IT IS HARD TO FAIL, BUT IT IS WORSE NEVER TO HAVE TRIED TO SUCCEED.

-Theodore Roosevelt-
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Topic / Content</th>
<th>For Class</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Homework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 5</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>STAFF INSERVICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 6</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Introduction of the DBQ</td>
<td>DBQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Read Ch 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 7</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>DBQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 8</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Ch 16 Conquering a Continent</td>
<td>Quiz, note check</td>
<td>Quiz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 9</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Ch 16 Conquering a Continent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Read Ch 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 12</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Ch 17 Industrial America</td>
<td>Quiz, note check</td>
<td>Quiz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 13</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Ch 17 Industrial America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 14</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Ch 17 Industrial America</td>
<td>Essay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 15</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>ELA SIMULATION</td>
<td>Homerooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>MLK DAY</td>
<td>Staff Inservice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 20</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Unit 9 Test</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td></td>
<td>Read Ch 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 21</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Review Test</td>
<td>The Victorians</td>
<td>Quiz, note check</td>
<td>Quiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 22</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>The Victorians</td>
<td></td>
<td>Read: Social Darwinism/Gospel of Wealth Questions Due: 1/23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 23</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>The Victorians</td>
<td>Social Gospel</td>
<td>In Class</td>
<td>Read Ch 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 26</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>“Civilization’s Inferno”</td>
<td>Quiz, note check</td>
<td>Quiz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 27</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>“Civilization’s Inferno”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 28</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>“Civilization’s Inferno”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 29</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>“Civilization’s Inferno”</td>
<td>HIPP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Read Ch 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 30</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Whose Government?</td>
<td>Quiz, note check</td>
<td>Quiz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Essay</td>
<td>Essay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 3</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Unit 10 Test</td>
<td>Test (Ch. 18-19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 4</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Review Test</td>
<td>Whose Government?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 5</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Whose Government?</td>
<td>Spider Web</td>
<td>Read OpV 11 A/B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 6</td>
<td>Early Release</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Whose Government?</td>
<td>Seminar/ Article Analysis</td>
<td>Article Analysis Due Read Ch 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 9</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>An Emerging World Power</td>
<td>Quiz, note check</td>
<td>Quiz</td>
<td>Read: OpV 13 A/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 10</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>Counselor’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 11</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Annexation of the Philippines</td>
<td>Class Debate</td>
<td>Article Analysis Due</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 12</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>An Emerging World Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 13</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>An Emerging World Power</td>
<td>Imperialism to WW1</td>
<td>Spider Web</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 16</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>No School</td>
<td>Staff Inservice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 17</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Unit 11 Test</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 18</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Review Test</td>
<td>Essay</td>
<td>Read Ch 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 19</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Cultural Conflict, Bubble &amp; Bust</td>
<td>Quiz, note check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 20</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Cultural Conflict, Bubble &amp; Bust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 23</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Cultural Conflict, Bubble &amp; Bust</td>
<td>Causes of the Depression</td>
<td>Read Ch 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 24</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Great Depression/New Deal</td>
<td>Quiz, note check</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alphabet Chart Due 2/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 25</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Great Depression/New Deal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 26</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Great Depression/New Deal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Read Ch 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 27</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>The World at War</td>
<td>Quiz, note check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Essay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 3</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Unit 12 Test</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 4</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Review Test</td>
<td>Essay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 5</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>The World at War</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 6</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>The World at War</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Read Ch 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 9</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Cold War America Quiz, note check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 10</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Cold War America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 11</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Cold War America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 12</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>DBQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 13</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>DBQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**March 13 is the Last day of the Grading period**

**Spring Break – March 16 - 20**

**Unit 13 Test – March 24 or 25**
Social Philosophies of the Late Nineteenth Century

**Directions:** Read the following excerpts, answer the questions that follow, and be prepared for class discussion.

**William Graham Sumner: Social Darwinism**

Certain ills belong to the hardships of human life. They are natural. They are part of the struggle with Nature for existence. We cannot blame our fellow-men for our share of these. My neighbor and I are both struggling to free ourselves from these ills. The fact that my neighbor has succeeded in this struggle better than I constitutes no grievance for me. Certain other ills are due to the malice of men, and to the imperfections or errors of civil institutions. These ills are an object of agitation, and a subject of discussion. The former class of ills is to be met only by manly effort and energy; the latter may be corrected by associated effort. The former class of ills is constantly grouped and generalized, and made the object of social schemes. . . . The second class of ills may fall on certain social classes, and reform will take the form of interference by other classes in favor of that one. The last fact is, no doubt, the reason why people have been led, not noticing distinctions, to believe that the same method was applicable to the other class of ills. The distinction here made between the ills which belong to the struggle for existence and those which are due to the faults of human institutions is of prime importance. . . .

Under the names of the poor and the weak, the negligent, shiftless, inefficient, silly, and imprudent are fastened upon the industrious and prudent as a responsibility and a duty. On the one side, the terms are extended to cover the idle, intemperate, and vicious, who, by the combination, gain credit which they do not deserve, and which they could not get if they stood alone. One the other hand, the terms are extended to include wage-receivers of the humblest rank, who are degraded by the combination. The reader who desires to guard himself against fallacies should always scrutinize the terms “poor” and “weak” as used, so as to see which or how many of these classes they are made to cover.

The humanitarians, philanthropists, and reformers, looking at the facts of life as they present themselves, find enough which is sad and unpromising in the condition of many members of society. They see wealth and poverty side by side. They note great inequality of social position and social chances. They eagerly set about the attempt to account for what they see, and to devise schemes for remedying what they do not like. In their eagerness to recommend the less fortunate classes to pity and consideration they forget all about the rights of other classes; they gloss over all the faults of the classes in question, and they exaggerate their misfortunes and their virtues. They invent new theories of property, distorting rights and perpetrating injustice, as any one is sure to do who sees about the re-adjustment of social relations with the interest of one group distinctly before his mind, and the interests of all other groups thrown into the background. . . . The man who has done nothing to raise himself above poverty finds that the social doctors flock about him, bringing the capital which they have collected from the other class, and promising him the aid of the State to give him what the other had to work for. In all these schemes and projects the organized intervention of society through the State is either planned or hoped for, and the State is thus made to become the protector and guardian of certain classes. . . . Their schemes, therefore, may always be reduced to this type—that A and B decide what C shall do for D. . . . In all the discussions attention is concentrated on A and B, the noble social reformers, and on D, the “poor man,” I call C the Forgotten Man, because I have never seen that any notice was taken of him in any of the discussions. . . . Here it may suffice to observe that, on the theories of the social philosophers to whom I have referred, we should get a new maxim of judicious living: Poverty is the best policy.
If you get wealth, you will have to support other people; if you do not get wealth, it will be the duty of other people to support you . . . .

