

Erin Miller

Bakersfield College

History 17B: US History from 1865

Class Packet

Fall 2011

Table of Contents

- I. Tips for Reading History
- II. Guidelines for Reading Primary Sources
- III. Study Guides for Readings
- IV. Writing Assignment I
 - A. Sample Essays
- V. Writing Assignment II
 - A. Book Review Subject List
 - B. Book Review Assignment
 - C. Sample Book Reviews
 - D. Film Review Assignment
 - E. Sample Film Review
 - F. Service Learning Assignment
 - G. Service Learning Sample
- VI. Oral Presentation Assignment
- VII. Guide to Effective Oral Presentations

Tips for Reading History

Dear All:

Below I have listed some general guidelines for you to consider while you read throughout the semester. Hopefully using these questions will help you read more efficiently.

All the Best,

Erin

1. **What are the main themes for the readings?** (For example, a few themes from one week would include the following: the meaning of freedom for slaves, the New South, and Reconstruction.)
2. **Keep a running list of the main characters, events, and other important factors** that seemed to help influence history. For example, Thaddeus Stevens, Andrew Johnson, Black Codes, Freeman's Bureau.
3. **Significance:** always keep in mind what the significance of each person and event is. How did they/it change history? Why do we care about them?
4. **Read before you attend lecture, take thorough notes during lectures and discussion. Reread them as soon as possible after class.** This will probably be the most difficult for some of you, but if you do the reading (at least skim it) before lecture, what you hear will be more easily remembered.

Evaluating Primary Sources

Primary Sources: Arthur Marwick. *The Nature of History*. London: MacMillan Press Ltd., 1989.

- A. **Authenticity:** Is the source authentic; is it what it purports to be?
- B. **Provenance:** Where did the source come from; where was it originally found?
- C. **Dating:** When exactly was the source produced? What is its date? How close is its date to the date of the events to which it relates or to dates relevant to the topic being investigated? How does this particular source relate chronologically to other relevant sources? How does it relate to other significant dates?
- D. **What type of source** is it, a private letter, an official report, a public document of record, or what?
- E. **Who created it?** What person or group of persons created the source? What basic attitudes, prejudices, and vested interests would he, she or they be likely to have? How and for what purposes did the source come to exist? Who was it written for or addressed to?
- F. **How far does it provide good first-hand information?** Is the author of the source really in a good position to provide first-hand information on the particular topic the historian is interested in? Is the writer dependent, perhaps, on hearsay?
- G. **Technical points, contemporary illusions?** How exactly was the document understood by contemporaries? What, precisely, does it say?

Chapter 16, Reconstruction

Chapter 16 Terms

~~First Battle of Bull Run~~
~~Confederate Nationalism~~
~~Southern Cities and Industry~~
~~Union Cause~~
~~Emancipation~~
~~African American Recruits~~
~~Black Soldiers and Manhood~~
~~Anti-war Sentiment~~
~~Draft Riots~~
~~Surrender at Appomattox~~
Lincoln's 10 percent Plan
13th, 14th, 15th Amendment
Feel of Freedom
Black Churches
Johnson's Reconstruction Plan
Johnson's Pardon Policy
Congressional Reconstruction
Reconstruction Acts of 1867-68
Impeachment
Negro Rule
Ku Klux Klan
Compromise 1877

Grand Strategy
Human Suffering
Inequities of the Draft
Walt Whitman's War
Confiscation Acts
Who Freed the Slaves?
Battle of Gettysburg
Disintegration of Confederacy
Sherman's March to Sea
Death Toll
Wade-Davis Bill
Freedman's Bureau
Blacks and Families
Sharecropping
Radical Republicans
Black Codes
Radical Republicans
Constitutional Crisis
White Resistance
Scalawags and Carpet Baggers
General Amnesty

Chapter 16 Study Questions

1. The Civil War has been described as a "Second American Revolution." Is such a characterization accurate? Why or why not?
2. Andrew Johnson's Reconstruction plan was harsher than Lincoln's, but he still came under fire from the Radicals. Why?
3. Why did many southerners act as if they had not lost the Civil War? What made these southerners think they could get away with these actions?
4. Why could African Americans not retain the political power they held after the war?
5. How much responsibility do white southerners bear for the "failure" of Reconstruction? Do white northerners deserve any criticism?
6. What problems plagued the southern economy during the Civil War and Reconstruction? Why did southern planters concentrate so much on cotton production? What problems did this specialization create?

The Development of the West (Ch. 17)

Key Terms

Buffalo	The Long Walk	Salmon
Buffalo Solider	Dawes Act	Zitkala-sa
Riparian Rights	Railroad	Ghost Dance
Newlands Reclamation Act		Social Isolation

Study Questions

1. How were the trans-Mississippi Indians members of subsistence economies? How did their systems differ from a market economy? Did the Native Americans have other cultural traditions that brought about conflict with white Americans? If so, what were they?
2. How did western expansion consist of exploitation? How did corporations fit into the West? What part did individuals play in closing the frontier? Was the West wild? Why or why not?
3. What problems challenged western farmers and ranchers? How did people respond to those difficulties? What innovations helped Americans conquer the western frontier? What attracted folks to move to the Far West or the Great Plains?

The Rise of the Machine, 1877-1920 (Ch. 18)

- I. Entrepreneurs
- II. Scientific Management
- III. Gospel of Wealth
- IV. Labor Unions
- V. Consumption

Key Terms:

Henry Ford	Knights of Labor
Thomas Edison	Scientific Management
Frederick W. Taylor	Gospel of Wealth
American Federation of Labor (AFL)	Industrial Workers of the World (IWW)
Pullman Strike	Homestead Strike
Haymarket Riot	Triangle Shirtwaist Company Fire
Dwight Merrick	Electricity
Sherman Anti-Trust Act	Consumption & Advertising
Andrew Carnegie	

Study Questions Chapter 18:

4. Why did businessmen embrace consolidation? How did they institute it? What role did mechanization play in this era? Why did efficiency become so important?
5. How did workers respond to industrialization? What problems did unions face during this era? How did the changes affect women? Children? Minorities? Were the courts or the government sympathetic to the needs of labor? Why or why not?
6. What economic problems did southerners face after 1877? How did southerners respond to those difficulties? What is the New South? Did a New South emerge after Reconstruction? Why or why not?
7. Did the machine age raise or lower the American standard of living? If so, how? Which groups benefited the most from industrialization? Which groups benefited the least? How so?
8. In what ways did mass communication transform the machine age? What role did changes in transportation play? How did advertising influence consumerism? What other marketing innovations characterized this period?
9. How did Americans respond to Social Darwinism? Why? How did industrialists use Social Darwinism to their benefit? What arguments did critics of Social Darwinism use?

The Vitality and Turmoil of Urban Life, 1877-1920 and Gilded Age Politics (Ch. 19 [continued] and 20)

Chapter 19 Key Terms:

Commuter Railroads	Urban Sprawl
Social Mobility	
Racial Segregation	Violence
Barrios	Poverty Relief
Settlement Houses	Civic Reform
Leisure	Football
Yellow Journalism	

Group A: Marcus, 82-87, Honest and Dishonest Graft

Group B: Marcus, 89-94, Antilynching Campaign in Tennessee

Group C: Marcus, 116-122, A Bintel Brief

Chapter 19 Study Questions:

10. How did mass transportation affect cities? How did it affect industrialization? What cultural implications did it have?
11. Why did immigrants leave their native countries? Why did they come to America? What influence did the immigrant cultures have on America? What influence did America have on them?
12. Why was poverty so rampant in the inner cities? What types of housing problems did city dwellers encounter? Did reform efforts help? How important were family and ethnic connections?
13. How did the leisure and entertainment industry develop? Why did this industry emerge at this time? Was this an important development for urban life? For rural life? Why or why not?
14. How did political bosses hold on to their constituency? Was the political machine and bossism system helpful or harmful to immigrants? Were reform efforts successful? Why or why not?

Chapter 20 Key Terms:

Stalwarts	Half Breeds
Mugwumps	Civil Service Reform
Railroad Regulation	Gold & Silver Standard
Women's Suffrage	Grover Cleveland
James Buchanan	Lynching
Disenfranchisement	Plessy vs. Ferguson
Cummins v. County Board of Education	
Farmers' Alliance	Agrarian Unrest
Populism	Depression
Eugene V. Debbs	William Jennings Bryan
William McKinley	

Chapter 20 Study Questions:

15. No party dominated politics through most of the Gilded Age; did this situation have a positive or negative effect on American government? Why? What effect did the differing factions within the parties have? Why?
16. Civil-service reform constituted a significant movement in the Gilded Age. What roadblocks did reformers face in this area? How were these roadblocks overcome? What immediate effect did the reform have? What long-term results came from the change?
17. How did economic issues generate protests during the Gilded Age? Specifically, how did Americans respond to the depression of the 1890s? Why did socialism start to attract a large following? What did Coxey's Army hope to accomplish? What became of those goals?
18. Did black southerners face any unique economic challenges from 1877 to 1892? If so, what? What social conditions did African Americans experience in the postwar South? Why did so much violence occur? What led to the Jim Crow laws? What purpose did those laws serve? What form did political discrimination take?
19. Populism became a major movement in American politics. Where did Populism find its roots? What did the Populists hope to achieve? How much success did they enjoy during the Gilded Age?
20. What concerns helped make free silver such a major issue? How would free silver have affected the American economy? Who supported free silver? Who opposed it? Why? Why did the free-silver issue eventually lose out to the gold supporters?

Chapter 21: The Progressive Era, 1895-1920

Chapter 21 Key Terms:

Muckrakers	Upper-Class Reformers
Workers' Compensation	Social Gospel
Progressivism	Socialists
Robert M. La Follette	Prohibition
John Dewey	Progressive Education
Eugenics	Booker T. Washington
Talented Tenth	The Woman movement
Society of American Indians	Feminism
Margaret Sanger	Woman's Suffrage
Theodore Roosevelt	Panic of 1907
	Woodrow Wilson

Chapter 21 Study Questions:

21. What differences existed between upper-class reformers, working-class reformers, and socialists? What goals did each group have? Did they share anything in common? Why or why not?
22. How did legislation help reformers advance their causes? Did they enjoy any substantive successes? If so, what? How effective were they at promoting moral reform through legislation? Did this particular approach to morality cause any problems?
23. What inequities did minorities and women face in American society? Did reformers try to solve these problems? If so, how; if not, why not? Were they successful? Why or why not?
24. Did Theodore Roosevelt epitomize the Progressive American? Why or why not? Did he use the presidency in innovative ways? If so, how? How did he influence American society in social terms?
25. How did Woodrow Wilson and Theodore Roosevelt differ in their approach to Progressivism? What similarities did the two approaches have? What were major stumbling blocks for both men in enacting reform? Did they enjoy any successes?

Chapter 22: The Quest for Empire, 1865–1914

Chapter 22 Key Terms:

Imperial Dreams	Foreign Policy Elite
Manliness (p.)626	“Civilizing Impulse”
William H. Seward	Navalism
Hawaii	Sinking of the Maine
Cuba	McKinley’s Ultimatum
Spanish American War	Treaty of Paris
Anti-Imperialist Arguments	Imperialist Arguments
Theodore Roosevelt	Platt Amendment
Panama Canal	US Mexican Relations
“Dollar Diplomacy”	Porfirio Diaz (p. 642)
Emiliano Zapata (look up on the web)	

Chapter 22 Study Questions:

26. Did the anti-imperialists’ argument that the United States could maintain a strong foreign trade without subjugating foreign people offer a viable option? Why or why not? How much did European imperialism influence American expansionism?
27. American annexation of Hawai’i justified the actions of the white elite on the island. What do you think constituted the major considerations in this decision? Do you think this action influenced future imperialism by the United States? How so?
28. Did the Open Door policy of the United States protect only American imperial desires? Did this policy have any benefits for China? For any European nation? Did the United States have the right to issue the policy? Why or why not? How did this policy affect American relations with Japan?
29. What effect did the Platt Amendment have on Cuban independence? Why did the United States issue the Platt Amendment? What were the primary concerns of American foreign policy regarding the Caribbean? Why?
30. Why did Theodore Roosevelt believe it necessary to issue his Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine? Did his assumptions have any validity? Why or why not? Who benefited from the Corollary?

KEEP READING: YOUR GROUP READINGS ARE BELOW!

On the pages that follow, you will find the source readings:

American Anti-Imperialist League Program

American Anti-Imperialist League
1899

We hold that the policy known as imperialism is hostile to liberty and tends toward militarism, an evil from which it has been our glory to be free. We regret that it has become necessary in the land of Washington and Lincoln to reaffirm that all men, of whatever race or color, are entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We maintain that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. We insist that the subjugation of any people is "criminal aggression" and open disloyalty to the distinctive principles of our government.

We earnestly condemn the policy of the present national administration in the Philippines. It seeks to extinguish the spirit of 1776 in those islands. We deplore the sacrifice of our soldiers and sailors, whose bravery deserves admiration even in an unjust war. We denounce the slaughter of the Filipinos as a needless horror. We protest against the extension of American sovereignty by Spanish methods.

We demand the immediate cessation of the war against liberty, begun by Spain and continued by us. We urge that Congress be promptly convened to announce to the Filipinos our purpose to concede to them the independence for which they have so long fought and which of right is theirs.

The United States have always protested against the doctrine of international law which permits the subjugation of the weak by the strong. A self-governing state cannot accept sovereignty over an unwilling people. The United States cannot act upon the ancient heresy that might makes right.

Imperialists assume that with the destruction of self-government in the Philippines by American hands, all opposition here will cease. This is a grievous error. Much as we abhor the war of "criminal aggression" in the Philippines, greatly as we regret that the blood of the Filipinos is on American hands, we more deeply resent the betrayal of American institutions at home. The real firing line is not in the suburbs of Manila. The foe is of our own household. The attempt of 1861 was to divide the country. That of 1899 is to destroy its fundamental principles and noblest ideals.

Whether the ruthless slaughter of the Filipinos shall end next month or next year is but an incident in a contest that must go on until the declaration of independence and the constitution of the United States are rescued from the hands of their betrayers. Those who dispute about standards of value while the foundation of the republic is undermined will be listened to as little as those who would wrangle about the small economies of the household while the house is on fire. The training of a great people for a century, the aspiration for liberty of a vast immigration are forces that will hurl aside those who in the delirium of conquest seek to destroy the character of our institutions.

We deny that the obligation of all citizens to support their government in times of grave national peril applies to the present situation. If an administration may with impunity ignore the issues upon which it was chosen, deliberately create a condition of war anywhere on the face of the globe, debauch the civil service for spoils to promote the adventure, organize a truth-suppressing censorship, and demand of all citizens a suspension of judgement and their unanimous support while it chooses to continue the fighting, representative government itself is imperiled.

We propose to contribute to the defeat of any person or party that stands for the forcible subjugation of any people. We shall oppose for re-election all who in the white house or in congress betray American liberty in pursuit of un-American ends. We still hope that both of our great political parties will support and defend the declaration of independence in the closing campaign of the century.

We hold with Abraham Lincoln, that "no man is good enough to govern another man without that other's consent. When the white man governs himself, that is self-government, but when he governs himself and also governs another man, that is more than self-government--that is despotism." "Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men in all lands. Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves, and under a just God cannot long retain it."

We cordially invite the co-operation of all men and women who remain loyal to the declaration of independence and the constitution of the United States.

Credits: American Anti-Imperialist League. "Platform of the American Anti-Imperialist League." Text from Carl Schurz, *The Policy of Imperialism*, Liberty Tract No. 4 (Chicago: American Anti-Imperialist League, 1899).

Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine

Roosevelt, Theodore
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 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.

Platt Amendment

U.S. Government
1901

Article I. The Government of Cuba shall never enter into any treaty or other compact with any foreign power or powers which will impair or tend to impair the independence of Cuba, nor in any manner authorize or permit any foreign power or powers to obtain colonization or for military or naval purposes, or otherwise, lodgment in or control over any portion of said island.

Article II. The Government of Cuba shall not assume or contract any public debt to pay the interest upon which, and to make reasonable sinking-fund provision for the ultimate discharge of which, the ordinary revenues of the Island of Cuba, after defraying the current expenses of the Government, shall be inadequate.

Article III. The Government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty, and for discharging the obligations with respect to Cuba imposed by the Treaty of Paris on the United States, now to be assumed and undertaken by the Government of Cuba. . . .

Article V. The government of Cuba will execute, and, as far as necessary, extend the plans already devised, or other plans to be mutually agreed upon, for the sanitation of the cities of the island, to the end that a recurrence of epidemic and infectious diseases may be prevented, thereby assuring protection to the people and commerce of Cuba, as well as to the commerce of Southern ports of the United States and the people residing therein. . . .

Article VII. To enable the United States to maintain the independence of Cuba, and to protect the people thereof, as well as for its own defense, the Government of Cuba will sell or lease to the United States lands necessary for coaling or naval stations, at certain specified points, to be agreed upon with the President of the United States.

Credits: Congressional Record, 56th Cong., 2d sess., 1901, p. 2954.

US Journalist James Creelman interviews Mexican President Porfirio Diaz, 1908

Note on the document: US investors and businessmen and Republican US President William Howard Taft supported the Diaz dictatorship. Look for reasons in this interview, given Mar. 3, 1908, why that would be the case. When published in Mexico in 1910, the interview caused a tremendous stir, because Diaz had promised to retire from office that year. A question worth pondering. If Diaz was an wonderful as this interview depicts him, why did millions of Mexicans rise to oppose his rule?

-
- From the heights of Chapultepec Castle President Diaz looked down upon the venerable capital of his country, spread out on a vast plain, with a ring of mountains flung up grandly about it, and I, who had come nearly four thousand miles from New York to see the master and hero of modern Mexico--the inscrutable leader in whose veins is blended the blood of the primitive Mixtecs with that of the invading Spaniards--watched the slender, erect form, the strong, soldierly head and commanding, but sensitive, countenance with an interest beyond words to express.
 - A high, wide forehead that slopes up to crisp white hair and over hangs deep-set, dark brown eyes that search your soul, soften into inexpressible kindness and then dart quick side looks--terrible eyes, threatening eyes, loving,

confiding, humorous eyes--a straight, powerful, broad and somewhat fleshy nose, whose curved nostrils lift and dilate with every emotion; huge, virile jaws that sweep from large, flat, fine ears, set close to the head, to the tremendous, square, fighting chin; a wide, firm mouth shaded by a white mustache; a full, short, muscular neck; wide shoulders, deep chest; a curiously tense and rigid carriage that gives great distinction to a personality suggestive of singular power and dignity-- that is Porfirio Diaz in his seventy-eighth year, as I saw him a few weeks ago on the spot where, forty years before, he stood-with his besieging army surrounding the City of Mexico, and the young Emperor Maximilian being shot to death in Queretaro, beyond those blue mountains to the north--waiting grimly for the thrilling end of the last interference of European monarchy with the republics of America.

