger or entertains any projects as regards the other nations of the Western Hemisphere save such as are for their welfare. All that this country desires is to see the neighboring countries stable, orderly, and prosperous. Any country whose people conduct themselves well can count upon our hearty friendship. If a nation shows that it knows how to act with reasonable efficiency and decency in social and political matters, if it keeps order and pays its obligations, it need fear no interference from the United States. Chronic wrongdoing, or an impotence which results in a general loosening of the ties of civilized society, may in America, as elsewhere, ultimately require intervention by some civilized nation, and in the Western Hemisphere the adherence of the United States to the Monroe Doctrine may force the United States, however reluctantly, in flagrant cases of such wrongdoing or impotence, to the exercise of an international police power. If every country washed by the Caribbean Sea would show the progress in stable and just civilization which with the aid of the Platt amendment Cuba has shown since our troops left the island, and which so many of the republics in both Americas are constantly and brilliantly showing, all question of interference by this Nation with their affairs would be at an end. Our interests and those of our southern neighbors are in reality identical. They have great natural riches, and if within their borders the law reign of law and justice obtains, prosperity is sure to come to them. While they thus obey the primary laws of civilized society they may rest assured that they will be treated by us in a spirit of cordial and helpful sympathy. We would interfere with them only in the last resort, and then only if it became evident that their inability or unwillingness to do justice at home and abroad had violated the rights of the United States or had invited foreign aggression to the detriment of the entire body of American nations. It is a mere truism to say that every nation, whether in America or anywhere else, which desires to maintain its freedom, its independence, must ultimately realize that the right of such independence can not be separated from the responsibility of making good use of it.

In asserting the Monroe Doctrine, in taking such steps as we have taken in regard to Cuba, Venezuela, and Panama, and in endeavoring to circumscribe the theater of war in the Far East, and to secure the open door in China, we have acted in our own interest as well as in the interest of humanity at large. There are, however, cases in which, while our own interests are not greatly involved, strong appeal is made to our sympathies... But in extreme cases action may be justifiable and proper. What form the action shall take must depend upon the circumstances of the case; that is, upon the degree of the atrocity and upon our power to remedy it. The cases in which we could interfere by force of arms as we interfered to put a stop to intolerable conditions in Cuba are necessarily very few.

... It must be understood that under no circumstances will the United States use the Monroe Doctrine as a cloak for territorial aggression. We desire peace with all the world, but perhaps most of all with the other peoples of the American Continent. There are, of course, limits to the wrongs which any self-respecting nation can endure. It is always possible that wrong actions toward this Nation, or toward citizens of this Nation, in some State unable to keep order among its own people, unable to secure justice from outsiders, and unwilling to do justice to those outsiders who treat it well, may result in our having take action to protect our rights; but such action will not be taken with a view to territorial aggression, and it will be taken at all only with extreme reluctance and when it has become evident that every other resource has been exhausted.

Moreover, we must make it evident that we do not intend to permit the Monroe Doctrine to be used by any nation on this Continent as a shield to protect it from the consequences of its own misdeeds against foreign nations. If a republic to the south of us commits a tort against a foreign nation, such as an outrage against a citizen of that nation, then the Monroe Doctrine does not force us to interfere to prevent punishment of the tort, save to see that the punishment does not assume the form of territorial occupation in any shape. The case is more difficult when it refers to a contractual obligation. Our own Government has always refused to enforce such contractual obligations on behalf of its citizens by an appeal to arms. It is much to be wished that all foreign governments would take the same view. But they do not; and in consequence we are liable at any time to be brought face to face with disagreeable alternatives. On the one hand, this country would certainly decline to go to war to prevent a foreign government from collecting a just debt; on the other hand, it is very inadvisable to permit any foreign power to take possession, even temporarily, of the custom houses of an American Republic in order to enforce the payment of its obligations; for such temporary occupation might turn into a permanent occupation. The only escape from these alternatives may at any time be that we must ourselves undertake to bring about some arrangement by which so much as possible of a just obligation shall be paid. It is far better that this country should put through such an arrangement, rather than allow any foreign country to undertake it. To do so insures the defaulting republic from having to pay debt of an improper character under duress, while it also insures honest creditors of the republic from being passed by in the interest of dishonest or grasping creditors. Moreover, for the United States to take such a position offers the only possible way of insuring us against a clash with some foreign power. The position is, therefore, in the interest of peace as well as in the interest of justice. It is of benefit to our people; it is of benefit to foreign peoples; and most of all it is really of benefit to the country concerned...