We each owe it to the other to guarantee rights. Rights do not pertain to results, but only to chances. They pertain to the conditions of the struggle for existence, not to any of the results of it; to the pursuit of happiness, not to the possession of happiness. It cannot be said that each one has a right to have some property, because if one man had such a right some other man or men would be under a corresponding obligation to provide him with some property. Each has a right to acquire and possess property if he can. . . . Rights should be equal, because they pertain to chances, and all ought to have equal chances so far as chances are provided or limited by the action of society. This, however, will not produce equal results, but it is right just because it will produce unequal results—that is, results which shall be proportioned to the merits of individuals.

1. What does Sumner say about the ills of human life?

2. What are the major mistakes in thinking on the part of the so-called social reformers?

3. Who is the Forgotten Man, according to Sumner?

4. What is the difference between rights and results?

5. Do you believe that Sumner is a Social Darwinist and an accurate representative of his philosophy?

Andrew Carnegie: The Gospel of Wealth

The problem of our age is the proper administration of wealth, that the ties of brotherhood may still bind together the rich and poor in harmonious relationship. The conditions of human life have not only been changed, but revolutionized, within the past few hundred years. In former days there was little difference between the dwelling, dress, food, and environment of the chief and those of his retainers. The Indians are today where civilized man then was. When visiting the Sioux, I was led to the wigwam of the chief. It was like the others in external appearance, and even within the difference was trifling between it and those of the poorest of his braves. The contrast between the palace of the millionaire and the cottage of the laborer with us today measures the change which has come with civilization. This change, however, is not to be deplored, but welcomed as highly beneficial. It is well, nay, essential, for the progress of the race that the houses of some should be homes for all that is highest and best in literature and the arts, and for all the refinements of civilization, rather than that none should be so. Much better this irregularity than universal squalor. Without wealth there can be no Maecenas...

The price which society pays for the law of competition, like the price it pays for cheap comforts and luxuries, is also great; but the advantages of this law are also greater still than its cost—for it is to this law that we owe our wonderful material development, which brings improved conditions in its train. But, whether the law be benign or not... It is here; we cannot evade it; no substitutes for it have been found; and while the law may be sometimes hard for the individual, it is best for the race, because it insures the survival of the fittest in every department. We accept and welcome, therefore, as conditions to which we must accommodate ourselves, great inequality of environment; the concentration of business, industrial and commercial, in the hands of a few; and the law of competition between these, as being not only beneficial, but essential for the future progress of the race...

Objections to the foundations upon which society is based are not in order, because the conditions of the race is better with these than it has been with any other which has been tried. Of the effect of any new substitutes proposed we cannot be sure. The Socialist or Anarchist who seeks to overturn present conditions is to be regarded as attacking the foundation upon which civilization itself rests, for civilization took its start from the day when the capable, industrious workman said to his incompetent and lazy fellow, "If thou dost not sow, thou shalt not reap," and thus ended primitive Communism by separating the drones from the bees. One who studies this subject will soon be brought face to face with the conclusion that upon the sacredness of property civilization itself depends—the right of the laborer to his hundred dollars in the savings-bank, and equally the legal right of the millionaire to his millions... To those who propose to substitute Communism for this intense Individualism, the answer therefore is: The race has tried that. All progress from that barbarous day to the present time has resulted from its displacement. Not evil, but good, has come to the race from the accumulation of wealth by those who have the ability and energy that produce it...

[There is] only one mode of using great fortunes; but in this we have the true antidote for the temporary unequal distribution of wealth, the reconciliation of the rich and the poor—a reign of harmony, another ideal, differing, indeed, from that of the Communist in requiring only the further evolution of existing conditions, not the total overthrow of our civilization. It is founded upon the present most intense Individualism, and the race is prepared to put it in practice by degrees whenever it pleases. Under its sway we shall have an ideal State, in which the surplus wealth of the few will become, in the best sense, the property of the many, because [it is] administered for the common good; and this wealth, passing through the hands of the few, can be made a much more potent force for the elevation of our race than if distributed in small sums to the people themselves.
Even the poorest can be made to see this, and to agree that great sums gathered by some of their fellow-citizens and spent for public purposes, from which the masses reap the principal benefit, are more valuable to them if scattered among themselves in trifling amounts through the course of many years....

Poor and restricted are our opportunities in this life, narrow our horizon, our best work most imperfect; but rich men should be thankful for one inestimable boon. They have it in their power during their lives to busy themselves in organizing benefactions from which the masses of their fellows will derive lasting advantage, and thus dignify their own lives. The highest life is probably to be reached, not by such imitation of the life of Christ as Count Tolstoi gives us, but, while animated by Christ's spirit, by recognizing the changed conditions of this age, and adopting modes of expressing this spirit suitable to the changed conditions under which we live, still laboring for the good of our fellows, which was the essence of his life and teaching, but laboring in a different manner.

This, then, is held to be the duty of the man of wealth: To set an example of modest, unostentatious living, shunning display or extravagance; to provide moderately for the legitimate wants of those dependent upon him; and, after doing so, to consider all surplus revenues which come to him simply as trust funds, which he is called upon to administer, and strictly bound as a matter of duty to administer in the manner which, in his judgment, is best calculated to produce the most beneficial results for the community—the man of wealth thus becoming the mere trustee and agent for his poorer brethren, bringing to their service his superior wisdom, experience, and ability to administer, doing for them better than they would or could do for themselves....

In bestowing charity, the main consideration should be to help those who will help themselves; to provide part of the means by which those who desire to improve may do so; to give those who desire to rise the aids by which they may rise; to assist, but rarely or never to do all. Neither the individual nor the race is improved by almsgiving.... He is the only true reformer who is as careful and as anxious not to aid the unworthy as he is to aid the worthy, and, perhaps, even more so, for in almsgiving more injury is probably done by rewarding vice than by relieving virtue....

Thus is the problem of rich and poor to be solved. The laws of accumulation will be left: free, the laws of distribution free. Individualism will continue, but the millionaire will be but a trustee for the poor; intrusted for a season with a great part of the increased wealth of the community, but administering it for the community far better than it could or would have done for itself. The best minds will thus have reached a stage in the development of the race in which it is clearly seen that there is no mode of disposing of surplus wealth creditable to thoughtful and earnest men into whose hands it flows, save by using it year by year for the general good. This day already dawns. Men may die without incurring the pity of their fellows, still sharers in great business enterprises from which their capital cannot be or has not been withdrawn, and which is left chiefly at death for public uses; yet the day is not far distant when the man who dies leaving behind him millions of available wealth, which was free for him to administer during life, will pass away "unwept, unhonored, and unsung," no matter to what uses he leaves the dross which he cannot take with him. Of such as these the public verdict will then be: "The man who dies thus rich dies disgraced."

Such, in my opinion, is the true gospel concerning wealth, obedience to which is destined some day to solve the problem of the rich and the poor, and to bring "Peace on earth, among men good will."