- It is the intense, magnetic something in the wide-open, fearless, dark eyes and the sense of nervous challenge in the sensitive, spread nostrils, that seem to connect the man with the immensity of the landscape, as some elemental force.
- There is not a more romantic or heroic figure in all the world, nor one more intensely watched by both the friends and foes of democracy, than the soldier-statesman, whose adventurous youth pales the pages of Dumas, and whose iron rule has converted the warring, ignorant, superstitious and impoverished masses of Mexico, oppressed by centuries of Spanish cruelty and greed, into a strong, steady, peaceful, debt-paying and progressive nation.
- For twenty-seven years he has governed the Mexican Republic with such power that national elections have become mere formalities. He might easily have set a crown upon his head.
- Yet to-day, in the supremacy of his career, this astonishing man-- foremost figure of the American hemisphere and unreadable mystery to students of human government--announces that he will insist on retiring from the Presidency at the end of his present term, so that he may see his successor peacefully established and that, with his assistance, the people of the Mexican Republic may show the world that they have entered serenely and preparedly upon the last complete phase of their liberties, that the nation is emerging from ignorance and revolutionary passion, and that it can choose and change presidents without weakness or war.
- It is something to come from the money-mad gambling congeries of Wall Street and in the same week to stand on the rock of Chapultepec, in surroundings of almost unreal grandeur and loveliness, beside one who is said to have transformed a republic into an autocracy by the absolute compulsion of courage and character, and to hear him speak of democracy as the hope of mankind.
- This, too, at a time when the American soul shudders at the mere thought of a third term for any President.
- The President surveyed the majestic, sunlit scene below the ancient castle and turned away with a smile, brushing a curtain of scarlet trumpet-flowers and vine-like pink geraniums as he moved along the terrace toward the inner garden, where a fountain set among palms and flowers sparkled with water from the spring at which Montezuma used to drink, under the mighty cypresses that still rear their branches about the rock on which we stood.
- "It is a mistake to suppose that the future of democracy in Mexico has been endangered by the long continuance in office of one President," he said quietly. I can say sincerely that office has not corrupted my political ideals and that I believe democracy to be the one true, just principle of government, although in practice it is possible only to highly developed peoples."
- For a moment the straight figure paused and the brown eyes looked over the great valley to where snow-covered Popocatepetl lifted its volcanic peak nearly eighteen thousand feet among the clouds beside the snowy craters of Ixtaccihuatl--a land of dead volcanoes, human and otherwise.
- "I can lay down the Presidency of Mexico without a pang of regret, but I cannot cease to serve this country while I live," he added.
- The sun shone full in the President's face but his eyes did not shrink from the ordeal. The green landscape, the smoking city, the blue tumult of mountains, the thin, exhilarating, scented air, seemed to stir him, and the color came to his cheeks as he clasped his hands behind him and threw his head backward. His nostrils opened wide.
- "You know that in the United States we are troubled about the question of electing a President for three terms?"
- He smiled and then looked grave, nodding his head gently and pursing his lips. It is hard to describe the look of concentrated interest that suddenly came into his strong, intelligent countenance.
- "Yes, yes, I know," he replied. "It is a natural sentiment of democratic peoples that their officials should be often changed. I agree with that sentiment."
- It seemed hard to realize that I was listening to a soldier who had ruled a republic continuously for more than a quarter of a century with a personal authority unknown to most kings. Yet he spoke with a simple and convincing manner, as one whose place was great and secure beyond the need of hypocrisy.
- "It is quite true that when a man has occupied a powerful office for a very long time he is likely to begin to look upon it as his personal property, and it is well that a free people should guard themselves against the tendencies of individual ambition.

- "Yet the abstract theories of democracy and the practical, effective application of them are often necessarily different--that is when you are seeking for the substance rather than the mere form.
- "I can see no good reason why President Roosevelt should not be elected again if a majority of the American people desire to have him continue in office. I believe that he has thought more of his country than of himself. He has done and is doing a great work for the United States, a work that will cause him, whether he serves again or not, to be remembered in history as one of the great Presidents. I look upon the trusts as a great and real power in the United States, and President Roosevelt has had the patriotism and courage to defy them. Mankind understands the meaning of his attitude and its bearing upon the future. He stands before the world as a statesman whose victories have been moral victories. ...
- "Here in Mexico we have had different conditions. I received this Government from the hands of a victorious army at a time when the people were divided and unprepared for the exercise of the extreme principles of democratic government. To have thrown upon the masses the whole responsibility of government at once would have produced conditions that might have discredited the cause of free government.
- "Yet, although I got power at first from the army, an election was held as soon as possible and then my authority came from the people. I have tried to leave the Presidency several times, but it has been pressed upon me and I remained in office for the sake of the nation which trusted me. The fact that the price of Mexican securities dropped eleven points when I was ill at Cuernavaca indicates the kind of evidence that persuaded me to overcome my personal inclination to retire to private life.
- "We preserved the republican and democratic form of government. We defended the theory and kept it intact. Yet we adopted a patriarchal policy in the actual administration of the nation's affairs, guiding and restraining popular tendencies, with full faith that an enforced peace would allow education, industry and commerce to develop elements of stability and unity in a naturally intelligent, gentle and affectionate people.
- "I have waited patiently for the day when the people of the Mexican Republic would be prepared to choose and change their government at every election without danger of armed revolutions and without injury to the national credit or interference with national progress. I believe that day has come. ...
- "In the old days we had no middle class in Mexico because the minds of the people and their energies were wholly absorbed in politics and war. Spanish tyranny and misgovernment had disorganized society. The productive activities of the nation were abandoned in successive struggles. There was general confusion. Neither life nor property was safe. A middle class could not appear under such conditions."
- "General Diaz," I interrupted, "you have had an unprecedented experience in the history of republics. For thirty years the destinies of this nation have been in your hands, to mold them as you will; but men die, while nations must continue to live. Do you believe that Mexico can continue to exist in peace as a republic? Are you satisfied that its future is assured under free institutions?"
- It was worth while to have come from New York to Chapultepec Castle to see the hero's face at that moment. Strength, patriotism, warriorship, prophethood seemed suddenly to shine in his brown eyes.
- "The future of Mexico is assured," he said in a clear voice. "The principles of democracy have not been planted very deep in our people, I fear. But the nation has grown and it loves liberty. Our difficulty has been that the people do not concern themselves enough about public matters for a democracy. The individual Mexican as a rule thinks much about his own rights and is always ready to assert them. But he does not think so much about the rights of others. He thinks of his privileges, but not of his duties. Capacity for self-restraint is the basis of democratic government, and self-restraint is possible only to those who recognize the rights of their neighbors.
- "The Indians, who are more than half of our population, care little for politics. They are accustomed to look to those in authority for leadership instead of thinking for themselves. That is a tendency they inherited from the Spaniards, who taught them to refrain from meddling in public affairs and rely on the Government for guidance.
- "Yet I firmly believe that the principles of democracy have grown and will grow in Mexico."
- "But you have no opposition party in the Republic, Mr. President. How can free institutions flourish when there is no opposition to keep the majority, or governing party, in check?"
- "It is true there is no opposition party. I have so many friends in the republic that my enemies seem unwilling to identify themselves with so small a minority. I appreciate the kindness of my friends and the confidence of my country; but such absolute confidence imposes responsibilities and duties that tire me more and more.
- "No matter what my friends and supporters say, I retire when my present term of office ends, and I shall not serve again. I shall be eighty years old then.
- "My country has relied on me and it has been kind to me. My friends have praised my merits and overlooked my faults. But they may not be willing to deal so generously with my successor and he may need my advice and support; therefore I desire to be alive when he assumes office so that I may help him."

- He folded his arms over his deep chest and spoke with great emphasis. "I welcome an opposition party in the Mexican Republic," he said. "If it appears, I will regard it as a blessing, not as an evil. And if it can develop power, not to exploit but to govern, I will stand by it, support it, advise it and forget myself in the successful inauguration of complete democratic government in the country.
- "It is enough for me that I have seen Mexico rise among the peaceful and useful nations. I have no desire to continue in the Presidency. This nation is ready for her ultimate life of freedom. At the age of seventy-seven years I am satisfied with robust health. That is one thing which neither law nor force can create. I would not exchange it for all the millions of your American oil king."
- His ruddy skin, sparkling eyes and light, elastic step went well with his words. For one who has endured the privations of war and imprisonment, and who to-day rises at six o'clock in the morning, working until late at night at the full of his powers, the physical condition of President Diaz, who is even now a notable hunter and who usually ascends the palace stairway two steps at a time is almost unbelievable.
- "The railway has played a great part in the peace of Mexico," he continued. "When I became President at first there were only two small lines, one connecting the capital with Vera Cruz, the other connecting it with Queretaro. Now we have more than nineteen thousand miles of railways. Then we had a slow and costly mail service, carried on by stage coaches, and the mail coach between the capital and Puebla would be stopped by highwaymen two or three times in a trip, the last robbers to attack it generally finding nothing left to steal. Now we have a cheap, safe and fairly rapid mail service throughout the country with more than twenty-two hundred post-offices. Telegraphing was a difficult thing in those times. To-day we have more than forty-five thousand miles of telegraph wires in operation.
- "We began by making robbery punishable by death and compelling the execution of offenders within a few hours after they were caught and condemned. We ordered that wherever telegraph wires were cut and the chief officer of the district did not catch the criminal, he should himself suffer; and in case the cutting occurred on a plantation the proprietor who failed to prevent it should be hanged to the nearest telegraph pole. These were military orders, remember.
- "We were harsh. Sometimes we were harsh to the point of cruelty. But it was all necessary then to the life and progress of the nation. If there was cruelty, results have justified it."
- The nostrils dilated and quivered. The mouth was a straight line. "It was better that a little blood should be shed that much blood should be saved. The blood that was shed was bad blood; the blood that was saved was good blood.
- "Peace was necessary, even an enforced peace, that the nation might have time to think and work. Education and industry have carried on the task begun by the army." . . . "And which do you regard as the greatest force for peace, the army or the schoolhouse?" I asked.
- The soldier's face flushed slightly and the splendid white head was held a little higher.
- "You speak of the present time?"
- "Yes."
- "The schoolhouse. There can be no doubt of that. I want to see education throughout the Republic carried on by the national Government. I hope to see it before I die. It is important that all citizens of a republic should receive the same training, so that their ideals and methods may be harmonized and the national unity intensified. When men read alike and think alike they are more likely to act alike."
- "And you believe that the vast Indian population of Mexico is capable of high development?"
- "I do. The Indians are gentle and they are grateful, all except the Yacquis and some of the Mayas. They have the traditions of an ancient civilization of their own. They are to be found among the lawyers, engineers, physicians, army officers and other professional men.
- Over the city drifted the smoke of many factories.
- "It is better than cannon smoke," I said.
- "Yes," he replied, "and yet there are times when cannon smoke is not such a bad thing. The toiling poor of my country have risen up to support me, but I cannot forget what my comrades in arms and their children have been to me in my severest ordeals."
- There were actually tears in the veteran's eyes. "That," I said, pointing to a hideously modern bull-ring near the castle, "is the only surviving Spanish institution to be seen in this landscape."
- "You have not noticed the pawnshops," he exclaimed. Spain brought to us her pawn-shops, as well as her bull-rings." . . . There are nineteen thousand miles of railways operated in Mexico, nearly all with American managers, engineers and conductors, and one has only to ride on the Mexican Central system or to enjoy the trains de luxe of the National Line to realize the high transportation standards of the country.

- So determined is President Diaz to prevent his country from falling into the hands of the trusts that the Government is taking over and merging in one corporation, with the majority stock in the Nation's hands, the Mexican Central, National and Inter-oceanic lines--so that, with this mighty trunk system of transportation beyond the reach of private control, industry, agriculture, commerce and passenger traffic will be safe from oppression.
- This merger of ten thousand miles of railways into a single company, with \$113,000,000 of the stock, a clear majority, in the Government's hands, is the answer of President Diaz and his brilliant Secretary of Finances to the prediction that Mexico may some day find herself helplessly in the grip of a railway trust.
- Curiously enough, the leading American railway officials representing the lines which are to be merged and controlled by the Government spoke to me with great enthusiasm of the plan as a distinct forward step, desirable alike for shippers and passengers and for private investors in the roads.
- Two-thirds of the railways of Mexico are owned by Americans, who have invested about \$300,000,000 in them profitably. As it is, freight and passenger rates are fixed by the Government, and not a time table can be made or changed without official approval. It may surprise a few Americans to know that the first-class passenger rate in Mexico is only two and two-fifths cents a mile, while the second-class rate, which covers at least one-half of the whole passenger traffic of the country, is only one cent and one-fifth a mile--these figures being in terms of gold, to afford a comparison with American rates.
- I have been privately assured by the principal American officers and investors of the larger lines that railway enterprises in Mexico are encouraged, dealt with on their merits and are wholly free from blackmail, direct or indirect. ... More than \$1,200,000,000 of foreign capital has been invested in Mexico since President Diaz put system and stability into the nation. Capital for railways, mines, factories and plantations has been pouring in at the rate of \$200,000,000 a year. In six months the Government sold more than a million acres of land.
- In spite of what has already been done, there is still room for the investment of billions of dollars in the mines and industries of the Republic. Americans and other foreigners interested in mines, real estate, factories, railways and other enterprises have privately assured me, not once, but many times, that, under Diaz, conditions for investment in Mexico are fairer and quite as reliable as in the most highly developed European countries. The President declares that these conditions will continue after his death or retirement.
- Since Diaz assumed power, the revenues of the Government have increased from about \$15,000,000 to more than \$115,000,000, and yet taxes have been steadily reduced. When the price of silver was cut in two, President Diaz was advised that his country could never pay its national debt, which was doubled by the change in values. He was urged to repudiate a part of the debt. The President denounced the advice as foolishness as well as dishonesty, and it is a fact that some of the greatest officers of the government went for years without their salaries that Mexico might be able to meet her financial obligations dollar for dollar.
- The cities shine with electric lights and are noisy with electric trolley cars; English is taught in the public schools of the great Federal District; the public treasury is full and overflowing and the national debt decreasing; there are nearly seventy thousand foreigners living contentedly and prosperously in the Republic-- more Americans than Spaniards; Mexico has three times as large a population to the square mile as Canada; public affairs have developed strong men like Jose Yves Limantour, the great Secretary of Finances, one of the most distinguished of living financiers; Vice-president Corral, who is also Secretary of the Interior; Ignacio Mariscal, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Enrique Creel, the brilliant Ambassador at Washington.
- And it is a land of beauty beyond compare. Its mountains and valleys, its great plateaus, its indescribably rich and varied foliage, its ever blooming and abundant flowers, its fruits, its skies, its marvelous climate, its old villages, cathedrals, churches, convents--there is nothing quite like Mexico in the world for variety and loveliness. But it is the gentle, trustful, grateful Indian, with his unbelievable hat and many-colored blanket, the eldest child of America, that wins the heart out of you. After traveling all over the world, the American who visits Mexico for the first time wonders how it happened that he never understood what a fascinating country of romance he left at his own door. It is the hour of growth, strength and peace which convinces Porfirio Diaz that he has almost finished his task on the American continent.
- Yet you see no man in a priest's attire in this Catholic country. You see no religious processions. The Church is silent save within her own walls. This is a land where I have seen the most profound religious emotion, the most solemn religious spectacles--from the blanketed peons kneeling for hours in cathedrals, the men carrying their household goods, the women suckling their babies, to that indescribable host of Indians on their knees at the shrine of the Virgin of Guadalupe. I asked President Diaz about it while we paced the terrace of Chapultepec Castle.
- He bowed his white head for a moment and then lifted it high, his dark eyes looking straight into mine. "We allow no priest to vote, we allow no priest to hold public office, we allow no priest to wear a distinctive dress in public, we allow no religious processions in the streets," he said. "When we made those laws we were not fighting against

religion, but against idolatry. We intend that the humblest Mexican shall be so far freed from the past that he can stand upright and unafraid in the presence of any human being. I have no hostility to religion; on the contrary, in spite of all past experience, I firmly believe that there can be no true national progress in any country or any time without real religion.'

- Such is Porfirio Diaz, the foremost man of the American hemisphere. What he has done, almost alone and in such a few years, for a people disorganized and degraded by war, lawlessness and comic opera politics, is the great inspiration of Pan-Americanism, the hope of the Latin-American republics. Whether you see him at Chapultepec Castle, or in his office in the National Palace, or in the exquisite drawing-room of his modest home in the city, with his young, beautiful wife and his children and grandchildren by his first wife about him, or surrounded by troops, his breast covered with decorations conferred by great nations, he is always the same-simple, direct and full of the dignity of conscious power.
- In spite of the iron government he has given to Mexico, in spite of a continuance in office that has caused men to say that he has converted a republic into an autocracy, it is impossible to look into his face when he speaks of the principle of popular sovereignty without believing that even now he would take up arms and shed his blood in defense of it.
- Only a few weeks ago [US] Secretary of State [Elihu] Root summed up President Diaz when he said: It has seemed to me that of all the men now living, General Porfirio Diaz, of Mexico, was best worth seeing. Whether one considers the adventurous, daring, chivalric incidents of his early career; whether one considers the vast work of government which his wisdom and courage and commanding character accomplished; whether one considers his singularly attractive personality, no one lives to-day that I would rather see than President Diaz. If I were a poet I would write poetic eulogies. If I were a musician I would compose triumphal marches. If I were a Mexican I should feel that the steadfast loyalty of a lifetime could not be too much in return for the blessings that he had brought to my country. As I am neither poet, musician nor Mexican, but only an American who loves justice and liberty and hopes to see their reign among mankind progress and strengthen and become perpetual, I look to Porfirio Diaz, the President of Mexico, as one of the great men to be held up for the hero-worship of mankind.

Plan of Ayala, 1911, by Emiliano Zapata

Note on the document: Zapata and his peasant followers in Morelos fought hard against the dictatorship of Porfirio Diaz, trying to regain their lands stolen from them. Originally a backer and ally of Diaz's successor, President Francisco Madero, Zapata turned against Madero after concluding that the new president had betrayed his promises to the people of Mexico. Look for specific complaints lodged by Zapata and his followers against Madero.