Honors U.S. History

From *The World of Fundamentalism* by Robert Wuthnow

Robert Wuthnow is a *Century* editor at large and a member of the faculty at Princeton University. This article appeared in *The Christian Century*, April 22, 1992, pp. 426-429. Copyright by The Christian Century Foundation, used by permission. Current articles and subscription information can be found at <http://www.christiancentury.org>. Article prepared for Religion Online by Harry W. Adams.

Hang around mainline churches for a while and sooner or later you'll hear worried remarks about fundamentalists. Stories of their tactics and foibles frequent the newspapers. Some of their leaders broadcast regularly on radio and television. But what exactly is fundamentalism? Do journalists have it straight? Or have we been receiving misleading information?

Thanks to a major project sponsored by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences many of the best minds in religious studies from colleges and universities all over the world have been hard at work trying to answer this question. Directed by Martin E. Marty and R. Scott Appleby, funded lavishly by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, the project is employing a cast of hundreds, holding scores of conferences and symposia, and is expected to produce at least six lengthy volumes of essays over the next several years. The initial volume has already provided many valuable insights into the world of fundamentalism. Some of these insights will be familiar to knowledgeable readers, but because the movement is so misunderstood it is important to set the record straight.

Contrary to the vague, misleading ways in which the term is often deployed in popular journalism, fundamentalism, the present volume reminds us, is a specific theological movement. It can be understood only in relation to particular times, places, events and figures. Christian fundamentalism should not be confused with evangelicalism, the charismatic movement or conservative Christianity in general, although it has had connections with all these. Nor should it be considered a personality style, a mind-set, a form of religious militancy, a world view or even a particular orientation toward the truth. Fundamentalism has always been shaped by its implicit dialogue with the world surrounding it.

Most histories of American fundamentalism (including the valuable section in this volume written by sociologist Nancy T. Ammerman) trace its roots to Princeton Theological Seminary in the 1880s. There, Archibald Alexander Hodge and Benjamin B. Warfield defended biblical authority against the challenges voiced in the name of science and historical criticism. Warfield's successor, J. Gresham Machen, became a prominent figure in the fundamentalist-modernist debates of the 1920s, having moved by that time to Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia following a dispute with Princeton colleagues to his theological left. The work of Hodge, Warfield and Machen built a solid if narrow intellectual foundation for what is still probably the most cherished doctrine of fundamentalism: the inerrancy of Scripture.

This doctrine has been interpreted variously in subsequent decades, but generally it holds that the written text of the Bible was inspired by God, that the Bible is thus a record of the actual, words of God, and that it therefore can be trusted to be infallible in all its details. Inerrantists differ in how they reconcile scientific and historical problems in the text, but most agree that the scribes and those who determined the canon did not (either accidentally or intentionally) introduce errors into Scripture. Portions of the Bible have figurative meanings, inerrantists usually recognize, but they warn against taking liberties with such an interpretive principle. Fundamentalists consider inerrancy to be a common-sense understanding of the Bible. How widely this doctrine is currently held can be gauged by the results of a recent national poll in which 47 percent of active Protestants agreed with the statement that "everything in the Bible should be taken literally, word for word." In the same study, 48 percent of active Protestants disagreed with the statement that "the Bible may contain historical or scientific errors."

A second intellectual strand of American fundamentalism is the doctrine of dispensational premillennialism. Dispensationalism divides history into distinct periods (dispensations), according to clues in the prophetic texts of the Bible. John Nelson Darby, a Plymouth Brethren, propounded this idea during the last quarter of the 19th century in Great Britain; the 1909 publication of the Scofield edition of the King James Version of the Bible popularized the scheme in the U.S. Premillennialism asserts that history as we know it will end with Jesus' literal return to earth, after which he will establish a godly kingdom that will last for a thousand years. Although premillennialism was becoming more prominent in a number of Protestant denominations by the start of the 20th century, it was furthered by the teachings of the dispensationalists.