1. What is the problem with society, according to Carnegie? How does he account for major changes within society?

2. Who were the Maecenas?

3. What does Carnegie say about human competition and the accumulation of wealth?

4. What is the best way to rectify the differences between the rich and the poor?

5. Is charity good or bad for society?
Walter Rauschenbusch: The Social Gospel

The social movement is the most important ethical and spiritual movement in the modern world, and the social gospel is the response of the Christian consciousness to it. Therefore it had to be. The social gospel registers the fact that for the first time in history the spirit of Christianity has had a chance to form a working partnership with real social and psychological science. It is the religious reaction on the historical advent of democracy. It seeks to put the democratic spirit, which the Church inherited from Jesus and the prophets, once more in control of the institutions and teachings of the Church.

If theology is to offer an adequate doctrinal basis for the social gospel, it must not only make room for the doctrine of the Kingdom of God, but give it a central place and revise all other doctrines so that they will articulate organically with it.

This doctrine is itself the social gospel. Without it, the idea of redeeming the social order will be but an annex to the orthodox conception of the scheme of salvation. It will live like a negro servant family in a detached cabin back of the white man's house in the South. If this doctrine gets the place which has always been its legitimate right, the practical proclamation and application of social morality will have a firm footing.

The Kingdom of God is humanity organized according to the will of God. Interpreting it through the consciousness of Jesus we may affirm these convictions about the ethical relations within the Kingdom: (a) Since Christ revealed the divine worth of life and personality, and since his salvation seeks the restoration and fulfillment of even the least, it follows that the Kingdom of God, at every stage of human development, tends toward a social order which will best guarantee to all personalities their freest and highest development. This involves the redemption of social life from the cramping influence of religious bigotry, from the repression of self-assertion in the relation of upper and lower classes, and from all forms of slavery in which human beings are treated as mere means to serve the ends of others. (b) Since love is the supreme law of Christ, the Kingdom of God implies a progressive reign of love in human affairs. We can see its advance wherever the free will of love supersedes the use of force and legal coercion as a regulative of the social order. This involves the redemption of society from political autocracies and economic oligarchies; the substitution of redemptive for vindictive penology; the abolition of constraint through hunger as part of the industrial system; and the abolition of war as the supreme expression of hate and the complete cessation of freedom. (c) The highest expression of love is the free surrender of what is truly our own, life, property, and rights. A much lower but perhaps more decisive expression of love is the surrender of any opportunity to exploit men. No social group or organization can claim to be clearly within the Kingdom of God which drains others for its own ease, and resists the effort to abate this fundamental evil. This involves the redemption of society from private property in the natural resources of the earth, and from any condition in industry which makes monopoly profits possible. (d) The reign of love tends toward the progressive unity of mankind, but with the maintenance of individual liberty and the opportunity of nations to work out their own national peculiarities and ideals.

The Kingdom of God is not confined within the limits of the Church and its activities. It embraces the whole of human life. It is the Christian transfiguration of the social order. The Church is one social institution alongside of the family, the industrial organization of society, and the State. The Kingdom of God is in all these, and realizes itself through them all. During the Middle Ages all society was ruled and guided by the Church. Few of us would want modern life to return to such a condition. Functions which the Church used to perform, have now far outgrown its capacities. The Church is indispensable to the religious education of humanity and to the conservation of religion, but the greatest future awaits religion in the public life of humanity.

1. What is so significant about the social gospel movement, according to Rauschenbusch?

2. Why are Christians obliged to follow the principles of the social gospel movement?

3. What is the supreme law of Christ?

4. How should the church relate to society?

5. How is Rauschenbusch's approach different from that of Carnegie?
Terms Related to the Start of the Great Depression

Directions: Define the following terms.

1. Speculation

2. Overproduction

3. Underconsumption

4. Buying on margin

5. Tariff

6. Capital

7. Credit

8. Stock market crash
19-2 | Competing Against the Party Machine


So evering social reformer and founder of Hull House, Jane Addams knew political corruption when she saw it. She also understood its power to seduce the poor who depended on the arges of party bosses dispensing jobs and food to the hungry and unemployed. She intended for the settlement house she established in a poor immigrant neighborhood in Chicago to counter those seductions through educational programs for children, classes for women, and activities to uplift, improve, and better both the poor she served and the middle-class women reformers who sought a useful outlet for their time and talents.

The unusual struggle in Chicago, described in The Outlook last week, between the boss of the Nineteenth Ward and Hull House, was, in a measure, precipitated by a paper prepared by Miss Jane Addams, the head of Hull House, for the "International Journal of Ethics," but read at a meeting in Chicago, and so reported by the Chicago daily papers as to stir the wrath of the Alderman described. The entire paper has just appeared in the "International Journal of Ethics," to the courtesy of whose editors The Outlook is indebted for permission to reprint. We have selected those passages which show why the Alderman, who is the most obedient servant of the monopolies, holds a thus far impregnable position in a ward composed of the very poor. The situation presented is so far from confirming the conclusions of pessimists that it awakens new faith in the supremacy of human virtue, when that virtue manifests itself in constant neighborliness instead of annual political sermons.—The Editor.

Primitive people, such as the South Italian peasants who live in the Nineteenth Ward, deep down in their hearts admire nothing so much as the good man. The successful candidate must be a good man according to the standards of his constituents. He must not attempt to hold up a morality beyond them, nor must he attempt to reform or change the standard. If he believes what they believe, and does what they are all cherishing a secret ambition to do, he will dazzle them by his success and win their confidence. Any one who has lived among poorer people cannot fail to be impressed with their constant kindness to each other: that unfailing response to the needs and distresses of their neighbors, even when in danger of bankruptcy themselves. This is their reward for living in the midst of poverty. They have constant opportunities for self-sacrifice and generosity, to which, as a rule, they respond. A man stands by his friend when he gets too drunk to take care of himself, when he loses his wife or child, when he is evicted for non-payment of rent, when he is arrested for a petty crime. It seems to such a man entirely fitting that his Alderman should do the same thing on a larger scale—that he should help a constituent out of trouble just because he is in trouble, irrespective of the justice involved.

The Alderman, therefore, bails out his constituents when they are arrested, or says a good word to the police justice when they appear before him for trial; uses his "pull" with the magistrate when they are likely to be fined for a civil misdemeanor, or sees what he can do to "fix up matters" with the State's attorney when the charge is really a serious one.

Because of simple friendliness, the Alderman is expected to pay rent for the hard-pressed tenant when no rent is forthcoming, to find jobs when work is hard to get, to procure and divide among his constituents all the places which he can seize from the City Hall. The Alderman of the Nineteenth Ward at one time made the proud boast that he had two thousand six hundred people in his ward upon the public pay-roll. This, of course, included day laborers, but each one felt under distinct obligations to him for getting the job.

If we recollect, further, that the franchise-seeking companies pay respectful heed to the applicants backed by the Alderman, the question of voting for the successful man becomes as much an industrial as a political one. An Italian laborer wants a job more than anything else, and quite simply votes for the man who promises him one.