-
- Liberating Plan of the sons of the State of Morelos, affiliated with the Insurgent Army which defends the fulfillment of the Plan of San Luis, with the reforms which it has believed proper to add in benefit of the Mexican Fatherland.
 - We who undersign, constituted in a revolutionary junta to sustain and carry out the promises which the revolution of November 20, 1910 just past, made to the country, declare solemnly before the face of the civilized world which judges us and before the nation to which we belong and which we call [sic, llamamos, misprint for amamos, love], propositions which we have formulated to end the tyranny which oppresses us and redeem the fatherland from the dictatorships which are imposed on us, which [propositions] are determined in the following plan:
 - 1. Taking into consideration that the Mexican people led by Don Francisco I. Madero went to shed their blood to reconquer liberties and recover their rights which had been trampled on, and not for a man to take possession of power, violating the sacred principles which he took an oath to defend under the slogan "Effective Suffrage and No Reelection," outraging thus the faith, the cause, the justice, and the liberties of the people: taking into consideration that that man to whom we refer is Don Francisco I. Madero, the same who initiated the above-cited revolution, who imposed his will and influence as a governing norm on the Provisional Government of the ex-President of the Republic Attorney Francisco L. de Barra [sic], causing with this deed repeated sheddings of blood and multiplicate misfortunes for the fatherland in a manner deceitful and ridiculous, having no intentions other than satisfying his personal ambitions, his boundless instincts as a tyrant, and his profound disrespect for the fulfillment of the preexisting laws emanating from the immortal code of '57, written with the revolutionary blood of Ayutla;
 - Taking into account that the so-called Chief of the Liberating Revolution of Mexico, Don Francisco I. Madero, through lack of integrity and the highest weakness, did not carry to a happy end the revolution which gloriously he initiated with the help of God and the people, since he left standing most of the governing powers and corrupted

elements of oppression of the dictatorial government of Porfirio Díaz, which are not nor can in any way be the representation of National Sovereignty, and which, for being most bitter adversaries of ours and of the principles which even now we defend, are provoking the discomfort of the country and opening new wounds in the bosom of the fatherland, to give it its own blood to drink; taking also into account that the aforementioned Sr. Francisco I. Madero, present President of the Republic, tries to avoid the fulfillment of the promises which he made to the Nation in the Plan of San Luis Potosí, being [sic, siendo, misprint for ciendo, restricting] the above-cited promises to the agreements of Ciudad Juárez, by means of false promises and numerous intrigues against the Nation nullifying, pursuing, jailing, or killing revolutionary elements who helped him to occupy the high post of President of the Republic;

- Taking into consideration that the so-often-repeated Francisco I. Madero has tried with the brute force of bayonets to shut up and to drown in blood the pueblos who ask, solicit, or demand from him the fulfillment of the promises of the revolution, calling them bandits and rebels, condemning them to a war of extermination without conceding or granting a single one of the guarantees which reason, justice, and the law prescribe; taking equally into consideration that the President of the Republic Francisco I. Madero has made of Effective Suffrage a bloody trick on the people, already against the will of the same people imposing Attorney José M. Pino Suárez in the Vice-Presidency of the Republic, or [imposing as] Governors of the States [men] designated by him, like the so-called General Ambrosio Figueroa, scourge and tyrant of the people of Morelos, or entering into scandalous cooperation with the cientícos party, feudal landlords, and oppressive bosses, enemies of the revolution proclaimed by him, so as to forge new chains and follow the pattern of a new dictatorship more shameful and more terrible than that of Porfirio Díaz, for it has been clear and patent that he has outraged the sovereignty of the States, trampling on the laws without any respect for lives or interests, as has happened in the State of Morelos, and others, leading them to the most horrendous anarchy which contemporary history registers.

- For these considerations we declare the aforementioned Francisco I. Madero inept at realizing the promises of the revolution of which he was the author, because he has betrayed the principles with which he tricked the will of the people and was able to get into power: incapable of governing, because he has no respect for the law and justice of the pueblos, and a traitor to the fatherland, because he is humiliating in blood and fire Mexicans who want liberties, so as to please the científicos, landlords, and bosses who enslave us, and from today on we begin to continue the revolution begun by him, until we achieve the overthrow of the dictatorial powers which exist.

- 2. Recognition is withdrawn from Sr. Francisco I. Madero as Chief of the Revolution and as President of the Republic, for the reasons which before were expressed, it being attempted to overthrow this official.

- 3. Recognized as Chief of the Liberating Revolution is the illustrious General Pascual Orozco, the second of the Leader Don Francisco I. Madero, and in case he does not accept this delicate post, recognition as Chief of the Revolution will go to General Don Emiliano Zapata.

- 4. The Revolutionary Junta of the State of Morelos manifests to the Nation under formal oath: that it makes its own the plan of San Luis Potosí, with the additions which are expressed below in benefit of the oppressed pueblos, and it will make itself the defender of the principles it defends until victory or death.

- 5. The Revolutionary Junta of the State of Morelos will admit no transactions or compromises until it achieves the overthrow of the dictatorial elements of Porfirio Díaz and Francisco I. Madero, for the nation is tired of false men and traitors who make promises like liberators and who on arriving in power forget them and constitute themselves as tyrants.

- 6. As an additional part of the plan we invoke, we give notice: that [regarding] the fields, timber, and water which the landlords, científicos, or bosses have usurped, the pueblos or citizens who have the titles corresponding to those properties will immediately enter into possession of that real estate of which they have been despoiled by the bad faith of our oppressors, maintaining at any cost with arms in hand the mentioned possession; and the usurpers who consider themselves with a right to them [those properties] will deduce it before the special tribunals which will be established on the triumph of the revolution.

- 7. In virtue of the fact that the immense majority of Mexican pueblos and citizens are owners of no more than the land they walk on, suffering the horrors of poverty without being able to improve their social condition in any way or to dedicate themselves to Industry or Agriculture, because lands, timber, and water are monopolized in a few hands, for this cause there will be expropriated the third part of those monopolies from the powerful proprietors of

them, with prior indemnization, in order that the pueblos and citizens of Mexico may obtain ejidos, colonies, and foundations for pueblos, or fields for sowing or laboring, and the Mexicans' lack of prosperity and wellbeing may improve in all and for all.

- 8. [Regarding] The landlords, cientificos, or bosses who oppose the present plan directly or indirectly, their goods will be nationalized and the two third parts which [otherwise would] belong to them will go for indemnizations of war, pensions for widows and orphans of the victims who succumb in the struggle for the present plan.
- 9. In order to execute the procedures regarding the properties aforementioned, the laws of disamortization and nationalization will be applied as they fit, for serving us as norm and example can be those laws put in force by the immortal Juárez on ecclesiastical properties, which punished the despots and conservatives who in every time have tried to impose on us the ignominious yoke of oppression and backwardness.
- 10. The insurgent military chiefs of the Republic who rose up with arms in hand at the voice of Don Francisco I. Madero to defend the plan of San Luis Potosí, and who oppose with armed force the present plan, will be judged traitors to the cause which they defended and to the fatherland, since at present many of them, to humor the tyrants, for a fistful of coins, or for bribes or connivance, are shedding the blood of their brothers who claim the fulfillment of the promises which Don Francisco I. Madero made to the nation.
- 11. The expenses of war will be taken in conformity with Article II of the Plan of San Luis Potosí, and all procedures employed in the revolution we undertake will be in conformity with the same instructions which the said plan determines.
- 12. Once triumphant the revolution which we carry into the path of reality, a Junta of the principal revolutionary chiefs from the different States will name or designate an interim President of the Republic, who will convoke elections for the organization of the federal powers.
- 13. The principal revolutionary chiefs of each State will designate in Junta the Governor of the State to which they belong, and this appointed official will convoke elections for the due organization of the public powers, the object being to avoid compulsory appointments which work the misfortune of the pueblos, like the so-well-known appointment of Ambrosio Figueroa in the State of Morelos and others who drive us to the precipice of bloody conflicts, sustained by the caprice of the dictator Madero and the circle of cientificos and landlords who have influenced him.
- 14. If President Madero and other dictatorial elements of the present and former regime want to avoid the immense misfortunes which afflict the fatherland, and [if they] possess true sentiments of love for it, let them make immediate renunciation of the posts they occupy and with that they will with something staunch the grave wounds which they have opened in the bosom of the fatherland, since, if they do not do so, on their heads will fall the blood and the anathema of our brothers.
- 15. Mexicans: consider that the cunning and bad faith of one man is shedding blood in a scandalous manner, because he is incapable of governing; consider that his system of government is choking the fatherland and trampling with the brute force of bayonets on our institutions; and thus, as we raised up our weapons to elevate him to power, we again raise them up against him for defaulting on his promises to the Mexican people and for having betrayed the revolution initiated by him, we are not personalists, we are partisans of principles and not of men!

- Mexican People, support this plan with arms in hand and you will make the prosperity and well-being of the fatherland.

- Ayala, November 25, 1911

Liberty, Justice, and Law

Signed, General in Chief Emiliano Zapata [This] is a true copy taken from the original. Camp in the Mountains of Puebla, December 11, 1911. Signed, General in Chief Emiliano Zapata.



Events of 1911

Executive Office, State of Texas, Austin.

The attention of the people of Texas is respectfully called to the fact that for the purposes of procuring and maintaining amicable and peaceable relations between the Republic of the United States of America and the Republic of the United Mexican States, and the people thereof, a treaty exists, and is in full force and effect between the said two Republics, under the terms of which the liberties and properties of the citizens of the respective Governments are guaranteed protection under the flags of said Governments, respectively; except, however, such goods and properties as are defined and distinguished by said treaty as contraband, same being as follows, viz:

FIRST:

Cannons, mortars, howitzers, swivels, blunder-busses, muskets, fuses, rifles, carbines, pistols, pikes, swords, sabres, lances, spears, halberts, grenades, bombs, powder, matches, balls, and all other things belonging to the use of these arms.

SECOND:

Bucklers, helmets, breast-plates, coats of mail, infantry, belts, and clothes made up in military form and for military use.

THIRD:

Cavalry belts and horses with their furniture.

FOURTH:

And, generally, all kinds of arms and instruments of iron, steel, brass, and copper, or any other materials manufactured, prepared and formed expressly to make war by sea and land, which said goods are not by said treaty protected from seizure when being transported and carried into either of said Republics in aid of, or for the use of, the enemy or enemies thereof.

Executive Office, State of Texas, Austin.

Attention is further called to the fact that Section 5281 of the United States Statutes provides that "every citizen of the United States within the territory or jurisdiction thereof, accepts and exercises a commission to serve a foreign prince, state, colony, district or people in war, by land or by sea, against any prince, state, colony, district, or people with whom the United States is at peace, shall be deemed guilty of a high misdemeanor, and shall be fined not more than Two Thousand Dollars, (\$2,000.00) and imprisoned not more than three years.

And that Section 5282, of the United States Statutes provides that "every person who, within the territory or jurisdiction of the United States, enlists or enters himself, or hires or retains another person to enlist under himself or to go beyond the limits or jurisdiction of the United states with intent to be enlisted or entered in the service of any foreign prince, state, colony, district or people, as a soldier, or as a marine, or seaman on board any vessel of war, letter of marque or privateer, shall be fined not more than one Thousand Dollars, (\$1,000) and imprisoned not more than three years.

And that Section 5286 of the United states Statutes provides that "every person who, within the territory or the jurisdiction of the United States begins or sets on foot, or provides or prepares the means for any military expedition, or inspires to be carried on from thence against the territory or dominion of any foreign prince, or state, or of any colony, state, district or people with whom the United States is at peace, shall be deemed guilty of a high misdemeanor, and shall be fined not exceeding Three Thousand Dollars, (\$3,000.00) and imprisoned not more than three years.

The attention of the Governor has been called to the fact that there now exists in the United Mexican States, Military strife; and it appearing to be the duty of every citizen of the state of Texas, in good faith to strictly observed the neutrality laws, and refrain from encouraging, aiding, abetting or participating in any manner in violating either the letter or spirit of same.

AMERICAN CONSULAR SERVICE:

C. P. DIAZ, MEXICO.

SUBJECT: Conditions on both sides of the line separating America from Mexico.

November 2, 1911.

The Honorable

The Secretary of State,

Washington, D. C.

Sir: I have the honor to advise that El Pais of Mexico City, Mexico, of the 30th ultimo, says:-

"That it has received a letter from Zapata, the notorious Bandit, dated the 27th ultimo, at the town of Matamoros in the 'Hot Lands' which, translated, reads, in part, as follows:-

"That he, Zapata, has had nothing to do with the Chiefs of the men who recently sacked, robbed, and committed other horrible crimes in the towns of the Federal District. That the crimes heretofore attributed to him occurred long before, and he has not since been connected with such matters. That greater Mexicans than he have committed still greater crimes than those to him imputed, but their time has passed and their record is history. That the Rebels now moving about in various parts in the Hot Lands are part of those under his command during the Madero Revolution; a part of those that were licensed or discharged. That when they were discharged he begged of them to keep the greatest possible order and to go to work soon as it could be found. That they were found out of work by General Reyes, who afterward provided them with arms. That he assures they will not come to the Hot Lands and that they, the Rebels who committed the depredations in the Federal District recently, are Reyistas. That he has been charged with the crimes committed by the Reyistas with whom he has had nothing to do."

The El Pais says that Zapata denies that the forces which assaulted Milpa Alta and other towns in the Federal District were Zapatistas, although he acknowledges that they were under his command formerly, and he affirms that they were

Reyistas. That the denial as well as the affirmation were gratuitous and absurd, as when the Rebels entered Milpa Alta and other towns that were attacked they cried out "Viva Zapata" and proclaimed that they were Zapatistas.

TELEGRAM RECEIVED 4

MEXICO CITY, MEXICO, DATED NOVEMBER 9, 1911. REC'D 10:00 P.M.

SECRETARY OF STATE,

WASHINGTON.

NOVEMBER 9, 6 P.M.

SITUATION IN SOUTHERN MEXICO AT PRESENT MOMENT NOT REASSURING. IN PRACTICALLY ALL STATES SOUTH OF MEXICO CITY THERE IS WIDESPREAD DISORDER AND BRIGANDAGE AND DEFIANCE OF AUTHORITY. IN THE STATE OF OAXACA ALONE MORE THAN ONE THOUSAND PERSONS HAVE BEEN KILLED IN ENGAGEMENTS BETWEEN REGULAR TROOPS AND BANDITS DURING THE LAST TWO WEEKS. THE MOVEMENT SEEMS TO BE GROWING IN STRENGTH AND PRESENTS, SOME INDICATION OF ORGANIZATION AND DIRECTION. I FEAR THAT UNLESS THE GOVERNMENT ADDRESSES ITSELF ENERGETICALLY TO THE SUPPRESSION OF LAWLESSNESS THE MOVEMENT WILL EXTEND TO NORTHERN STATES. SO FAR I HAVE NO REPORTS OF ATTACKS ON OR INJURIES TO AMERICAN CITIZENS.

WILSON

Events of 1913

FROM: MEXICO CITY DATED: FEBRUARY 23, 1913 REC'D 6 P. M. TELEGRAM RECEIVED

SECRETARY OF STATE, WASHINGTON, D. C. TWENTY-SEVEN FEBRUARY 23, 1 P.M.

MR. DE LA BARRA INFORMED ME LAST EVENING THAT THE GOVERNMENT INTENDED TO TRANSFER THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT TO THE PENITENTIARY WHERE IT WOULD BE POSSIBLE TO MAKE THEM MORE COMFORTABLE AND WHERE THEY WOULD BE IN SECURITY UNTIL THE PUBLIC PASSIONS HAD SUBSIDED. THEY WERE ACCORDINGLY TRANSFERRED LAST NIGHT ABOUT ELEVEN-THIRTY AND EN ROUTE TO THE PENITENTIARY THE PARTY WAS ATTACKED, ACCORDING TO THE GOVERNMENT'S PUBLISHED REPORTS THIS MORNING, AND IN THE STRUGGLE WHICH FOLLOWED BOTH THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT WERE KILLED. PRESIDENT HUERTA IN A PUBLISHED LETTER EXPLAINS THE OCCURRENCE IN THIS WAY AND ALSO STATES THAT ALL THE CIRCUMSTANCES WILL BE MADE THE SUBJECT OF A RIGID JUDICIAL INVESTIGATION. MR. DE LA BARRA HOLDS A RECEPTION TO THE DIPLOMATIC CORPS TOMORROW. I SHALL ASK HIM TO SUSPEND IT UNTIL THE DIPLOMATIC CORPS CAN HAVE THE ADVANTAGE OF A FULL UNDERSTANDING OF THIS OCCURRENCE.

TELEGRAM RECEIVED CIPHER
FROM: MEXICO CITY, DATED FEB. 11, 1913 REC'D 11:30 P.M.
SECRETARY OF STATE, WASHINGTON, D. C.
FEBRUARY 11, 6 P.M.

IN VIEW OF THE SERIOUS AND POSSIBLY PROLONGED FIGHTING BETWEEN THE FEDERAL AND REVOLUTIONARY FORCES NOW TAKING PLACE IN THE HEART OF A MODERN CAPITAL CITY; A WARFARE WHICH IS VIOLATING THE RULES OF CIVILIZED COMBAT AND ENTAILING UNTOLD LOSS OF LIFE AND DESTRUCTION OF NON-COMBATANT PROPERTY AND DEPRIVING OF ANY GUARANTEES OF PROTECTION THE TWENTY-FIVE THOUSAND RESIDENT FOREIGNERS, I AM CONVINCED THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE INTEREST OF HUMANITY AND IN THE DISCHARGE OF ITS POLITICAL OBLIGATIONS SHOULD SEND HITHER INSTRUCTIONS OF A FIRM DRASTIC AND PERHAPS MENACING CHARACTER TO BE TRANSMITTED PERSONALLY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF PRESIDENT MADERO. ALSO TO THE LEADERS OF THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT.

IF I WERE IN POSSESSION OF INSTRUCTIONS OF THIS CHARACTER OR CLOTHED WITH THE GENERAL POWERS IN THE NAME OF THE PRESIDENT I MIGHT POSSIBLY BE ABLE TO INDUCE A CESSATION OF HOSTILITIES AND THE INITIATION OF NEGOTIATIONS HAVING FOR THEIR OBJECT DEFINITE PACIFIC ARRANGEMENTS.
WILSON

DEPARTMENT OF STATE DIVISION OF LATIN-AMERICAN AFFAIRS MEMORANDUM February 12, 1913.

The Secretary:

The division, of Latin American Affairs is of opinion that an instruction of firm, drastic, and perhaps menacing character recommended in Mr. Wilson's telegram, of February 11, 6 p.m., should not at this time be sent for the following reasons:

- (a) Mr. Wilson states that if he had such an instruction he believes that he would possibly be able to induce a cessation of hostilities, so that the most, in his judgment, that such an instruction could do would be to put him in a position where he might possibly produce a cessation of hostilities.
- (b) Such an instruction seems in the opinion of this division wholly undesirable unless the Government of the United States is prepared ultimately to make good any threat it might make. To do this would mean that the President of the United States should be authorized at once by Congress to avail of the Army and Navy of the United States to force compliance on the part of Mexico. Congress has not yet acted, and any action on its part at this time would probably

be construed, no matter how mistakenly, as the first step in actual armed intervention.