Another development contributing to the rise of fundamentalism was the emergence at the end of the 19th century of the holiness and Pentecostal movements. Their enthusiastic members gathered for revival meetings in which they confessed their sins, affirmed (or reaffirmed) their faith in Jesus Christ, and experienced a cleansing renewal of their lives that they attributed to the Holy Spirit. After the famous Azusa Street revival in Los Angeles in 1906, speaking in tongues and miraculous hearings became common in Pentecostalism.

Between 1875 and 1914 fundamentalism grew in disparate settings, largely as a scattered set of teachings rather than as an organized movement. Many new immigrants in the cities were ripe for recruiting by itinerant revivalists, because these newcomers had become geographically dislodged from traditional denominations and ethnic communities. Bible institutes, such as the one founded in Chicago in 1886 by Dwight L. Moody, sprung up to give new converts additional training in becoming evangelists and lay leaders. As the nation entered a new century, growing numbers of people flocked to prophecy conferences to learn what the Bible said about the course of history and the second coming of Christ. Fundamentalist leaders relied heavily on the print media, publishing Bibles, tracts and periodicals in increasing numbers. The most notable publishing venture, however, was the project known as *The Fundamentals*. Launched by Los Angeles oil millionaires Lyman and Milton Stewart, it consisted of 12 paperback volumes published between 1910 and 1915 and contained 90 essays on the Bible and related topics. Some 3 million copies were printed.

Only after 1919 did fundamentalism become an organized movement. That year 6,000 people attended the first World's Christian Fundamentals Association conference in Philadelphia. The following year a coalition of fundamentalists formed in the Northern Baptist Convention, and about the same time a similar coalition emerged among Presbyterian conservatives. Increasing numbers of fundamentalists also began to oppose the teaching of evolution in schools; their struggle culminated in 1925 with the famous trial of John Scopes in Dayton, Tennessee. Paradoxically, it was the opposition in these years of liberals and modernists such as pastor Harry Emerson Fosdick and the American Civil Liberties Union that did more to crystallize the identity of fundamentalism as a single movement than any of the efforts of its own leaders.

After 1925, fundamentalism began to wane. Although millions of Americans continued to believe in such doctrines as biblical inerrancy and the imminent return of Christ, historians generally concede that fundamentalism as an organized movement gradually declined during the next two decades. Some attribute this decline to an apparent assumption by the media and liberal religious leaders that fundamentalists no longer posed a serious threat to modernism. Others point out that the Depression and the rationing of tires and gasoline during World War II made it difficult for fundamentalists to hold national conferences or stage massive unifying rallies. Whatever the reasons, fundamentalism has been from the start sufficiently diverse that its various factions have increasingly gone in their own directions. Fundamentalist Presbyterians, for example, tended to stress biblical inerrancy like their Baptist counterparts, but did not agree with them on the tenets of dispensationalism. Neither group countenanced the more experiential orientations of the Pentecostals. The result was a proliferation of small sects. Separatist groups of Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists and Pentecostals emerged in abundance. Indeed, separatism itself came to be a distinguishing feature of fundamentalism.

The emergence of the more moderate "evangelical" movement after World War II did much to unify and revitalize conservative Protestantism. But this development was a mixed blessing for fundamentalists. It

preserved some of the basic teachings of fundamentalism, dressing them up in new garb and toning down some of the harshness of the earlier rhetoric. But evangelicals decried the separatism, anti-intellectualism and dogmatism of fundamentalists. And fundamentalist leaders for the most part stayed on the fringe, refusing to participate in evangelicals' new organizations, periodicals, colleges and parachurch groups.

Even a brief recounting of this history helps us understand what a considerable shock it was to most religious leaders and social observers when the media in the 1970s began to report on a resurgence of fundamentalism. Certainly the renewed vitality of the movement was not coming from old-guard fundamentalists such as Presbyterian Carl McIntyre or independents such as Bob Jones, Sr., and John R. Rice. It was not even coming from popular evangelist Billy Graham, who by the 1970s was squarely in the moderate evangelical camp. To some extent the resurgence of fundamentalism was as much a media creation as was its original appearance in the '20s. Journalists who knew virtually nothing about the nuances of American religious history, for example, described presidential candidate Jimmy Carter as a fundamentalist just because he was an active Southern Baptist. But media attention alone does not account for fundamentalists' renewed visibility.