The Alderman gives presents at weddings and christenings. He seizes these days of family festivities for making friends. It is easiest to reach people in the holiday mood of expansive good will, but on their side it seems natural and kindly that he should do it. The Alderman procures passes from the railroads when his constituents wish to visit friends or to attend the funerals of distant relatives; he buys tickets galore for benefit entertainments given for a widow or a consumptive in peculiar distress; he contributes to prizes which are awarded to the handsomest lady or the most popular man. At a church bazaar, for instance, the Alderman finds the stage all set for his dramatic performance. When others are spending pennies he is spending dollars. Where anxious relatives are canvassing to secure votes for the two most beautiful children who are being voted upon, he recklessly buys votes from both sides, and laughingly declines to say which one he likes the best, buying off the young lady who is persistently determined to find out, with five dollars for the flower bazaar, the poses, of course, to be sent to the sick of the parish. The moral atmosphere of a bazaar suits him exactly. He murmurs many times, "Never mind: the money all goes to the poor" or, "It is all straight enough if the church gets it."

There is something archaic in a community of simple people in their attitude towards death and burial. Nothing so easy to collect money for as a funeral. If the Alderman seizes upon festivities for expressions of his good will, much more does he seize upon periods of sorrow. At a funeral he has the double advantage of ministering to a genuine craving for comfort and solace and at the same time of assisting at an important social function. . . .

A man who would ask at such a time where all this money comes from would be considered sinister. Many a man at such a time has formulated a lenient judgment of political corruption and has heard kindly speeches which he has...
idow and the fatherless." "He knows the poor better than the big guns who are ways about talking civil service and reform."

Indeed, what headway can the notion of civic purity, of honesty of administration, make against this big manifestation of human friendliness, this stalking revival of village kindness? . . .

Such an Alderman will keep a standing account with an undertaker, and phone every week, and sometimes more than once, the kind of outfit he ishems provided for a bereaved constituent, until the sum may roll up into hun- 

dreds a year. Such a man understands what the people want, and ministers just tru- 

to a great human need as the musician or the artist does. I recall an tempt to substitute what we might call a later standard.

A delicate little child was deserted in the Hull House nursery. An investi- 

gation showed that it had been born ten days previously in the Cook County Hospital, it no trace could be found of the unfortunate mother. The little thing lived for 

veral weeks, and then, in spite of every care, died. We decided to have it buried 

the county, and the wagon was to arrive by eleven o'clock. About nine o'clock 

the morning the rumor of this awful deed reached the neighbors. A half-dozen 

dem came, in a very excited state of mind, to protest. They took up a collection 

for their poverty with which to defray a funeral. We were then comparatively 

in the neighborhood. We did not realize that we were really shocking a genu- 

ine moral sentiment of the community. In our crudeness, we instanced the care 

and kindness which had been expended upon the little creature while it was 

in that it had had every attention from a skilled physician and trained nurse; we 
en intimated that the excited members of the group had not taken part in this, 

and that it now lay with us to decide that the child should be buried, as it had been 

in, at the county's expense. It is doubtful whether Hull House has ever done 

thing which injured it so deeply in the minds of some of its neighbors. We were 

ly forgiven by the most indulgent on the ground that we were spinsters and 
uld not know a mother's heart. No one born and reared in the community could 

easily have made a mistake like that. No one who had studied the ethical stan- 

ds with any care could have bungled so completely . . .

The question does, of course, occur to many minds. Where does the money 

me from with which to dramatize so successfully? The more primitive people 

cept the truthful statement of its sources without any shock to their moral 

se. To their simple minds he gets it "from the rich," and so long as he again 
ves it out to the poor, as a true Robin Hood, with open hand, they have no 
jections to offer. Their ethics are quite honestly those of the merry making for- 

ters. The next less primitive people of the vicinage are quite willing to admit 
he leads "the gang" in the City Council, and sells out the city franchises; that 
akes deals with the franchise-seeking companies; that he guarantees to steep- 

ious measures through the Council, for which he demands liberal pay: that 

is, in short, a successful boggler. But when there is intellect enough to get this 
nt of view, there is also enough to make the contention that this is universally 

done: that all the Aldermen do it more or less successfully, but that the Alderman 
of the Nineteenth Ward is unique in being so generous: that such a state of affairs 
is to be deplored of course, but that that is the way business is run, and we are 
fortunate when a kind-hearted man who is close to the people gets a large share 
of the boodle; that he serves these franchised companies who employ men in the 
building and construction of their enterprises, and that they are bound in return 
give back to his constituency. Even when they are intelligent enough to com-
plete the circle, and to see that the money comes, not from the pockets of the 
companies' agents, but from the street-car fares of people like themselves, it 
almost seems as if they would rather pay two cents more each time they ride than 
give up the consciousness that they have a big, warm-hearted friend at court who 
will stand by them in an emergency. The sense of just dealing comes apparently 
uch later than the desire for protection and kindness. The Alderman is really 
elected because he is a good friend and neighbor.

During a campaign a year and a half ago, when a reform league put up a 
candidate against our corrupt Alderman, and when Hull House worked hard to 
ally the moral sentiment of the ward in favor of the new man, we encountered 
another and unexpected difficulty. Finding that it was hard to secure enough 
local speakers of the moral tone which we desired, we imported orators from 
other parts of the town, from the "better element," so to speak. Suddenly we 
heard it rumored on all sides that, while the money and speakers for the reform 
candidate were coming from the swells, the money which was backing our cor-
rupt Alderman also came from a swell source: it was rumored that the presi-
dent of a street-car combination, for whom he performed constant offices in the 
City Council, was ready to back him to the extent of fifty thousand dollars; that he, 
too, was a good man, and sat in high places; that he had recently given a large 
sum of money to an educational institution, and was, therefore, as philanthropic, 
not to say good and upright, as any man in town: that our Alderman had the 
sanction of the highest authorities, and that the lecturers who were talking against 
corruption, and the selling and buying of franchises, were only the cranks, and 
not the solid business men who had developed and built up Chicago.

All parts of the community are bound together in ethical development. If the 
so-called more enlightened members of the community accept public gifts from 
the man who buys up the Council, and the so-called less enlightened members 
accept individual gifts from the man who sells out the Council, we surely must 
take our punishment together.

Another curious experience during that campaign was the difference of 
standards between the imported speakers and the audience. One man, high in 
the council of the "better element," one evening used as an example of the phi-
thropic politician an Alderman of the vicinity, recently dead who was devot-
edly loved and mourned by his constituents. When the audience caught the 
familiar name in the midst of the platitudes, they brightened up wonderfully. 
But, as the speaker went on, they first looked puzzled, then astounded, and gradu-
ally their astonishment turned to indignation. The speaker, all unconscious of 
the situation, went on, imagining, perhaps, that he was addressing his usual

1boggler: Corrupt politician who gives or accepts bribes.
audience, and totally unaware that he was perpetrating an outrage upon the finest feelings of the people who were sitting before him. He certainly succeeded in irrevocably injuring the chances of the candidate for whom he was speaking. The speaker's standard of ethics was upright dealing in positions of public trust. The standard of ethics held by his audience was, being good to the poor and speaking gently of the dead. If he considered them corrupt and illiterate voters, they quite honestly held him a blackguard.