(c) If Mr. Wilson were in possession of such an instruction and failed to bring about cessation of hostilities it would be humanly impossible for the United States Government to compel compliance with its demand until the solution of the dispute at Mexico City had been reached and hostilities indulged in.

(d) Moreover, even if the United States were in position, and the President had Congressional authorization, and was prepared to make good such a threat, the only possible action that could be taken by the United States Government would be armed intervention and the sending of military forces to prevent fighting in Mexico City, and we would be put in the position of ourselves initiating and carrying on hostilities in Mexico City, because the Mexicans most certainly would not come out to meet the United States troops, and we would thus be put in the position of ourselves doing what we forbid Mexico to do, and doing it for the purpose only of maintaining what we might believe to be a principal, while the Mexicans are fighting in Mexico City with the entire Government and Republic at stake.

(e) Moreover, the present Administration, if after proper preparation took the action recommended by Mr. Wilson would be in the position possibly of plunging the country in a war which would not have an opportunity to carry on, and which would have to be turned over to a new Administration which would have none of the responsibilities of the state of affairs found to exist when it comes into power.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
DIVISION OF LATIN-AMERICAN AFFAIRS
MEMORANDUM

This division feels that there now exists in the City of Mexico a situation which if solved by the triumph of General Diaz would result in placing some one individual in control of the Mexican Federal army and of unifying this element which the reins of Government would follow. If Madero triumphs the disorders will probably continue, unless the whole Diaz faction should be annihilated or captured as a result of its defeat.

It is believed that the Government of the United States has done as far as it should under the circumstances, and that a state of alert preparedness is all that need at this time be maintained.

Doyle

National Palace, Mexico City, February 14 1913. (Filed 5:55 p.m. at Mexico City)

Mr. W. H. Taft

President of the United States, Washington, D. C.

I have been informed that the Government over which your Excellency worthily presides has ordered that war ships shall set out for Mexican coasts with troops to be disembarked to come to this capital to give protection to Americans. Undoubtedly the information which you have and which has caused you so to determine is erroneous or exaggerated since the lives of the Americans in this capital will be in no danger if they quit the firing zone and concentrate themselves at certain places in the city, and in the suburban towns in which there is absolute tranquility and in which the Government can give them every measure of protection. If you will instruct Americans resident in the capital to do this, according to the practice established by one of your former messages, all danger to the lives of American and foreign residents will be avoided. With regard to material damages to property the Government does not hesitate to accept all the responsibility imposed upon it by International Law. I request then that your Excellency order your ships not to disembark troops since this will cause a conflagration with consequences inconceivably more vast than that which it is desired to remedy. I assure your Excellency that the Government is taking all measures to the end that the rebels in the citadel shall do the least damage possible and I have hopes that soon everything will be settled. It is true that my country is passing at this moment through a terrible trial and the disembarkation of American forces would only make the situation worse and through a lamentable error the United States would do a terrible wrong to a nation which has always been a loyal friend and will tend to make more difficult the reestablishment in Mexico of a democratic Government similar to that of the great American nation. I appeal to the sentiments of equity and justice which have been the rule of your Government and which undoubtedly represent the

feelings of the great American people, over whose destinies you have presided with such skill.

Francisco I. Madero

Received and translated at White House 10:00 p.m.

His Excellency

Pedro Lascurain

Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Mexico, February 15, 1913.

My dear Mr. Lascurain-

Referring to our conversation this afternoon I beg to transmit to you here-with a copy of a note addressed by your Embassy in Washington, to the Department of State.

As this note is in absolute contradiction of the facts, I must beg you to be kind enough to send me a note indicating exactly what took place at the interview which we had on Friday morning.

The following is my version: That after some discussion relative to other matters and after you had expressed your deep concern relative to the existing situation, you remarked that you hoped there was no intention on the part of the American Government of landing marines or soldiers in Mexico. I replied to you that I had no control nor had. I made any representations to the Government at Washington on the subject, but that I could reasonably anticipate a situation developing here when our Government would be called upon by the European Governments to furnish protection for their nationals in the abnormal situation which exists here. I then indicated to you that you should be made to reduce the measure of danger to foreigners and to afford protection. You seemed to be impressed with the importance of my statements, and, as I have reason to know, you afterwards worked most diligently to secure some results in line with my suggestion.

As I regard the note sent from the Mexican Embassy as highly improper and its reflecting upon me and upon this Embassy most unjustly, I shall consider it a favor if you will be kind enough to send me a letter by the bearer of such character as would be in accordance with your knowledge of the facts.

Believe me, my dear Mr. Lascurain, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Henry Lane Wilson

TELEGRAM SENT

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, Washington

February 16, 1913.

His Excellency,

Francisco I. Madero

President of the United Mexican States, Mexico City.

From your Excellency's telegram which reached me the 14th; it appeared that Your Excellency was somewhat misinformed as to the policy of the United States to-wards Mexico which has been uniform for two years, or as to the naval or other measures thus far taken which are measures of natural precaution. Period. The Ambassador telegraphs that when you were good enough to show him your telegram to me he pointed out this fact. Period. Your Excellency must, therefore, be aware that the reports which appear to have reached you that orders have already been given to land forces, were inaccurate. The Ambassador, who is fully informed, is nevertheless being again instructed to afford you any desired information. Period. Fresh assurances of friendship to Mexico are unnecessary after two years of proofs of patience and good will. Paragraph.

In view of the special friendship and relations between the two countries I cannot too strongly impress upon Your Excellency the vital importance of the early establishment of that real peace and order which this Government has so long hoped to see, both because American citizens and their property must be protected and respected, and also because this nation sympathizes deeply with the afflictions of the Mexican people. Paragraph.

In reciprocating the anxiety shown by Your Excellency's message I feel it my duty to add sincerely and without reserve that the course of events during the past two years culminating in the present most dangerous situation creates in this country extreme pessimism and the conviction that the present paramount duty is the prompt relief of the situation.

Wm. H. Taft

TELEGRAM RECEIVED FROM MEXICO CITY, DATED FEB. 17, 1913. REC'D 7:48 A.M.

SECRETARY OF STATE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

FEBRUARY 17, 1 A.M.

DEPARTMENT'S FEBRUARY 15, 12 MIDNIGHT. THE EMBASSY'S FEBRUARY 14, 2 P.M., FEBRUARY 15, 11 A.M., FEBRUARY 17, 7 P.M., FEBRUARY 15, 11 P. M., WOULD SEEM TO HAVE COVERED THE DEPARTMENT'S INQUIRY BUT IN AMPLIFICATION THEREOF I MAY SAY THAT IN THE INTERVIEW WITH MR. LASCURAIN HELD ON FRIDAY MORNING HE ASKED ME IN A PURELY AND FRIENDLY WAY WHETHER OUR GOVERNMENT HAD ANY INTENTION OF LANDING TROOPS IN MEXICO. I REPLIED THAT I HAD NO AUTHORITY IN THAT MATTER AND THAT I HAD RECEIVED NO INSTRUCTIONS THEREIN BUT THAT HE MUST KNOW THAT IT IS POSSIBLE EUROPEAN POWERS WERE BRINGING UPON THE GOVERNMENT (?) AND THAT IF THE SITUATION HERE GREW TO BE INTOLERABLE INVOLVING GREAT DANGER TO FOREIGN (?) MY GOVERNMENT WOULD NECESSARILY HAVE TO CONSIDER THE QUESTION OF OBTAINING THAT PROTECTION WHICH THE MEXICAN GOVERNMENT SEEMED UNABLE TO GIVE. IT WAS DISTINCTLY UNDERSTOOD AT THAT TIME THAT WE WERE TALKING MAN TO MAN AND ENTIRELY OUTSIDE OF OFFICIAL RELATIONS. ON NO OTHER OCCASION HAVE I MENTIONED INTENTIONS OF OUR GOVERNMENT EXCEPT UPON THE OCCASION OF MY VISIT WITH THE GERMAN MINISTER TO THE PALACE WHEN, AS RECITED TO HIM, MY FEBRUARY 15, 11 P.M., THE PRESIDENT EXPRESSED THE HOPE THAT WE WOULD NOT LAND MARINES, REPLIED SIMPLY THAT I HAD NO INSTRUCTIONS AND NO AUTHORITY IN THE MATTER. THIS AFTERNOON I VISITED MR. LASCURAIN AND RECALLED THE CHARACTER OF OUR INTERVIEW TO HIM. HE AGREED WITH ME IN EVERY PARTICULAR AND SAID THAT IF I WOULD ADDRESS A NOTE TO HIM HE WOULD REPLY IN ACCORDANCE WITH OUR UNDERSTANDING. I ACCORDINGLY WROTE SUCH A NOTE MARKED IT PERSONAL AND UNOFFICIAL AND DISPATCHED IT TO HIM BY MR. TENNANT ASKING FOR A REPLY NOT WITHSTANDING THE PERSONAL CHARACTER OF THE NOTE MR. LASCURAIN SAID THAT HE COULD NOT REPLY WITHOUT CONSULTING WITH THE PRESIDENT ASKING MR. TENNANT TO RETURN AT SEVEN THIRTY. MR. TENNANT WENT AT SEVEN THIRTY. MR. LASCURAIN, APPARENTLY MUCH EXCITED, ASKED FOR A FURTHER DELAY UNTIL MORNING.

TELEGRAM RECEIVED FROM: MEXICO CITY FEB. 17, 1913.

IN REGARD TO THE PRESIDENT'S TELEGRAM I MAY SAY THAT IT IS IRREGULAR, FALSE AND MISLEADING AND THAT HAVING INFORMED HIM SO I MAY ALSO INFORM THE DEPARTMENT TO THE SAME EFFECT. MY COLLEAGUES, WHO UNITED WITH ME IN SENDING A REPRESENTATION TO THE PRESIDENT RELATIVE TO HIS RESIGNATION, DESIRE ME TO EXPRESS THEIR ENTIRE DISAPPROVAL OF THE PRESIDENT'S TELEGRAM IN SO FAR AS THE SAME RELATES TO THE NATURE OF THEIR REPRESENTATION, AS IT WAS FULLY UNDERSTOOD BOTH BY THE PRESIDENT AND MY COLLEAGUES THAT THEIR REPRESENTATIONS WERE FRIENDLY AND UNOFFICIAL. THEY INTEND TO SO INFORM THEIR GOVERNMENTS. I SHALL GREATLY APPRECIATE AND BELIEVE IT TO BE OF REAL IMPORTANCE THAT THE PRESIDENT IN HIS REPLY TO THE PRESIDENT OF MEXICO

WILL SHARPLY REBUKE THE SCARCELY VEILED ATTACK ON THIS EMBASSY WHICH IS ENDEAVORING TO DO ITS FULL DUTY IN A TRYING SITUATION AND ALSO THAT THE NOTE OF MEXICAN EMBASSY MAY BE REBUKED AS FALSE, MISLEADING AND ENTIRELY IRREGULAR IN THE DIPLOMATIC CONFERENCE EXCHANGES BETWEEN GOVERNMENTS.

ALTHOUGH ONLY THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE GREAT POWERS HAVE ACTED WITH ME IN THESE MATTERS WE HAVE THE SUPPORT OF THE ENTIRE DIPLOMATIC CORP.

WILSON.

FROM: MEXICO CITY, DATED FEB, 17, 4 P.M. REC'D 8:09 P.M, SECRETARY OF STATE, WASHINGTON. FEBRUARY 17, 4 P.M.

GENERAL HUERTA HAS JUST SENT HIS MESSENGER TO ME AGAIN TO SAY THAT I MAY ANTICIPATE SOME ACTION WHICH WILL (*) MADERO FROM POWER AT ANY MOMENT AND THAT PLANS WERE FULLY MATURED. THE PURPOSE OF DELAY BEING TO AVOID ANY VIOLENCE OR BLOODSHED, I ASKED NO (*) AND MADE NO SUGGESTIONS BEYOND REQUESTING THAT NO LIVES BE TAKEN EXCEPT BY DUE PROCESS OF LAW. I AM UNABLE TO SAY WHETHER THESIS. PLANS WILL COME TO ANYTHING OR NOT. I SIMPLY REPEAT TO THE GOVERNMENT THE WORD SENT TO ME WHICH I FEEL BOUND TO LISTEN TO AS IT SO INTIMATELY CONCERNS THE SITUATION OF OUR NATIONALS IN THIS CITY.

WILSON

From General Huerta. Military Commander of Mexico (Translation)

His Excellency the American Ambassador, Present.

The President of the Republic and his Ministers are now in my power at the National Palace, as prisoners. I trust that Your Excellency will interpret this act of mine as the most patriotic manifestation of a man who has no other ambition than to serve his country. I beg Your Excellency to accept this act as one which has no further object than to restore peace in the Republic and to insure the interests of its children and those of the foreigners who have brought to us so many benefits.

I offer Your Excellency my greeting and with the greatest respect I beg you to bring the contents of this note to the attention of His Excellency President Taft.

I also beg you to convey this information to the various diplomatic missions in this city.

If Your Excellency would honor me by sending this information to the rebels at Ciudadela, I would see in this action a further motive of gratitude from the people of the Republic and myself towards you and the always glorious people of the United States,

With all respects I am, Your Excellency's obedient servant.

Mexico, February 18, 1913.

V. Huerta:

General in Chief of the Operating Army and Military Commander of the City of Mexico.

TELEGRAM RECEIVED (VIA GALVESTON) CIPHER

FROM: MEXICO CITY, DATED FEB. 18, 1913, REC'D FEB. 19, 4:20 A.M.

SECRETARY OF STATE, WASHINGTON, D. C. TWELVE, FEB, 18, 12 MIDNIGHT,

APPREHENSIVE OF THE SITUATION WHICH MIGHT ENSUE AFTER THE DOWNFALL OF PRESIDENT

MADERO I INVITED GENERAL HUERTA AND GENERAL DIAZ TO COME TO THE EMBASSY FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSIDERING THE QUESTION OF PRESERVING ORDER IN THE CITY. AFTER THEY ARRIVED I DISCOVERED THAT MANY OTHER THINGS HAD TO BE DISCUSSED FIRST AND AFTER ENORMOUS DIFFICULTIES I MANAGED TO GET THEM TO AGREE TO WORK IN COMMON ON AN UNDERSTANDING THAT HUERTA SHOULD BE THE PROVISIONAL PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC AND THAT DIAZ SHOULD NAME THE CABINET AND THAT THEREAFTER HE SHOULD HAVE THE SUPPORT OF HUERTA FOR THE, PERMANENT PRESIDENCY, AFTER THESE POINTS WERE SETTLED BOTH LEFT THE EMBASSY TO PUT INTO EFFECT COMMON ORDER WHICH THEY HAD AGREED UPON FOR THE PUBLIC PEACE. I EXPECTED NO FURTHER TROUBLE IN THE CITY AND I CONGRATULATE THE DEPARTMENT UPON THE HAPPY OUTCOME OF EVENTS WHICH HAVE BEEN DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY THE RESULT OF IT INSTRUCTIONS.

WILSON

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, Washington February 20, 1913, 11 p.m. American Embassy, Mexico City. Twenty-three.

CONFIDENTIAL AND URGENT. You may informally and unofficially inform General Huerta that his telegram of February 18th to the President has been received.

While it is the general duty of this Government to conserve for the use on behalf of its own citizens and its national interests the influence it possesses, nevertheless General Huerta's consulting you as the treatment of Madero tends to give you a certain responsibility in the matter. It moreover goes without saying that cruel treatment of the ex-President would injure, in the eyes of the world, the reputation of Mexican civilization, and this Government earnestly hopes to hear of no such treatment and hopes to hear that he has been dealt within a manner consistent with peace and with humanity.

Without assuming responsibility you may in your discretion make use of these ideas in your conversation with General Huerta.

De/La.

Knox

WILSON

Espatado 11, Havana, Cuba. February 24, 1913.

Hon T. L. Reilly, M. C. Meriden, Conn.

My dear Sir:

I sent you a cable yesterday evening as follows: "Oppose recognition of Huerta-Diaz government." In cold blood this sounds rather abrupt or even arbitrary but I assure it was not so intended. I merely wished to say in the fewest practicable words that I am opposed to any recognition of the Huerta-Diaz government in Washington and that I wished to respectfully but strenuously urge you to use your influence to the same end. I hope that you will kindly excuse the brevity of the cablegram and lack of the usual rhetorical forms and accept instead of the cable the fuller form here enclosed now it has reached you.

I suppose it is of necessary to point out that the gang in charge of Mexico City at this moment represent no one but themselves and a handful of rich Mexicans who wish to terrorize their fellow countrymen in the good old Porfirio-Diaz style and reduce them to the medieval state that prevailed in Mexico up to two years ago. The Democratic party if it stands for anything at all should stand for popular government as distinguished from military despotism and aside from party considerations it is better from the American standpoint that Mexico fall into several different states, each more easily- dominated by the American government, than that the whole country fall again under military despotism. Madero failed because he lacked governing capacity and understanding of the democratic ideal. It requires an abler man to lead democracy than imperialism and Madero was not that man but this is no

reason why the United States should help to foist a new Diaz regime upon Mexico; No government can live three months in Mexico that does not received support from the United States in the way of recognition etc. to permit the passage of arms, etc. The United States having the power cannot escape the responsibility and I look to the democratic party to solve the problem along democratic and not despotic lines-which means no recognition for the assassins now in power in Mexico. They will not last long if their opponents are allowed to freely import arms. In the meantime Americans may need real protection in Mexico and it is up to Washington to see that they get it. With best wishes for your continued political success.

I beg to remain,

Yours respectfully, J. Herbert Foster

Passengers on the train from Torreon, Coahuila, Mexico, arriving in C. P. Diaz, Mexico, the 1st instant, informed me that when they left Torreon the night of the 30th ultimo, they were on the floor of the coaches of the train to escape the rain of bullets that were fired from the guns of the Ex-Madero Revolutionists and the Federal soldiers, who evidently were having a fight for some reason the passengers could not ascertain before the train left Torreon. No one on the train was wounded.

The Border Press says that Madero was in Torreon on the 31st instant, and let that same day for Chihuahua. That same Press infers that the "Texas Rangers" are to have charge of the detection of the violation of the U.S. Laws of Neutrality instead of the U. S. Federal Officers, in the future. Insinuating that the U. S. Federal Officers have been found in-efficient Relative to this matter I have to again repeat that the Texas Rangers have yet to exhibit interest in the Business Texans consider belongs to the Federal Government, and in the Madero Revolution matter the Texans were very much interested in the success of the Revolutionists. So much so that they made much difficult the work of all U. S. Federal Officers on the Border, and they took active part in the celebration in the towns and cities on the Mexican side of the border line, held after the Madero Revolution succeeded. Should another Revolutionist appear who would or could appeal to the Texans, I fear for the efficiency of the Rangers in neutrality matters.