The main reason fundamentalism has seemed to be on the upswing during the past 15 years is that new leaders, resources and rallying causes have emerged. The new leaders are generally pastors of nondenominational, Pentecostal, independent Baptist or Southern Baptist congregations. Their resources have consisted mainly of large suburban churches or television ministries, which provide them with sizable financial bases and either autonomy from, or power within, denominational hierarchies. They are no longer concerned simply about the private beliefs of individual congregants, but with such social issues as abortion and pornography. Some of them founded church schools and feared these were being threatened by unfavorable court rulings. Others amassed funds and mailing lists in an effort to influence American politics directly. In the 1980s, preachers like Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson were only the most prominent of hundreds of new leaders.

Observers label this new wave of conservative Protestantism "fundamentalism" partly because it seems to embody so much of what its counterpart stood for a half-century earlier. The Bible is still an authoritative source for most fundamentalists, although fundamentalist preachers certainly take interpretive liberties. Inerrancy of the Bible is still a celebrated cause in some circles, most notable among the Southern Baptist Convention's new leadership. Dispensationalism is perhaps less in vogue than it once was, even at seminaries once considered its chief proponents, but interest in prophecy runs high and predictions of Armageddon, wars, stock-market crashes, floods and epidemics continue to attract wide public attention. Millions of Americans claim to be born again, and many of these emphasize the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, speaking in tongues and other charismatic gifts. Some are still fighting the old battle against the teaching of Darwinism. And many analysts see the new causes, such as the anti-abortion movement and the effort to return prayer to public schools, as symbolic struggles against the manifestations of "modernity."

Yet those labeled fundamentalist did not all accept the categorization. For a short while, Jerry Falwell called himself a fundamentalist and even launched a journal under that title, but his handlers found it more effective for him to appeal to the public in the name of morality than as a leader of fundamentalists. Pat Robertson sometimes identified himself with the Pentecostalist tradition, but he eschewed being labeled a fundamentalist. Few of the lesser-known figures or their followers adopted the label either. They preferred more generic terms, such as "Christian" or "believer," or talked in the language of denominations and local congregations.

Defending a Thesis

General topic: _____

Positive Statement

Thesis (Subject Matter + Controlling Idea):

Reasons/Support:

Questions/Topics Mr. Bryant will raise:

Normative Statement

Recommendation for current policy or practice based on your thesis:

Defending a Thesis

General topic: _____

Positive Statement

Thesis (Subject Matter + Controlling Idea):

Reasons/Support:

Questions/Topics Mr. Bryant will raise:

Normative Statement

Recommendation for current policy or practice based on your thesis:

Ideas in Context: The Story of a Book

Title _____ Publish date _____

A. *Physical Properties*

1. Describe the cover of this book—include color, texture, condition, artwork, lettering, etc.
2. Explain the smell of the pages using comparison.
3. Record any inscriptions, writing, or labels below:

B. *Format and Content*

1. What is this book? (circle one)
Novel History Instructions Reference Music Art Other
2. Briefly explain one idea this book contains in your own words.

C. *The First Owner*

Write a story describing how the first owner received this book.

- Incorporate elements of life in the West (Europe or North America) that you have been studying.
- Use any inscriptions or markings in the book that indicate names, dates, or occasions. If there are none, imagine what would be appropriate to the time period.
- Assume that this book was either purchased at a bookstore or given as a gift.
- Use your imagination to create situations, characters, and dialogue.

Story continues on the other side.

D. How It Got Here

Trace a possible history from the first purchase of this book to the bookshelf in Room 214 of Central Valley Christian High School. You may use paragraphs, an outline, bullet points, or a flow chart to describe this process. For historical purposes, a generation is 25 years—meaning that if the book was not sold during this time, it remained within a family for several generations. Mr. Bryant was the last recipient of this book--somehow...