If we would hold to our political democracy, some pains must be taken to keep on common ground in our human experiences, and to some solidarity in our ethical conceptions. And if we discover that men of low ideals and corrupt practice are forming popular political standards simply because such men stand by and for and with the people, then nothing remains but to obtain a like sense of identification before we can hope to modify ethical standards.

READING AND DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. What challenge does Addams see blocking the efforts of urban reformers trying to improve the lives of the working class in Chicago? How did the reform aid she provided differ from the work of party bosses?

2. To what extent do issues of class and gender help and hinder the work of reform she undertook at Hull House? What conclusions about women's role in reform can you draw from Addams’s essay?

19-3 | American Dream Meets Tenement Reality

MARIE GANZ AND NAT J. FERBER, Rebels: Into Anarchy, and Out Again (1920)

Five-year-old Marie Ganz emigrated with her mother from the central European region of Galicia to join her father, Lazarus, in New York City in 1896. Like millions of other immigrants, Marie and her family left the world they knew for the unknown, but promising, opportunities in America. Her memoir, published in 1920 when she was thirty, evokes the dreams and disappointments immigrant families faced in their early years. Ganz's early experiences inspired her labor reform efforts and anarchism.

It was a home of two tiny rooms. The room in the rear was not much larger than a good-sized clothes closet, and not the stuffiest of closets could be more lacking in sunlight and air. The walls were as blank as an underground dungeon's. There was neither window nor ventilating shaft. The room in front, almost twice as large, though half a dozen steps would have brought anybody with full-grown legs across its entire length, was a kitchen and living-room by day, a bedroom by

Muckraker Exposes Chicago’s Meat-Packing Industry

UPTON SINCLAIR, The Jungle (1906)

Social reformers exposed the evils of the industrial economy through a new form of investigative journalism caricatured by some as “muckraking” for the filth they stirred while peering into the unhealthy and dehumanizing conditions then existing in the nation’s factories. With a journalist’s eye for detail, author Upton Sinclair investigated Chicago’s meat-packing industry, expecting to shock readers of his novel, The Jungle, with scenes of a workplace dystopia, where aborers were abused to the point of mental and physical collapse. In the end, the novel’s graphic depictions of the “disassembly” line, where pigs were butchered into the nation’s packaged meat industry, captured the most attention, resulting in a public outcry and passage of the Meat Inspection Act and the Pure Food and Drug Act.

There is over a square mile of space in the yards, and more than half of it is occupied by cattle-pens; north and south as far as the eye can reach there stretches a sea of pens. And they were all filled—so many cattle no one had ever dreamed existed in the world. Red cattle, black, white, and yellow cattle; old cattle and young cattle; great bellowing bulls and little calves not an hour born; meek-eyed stock cows and fierce, long-horned Texas steers. The sound of them here was as of all the barnyards of the universe; and as for counting them—it would have taken all day simply to count the pens. Here and there ran long alleys, blocked at intervals by gates; and Jokubas told them that the number of these gates was twenty-five thousand. Jokubas had recently been reading a newspaper article which was full of statistics such as that, and he was very proud as he repeated them and made his guests cry out with wonder. Jurgis¹ too had a little of this sense of pride. Had he not just gotten a job, and become a sharer in all this activity, a cog in this marvellous machine?

Here and there about the alleys galloped men upon horseback, booted, and carrying long whips, they were very busy, calling to each other, and to those who were driving the cattle. They were drovers and stock-raisers, who had come from far states, and brokers and commission-merchants, and buyers for all the big packing-houses. Here and there they would stop to inspect a bunch of cattle, and there would be a parley, brief and businesslike. The buyer would nod or drop his whip, and that would mean a bargain; and he would note it in his little book, along with hundreds of others he had made that morning. Then Jokubas pointed out the place where the cattle were driven to be weighed, upon a great scale that would weigh a hundred thousand pounds at once and record it automatically. It was near to the east entrance that they stood, and all along this east side of the yards ran the railroad tracks, into which the cars were run, loaded with cattle. All

¹Jokubas Szedvitas and Jurgis Rudkus, two characters in the novel, both emigrate from Lithuania and ultimately succumb to what Sinclair describes as the brutalities of capitalism.

night long this had been going on, and now the pens were full; by to-night they would all be empty, and the same thing would be done again.

“And what will become of all these creatures?” cried Teta Elzbieta.

“By to-night,” Jokubas answered, “they will all be killed and cut up; and over there on the other side of the packing-houses are more railroad tracks, where the cars come to take them away.”

There were two hundred and fifty miles of track within the yards, their guide went on to tell them. They brought about ten thousand head of cattle every day, and as many hogs, and half as many sheep—which meant some eight or ten million live creatures turned into food every year. One stood and watched, and little by little caught the drift of the tide, as it set in the direction of the packing-houses. There were groups of cattle being driven to the chutes, which were roadways about fifteen feet wide, raised high above the pens. In these chutes the stream of animals was continuous; it was quite uncanny to watch them, pressing on to their fate, all unsuspicious—a very river of death. Our friends were not poetical, and the sight suggested to them no metaphors of human destiny; they thought only of the wonderful efficiency of it all. The chutes into which the hogs went climbed high up—to the very top of the distant buildings; and Jokubas explained that the hogs went up by the power of their own legs, and then their weight carried them back through all the processes necessary to make them into pork.

“They don’t waste anything here,” said the guide, and then he laughed and added a witticism, which he was pleased that his unsophisticated friends should take to be his own: “They use everything about the hog except the squeal.” In front of Brown’s General Office building there grows a tiny plot of grass, and this, you may learn, is the only bit of green thing in Packingtown; likewise this jest about the hog and his squeal, the stock in trade of all the guides, is the one gleam of humor that you will find there.

After they had seen enough of the pens, the party went up the street, to the mass of buildings which occupy the centre of the yards. These buildings, made of brick and stained with innumerable layers of Packingtown smoke, were painted all over with advertising signs, from which the visitor realized suddenly that he had come to the home of many of the torments of his life. It was here that they made those products with the wonders of which they pestered him so—by placards that defaced the landscape when he travelled, and by staring advertisements in the newspapers and magazines—by silly little jingles that he could not get out of his mind, and gaudy pictures that lurked for him around every street corner. Here was where they made Brown’s Imperial Hams and Bacon, Brown’s Dressed Beef, Brown’s Excelsior Sausages! Here was the headquarters of Durham’s Pure Leaf Lard, of Durham’s Breakfast Bacon, Durham’s Canned Beef, Potted Ham, Devilled Chicken, Peerless Fertilizer!