Two carbon copies of this dispatch are enclosed herewith, one will be sent to the Honorable Ambassador to Mexico, Mexico City, Mexico, and another to the Honorable Consul-General to Northern Mexico, Monterrey, Mexico.

Enclosures-

2 carbon copies of this Dispatch.

I have the honor to be, Sir, Your obedient servant,
American Consul.

Chapter 23: Americans in the Great War, 1914-1920

Chapter 23 Key Terms:

Neutrality	Wilsonianism
Submarine Warfare	Peace Advocates
War Declaration	Selective Service Act
Trench Warfare	Bolshevik Revolution
14 Points	Casualties
Labor Shortage/Women in the War	National War Labor Board
The Committee on Public Information	Red Scare
Espionage and Sedition Acts	American Legion
Black Militancy	League of Nations/Article 10
Senate Rejection of Treaty	

Key Dates:

- 1914 First World War Begins in Europe
- 1915 Germans sink Lusitania off cost of Ireland
- 1916 After torpedoing the Sussex, German pledges not to attack merchant ships without warning. Also Nation Defense Act Expands Military.
- 1917
 1. Germany Declares unrestricted submarine warfare
 2. Russian Revolution ousts the czar; Bolsheviks later take power
 3. United States enters WWI
 4. Selective Service Act Creates Draft
 5. Espionage Act Limits First Amendment rights
 6. Race riot breaks out in East St. Louis, Illinois
- 1918
 1. Wilson Announces Fourteen Points for New world order
 2. Sedition Act further limits freedom of speech
 3. US troops at Chateau-Thierry help blunt German offensive
 4. US troops intervene in Russia against Bolsheviks
 5. Spanish flu pandemic kills 20 million worldwide
 6. Armistice ends First World War
- 1919
 1. Paris Peace Conference punishes Germany (key to Hitler's Rise later) and launches League of Nations
 2. May Day bombing helps instigate Red Scare
 3. American Legion Organizes for Veterans' benefits and antiradicalism
 4. Wilson suffers stroke after speaking tour
 5. Senate rejects Treaty of Versailles and US membership in League of Nations
 6. Schenck v. US upholds Espionage Act
- 1920 Palmer Raids round up suspected radicals

Chapter 23 Study Questions:

31. Despite its official policy of neutrality, how did the United States in reality support the Allies? For what reasons would the United States support the Allies? Did the British do anything for the United States that the Germans had not or would not do? If so, why?
32. Did the United States have ample cause to enter World War I? Did Wilson have reasonable attitudes toward freedom of the seas? What role did American business play in America's going to war?

33. When the United States joined in the war, government took a much more active role in directing domestic affairs. Was the Selective Service Act ethical? Why or why not? Were the Espionage and Sedition Acts justifiable in a time of war? Why or why not?
34. What changes did the war provide for women and African Americans? Did these changes prove beneficial? Did they have negative ramifications? Why? What happened after the war?
35. Why did the United States Senate reject the Treaty of Versailles? What might have led to approval? How did rejection reflect attitudes toward the war and American involvement?

On the pages that follow, you will find the source readings:

Group A:

American Neutrality Policy

Wilson, Woodrow
1914

Proclamation of August 4, 1914

Whereas a state of war unhappily exists between Austria-Hungary and Serbia and between Germany and Russia and between Germany and France:

And Whereas the United States is on terms of friendship and amity with the contending powers, and with the persons inhabiting their several dominions;

And Whereas there are citizens of the United States residing within the territories or dominions of each of the said belligerents and carrying on commerce, trade, or other business or pursuits therein;

And Whereas there are subjects of each of the said belligerents residing within the territory or jurisdiction of the United States, and carrying on commerce, trade, or other business or pursuits therein;

And Whereas the laws and treaties of the United States, without interfering with the free expression of opinion and sympathy, or with the commercial manufacture or sale of arms or munitions of war, nevertheless impose upon all persons who may be within their territory and jurisdiction the duty of an impartial neutrality during the existence of the contest;

And Whereas it is the duty of a neutral government not to permit or suffer the making of its waters subservient to the purposes of war;

Now, Therefore, I, Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States of America, in order to preserve the neutrality of the United States . . . do hereby declare and proclaim. . . .

That the statutes and the treaties of the United States and the law of nations alike require that no person, within the territory and jurisdiction of the United States, shall take part, directly or indirectly, in the said wars, but shall remain at peace with all of the said belligerents, and shall maintain a strict and impartial neutrality. . . .

Credits: Woodrow Wilson, *The New Democracy: Presidential Messages, Addresses, and Papers (1913-1917)*, Ray Stannard Baker and William E. Dodd, eds. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1926), Vol. 1, pp. 151-152, 155.

Group B:

Espionage Act

U.S. Government

Section 1. That (a) whoever, for the purpose of obtaining information respecting the national defense with intent or reason to believe that the information to be obtained is to be used to the injury of the United States, or to the advantage of any foreign nation, goes upon, enters, flies over, or otherwise obtains information, concerning any vessel, aircraft, work of defense, navy yard, naval station, submarine base, coaling station, fort, battery, torpedo station, dockyard, canal, railroad, arsenal, camp, factory, mine, telegraph, telephone, wireless, or signal station, building, office, or other place connected with the national defense, owned or constructed, or in progress of construction by the United States or under the control of the United States, or of any of its officers or agents, or within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, or any place in which any vessel, aircraft, arms, munitions, or other materials or instruments for use in time of war are being made, prepared, repaired, or stored, under any contract or agreement with the United States, or with any person on behalf of the United States, or otherwise on behalf of the United States, or any prohibited place within the meaning of section six of this title; or (b) whoever for the purpose aforesaid, and with like intent or reason to believe, copies, takes, makes, or obtains, or attempts, or induces or aids another to copy, take, make, or obtain, any sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blue print, plan, map, model, instrument, appliance, document, writing or note of anything connected with the national defense; or whoever, for the purpose aforesaid, receives or obtains or agrees or attempts or induces or aids another to receive or obtain from any other person, or from any source whatever, any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blue print, plan, map, model, instrument, appliance, or note, of anything connected with

the national defense, knowing or having reason to believe, at the time he receives or obtains, or agrees or attempts or induces or aids another to receive or obtain it, that it has been or will be obtained, taken, made or disposed of by any person contrary to the provisions of this title; or (d) whoever, lawfully or unlawfully having possession of, access to, control over, or being intrusted with any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blue print, plan, map, model, instrument, appliance, or note relating to the national defense, willfully communicates or transmits or attempts to communicate or transmit the same and fails to deliver it on demand to the officer or employee of the United States entitled to receive it; or (e) whoever, being intrusted with or having lawful possession or control of any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blue print, plan, map, model, note, or information, relating to the national defense, through gross negligence permits the same to be removed from its proper place of custody or delivered to anyone in violation of his trust, or to be lost, stolen, abstracted, or destroyed, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than two years, or both.

Section 2. (a) Whoever, with intent or reason to believe that it is to be used to the injury of the United States or to the advantage of a foreign nation, communicates, delivers, or transmits, or attempts to, or aids, or induces another to, communicate, deliver or transmit, to any foreign government, or to any faction or party or military or naval force within a foreign country, whether recognized or unrecognized by the United States, or to any representative, officer, agent, employee, subject, or citizen thereof, either directly or indirectly any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blue print, plan, map, model, note, instrument, appliance, or information relating to the national defense, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than twenty years: Provided, That whoever shall violate the provisions of subsection (a) of this section in time of war shall be punished by death or by imprisonment for not more than thirty years; and (b) whoever, in time of war, with intent that the same shall be communicated to the enemy, shall collect, record, publish or communicate, or attempt to elicit any information with respect to the movement, numbers, description, condition, or disposition of any of the armed forces, ships, aircraft, or war materials of the United States, or with respect to the plans or conduct, or supposed plans or conduct of any naval or military operations, or with respect to any works or measures undertaken for or connected with, or intended for the fortification of any place, or any other information relating to the public defense, which might be useful to the enemy, shall be punished by death or by imprisonment for not more than thirty years.

Section 3. Whoever, when the United States is at war, shall willfully make or convey false reports or false statements with intent to interfere with the operation or success of the military or naval forces of the United States or to promote the success of its enemies and whoever when the United States is at war, shall willfully cause or attempt to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny,

refusal of duty, in the military or naval forces of the United States, or shall willfully obstruct the recruiting or enlistment service of the United States, to the injury of the service or of the United States, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000 or imprisonment for not more than twenty years, or both.

Section 4. If two or more persons conspire to violate the provisions of section two or three of this title, and one or more of such persons does any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each of the parties to such conspiracy shall be punished as in said sections provided in the case of the doing of the act the accomplishment of which is the object of such conspiracy. Except as above provided conspiracies to commit offenses under this title shall be punished as provided by section thirty-seven of the Act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States approved March fourth, nineteen hundred and nine.

Section 5. Whoever harbors or conceals any person who he knows, or has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect, has committed, or is about to commit, an offense under this title shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than two years, or both.

Section 6. The President in time of war or in case of national emergency may by proclamation designate any place other than those set forth in subsection (a) of section one hereof in which anything for the use of the Army or Navy is being prepared or constructed or stored as a prohibited place for the purpose of this title: Provided, That he shall determine that information with respect thereto would be prejudicial to the national defense.

Section 7. Nothing contained in this title shall be deemed to limit the jurisdiction of the general courts-martial, military commissions, or naval courts-martial under sections thirteen hundred and forty-two, thirteen hundred and forty-three, and sixteen hundred and twenty-four of the Revised Statutes as amended.

Section 8. The provisions of this title shall extend to all Territories, possessions, and places subject to the jurisdiction of the United States whether or not contiguous thereto, and offenses under this title, when committed upon the high seas or elsewhere within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States and outside the territorial limits thereof shall be punishable hereunder.

Section 9. The Act entitled "An Act to prevent the disclosure of national defense secrets," approved March third, nineteen hundred and eleven, is hereby repealed.

Group C:

Socialist Critique of World War I

Debs, Eugene V.
1918

. . . When the Bolsheviki came into power and went through the archives they found and exposed the secret treaties--the treaties that were made between the Czar and the French Government, the British Government and the Italian Government, proposing, after the victory was achieved, to dismember the German Empire and destroy the Central Powers. These treaties have never been denied nor repudiated. Very little has been said about them in the American press. I have a copy of these treaties, showing that the purpose of the Allies is exactly the purpose of the Central Powers, and that is the conquest and spoliation of the weaker nations that has always been the purpose of war. . . .

The master class has always declared the wars; the subject class has always fought the battles. The master class has had all to gain and nothing to lose, while the subject class has had nothing to gain and all to lose--especially their lives. . . .

And here let me emphasize the fact--and it cannot be repeated too often--that the working class who fight all the battles, the working class who make the supreme sacrifices, the working class who freely shed their blood and furnish the corpses, have never yet had a voice in either declaring war or making peace. It is the ruling class that invariably does both. They alone declare war and they alone make peace. . . .

What a compliment it is to the Socialist movement to be persecuted for the sake of the truth! The truth alone will make the people free. And for this reason the truth must not be permitted to reach the people. The truth has always been dangerous to the rule of the rogue, the exploiter, the robber. So the truth must be ruthlessly suppressed. That is why they are trying to destroy the Socialist movement; and every time they strike a blow they add a thousand new voices to the hosts proclaiming that Socialism is the hope of humanity. . . .

Do not worry over the charge of treason to your masters, but be concerned about the treason that involves yourselves. Be true to yourself and you cannot be a traitor to any good cause on earth.

Yes, in good time we are going to sweep into power in this nation and throughout the world. We are going to destroy all enslaving and degrading capitalist institutions and recreate them as free and humanizing institutions. The world is daily changing before our eyes. The sun of capitalism is setting; the sun

of Socialism is rising. It is our duty to build the new nation and the free republic. We need industrial and social builders. We Socialists are the builders of the beautiful world that is to be. We are all pledged to do our part. We are inviting--aye challenging you--in the name of your own manhood and womanhood to join us and do your part.

In due time the hour will strike and this great cause triumphant--the greatest in history--will proclaim the emancipation of the working class and the brotherhood of all mankind.

Credits: Eugene V. Debs, "Speech," June 16, 1918, Canton, Ohio (New York: Oriole

Chapter 24: The New Era, 1920-29

Chapter 24 Key Terms:

New Lobbying	Coolidge Prosperity
Women in Politics	Automobile
Radio	Marcus Garvey
Suburbs	Household Management
Social Values	Ku Klux Klan
Fundamentalism	Scopes Trial
Sports	Harlem Renaissance
Prohibition	Jazz
Herbert Hoover	Stock Market Crash
Failure of Federal Policies	

Chapter 24 Study Questions:

36. Why did the 1920s experience a sharp rejection of the reform-mindedness of the two previous decades? What role did the war have on this shift? Did Americans just grow tired of reform? If so, why? Did the need for reform no longer exist? Why or why not?
37. Had the United States truly become urban by 1920? Why or why not? How did urbanization affect Americans' values? What effect did cars, radios, movies, and advertising have on society?
38. How did new technologies increase leisure time? How did these innovations affect women? Did the changes advance women's causes? If so, how? What other changes did women experience in the 1920s?

Chapter 25, The Great Depression and the New Deal, 1929-1941.

Chapter 25 Key Terms:

Stock Market Crash 1929	Hawley-Smoot Tariff
Scottsboro Boys	Bank Failure
Bonus Army	Hoover's Reconstruction
Franklin D. Roosevelt	New Deal
First 100 Days	National Industrial Recovery Act
Agricultural Adjustment Act	Left Wing Critics
Second New Deal	Mass Media
Court-Pack	Roosevelt Recession

Chapter 25 Study Questions:

39. What led to the worsening economic conditions between 1929 and 1933? How did Hoover respond to the depression? Why?
40. What did Roosevelt hope to achieve with the New Deal? What specific programs were designed to meet specific goals? What degree of success did the New Deal enjoy? What failures did it experience? How did the First and Second New Deals differ?
41. Beyond economics, how did the New Deal affect the United States? What political and social ramifications did Roosevelt's approach have? Who made up the New Deal coalition? Why

Chapter 26, The United States in a Troubled World, 1920-1941.

Chapter 26 Key Terms

Washington Navel Conference	Kellogg-Briand Pact
German Reparations	Recognition of Soviet Union
Good Neighbor Policy	Mexican Nationalism
German Aggression Under Hitler	Isolationist View
Roosevelt's Views	Jiang Jieshi
Manchurian Crisis	Roosevelt's Quarantine Speech
Atlantic Charter	Attack on Pearl Harbor
Peacetime Military Draft	

Chapter 26 Study Questions

42. What did Americans mean by "independent isolationism"? Was the United States truly isolationist in the 1920s? How did business help define the American position in world affairs?
43. How did the United States work to improve relations with Latin America during this period? Why? Did the United States take positions that hurt relations? What else could America have done?
44. What factors made Americans want to remain neutral when aggression began in Europe in the 1930s? How did the United States try to maintain neutrality? Why did Roosevelt change his position?
45. Why did Japan become so aggressive in the 1930s? What actions did the United States take to counter this aggression? Was the American response effective, or could more have been done?

46. Why did Japan believe it necessary to bomb Pearl Harbor? Why were American forces so unprepared for the attack?

Chapter 27, The Second World War at Home and Abroad, 1941-1945.

Chapter 27 Key Terms

War in the Pacific	“Europe First” Strategy
Manhattan Projects	Business & Universities War Effort
Propaganda and Popular Culture	Wartime Prosperity
Limits of American Ideals	Interment of Japanese Americans
Double V	Segregated Military
America and Holocaust	Selective Service
Tensions Among Allies	Yalta Conference
Harry Truman	War in the Pacific
Bombing of Japan	

Chapter 27 Study Questions

47. How did the Allies propose to defeat Germany? To defeat Japan? What issues led to disagreements between the Allies? Which battles ultimately proved to be turning points in the war? Why? Should Truman have used the atom bomb? Why or why not?
48. What influence did the war have on business, labor, and the economy? On politics and the government? How did the war affect women, children, and families? How did troops respond to the war and the end of the conflict?
49. Did racial minorities make any advances during the war? If so, what? Did minorities suffer as a result of the conflict? How so? What long-term effects did the war have on the place of minorities in American society?
50. What was the Holocaust? What was the Allied response? Why? What might the United States have done differently? What legacy did the Holocaust leave?
51. How did the Allies prepare for peace while still conducting the war? Why was that peace “flawed”? What specific issues arose at Yalta and Potsdam? How did the Allies resolve those concerns? What implications did diplomacy have for the postwar world?

Chapter 28 Key Terms

Decolonization	Stalin’s Aims
US Economic and Strategic Needs	Stalin and Truman
Atomic Diplomacy	Beginning of Cold War
Truman Doctrine	Warnings from Kennan and Churchill
Lippmann’s Critique	Marshall Plan
National Security Act	Berlin Blockade and Airlift
Twin Shocks	Vietnam’s Quests for Independence
Korean War	US Enters Vietnam
Truman’s Firing of MacArthur	Eisenhower
Nuclear Buildup	U-2 Incident
Racism and Segregation	Arab-Israeli Conflict
Suez Crisis	Eisenhower Doctrine

Geneva Accords
Cuban Revolution

National Liberation Front

Chapter 28 Study Questions

52. How effective was Truman's "get tough" policy with the Soviet Union? How effective was the policy of containment in Europe? In Asia? How did atomic technology influence this policy?
53. Was United Nations intervention in Korea justified? Did the United States act appropriately when the Chinese entered the war? Why did Truman fire MacArthur?
54. Why was the Dulles policy called "brinkmanship"? What was Eisenhower's "open skies" proposal? What was the "domino theory"?
55. What is the Third World? How did racial discrimination in the United States hinder American dealings with the Third World? Did the United States end discrimination for security reasons?

Chapter 29, America at Midcentury, 1945-1960.

Chapter 29 Key Terms

GI Bill	Taft-Hartley Act
Desegregation	Baby Boom
Postwar Liberalism	1948 Election
Truman's Fair Deal	Eisenhower's Dynamic Conservatism
Espionage and Nuclear Fears	Politics of Anticommunism
McCarthyism & Witch Hunts	Black Political Power
Montgomery Bus Boycott	Brown vs. the Board of Education
White Resistance	State's Rights
New Middle Class	Whiteness and national Culture
Consumer Culture	Crisis of Masculinity
Youth Culture	Sexuality
Challenges to Middle Class Culture	Critics of Conformity
Racism	Poverty

Chapter 29 Study Questions

56. What economic problems did the United States face between 1945 and 1952? How did Americans respond to those problems?
57. How did a civil rights movement emerge in the 1940s and 1950s? What role did the presidents and the Court play in the movement? What did African Americans do to help their cause?
58. Why did Dr. Benjamin Spock have so much influence on postwar America? What did his popularity say about the role of women in the postwar years?
59. What groups benefited from the growing affluence of the United States? What groups did not enjoy the fruits of the economic boom? Why not? Is it fair to say that even the poor were better off than they had been? Why or why not?

Chapter 30, The Tumultuous Sixties, 1960-1968.

Chapter 30 Key Terms

John Fitzgerald Kennedy (JFK)	Election of 1960
Nation Building in the Third World	Bay of Pigs Invasion
Cuban Missile Crisis	Students and the Movement
Kennedy and Civil Rights	Children's Crusade
Segregation Forever	March on Washington
Freedom Summer	Great Society (more terms on next page)
Kennedy Assassination	Civil Rights Act
Election of 1964	War on Poverty
Vietnam	Divisions at Home
Black Power	Youth and Politics
Free Speech Movement	Student Activism
Counterculture	Tet Offensive
Assassinations	Chicago Democratic National Convention
Nixon's Election	

Chapter 30 Study Questions

60. How does the legacy of the Kennedy administration live on in the United States? Did Kennedy institute any meaningful domestic policies? Why or why not?
61. How do you judge Kennedy's handling of the Bay of Pigs invasion? The Cuban Missile Crisis? The Berlin Crisis? Why?
62. What programs did Johnson initiate as part of the Great Society? What effect did these policies have on Americans? Why did Johnson have such success in gaining congressional support?
63. How did the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s mirror previous efforts for equality? How was this movement different from previous efforts? What factors encouraged the movement?
64. Was the Tonkin Gulf Resolution a reasonable grant of power to the President? Why or why not? What were the short- and long-term results of the resolution? How did Congress reassert itself?
65. What is a counterculture? Did one truly exist in the United States? Why or why not? What did the New Left want? Why? What were the differences between the counterculture and the New Left? Did either group have lasting influence on America? Why or why not?

Chapter 31, Continuing Divisions and New Limits, 1969-1980.

Chapter 31 Key Terms

African American Cultural Nationalism	Mexican American Activism
Chicano Movement	Native American Activism
Affirmative Action	Liberal and Radical Feminism
Opposition to Women's Movement	Gay Liberation
End in Vietnam	Morale Problems in Military
Invasion of Cambodia	Paris Peace Accords
Debate Over Lessons of Vietnam	Vietnam Vets (more terms next page)
Détente	Opening to China
Wars in the Middle East	Nixon's Domestic Agenda
Antiradicalism in Latin America	Watergate
Ford's Presidency	Attempts to Fix Economy
Tax Revolts	Religion
Sexuality and Family	Camp David Accords
Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan	Iranian Hostage Crisis
Rise of Saddam Hussein	

Chapter 31 Study Questions

66. Was détente a realistic policy? Why or why not? What were the problems associated with détente? What were the reasons for it?
67. How did the presidents of the 1970s respond to threats in the Middle East? Africa? Latin America? Asia?
68. Did the United States enjoy any diplomatic successes during this period? If so, what? Did the United States suffer from any diplomatic mistakes? If so, what? What diplomatic lessons should Americans have learned since 1945?
69. Discuss the use of identity politics and cultural nationalism by African Americans, Mexican Americans, and Native Americans in their attempt to deal with the problems they experienced in American society during the 1970s. How successful were these groups in achieving their goals?
70. Discuss the feminist movement of the 1960s and 1970s and discuss its accomplishments and failures. Were there divisions among women who defined themselves as feminists? If there were divisions, what was the nature of those divisions?
71. Discuss the Watergate scandal as a constitutional crisis. What was President Richard Nixon's role in the scandal? Why did the House Judiciary Committee make the decision it did concerning the articles of impeachment against the President? How does the Watergate scandal differ from other political scandals in American history?

Chapter 32, Conservatism Revived, 1980-1992.

Chapter 32 Key Terms

Ronald Reagan	New Conservative Coalition
Reagan's Conservative Agenda	Attacks on Welfare
Pro-Business Policies	Attacks on Organized Labor
The New Right	Reaganomics
Supply-Side Economics	Deregulation
Junk Bonds	Regan Doctrine
Soviet-American Tension	Iran-Contra Scandal (more terms next page)
US Interests in Middle East	Terrorism
Gorbachev	Growth of Religious Right
Culture Wars	The New Inequality
Aids epidemic	Ostentation
New Immigrants from Asia	Growing Latino Population
George Herbert Walker Bush	Pro-Democracy Movements
Costs of Victory	Operation Desert Storm
Domestic Problems	Clarence Thomas Nomination

Chapter 32 Study Questions

72. What effect did the Reagan years have on the United States? What policies provided his major successes? Were there any failures? Would he have won a third term? Why or why not?
73. How did Ronald Reagan's policies toward the Third World differ from those of previous presidents? What specific policies best illustrate the Reagan era? Why?
74. Why did America polarize during the Reagan administration? What forms did that polarization take? How did different Americans respond? How did it influence contemporary conditions? How did it affect your local community?
75. How has a shifting occupational structure influenced America? What led to the shift? How have businessmen and politicians responded? How does this situation shape your future?
76. How did the Reagan administration affect women and children, both positively and negatively? What unique problems did women face? What is the "feminization of poverty"? Does it affect your life?
77. What international problems did George Bush face? How did he handle them? What would you describe as his successes? Why? His failures? Why?
78. What factors brought an end to the Cold War? In what way was Ronald Reagan important in bringing an end to the Cold War? In what way was Mikhail Gorbachev important in bringing an end to the Cold War? What is the legacy of the Cold War for the United States? The Soviet Union? The world community of nations?

Writing Assignments on Following Pages

Writing Assignment #1

Description:

Assignment One: (2 to 3 pages) (5%) Read all three documents and readings assigned to all of the groups, ABC, for September 1st. Read the chapter on Reconstruction in the *People and A Nation* book as well. The objective of this assignment includes the following: it introduces you to the historical examination and analysis of primary sources; it introduces you to the questions historians ask of sources and their authors, it introduces you to the process of writing your own account of a historical event; and it enables me to assess your writing, analytical, and organizational skills early in the semester. After reading these primary sources, tell the story of the United States' reconstruction of the South. Analyze the various racial, ethnic, and social sub groups that played a role in the shaping of American Reconstruction. Determine the common, underlying arguments about American life during Reconstruction. Be sure to include all the primary sources, citing them appropriately. See my website for tips and guidelines for citation. Be sure to include the vantage point/perspective of each group/individual involved. You may want to consider the following questions: What was the aim of Reconstruction? Given the aims of Reconstruction, did it succeed? Did Reconstruction fail in the short-term but succeed in the long-term? See handout for additional information. Write an essay that argues whether or not you think Reconstruction failed or succeeded. Use evidence from the primary source readings in Marcus. There should be no more than 10 words that are quoted. See handout for additional details and grading rubric.

Objectives: The objective of this assignment includes the following: it introduces you to the historical examination and analysis of primary sources; it introduces you to the questions historians ask of sources and their authors, it introduces you to the process of writing your own account of a historical event; and it enables me to assess your writing, analytical, and organizational skills early in the semester. Allows analysis the various racial, ethnic, and social sub groups that played a role in the shaping of American Reconstruction.

Step One: Read at least three primary documents and the chapter on Reconstruction in the *People and A Nation* book.

1. *Norton*: Chapter 16, Reconstruction: An Unfinished Revolution
2. Frederick Douglass, *What the Black Man Wants*
3. Rosy Williams et. al, *The Murder of Jim Williams and African Americans During Reconstruction.*
4. Caleb Forshey and the Reverend James Sinclair, *White Southerner's Reactions to Reconstruction*
5. *African Americans During Reconstruction.*
6. Grimes Family and Swindell Brothers, *Work Under Sharecropper and Labor Contracts*

Step Two: After reading these primary sources, tell the story of the United States' reconstruction of the South. Be sure to include at least three primary sources, citing them appropriately. Be sure to include the vantage point/perspective of each group/individual involved. You may want to consider the following questions: What was the aim of Reconstruction? Given the aims of Reconstruction, did it succeed? Did Reconstruction fail in the short-term but succeed in the long-term? See handout for additional information.

Step Three: Write an essay that argues whether or not you think Reconstruction failed or succeeded. Use evidence from the primary source readings in Marcus. There should be no more than 10 words that are quoted. See handout for additional details.

Sample Essay:

Writing Assignment #1: Reconstruction

"I think freedom is very unfortunate for the negro," Caleb Forshey stated in 1866. His bold and brash words, a slap in the face to any freed man, woman or child, showed just how hateful many Southern whites were post-War. Their determination to halt all progress for African Americans was the ultimate cause of the failed reconstruction plan.

Republicans aimed to join the North and South and to liberate freed African Americans from their previously atrocious confines. One of the many important goals was to allow an educational system to emerge for freed slaves. They established the Freedmen's Bureau to help find the true identity of African Americans. Churches, schools and black neighborhoods formed. It gave them an education and a voice. Republicans also fought for all former slavery power to be destroyed. They did not want any form of Confederacy loyalty to remain. All former Confederates, in their eyes, should be kept far away from any public office or position of power.

Progress was made by the new amendments to the Constitution but once Johnson was president, things went downhill. Black codes and curfew laws were passed, the Grandfather Clause was used for voting and sharecropping systems set back many dreams and ambitions for blacks. The emergence of the KKK and the fear it invoked was yet more proof that

reconstruction failed. African Americans were oppressed for decades longer. "Did you ever stop to think that thinking don't do any good when you do it too late? Well, that's how it was with us," said former slave Felix Haywood. Unfortunately, his remarkable observation echoed the voice of many: Reconstruction had failed. Slow moving policies and a violent war had ravaged the nation and something stronger would be needed to achieve equality and to merge our nation together once again.

Assignment Two: (5 to 10 pages) (15%)

Option A:

Interpretive Book Review or Review of a Historically Based Film: (5 to 10 pages)

Choose a recent book or article from a scholarly journal that could fit within parameters of this syllabus. Write a substantial book review that places the arguments and evidence of the book you chose in dialogue with other books read for the course. I will provide detailed guidelines for film and book reviews, which are done quite differently.

This review should:

- Briefly summarize the book/article's findings and explain its significance.
- Situate the book in the appropriate historiographic contexts. Since many works will be responding directly to scholarship not included on this syllabus, you may have to do some additional reading.
- Draw some broader conclusions about the way the work does or does not reflect the cutting edge in its area of study.
- If you do a film, you must discuss both its historical accuracies and inaccuracies.

Option B:

Instead of completing writing assignment number three *Option A*, students may choose to perform a service-learning project. The service learning-project offers students a chance to volunteer for 15 hours throughout the semester in a local community organization (about an hour a week, depending on the kind of volunteer activity). The intention is to offer students the opportunity to move beyond lecture halls and be part of organizations working for the betterment of communities in the Bakersfield area. Students who take this option must then write a 2-3 page report on their experiences and present it as their paper to the class. The report should include a brief description of the community organization you have been working with, your assigned work, and your personal reflection on the experience. You must relate your service to an aspect of history. In addition to/or in lieu of working with a community organization, students may opt

to construct an oral history project that seeks to preserve the thoughts, beliefs, and ideas of today's Americans regarding a particular, agreed upon subject. This project also involves writing a similar 2-3 page report and presenting your experience to the class.

Option C: (5 to 10 pages)

Choose 3 documents from the archives in the Library's collections or through online databases suggested by your instructor. (You will meet and establish contact with library's subject specialists according to your area of interest. He/She will help you locate archives relevant to your interests.) Imagine these are the first three documents discovered about/by these people at the time. Imagine that prior to finding these documents, historians new little about this area. You're the fist to discover it. Reconstruct the history of your subjects through the voices and language used by the authors of the text you have chosen. Tell the story of their lives, but also of their interpretations of what is going on around them. Place the fragmented text in a historical context. Write a 5-10 page essay that tells about the life, work, family, and culture of these individuals.

ASSINGMENT OPTION ONE: Within the first paragraph you should briefly introduce the film and provide background, discussing the main claims and reasons set forth in the film. Within the first paragraph you should make a claim about the film you are analyzing and provide a roadmap explaining how you have organized your paper to support your main claim about this film. Your claim about the film must be supported throughout the entirety of the paper with a close analysis of the film and readings from the class, describing key features with specific examples, including character sketches, appeals to the intended audience, the plot, etc. As you construct good reasons to support your claim you should discuss particular themes and values set forth in the film as related to key moments of change in the film, as well as to particular characters and the consequences they face. Be sure to choose a film that deals with a historical topic. You must approve all films with me. You must discuss in your review the historical accuracy of the film.

- **Summarize** the plot, the content, and arrangement of the film.
- Discuss the **main themes and values** of the film, as well as key changes throughout the film in relationship to your thesis.
- **Make a claim** about the film. Organize your essay around this claim, including reasons and topic sentences that support your main claim. For example, The film *Crash* highlights real issues about race in contemporary society, but the film's reliance upon the intense use of pathos in foregrounding the role of race in every encounter detracts from the audience's ability to relate to the experiences of the characters.
- Discuss the **context** of the film, considering why the film was created, its purpose, and where it came from. This requires background information on the film.
- Describe who you think the intended **audience** is, explaining how you inferred this. Contemplate assumptions you think the director/writer assumed the audience knew or believed.
- Discuss the **medium and genre** (feature-length movie) and what expectations an audience might have about this genre. The use of non-English language as well.
- Discuss any use of words (non-verbal) that the director used throughout the film, connected to the images, to help support his claims.
- Discuss the writer/director's use of appeals to ethos, logos, and or pathos. Ethos: what is the character of what he represents? Logos: does he use any documentation of facts. Pathos:

assumption and appeals to the values of the audience? Are there any elements that can be considered symbolic?

- Research and discuss the identity of the creator and his other projects.
- Be sure to not only analyze the film with the rhetorical tools we have learned (language of race, gender, slavery, etc.), but to also write your own paper employing the elements of rhetoric. Each paragraph must have a topic sentence. And each paragraph should relate back to your main claim/thesis.
- State what this show/film **reveals about your position**: values, goals, acceptable roles in society, etc. List evidence to support your conclusions.

ASSINGMENT TWO: Evaluative Analysis (Film/Parts of Film are good, bad, effective, etc.)

Within the first paragraph you should briefly introduce the film and provide background, discussing the main claims and reasons set forth in the film. Within the first paragraph you should **make an evaluative claim based on criteria** about the film you are analyzing and provide a roadmap explaining how you have organized your paper to support your main claim about this film. (For example, evaluate whether or not this film effectively addresses the pervasiveness of racial stereotypes in our everyday encounters. You must define your criteria in order to support your claim.) Your claim about the film must be supported throughout the entirety of the paper with a close analysis of the film, describing key features with specific examples, including character sketches, appeals to the intended audience, the plot, etc. As you construct good reasons to support your claim you should discuss particular themes and values set forth in the film as related to key moments of change in the film, as well as to particular characters and the consequences they face.

- Determine an aspect of the film you want to evaluate. Define the term of your evaluation. For example, *Crash* effectively uses pathos to convince its audience of the centrality of racial stereotypes to people's treatment of one another, particularly in stressful or threatening situations. If this were your argument you would have to define what you mean by effectively in order for your reader to decide whether or not they agree with your claims, reasons, and proofs. Which criteria makes something good, bad, effective, etc.? Which is the most important criteria? Which criteria are fairly obvious and which will you have to argue for? Organize your essay around your claim, including reasons and topic sentences that support your main claim. **Describe each criterion and then analyze how well what you are evaluating meets that criterion.**
- If you are making an evaluation according to the effects the film produces, describe each effect in detail.
- Anticipate where your readers might question either your criteria or how they apply to your subject.
- Address opposing viewpoints by acknowledging how their evaluations might differ and by showing why your definition is better.
- Since you've made your stance clear about the film in the introductory claim and throughout your paper try to **conclude** with a compelling example or analogy that supports your claim.
- In your attempt to convince your readers you should **Summarize** the plot, the content, and arrangement of the film, discuss the **main themes and values** of the film, as well as key changes throughout the film in relationship to your thesis, discuss the **context** of the film, considering why the film was created, its purpose, and where it came from. This requires background information on the film. Describe who you think the intended **audience** is, explaining how you inferred this. Contemplate assumptions you think director/writer assumed the audience knew or believed.
- Write your own paper employing the elements of rhetoric. Each paragraph must have a topic sentence. And each paragraph should relate back to your main claim/thesis.

Subjects for Book Reviews, History 17B

1. United States, Reconstruction
2. Ku Klux Klan
3. Freedman's Bureau
4. Black Codes
5. Sharecropping
6. Andrew Johnson
7. Abraham Lincoln
8. Radical Republicans
9. Custer's Last Stand
10. Buffalo
Soldier's/Indians of North America
11. A Century of Dishonor
12. Wounded Knee
13. Transcontinental Railroad
14. Knights of Labor
15. Knights of the Ku Klux Klan
16. Chinese Exclusion Act
17. Jim Crow
18. Western Frontier
19. Industrialization
20. Thomas Edison
21. Triangle Shirtwaist
22. Urbanization
23. Machine Politics
24. Tammany Hall
25. Imperialism
26. Prohibition
27. Poverty and Progress
28. Haymarket Riot
29. American Federation of Labor
30. Henry Ford
31. Andrew Carnegie
32. William Jennings Bryan
33. Farmers' Alliance
34. Populism
35. Progressivism
36. Prohibition
37. Women's Suffrage
38. Jane Addams
39. Settlement Houses
40. Pancho Villa
41. William R. Hearst
42. Emilio Aguinaldo
43. Annexation of Hawaii
44. Philippine Insurrection
45. Cuban Revolution
46. Clarence Darrow
47. Woodrow Wilson
48. Herbert Hoover
49. Scopes Trial
50. George Plunkett
51. World War I/The Great War
52. Uboat Warfare
53. Zimmerman Telegram
54. Fourteen Points
55. Spanish Flu
56. Sacco and Vanzetti
57. Charles Lindbergh
58. Bolshevik Revolution
59. Lenin
60. Communism
61. Flappers
62. The Jazz Age
63. Harlem Renaissance
64. Booker T. Washington
65. W.E.B. Du Boise
66. Langston Hughes
67. Claude McKay
68. Stock Market Crash
69. Scottsboro Boys
70. Marian Anderson
71. Eleanor Roosevelt
72. New Deal
73. Second New Deal
74. Works Progress Administration
75. Great Depression
76. Forced Deportation
77. World War II
78. Hitler
79. Manhattan Project
80. A-bomb
81. Internment Camps
82. Theodore Roosevelt
83. Franklin D. Roosevelt
84. Henry Cabot Lodge
85. Vietnam
86. Hippies
87. Nazis
88. Cold War
89. Communism
90. Stalin
91. Winston Churchill
92. Attack on Pearl Harbor
93. John F. Kennedy
94. Lyndon B. Johnson
95. The Great Society
96. Ronald Reagan

Book Review Assignment and Samples

Dear All:

Here are some basic elements to a book review. Be sure to address these and put them in context with other things we've read this semester. As I mentioned, I've handed out two exemplarily student essays for your use as examples if you like. The two student writings, of course, are of an earlier assignment, so they do not address all of the requirements of assignment three, but they contain astute language and methods of analysis, as well as an ownership of the arguments and ideas of other historians we have read this semester. If you choose to review a historical novel, you must discuss historical accuracy/inaccuracy.