Entering one of the Durham buildings, they found a number of other visitors waiting; and before long there came a guide, to escort them through the place. They make a great feature of showing strangers through the packing-plants, for it is a good advertisement. But ponies [Mr.] Jokubas whispered maliciously that the visitors did not see any more than the packers wanted them to.
They climbed a long series of stairways outside of the building, to the top of five or six stories. Here were the chute, with its river of hogs, all patiently toiling upward; there was a place for them to rest to cool off, and then through tattered passageway they went into a room from which there is no returning to hogs.

It was a long, narrow room, with a gallery along it for visitors. At the head there was a great iron wheel, about twenty feet in circumference, with rings here and there along its edge. Upon both sides of this wheel there was a narrow space, into which came the hogs at the end of their journey; in the midst of them ood a great burly negro, bare-armed and bare-chested. He was resting for the moment, for the wheel had stopped while men were cleaning up. In a minute or so, however, it began slowly to revolve, and then the men upon each side of it crang to work. They had chains which they fastened about the leg of the nearest hog, and the other end of the chain they hooked into one of the rings upon the wheel. So, as the wheel turned, a hog was suddenly jerked off his feet and carried aloft.

At the same instant the ear was assailed by a most terrifying shriek; the visitors started in alarm, the women turned pale and shrank back. The shriek was followed by another, louder and yet more agonizing—for once started upon that urney, the hog never came back; at the top of the wheel he was shunted off on a trolley, and went sailing down the room. And meantime another was going up, and then another, and another, until there was a double line of them, dangling by a foot and kicking in frenzy—and squealing. The uproar was appalling, perilous to the ear-drums; one feared there was too much sound for the room to hold—that the walls must give way or the ceiling crack. There were ghastly squeals and low squawks, grunts, and wails of agony; there would come a sombering hush, and then a fresh outburst, louder than ever, surging up to a suffocating climax. It was too much for some of the visitors—the men would look each other, laughing nervously, and the women would stand with hands enched, and the blood rushing to their faces, and the tears starting in their eyes.

Meantime, heedless of all these things, the men upon the floor were going about their work. Neither squeals of hogs nor tears of visitors made any difference to them; one by one they hoisted up the hogs, and one by one with a swift roke they slit their throats. There was a long line of hogs, with squeals and life-ood ebbing away together; until at last each started again, and vanished with a splash into a huge vat of boiling water.

It was all so very businesslike that one watched it fascinated. It was pork-slicing by machinery, pork-making by applied mathematics. And yet somehow the most matter-of-fact person could not help thinking of the hogs; they were so innocent, they came so very trustingly, and they were so very human in their protests—and so perfectly within their rights! They had done nothing to deserve it; and it was adding insult to injury, as the thing was done here, swinging them up in this cold-blooded, impersonal way, without a pretense at apology, without the homage of a tear. Now and then a visitor wept, to be sure; but the slaughtering-machine ran on, visitors or no visitors. It was like some horrible crime committed in a dungeon, all unseen and unheeded, buried out of sight and of memory.

One could not stand and watch very long without becoming philosophical, without beginning to deal in symbols and similes, and to hear the hog-squeal of the universe. Was it permitted to believe that there was nowhere upon the earth, or above the earth, a heaven for hogs, where they were requited for all this suffering? Each one of these hogs was a separate creature. Some were white hogs, some were black; some were brown, some were spotted; some were old, some were young; some were long and lean, some were monstrous. And each of them had an individuality of his own, a will of his own, a hope and a heart's desire; each was full of self-confidence, of self-importance, and a sense of dignity. And trusting and strong in faith he had gone about his business, the while a black shadow hung over him and a horrid Fate waited in his pathway. Now suddenly it had swooped upon him, and had seized him by the leg. Relentless, remorseless, it was; all his protests, his screams, were nothing to it—it did its cruel will with him, as if his wishes, his feelings, had simply no existence at all; it cut his throat and watched him gasp out his life. And how was one to believe that there was nowhere a god of hogs, to whom this hog-personality was precious, to whom these hog-squeals and agonies had a meaning? Who would take this hog into his arms and comfort him, reward him for his work well done, and show him the meaning of his sacrifice? Perhaps some glimpse of all this was in the thoughts of our humble-minded Jurgis, as he turned to go on with the rest of the party, and muttered: "Dieve [God]—but I'm glad I'm not a hog!"

**READING AND DISCUSSION QUESTIONS**

1. How do you assess *The Jungle* as a cause of Progressive-Era legislation? Distinguish between short-term or immediate causes, like the publication of Sinclair's novel, and longer-term causes of reform legislation, such as unsanitary working conditions.

2. Analyze and explain Sinclair's point of view toward workplace conditions. To what extent does his depiction of the Chicago meat-jacking industry reflect Progressive-Era concerns about social democracy or the ability of individuals to live and participate fully in civil society?

**COMPARATIVE QUESTIONS**

1. Compare Jane Addams's reform efforts with the women's club activities Mary White Ovington describes in Document 18-4. What similarities do you see in their approach to reform and in the challenges they faced?

2. What response do you think *The Jungle* would have elicited from such different reformers as Jane Addams and Marie Ganz? How might each have interpreted the evidence of workplace abuse Sinclair presented in novel form?
Jim Crow and Black Response

VIEWPOINT 11A

Blacks Should Stop Agitating for Political Equality (1895)
Booker T. Washington (1856–1915)

Born a slave shortly before the Civil War, Booker T. Washington received his education at the Hampton Institute, an industrial school founded by Samuel C. Armstrong, a former Union general, for the education of freed blacks. After teaching at Hampton for a time, in 1881 Washington founded the Tuskegee Institute in Alabama, a vocational institute for blacks, which under his leadership grew into one of the leading centers of black education in the United States. Washington's national prominence was assured by his speech at the 1895 Atlanta Exposition, reprinted here, and for the next twenty years he was considered by white America to be the preeminent spokesman for the country's blacks. Those years were marked by the growth of "Jim Crow" laws and other measures that disenfranchised blacks and increased racial segregation. Washington advocated a policy of accommodation on civil rights issues, arguing that blacks should concentrate on economic self-improvement rather than changes in political laws.

What are the sources of Washington's optimism about race relations? What elements of Washington's speech might account for his popularity with white establishment leaders (including then-president Grover Cleveland, who in a letter to Washington wrote that the address "cannot fail to delight and encourage all who wish well for your race")?

Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Board of Directors and Citizens:

One-third of the population of the South is of the Negro race. No enterprise seeking the material, civil, or moral welfare of this section can disregard this element of our population and reach the highest success. I but convey to you, Mr. President and Directors, the sentiment of the masses of my race when I say that in no way have the value and manhood of the American Negro been more fittingly and generously recognized than by the managers of this magnificent exposition at every stage of its progress. It is a recognition that will do more to cement the friendship of the two races than any occurrence since the dawn of our freedom.

Not only this, but the opportunity here afforded will awaken among us a new era of industrial progress. Ignorant and inexperienced, it is not strange that in the first years of our new life we began at the top instead of at the bottom; that a seat in Congress or the state legislature was more sought than real estate or industrial skill; that the political convention or stump speaking had more attractions than starting a dairy farm or truck garden.