How to Write a Book Review for History

1. What is a Book Review?

Webster's Third New International Dictionary defines a book review: n 1: a descriptive and critical or evaluative account of a book. Critical and evaluative are the key words that describe a book review. These two words distinguish a review from a report, which often is little more than a plot outline. A book review may be favorable, unfavorable, or mixed. A mixed review is usually a favorable review that expresses reservations.

2. How do I choose a book to review?

Try to select a book on a subject about which you have some knowledge. If you have limited knowledge of the subject, then choose what interests you because you may have to do some background reading in reference encyclopedias or handbooks in order to be able to judge how adequately the author of the book you are reviewing has covered the topic.

3. How do I go about writing my review?

Although you should always ask your instructor about which format to follow and the desired length of the review, here are some general guidelines that may be helpful. Be brief. Remember, you are writing a review, not a report. Structure your review into a series of paragraphs. Each paragraph should deal with a single aspect of your criticism. Open your review by summarizing the subject matter of the book. Note the author's scope in treating the subject matter. In your next paragraph, present the main point, or thesis, that the author is making in the book. What is the author saying about the subject and why did the author write this book? Follow this with several paragraphs that expand on the arguments the author advances to support the thesis. Here you will want to give detailed evidence by quoting pertinent examples. Are the author's facts correct?

Place the book within a context. Have others written about this subject? To what extent does the author of the book you are reviewing accept or reject what others have said about the topic? Has the author offered new evidence, or has the author offered a new interpretation of the same evidence used by others? Are the author's judgments about the evidence sound? Does the author's work fill a gap in the existing literature about the subject? Conclude your review by balancing the book's strengths and weaknesses, achievements and failures, ending with something about the author's qualification to write on this subject.

*Sally Moffitt
History Bibliographer
401 Langsam Library
Revised and updated October 2003*

Another Suggestion/Approach to Book Reviews

Steps for Writing a Good Book Review

Introduce the subject, scope, and type of book

Identify the book by **author**, **title**, and sometimes **publishing information**.

Specify the **type** of book (for example, fiction, nonfiction, biography, autobiography). Help your readers to review with perspective.

Mention the book's **theme**.

Sometimes you will need to include **background** to enable reader(s) to place the book into a specific context. For example, you might want to describe the general problem the book addresses or earlier work the author or others have done.

Briefly summarize the content

For a nonfiction book, provide an overview, including paraphrases and quotations, of the book's thesis and primary supporting points.

For a work of fiction, briefly review the story line for readers, being careful not to give away anything that would lessen the suspense for readers.

Provide your reactions to the book

Describe the book: Is it interesting, memorable, entertaining, instructive? Why?

Respond to the author's opinions: What do you agree with? And why? What do you disagree with? And why?

Explore issues the book raises: What possibilities does the book suggest? Explain. What matters does the book leave out? Explain.

Relate your argument to other books or authors: Support your argument for or against the author's opinions by bringing in other authors you agree with.

Relate the book to larger issues: How did the book affect you? How have your opinions about the topic changed? How is the book related to your own course or personal agenda.

Conclude by summarizing your ideas

Close with a direct comment on the book, and tie together issues raised in the review. Briefly restate your main points and your thesis statement if your teacher requires it. If you like, you can offer advice for potential readers.

If you're still having trouble getting started writing your review, try working through some [prewriting questions](#) for writing reviews of books, movies, or plays.

[Return to the Write Place Catalogue](#)

© 1995, 1996, 1997 The Write Place

This handout was written by Maria Escales for LEO and the Write Place, St. Cloud State University. It may

be copied for educational purposes only. If you copy this document, please include our copyright notice and the name of the writer; if you revise it, please add your name to the list of writers.

Last update: 28 September 1997

URL: <http://leo.stcloudstate.edu/acadwrite/bookrev.html>

YOU ONLY HAVE 2000 TO 3000 WORDS, SO ORGANIZATION, PRIORITIZATION, AND CAREFUL ARTICULATION OF YOUR IDEAS IS PARAMOUNT.

Samples

A Psychosexual Confession

A Critical Analysis of Homosexual Rape in *Constructing the Black Masculine*

“Suddenly, the inexperienced traveler, surprised by the storm, discovers himself washed ashore, needy and disconcerted, onto the alien banks of racial and sexual self-consciousness. What follows is the troubled discovery of social meaninglessness” (Wallace 85). The preceding quote describes a young slave boy’s first awareness of his identity as both black and male. What this young slave boy probably hadn’t yet become aware of was the unique psychosexual formation, degradation, and rearticulation of his masculinity at work within the slavery system. Indeed, it seems that even most historians have yet to fully understand these complex processes, as such an understanding would require acknowledgment of the potential sexual interplay between male slaveholder and male slave, something that is noticeably absent from the great majority of historic slave discourse. However, Maurice Wallace’s *Constructing the Black Masculine* marks one of the very few attempts to recognize a homosexual perversity toward slaves by their masters. In his book, Wallace describes, through a close reading of the primary slave narratives *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass* and *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl*, the apparent silence in slave narratives toward homosexual rape, how this silence actually masks a great deal of repression amongst male slaves concerning the threat of rape, and the general emasculation that resulted from this threat. While his arguments are persuasive and groundbreaking, especially considering the extreme lack of academic study in the area of homosexual male rape of slaves, I believe that his reasoning can be better understood when situated within the parameters of Laura Mulvey’s psychosexual theory of castration. In the following paper, I will describe Wallace’s conclusions toward homosexual slave rape, as well as explain how Mulvey’s theory of male castration fear can account for the unique manifestations of masculinity amongst both slaves and masters.

Keeping the Silence

Perhaps, the most striking and revolting aspect of the American slave trade is the widespread rape of slave women by their masters. As Edward Baptist affirms, “the business was a slave-trading partnership, and systematic rape and sexual abuse of slave women were part of the normal practice of the men who ran the firm” (1). Indeed, such sexual abuse allowed for slaveholders to perpetuate an idea of black women as commodities and to increasingly neglect their humanity. Further justification for this sexual abuse can be found in the realization of the slave woman’s body as “a symbol of the deceptive beauty...of blackness” (Morgan 169). Similar discourse concerning the rape of slave women can be found in almost all of the slave narratives; as Harriet Jacobs relates, her master was the father of eleven slaves (32) and made many sexual advances toward her, asking her, “Do you know that I have a right to do as I like with you...?” (36). Undoubtedly, the great majority of slaveholders felt as if they had just this right with all of their slaves – both female *and* male.

It is difficult, then, to understand why no such accounts of homosexual male slave rape are evident. Indeed, slaveholders saw their male slaves as similar viable commodities; such commodification required processes of dehumanization to detract from the resulting guilt a slaveholder could experience. However, the dehumanization of male slaves is rarely recorded as sexual exploitation. Additionally, as Wallace elaborates, “the sexual horrors of slavery were [further] inspired by racialist fantasies about black eros, male and female” (88). If such sexual fantasies and sexual dehumanization could potentially apply to both male and female slaves, it is curious why so few homosexual abuse cases are noted.

Wallace explains the notable absence of homosexual abuse accounts by referencing Sigmund Freud’s theory of psychological repression to expel acknowledgment of our fears, desires, and impulses (83). As he states, first-person subjectivity in primary narratives “rests upon the autobiographer’s success in repressing ‘everything that...in some way or other [is] painful...alarming or disagreeable or shameful by the standards of the subject’s personality.’” In this manner, Wallace suggests that the first-person slave

narratives mask a severe repression of shameful homosexual advances. Indeed, as Ronald Summit notes in his analysis of child sexual abuse in wealthy families, it is “most conspicuous for its presumed absence” (40). Although Summit speaks to child sexual abuse, this idea of specific avoidance of a topic so natural to any discussion of sexual abuse may be applied to our own study. An analysis of the narrative of Cuban slave Esteban Montejo reveals a kind of elliptical gap in Montejo’s boyhood memories, as he writes, “if a boy was pretty and lively he was sent inside, to the master’s house. And there they started softening him up...well, I don’t know!” Charles Nero notes this passage as evidence of “physical abuse and possibly the rape of young black boys,” identifying Montejo’s supposed poor memory as a repression of violent recollections (975).

Further arguments for the absence of male rape narratives demonstrate the rules of social etiquette of the times. As Wallace claims, many slaves could not relate such sexual tales due to the “limits of public decorum” (89). I further argue that the society’s emphasis on Christianity refused an acknowledgement of homosexual behavior amongst the upstanding southern planters. Just as “for the African, the sin that caused him to be a less perfect or inferior image of God was his race” (Higginbotham 89), the Christian-based southern communities believed that, according to the Bible, homosexuality would blacken the souls of morally righteous white men. Indeed, as Southern culture was primarily a system of appearances, these white slaveholders necessarily were God-fearing, homophobic men in public. However, I argue that such appearances often served as slaveholders’ own form of repression, a way to conceal their systematic abuse of millions of innocent people beneath a virtuous veneer.

Emergent Whispers

Although Wallace maintains that few slave narratives overtly discuss instances of homosexual male slave rape, he does argue that insinuations of such sexual abuse are readily apparent, beginning with an analysis of *The Narrative of Frederick Douglass*. Noting the scene in which Douglass watches his master punish his Aunt Hester for disobeying her master by going out one night with a man named Ned

Roberts, Wallace interprets the punishment – which, at surface level, seems to be a whipping – as a rape, emphasizing the master’s positioning of Hester “for his fair infernal purpose” (24). Such an interpretation gives an entirely new light to Douglass’ claim, “I expected it would be my turn next.” Indeed, as Wallace observes, “Douglass reveals his own sexual vulnerability by a scopophobic worry betraying the spectragraphic surrogacy of the black woman’s body for Douglass’ frightful fantasies of male rape” (86). Although some historians argue that Douglass simply does not understand that the violation of Hester’s body is a “uniquely female experience” (Van Leer 131), Wallace asserts that Douglass’ observations imply the ubiquity of the “master’s wanton hand” (87), roving not only the woman’s body, but also the man’s.

Wallace further evaluates the legendary scene in which Douglass physically retaliates against the slave-breaker Covey. While this scene may be superficially read as Douglass’ reaction to the threat of Covey’s whip, Wallace suggests that Douglass is, instead, resisting the threat of rape that he unconsciously relates to whipping, an association consequential of his observation of the simultaneous whipping and rape of Hester (91). Indeed, in accordance with Frantz Fanon’s suggestion that sexuality is inherent in all “cruelties, torture, [and] beatings” (59), the battle between Douglass and Covey is rich with sexually-charged language. As Douglass writes, “Mr. Covey seemed now to think he had me, and could *do what he pleased*; but at this moment...I resolved to fight...I seized Covey hard by the throat; and as I did so, I *rose*. He *held on to me*, and I to him...[Covey] *trembled like a leaf*. This gave me assurance and *I held him* uneasy, causing the blood to run where *I touched him with the ends of my fingers*” (81). Interestingly, the language Douglass uses symbolically represents not the masters’ sexual abuse of the slave; rather, Douglass takes sexual control of his master, as Covey “trembles” in submission (Wallace 93). Consequently, this battle revives in Douglass “a sense of [his] own manhood” (82).

In a similar analysis of Harriet Jacobs’ *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl*, Wallace derives parallel homosexual insinuations from the story of Jacobs’ acquaintance and fellow slave Luke. Although it is never overtly stated that Luke is a victim of homosexual abuse, Jacobs does note that he was often

forced to “kneel beside the couch” on which his master lie in order to receive his ‘beatings’ and was often “not allowed to wear anything but his shirt” (156). Indeed, when Jacobs leaves Luke, he is actually “chained to the bedside of this cruel and disgusting wretch” (157). Of course, Luke’s master was said to be bedridden without use of his limbs, necessitating such bedside care. However, Jacobs explains that the master’s physical disabilities are a result of the “vices growing out of the ‘patriarchal institution’” (156). According to Wallace, such vices indicate masturbation and sodomy, as “medical science of the period [diagnosed] such sudden dissipation and palsy as that manifested by Luke’s master, once vigorous and virile, [as] the consequences of sexual perversions, for which the usual prognosis was progressive dementia” (89). As Jacobs concludes, “Some of these freaks were of a nature too filthy to be repeated” (156); as whipping is constantly referred to throughout her narrative, one may reason that she is not merely referring to such physical violence, but, instead, to the then-considered abomination of homosexuality.

Masculinity Displaced

Much of Wallace’s analysis investigates the consequential emasculation experienced by the victims of this homosexual abuse. In considering Douglass’ voyeurism of Hester’s rape as a kind of “empathetic identification with Hester’s indefensibility, Douglass’ fear of also being raped by Anthony discloses a pubescent psychosexual libidinality situated between the more formal poles of the libidinal masculine and the libidinal feminine” (Wallace 90). Just as slaves found their social identities constantly being formed by the interplay of White and Black, the male slaves who experienced both these fears and the materialization of these fears undoubtedly found their sexual identities trapped between the biological fact of their maleness and the psychosexual implications of bisexuality. And, as Wallace affirms, “it is precisely this constitutional polymorphism, ‘this vatic bisexuality which doesn’t annul [sexual] differences but stirs them up, pursues them, increases their number, that boys under patriarchy – especially slaveboys – cannot endure” (91).

It is here, I argue, that a complex understanding of the various constructions of a slave boy's masculinity must be examined, noting the formation, degradation, and rearticulation of their manliness. As their gender never assured them the same kind of power that male slaveholders were given purely by virtue of their roles as men (Wallace 85), these slaves were born victims of stolen masculinity. In participating in their own slave families, in marrying their wives and fathering their children, slaves were able to form fragile and, often, temporary constructions of masculinity. However, their experiences with homosexual rape and the consequent implied bisexuality once more eradicated their feeble attempts at manliness. One may wonder, then, how their masculinity, and, indeed, the masculinity of the slaveholders who also participated in these homosexual acts, can be rearticulated, can be saved.

Castration: Becoming Woman, Becoming Man

Full understanding of my argument concerning both the destruction and the rearticulation of the male slave's masculinity requires first an appreciation of Laura Mulvey's "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." Although it is specifically directed at film studies, it is applicable here in terms of its understanding of man's need to distance himself from woman, who is both familiar to him as a human being and unfamiliar as a human being without a penis. To man, woman represents lack of a penis and, thus, castration; he sees woman, observes her lack of penis, and assumes that he, too, could lose his penis (42). Mulvey asserts that

the male unconscious has two avenues of escape from this castration anxiety: preoccupation with the re-enactment of the original trauma (investigating the woman, demystifying her mystery), counterbalanced by the devaluation, punishment, or saving of the guilty object...; or else complete disavowal of castration by the substitution of a fetish object or turning the represented figure itself into a fetish so that it becomes reassuring rather than dangerous. (42)

Both of these avenues of escape are evident in the daily mechanisms of the slave trade, realized by all men involved – both black and white.

Male slaves represent a dual threat of castration for male slaveholders: the threat of being enslaved and the threat of being emasculated. As enslavement necessarily means a loss of agency, the very institution of slavery can be associated with castration, which necessarily indicates a parallel loss of sexual agency. Similarly, as male slaves are born into this state of stolen masculinity, they further represent the potential for absence of masculinity, or, symbolically-speaking, absence of penis.

In pursuing the first avenue of escape from castration, the slaveholder must re-enact the original traumas of the black slaves: their enslavement and emasculation. To do so, he must participate in a kind of sadism; as Mulvey maintains, “pleasure lies in ascertaining guilt, asserting control, and subjugating the person through punishment or forgiveness” (42). It is not difficult to understand how the slaveholders attributed guilt to the male slaves. European male travelers to Africa recorded observations of the black woman’s monstrosity in her body, her sexuality, and her childbirth practices (Morgan). Evolution of these concepts only led to a widespread American belief in the stupidity and beastliness of the black people in general. Undoubtedly, many shared the sentiment that the very fact that one could be enslaved said something about one’s character. Furthermore, in addressing the guilt of emasculated black slaves, a slaveholder could merely point to the inability of the slave to protect his wife, his children. Forgetting that the slaveholder, himself, had imposed these meanings, these conditions, and these institutions on the slave (Baptist 4), the slaveholder essentially forgets that he created the necessary differences between the slave and himself, between the emasculated and himself. However, he constantly unconsciously remembers his discovery of these differences (Baptist 5) and, hence, returns to this discovery through his constant assertion of control and subsequent punishment of the slave for his differences. In this new light, we may consider the imposing of the shackles of slavery, as well as the homosexual rape of slave men as punishments for the sins of blackness and emasculation. The slaveholders’ assertion of control allows

him to suppress the threatening presence of both sins, saving himself from his own enslavement and emasculation.

Pursuit of the second avenue of escape requires the slaveholder to participate in a commodity fetishism of the male slaves, transforming them from sexual threats to economic assets. In the perpetuation of both slavery and emasculation in male slaves in order to maintain order within slavery, slaveholders are able to ensure their own economic futures. Simultaneously, slaveholders are able to commodify slaves, to scrutinize them only in terms of a cost-benefits analysis. Their own objectification of male slaves allows them to reassert their control and eradicate any threats that they pose.

An understanding of the slaves' plight in resisting the threat of castration is necessarily complicated by their unique dual role as men who stand to lose their masculinity and as threat of that masculinity in their already-materialized emasculation through the homosexual abuse of the slaveholders. For instance, as Douglass observes the rape of Aunt Hester, he is able to both identify with Hester's "indefensibility," as well as voyeuristically and biologically identify with his master. This 'in-between' state of sexual identity furthers Wallace's claim for the male slaves' distressing bisexuality. In reaction to his ambiguous state, Wallace explains that the male slave "seems hurried to differentiate himself, to counter his own 'feminine' self-representation...and prove the phallic perfectibility of black men" (91).

Indeed, much of the male slave's escape from the threat of castration entails a necessary identification with the male slaveholder. Undoubtedly, the apparent self-sufficiency of black women threatened both male slaveholders and slaves, alike. As Elizabeth Fox-Genovese questions, "should the independence of [slave] women be interpreted as a collective gain or merely as the confirmation of slave men's weakness...?" (49). Such apparent strength in slave women exacerbated the threat of castration they posed to slave men, necessitating the avenues of escape that were previously exercised by the slaveholders. As Nell Irvin Painter describes, "As slaveowning children grew into adults, their identification with victims or victimizers often accorded to gender...white women were more likely to

take the side of the slaves, while white men nearly unanimously saw identifying with the aggressor as a requisite of manhood. Becoming such a man did not happen automatically or painlessly” (26). Although Irvin’s observation relates specifically to slaveowners, the claim for identification with aggressor can be carried through to a discussion of male slaves. I argue that male slaves, too, require this identification with aggression in order to enact the necessary subordination of the feminine and the subsequent claiming of the masculine.

Interestingly, due to the slaves’ unique sexual identity, the destruction of the castration threat they seek in subordination of women necessarily invokes their own destruction, as partial members of the effeminate community. It is this self-destructive position that poses perhaps the gravest challenge to the male slave’s masculinity. The slaveholders’ homosexual advances ultimately create in the slave a partial femininity demanding to be recognized, which, in turn, leads to the destruction of his identity in his biological and psychosexual need to suppress the feminine. There is a certain impossibility, then, in the potential for a successful slave masculinity when such homosexual abuse is present.

Conclusion

Wallace quotes Michel Foucault’s *The History of Sexuality*, “The most defenseless tenderness and the bloodiest powers have a similar need of confession. Western man has become a confessing animal” (86). This not only refers to the, perhaps, subconscious insinuations of homosexuality made within the slave narratives, but also to the subconscious drives of both the slaveholder and the slave to come to terms with their sexual identities, even if such confession and acknowledgement inevitably leads to one’s destruction. The complex mechanisms of a forming and reforming masculinity are evident in the slave trade and its binary poles of “black and white, male and man, biology and psychology” (85). Perhaps, it is time for history to come to an acknowledgment of all of these poles, to come to an acknowledgment of the homosexual abuse as recognized by Wallace, to come to an acknowledgment of

the role of castration anxiety as I argue with the aid of Mulvey. Indeed, it is time for history to come to its own confession.

Works Cited

1. Baptist, Edward. "‘Cuffy,’ ‘Fancy Maids,’ and ‘One-Eyed Men’: Rape, Commodification, and the Domestic Slave Trade in the United States." *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 106, No. 5 (Dec. 2001). 16 April, 2008. <<http://www.historycooperative.org/journals/ahr/106.5/ah0501001619.html>>.
2. Douglass, Frederick. *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass*. New York: Signet Classics, 1997.
3. Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin White Masks*. Trans. Charles Lam Markmann. New York: Grove, 1967.
4. Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth. "Southern Women, Southern Households." In *Within the Plantation Household: Black and White Women of the Old South*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 37-99.
5. Higginbotham, A. Leon. "The Ancestry of Inferiority." In *How Did American Slavery Begin?* Ed. Edward Countryman. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 1999. 87-98.
6. Jacobs, Harriet. *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl*. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 2001.
7. Morgan, Jennifer. "'Some Could Suckle over Their Shoulder': Male Travelers, Female Bodies, and the Gendering of Racial Ideology, 1500-1770." *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Ser., Vol. 54, No. 1. (Jan., 1997): 167-192.
8. Mulvey, Laura. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." In *Feminism and Film*. Ed E. Ann Kaplan. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. 34-47.
9. Nero, Charles. "Toward a Black Gay Aesthetic: Signifying in Contemporary Black Gay Literature." In *Cornerstones: An Anthology of African American Literature*. Ed. Melvin Donalson. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996. 971-989.
10. Painter, Nell Irvin. *Soul Murder and Slavery*. Markham Press Fund, 1993.
11. Summit, Ronald. "Hidden Victims, Hidden Pain: Societal Avoidance of Child Sexual Abuse." In *Lasting Effects of Child Sexual Abuse*. Ed. Gail Elizabeth Wyatt and Gloria Johnson Powell. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1988.
12. Van Leer, David. "Reading Slavery: The Anxiety of Ethnicity in Douglass' *Narrative*." In *Frederick Douglass: New Literary and Historical Essays*. Ed. Eric J Sundquist. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

13. Wallace, Maurice. "Constructing the Black Masculine." *Constructing the Black Masculine*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2002. 82-107.

Sample 2

Patriarchs, Power, and the Struggle to Maintain It: An Examination of "Planters and Patriarchy: Charleston, 1800-1860"

Michael P. Johnson's article "Planters and Patriarchy: Charleston, 1800-1860," examines Charleston's planter society in search of exposing the center of planter patriarchy and the means by which patriarchal power spread through the antebellum south. Primarily, the planters' rule relied on the coercion and subordination of those within their households and among society as a whole. Johnson argues that in public, planters spoke of their slaves as members of an extended plantation family, thus slaves were bound to their masters through ties of dependence.¹ Within this patriarchal society, planters justified family subordination through the concept of reciprocity. Since planters' patrimony depended on the success of slave labor, slaves, like the other family members, were expected to be obedient and subordinate. Slaves, however, never truly consented, which made coercion necessary tool for masters. In "Planters and Patriarchy," Johnson argues that when planters attempted to justify the coercion of slaves with patriarchal ideology, the coercion extended within their own white families. Consequently, the slave based patriarchal authority created its own conflicts through the challenges that threatened its own legitimacy.

According to Johnson, "planters claimed that the principles that structured their society originated in the patriarchal family."² Even though these households were based upon the coercion of family members and slaves alike, planters legitimized their dominance through the responsibilities of fatherhood

¹ Johnson, Michael P. "Planters and Patriarchy: Charleston, 1800-1860." *The Journal of Southern History* 46, no. 1 (Feb., 1980): 45.

² Johnson, 46.

and the pride of their family lineage. To these planters, coercion was a perfectly natural aspect of reciprocity between themselves and their dependents. Johnson, however, recognizes that the “legitimacy of the planters’ patriarchy was based on coercion and a family corrupted by race and slavery.”³ For Johnson, the patriarchal ideals were a way to justify the manipulation of other members of society. Similarly, in Eugene D. Genovese’s book, *Roll, Jordan, Roll*, Genevese argues that southern paternalism “grew out of the necessity to discipline and morally justify a system of exploitation.”⁴ Like Johnson, Genovese recognizes that paternalism had less to do with kindness and benevolence than it did creating social distinction and maintaining patriarchal power. He suggests that paternalism in the antebellum south characterized the involuntary slave labor as a legitimate return for protection from their masters. Further, paternalism defines the relations of subordination.⁵ In Johnson’s article, this subordination was the backbone of paternalistic power, and consequently, the patriarchal ideal for southern planters.

In “Planters and Patriarchs,” Johnson argues that the father’s authority primarily structured patriarchal families.⁶ Thus, the father’s role as provider and protector gave legitimacy to patriarchal authority. As such, the planters created images of the ideal father, which became the standard of excellence among these men.⁷ Johnson argues that as paternalistic idealism became more prominent, family names became the most significant form of paternal glorification. These names suggested that the preceding relatives had lived up to the patriarchal ideal. Thus, a family’s name became its identity, which was embedded among a system of patriarchal authority, and consequently, needed to be upheld. As James Oakes argues in his book, *The Ruling Race*, “the high social standing of the professional could afford him more than just material wealth and access to power.”⁸ Family names led to patriarchal power, which in a society ruled by paternalistic ideals, led to high social standing. Therefore, the family names mentioned in Johnson’s article could create greater opportunities than material wealth and power.

³ Johnson, 47.

⁴ Genovese, Eugene D. *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made*. New York: Vintage Books, 1976. 4.

⁵ Genovese, Eugene D., 5.

⁶ Johnson, 48.

⁷ Johnson, 48.

⁸ Oakes, James. *The Ruling Race*. Vintage Books, 1983. 11.

Johnson supports that as family names became increasingly important sources of societal authority, sons were expected to uphold the family name in order to secure their fathers' power. In doing so, planters' sons not only secured their fathers' authority, but sought to protect their lineage in hopes of one day inheriting its influence. In a letter to his nephew, southern planter Alfred Huger reminds him to "never forget what is due to your father's name."⁹ In this society marked by subordination and obedience, planters' sons were expected to honor their fathers by submitting to his authority and obeying his commands. Johnson argues that "sons were expected to follow their fathers' inclinations, not their own."¹⁰ In this sense, a son's only hope to gain his own authority was to submit to that of his father.

Like the planters' sons, the subordination of women was highly prevalent. In her book *Within the Plantation Household*, Elizabeth Fox-Genovese argues that "the distinctive forms of male dominance in the South developed in conjunction with the development of slavery as a social system."¹¹ As a result, as planters continued to insist on obedience and subordination from their slaves, their dominance extended to their own families, particularly women. Johnson argues that in the ideal patriarchal society, planters' wives and daughters remained far below the planters' seat of power.¹² Further, he argues that "within planter families, power, like wealth, belonged almost exclusively to the planters."¹³ Within this patriarchal society, women served two primary roles, to link successful patriarchal lineages through marriage and to continue the patriarchy by giving birth to heirs.¹⁴ As a father wrote to his daughter following her marriage, "the first maxim ... is never to attempt to control your husband."¹⁵ Johnson argues that women, like all others, were expected to remain obedient to their husbands' wishes, which protected his authority and enhanced the entire patriarchal ideal.

⁹ Huger quoted in Johnson, 49

¹⁰ Johnson 50.

¹¹ Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth. *Within the Plantation Household*. UNC Press, 1988. 43.

¹² Johnson, 50.

¹³ Johnson, 51.

¹⁴ Johnson, 50.

¹⁵ "A Letter of Advice" quoted in Johnson, 51.

As slaves were often regarded as members of the plantation family, they were also subject to the planters' authority. In "Planters and Patriarchy," however, Johnson emphasizes the planters' dependence on slavery and the paradox that this creates. Ultimately, the strength of the patriarchy was determined by the nature of the estate, which consisted of land and slaves.¹⁶ Johnson suggests that "the problem of Charleston planters was not to attain but to maintain an estate, and for that, they depended on slaves."¹⁷ The labor that slaves provided made the planters' land valuable. Since the patriarchs' power was a direct result of their land, he was dependent on the work of his slaves to uphold his patriarchal authority. Just as the patriarchs had to maintain control of their families, they had to do the same with their slaves. Thus, Johnson argues that "to maintain the patriarchy, planters had to exercise control over both their slaves and their family members."¹⁸ Planters controlled their slaves through coercion, while their patriarchal ideals and societal authority encouraged subordination and dependence among their family members. Consequently, Johnson argues that slaves and families were nearly one in the same in the realm of patriarchy; each was subject to the power of the planter patriarchs and helped to maintain their authority in society.

Returning to Eugene Genovese, patriarchy "was an anomaly even at the moment of its greatest apparent strength."¹⁹ This idea of patriarchy disguised the planters' use of power to control the slaves' labor. Johnson asserts that "so long as patriarchal authority could be based on consent, so long as the patriarch honored his lineage, and so long as the patrimony could be maintained, the tensions within the patriarchal family did not approach the breaking point."²⁰ As planters began to emphasize the familial reciprocity of slavery, however, they inadvertently exposed the coercive nature of their patriarchal power and created questions of legitimacy. Thus, Johnson reveals the conflict within the southern patriarchal ideal.

¹⁶ Johnson, 53.

¹⁷ Johnson, 53.

¹⁸ Johnson, 55.

¹⁹ Genovese, Eugene D., 6.

²⁰ Johnson, 55.

In order to maintain patriarchal authority, family members had to conform to these ideals. In doing so, however, they diminished the likelihood that the patrimony would be preserved and that the patriarchy would remain intact. Planters expected their sons, wives, and daughters to respect the patriarchal ideals and to act accordingly, which created conflict within the family and raised questions about the legitimacy of the patriarchs' power.²¹ Johnson shows that "the planters' family was both his pride and his problem."²² In order to maintain patriarchy, planters had to provide for their children, but by subdividing the estate among them, the planters diminished the probability that the patriarchal dynasty would survive. In 1862, planter William John Grayson stated, "This perpetual subdivision of estates is detrimental to the master, to the slaves, to the land, and therefore, to the state."²³ For planters, dividing their estates meant dividing their power and for them, this threatened the entire hierarchy of the patriarchal society. Johnson suggests that planters' sons were expected to become planters. Their fathers' expectations and estates encouraged them to depend upon the paternal inheritance rather than their own personal industry.

Johnson shows that "the patriarchal ideal required sons to learn to be rulers while they were taught to be subject."²⁴ Ultimately, the planters demanded subordinate sons and discouraged personal advancement, which often led to idle sons trapped in the conflict of patriarchy. Johnson shows that while family lineage depended upon planters' sons becoming successful farmers, planters' could only maintain their own authority so long as their sons remained dependent upon the patriarchy. Planters used their estate to maintain control of their sons, but this prolonged obedience kept them indefinitely dependent upon their fathers, rather than becoming active members of the planter society.²⁵ Through this argument, Johnson shows that the planters only preserved their power as long as those around them remained

²¹ Johnson, 55.

²² Johnson, 55.

²³ Johnson, 56.

²⁴ Johnson, 57.

²⁵ Johnson, 58.

submerged in their patriarchal dependency. Ultimately, the planters depended on their families and their slaves to uphold their authority and justify their exploitation of obedience.

Planters' sons were expected to maintain the paternal estate with little hope of obtaining it, while women were expected to uphold the patriarchal family. Both, however, were absolutely essential for preserving the patriarchal ideal.²⁶ Ultimately, however, the legitimacy of the subordination of these white family members depended on the slaves. Without their coercion, the patriarchal ideal would have no authority and the planters could not have asserted such upon their own families. "Planters and Patriarchy" addresses the paradox between patriarchal authority and the dependence these planters had on everyone around them. Johnson's focus on both the planter family and the slaves creates a unique look into the lives of the planter elite and the patriarchal ideals they created. Overall, Michael P. Johnson's article "Planters and Patriarchy: Charleston, 1800-1860" creates a well laid out argument that exposes the dependencies of the planters within such a powerful society. He shows their power was a result of their own dependence on the subordination of those around them. In relation to Eugene Genovese, Elizabeth Genovese-Fox, and James Oakes, Johnson uses a combination of several aspects of the planter society to create his own exploration of paternalism and its authority.

Johnson's examination of Charleston's planter society exposes the heart of planter patriarchy and gives deep insight to the process through which it spread. His use of primary resources, including planters themselves and women's diaries from the time creates a balance between different views in order to best support his argument. Johnson discusses the patriarchal ideal through the planters' sons, women, and slaves, each of which provide different aspects within his argument. Each of these come together and culminates in the ultimate paradox within southern society. Planters were dependent upon others' subordination in order to create and maintain their own patriarchal authority. As Johnson demonstrates throughout his article, the planters recognized the family as the central structure of the patriarchal ideology, but it was only through their exploitation that the planters were able to create dependence and

²⁶ Johnson, 65.

obedience. Essentially, however, the family's obedience was a direct result of the institution of slavery itself. The authority of the patriarchs emerged from their dependence on slaves, which were the foundation on which they were able to build their ideology. The contradictions among the patriarchal ideal reveal the complexity of the slave society as a whole, specifically in the context of patriarchs, power, and their journey to maintain it.

Bibliography

Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth. *Within the Plantation Household*. UNC Press, 1988.

Genovese, Eugene D. *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made*. New York: Vintage Books, 1976.

Johnson, Michael P. "Planters and Patriarchy: Charleston, 1800-1860." *The Journal of Southern History* 46, no. 1 (Feb., 1980).

Oakes, James. *The Ruling Race*. Vintage Books, 1983.

A Guide to Effective Oral Presentations: 3 S's and a Challenge

Adapted from: David Whetton and Kim Cameron, *Developing Management Skills*, 1991.

STRATEGY

- 1. Tailor your message to your audience.** What is your objective? To motivate? To inform? To persuade? To Teach? Understand the audience's needs, knowledge, and attitudes about your topic. Be concrete, specific, practical, and relevant.
- 2. Develop a logically compelling case for your plan.** Show how it solves a key problem, fosters a salient value, or reaches a goal. Avoid loose generalizations and poor logic.
- 3. Do not try to say too much. It always takes longer than you thought it would, so plan to use only 80% of the time allotted you.** Speak slowly -- about 100 words per minute. Allow time for changing transparencies. It takes 3 to 5 minutes to make each major point.

STRUCTURE

- 4. Organize your presentation in a logical sequence.** Begin by placing your topic in context and stating your objective. Outline what you are going to say, then say it. Focus on a few key points. Move from simple to complex, from before to after, from familiar to unfamiliar. Conclude with a summary and a specific proposal.
- 5. Use exhibits to enhance your message.** You can use quite a few slides or screen-show displays, but you should use only a moderate number of overhead transparencies because changing them takes time and distracts attention from what you are saying. Keep exhibits moderately simple and make sure the type is large enough to read easily from the back of the room. Avoid exhibits that contain many numbers. The best colors for transparencies are white or yellow lettering on dark blue backgrounds. Use variety or humor to keep your audience's attention.
- 6. Prepare for contingencies.** Adjust your pace and language to the audience's interest and comprehension. Anticipate comprehension difficulties.

STYLE

- 7. Present your material with controlled enthusiasm.** Project intensity and interest without shouting or preaching. Radiate confidence but be willing to make reasonable changes.
- 8. Candidly discuss pros and cons of your proposal.** Explain its advantages, then realistically appraise its risks and challenges. Conclude by reinforcing its benefits or proposing remedies for its deficiencies.
- 9. Never read a written speech.** Know what you are going to say well enough that you can say it with few cues -- say, key words on a card, or your visual aids. Speak naturally -- not faster than normal, nor with a stilted vocabulary. Counteract nervousness by memorizing your talk so thoroughly that you can deliver it conversationally.
- 10. Use natural and spontaneous body movements and facial expressions.** Use your body as well as the physical space to enhance your message. Keep direct eye contact with members of the audience. Pick out some specific people in different parts of the room, and direct your statements to them as if you were conversing. Use your hands to emphasize points, to direct attention, and merely to add action. Never put your hands in your pockets.
- 11. Provide variety and relief.** Alternate between speech and action, lecture and discussion. Use spontaneous humor wisely. Do not read your visual aids to the audience.

QUESTIONS AND CHALLENGES

- 12. Anticipate questions and prepare answers thoroughly.**
- 13. Use questions to strengthen your main arguments.** Answer questions candidly and positively.
Link objections to the positive features of your proposal.
- 14. Maintain control.** Be firm and assertive without being aggressive or defensive. Do not let interruptions disrupt your composure.