A ship lost at sea for many days suddenly sighted a friendly vessel. From the mast of the unfortunate vessel was seen a signal: "Water, water; we die of thirst!" The answer from the friendly vessel at once came back: "Cast down your bucket where you are." A second time the signal, "Water, water, send us water!" ran up from the distressed vessel, and was answered: "Cast down your bucket where you are." And a third and fourth signal for water was answered: "Cast down your bucket where you are." The captain of the distressed vessel, at last heeding the injunction, cast down his bucket, and it came up full of fresh, sparkling water from the mouth of the Amazon River.

"The wisest among my race understand that the agitation of questions of social equality is the extremest folly."

To those of my race who depend on bettering their condition in a foreign land or who underestimate the importance of cultivating friendly relations with the Southern white man, who is their next-door neighbor, I would say: Cast down your bucket where you are; cast it down in making friends, in every manly way, of the people of all races by whom we are surrounded. Cast it down in agriculture, mechanics, in commerce, in domestic service, and in the professions. And in this connection it is well to bear in mind that whatever other sins the South may be called to bear, when it comes to business, pure and simple, it is in the South that the Negro is given a man's chance in the commercial world, and in nothing is this exposition more eloquent than in emphasizing this chance.

Our greatest danger is that, in the great leap from slavery to freedom, we may overlook the fact that the masses of us are to live by the productions of our hands and fail to keep in mind that we shall prosper in proportion as we learn to dignify and glorify common labor, and put brains and skill into the common
occupations of life; shall prosper in proportion as we learn to draw the line between the superficial and the substantial, the ornamental gewgaws of life and the useful. No race can prosper till it learns that there is as much dignity in tilling a field as in writing a poem. It is at the bottom of life we must begin, and not at the top. Nor should we permit our grievances to overshadow our opportunities.

To those of the white race who look to the incoming of those of foreign birth and strange tongue and habits for the prosperity of the South, were I permitted I would repeat what I say to my own race, “Cast down your bucket where you are.” Cast it down among the 8 million Negroes whose habits you know, whose fidelity and love you have tested in days when to have proved treacherous meant the ruin of your firesides. Cast down your bucket among these people who have, without strikes and labor wars, tilled your fields, cleared your forests, builded your railroads and cities, and brought forth treasures from the bowels of the earth and helped make possible this magnificent representation of the progress of the South. Casting down your bucket among my people, helping and encouraging them as you are doing on these grounds, and, with education of head, hand, and heart, you will find that they will buy your surplus land, make blossom the waste places in your fields, and run your factories.

While doing this, you can be sure in the future, as in the past, that you and your families will be surrounded by the most patient, faithful, law-abiding, and unresentful people that the world has seen. As we have proved our loyalty to you in the past, in nursing your children, watching by the sickbed of your mothers and fathers, and often following them with tear-dimmed eyes to their graves, so in the future, in our humble way, we shall stand by you with a devotion that no foreigner can approach, ready to lay down our lives, if need be, in defense of yours; interlacing our industrial, commercial, civil, and religious life with yours in a way that shall make the interests of both races one. In all things that are purely social we can be as separate as the fingers, yet one as the hand in all things essential to mutual progress.

Development for All

There is no defense or security for any of us except in the highest intelligence and development of all. If anywhere there are efforts tending to curtail the fullest growth of the Negro, let these efforts be turned into stimulating, encouraging, and making him the most useful and intelligent citizen. Effort or means so invested will pay a thousand percent interest. These efforts will be twice blessed—“blessing him that gives and him that takes.”

There is no escape, through law of man or God, from the inevitable:

The laws of changeless justice bind
Oppressor with oppressed;
And close as sin and suffering joined
We march to fate abreast

Nearly 16 millions of hands will aid you in pulling the load upward, or they will pull against you the load downward. We shall constitute one-third and more of the ignorance and crime of the South, or one-third its intelligence and progress; we shall contribute one-third to the business and industrial prosperity of the South, or we shall prove a veritable body of death, stagnating, depressing, retarding every effort to advance the body politic.

Gentlemen of the exposition, as we present to you our humble effort at an exhibition of our progress, you must not expect overmuch. Starting thirty years ago with ownership here and there in a few quilts and pumpkins and chickens (gathered from miscellaneous sources), remember: the path that has led from these to the invention and production of agricultural implements, buggies, steam engines, newspapers, books, statuary, carving, paintings, the management of drugstores and banks, has not been trodden without contact with thorns and thistles. While we take pride in what we exhibit as a result of our independent efforts, we do not for a moment forget that our part in this exhibition would fall far short of your expectations but for the constant help that has come to our educational life, not only from the Southern states but especially from Northern philanthropists who have made their gifts a constant stream of blessing and encouragement.

The wisest among my race understand that the agitation of questions of social equality is the extremest folly, and that progress in the enjoyment of all the privileges that will come to us must be the result of severe and constant struggle rather than of artificial forcing. No race that has anything to contribute to the markets of the world is long in any degree ostracized. It is important and right that all privileges of the law be ours, but it is vastly more important that we be prepared for the exercise of these privileges. The opportunity to earn a dollar in a factory just now is worth infinitely more than the opportunity to spend a dollar in an opera house.

In conclusion, may I repeat that nothing in thirty years has given us more hope and encouragement and drawn us so near to you of the white race as this opportunity offered by the exposition; and here bending, as it were, over the altar that represents the results of the struggles of your race and mine, both starting practically empty-handed three decades ago, I pledge that, in your effort to work out the great and intricate problem which God has laid at the doors of the South, you shall have at all times the patient,
sympathetic help of my race; only let this be constantly in mind that, while from representations in these buildings of the product of field, of forest, of mine, of factory, letters, and art, much good will come—yet far above and beyond material benefits will be that higher good, that let us pray God will come, in a blotting out of sectional differences and racial animosities and suspicions, in a determination to administer absolute justice, in a willing obedience among all classes to the mandates of law. This, coupled with our material prosperity, will bring into our beloved South a new heaven and a new earth.

---

**VIEWPOINT 11B**

**A Critique of Booker T. Washington (1903)**

W.E.B. Du Bois (1868–1963)

From 1895 until his death twenty years later, the most famous leader of black America was Booker T. Washington, a political moderate who advocated a policy of economic self-improvement and political accommodation. An early critique of Washington's views comes from this excerpted passage from *The Souls of Black Folk*, a noted 1903 study of black life written by W.E.B. Du Bois. Du Bois, the first black granted a doctorate at Harvard University in Massachusetts, later helped found the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and was for many years America's leading black intellectual and civil rights activist.

What connection does Du Bois see between Washington's successes and popularity and potential problems for blacks in America? Could Du Bois be considered more or less realistic about civil rights than Washington? Why or why not?

---

Easily the most striking thing in the history of the American Negro since 1876 is the ascendency of Mr. Booker T. Washington. It began at the time when war memories and ideals were rapidly passing; a day of astonishing commercial development was dawning; a sense of doubt and hesitation overtook the freedmen's sons,—then it was that his leading began. Mr. Washington came, with a single definite programme, at the psychological moment when the nation was a little ashamed of having bestowed so much sentiment on Negroes, and was concentrating its energies on Dollars. His programme of industrial education, conciliation of the South, and submission and silence as to civil and political rights, was not wholly original; the Free Negroes from 1830 up to wartime had striven to build industrial schools, and the American Missionary Association had from the first taught various trades; and [Joseph C.] Price and others had sought a way of honorable alliance with the best of the Southerners. But Mr. Washington first indissolubly linked these things; he put enthusiasm, unlimited energy, and perfect faith into this programme, and changed it from a by-path into a veritable Way of Life. And the tale of the methods by which he did this is a fascinating study of human life.

It startled the nation to hear a Negro advocating such a programme after many decades of bitter complaint: it startled and won the applause of the South, it interested and won the admiration of the North; and after a confused murmur of protest, it silenced if it did not convert the Negroes themselves.

To gain the sympathy and cooperation of the various elements comprising the white South was Mr. Washington's first task; and this, at the time Tuskegee was founded, seemed, for a black man, well-nigh impossible. And yet ten years later it was done in the word spoken at Atlanta: “In all things purely social we can be as separate as the five fingers, and yet one as the hand in all things essential to mutual progress.”

This “Atlanta Compromise” is by all odds the most notable thing in Mr. Washington's career. The South interpreted it in different ways: the radicals received it as a complete surrender of the demand for civil and political equality; the conservatives, as a generously conceived working basis for mutual understanding. So both approved it, and to-day its author is certainly the most distinguished Southerner since Jefferson Davis, and the one with the largest personal following.

Next to this achievement comes Mr. Washington's work in gaining place and consideration in the North. Others less shrewd and tactful had formerly essayed to sit on these two stools and had fallen between them; but as Mr. Washington knew the heart of the South from birth and training, so by singular insight he intuitively grasped the spirit of the age which was dominating the North. And so thoroughly did he learn the speech and thought of triumphant commercialism, and the ideals of material prosperity, that the picture of a lone black boy poring over a French grammar amid the weeds and dirt of a neglected home soon seemed to him the acme of absurdities. One wonders what Socrates and St. Francis of Assisi would say to this.

And yet this very singleness of vision and thorough oneness with his age is a mark of the successful man. It is as though Nature must needs make men narrow in order to give them force. So Mr. Washington's cult has gained unquestioning followers, his work has wonderfully prospered, his friends are legion, and

his enemies are confounded. To-day he stands as the one recognized spokesman of his ten million fellows, and one of the most notable figures in a nation of seventy millions. One hesitates, therefore, to criticise a life which, beginning with so little, has done so much. And yet the time is come when one may speak in all sincerity and utter courtesy of the mistakes and shortcomings of Mr. Washington's career, as well as of his triumphs, without being thought captious or envious, and without forgetting that it is easier to do ill than well in the world.

The criticism that has hitherto met Mr. Washington has not always been of this broad character. In the South especially has he had to walk warily to avoid the harshest judgments—and naturally so, for he is dealing with the one subject of deepest sensitiveness to that section. Twice—once when at the Chicago celebration of the Spanish-American War he alluded to the color-prejudice that is "eating away the vitals of the South," and once when he dined with President Roosevelt—has the resulting Southern criticism been violent enough to threaten seriously his popularity. In the North the feeling has several times forced itself into words, that Mr. Washington's counsels of submission overlooked certain elements of true manhood, and that his educational programme was unnecessarily narrow. Usually, however, such criticism has not found open expression, although, too, the spiritual sons of the Abolitionists have not been prepared to acknowledge that the schools founded before Tuskegee, by men of broad ideals and self-sacrificing spirit, were wholly failures or worthy of ridicule. While, then, criticism has not failed to follow Mr. Washington, yet the prevailing public opinion of the land has been but too willing to deliver the solution of a wearisome problem into his hands, and say, "If that is all you and your race ask, take it."

Among his own people, however, Mr. Washington has encountered the strongest and most lasting opposition, amounting at times to bitterness, and even to-day continuing strong and insistent even though largely silenced in outward expression by the public opinion of the nation. Some of this opposition is, of course, mere envy; the disappointment of displaced demagogues and the spite of narrow minds. But aside from this, there is among educated and thoughtful colored men in all parts of the land a feeling of deep regret, sorrow, and apprehension at the wide currency and ascendancy which some of Mr. Washington's theories have gained. These same men admire his sincerity of purpose, and are willing to forgive much to honest endeavor which is doing something worth the doing. They cooperate with Mr. Washington as far as they conscientiously can; and, indeed, it is no ordinary tribute to this man's tact and power that, steering as he must between so many diverse interests and opinions, he so largely retains the respect of all.

But the hushing of the criticism of honest opponents is a dangerous thing. It leads some of the best of the critics to unfortunite silence and paralysis of effort, and others to burst into speech so passionate and intertemporarily as to lose listeners. Honest and earnest criticism from those whose interests are most nearly touched,—criticism of writers by readers, of government by those governed, of leaders by those led,—this is the soul of democracy and the safeguard of modern society. If the best of the American Negroes receive by outer pressure a leader whom they had not recognized before, manifestly there is here a certain palpable gain. Yet there is also irreparable loss,—a loss of that peculiarly valuable education which a group receives when by search and criticism it finds and commissions its own leaders. The way in which this is done is at once the most elementary and the nicest problem of social growth. History is but the record of such group-leadership; and yet how infinitely changeful is its type and character! And of all types and kinds, what can be more instructive than the leadership of a group within a group?—that curious double movement where real progress may be negative and actual advance be relative retrogression. All this is the social student's inspiration and despair.

Now in the past the American Negro has had instructive experience in the choosing of group leaders, founding thus a peculiar dynasty which in the light of present conditions is worth while studying. When sticks and stones and beasts form the sole environment of a people, their attitude is largely one of determined opposition to and conquest of natural forces. But when to earth and brute is added an environment of men and ideas, then the attitude of the imprisoned group may take three main forms,—a feeling of revolt and revenge; an attempt to adjust all thought and action to the will of the greater group; or, finally, a determined effort at self-realization and self-development despite environing opinion. . . .

Mr. Washington represents in Negro thought the old attitude of adjustment and submission; but adjustment at such a peculiar time as to make his programme unique. This is an age of unusual economic development, and Mr. Washington's programme naturally takes an economic cast, becoming a gospel of Work and Money to such an extent as apparently almost completely to overshadow the higher aims of life. Moreover, this is an age when the more advanced races are coming in closer contact with the less developed races, and the race-feeling is therefore intensified; and Mr. Washington's programme practically accepts the alleged inferiority of
3. He advocates common-school and industrial training, and depreciates institutions of higher learning; but neither the Negro common-schools, nor Tuskegee itself, could remain open a day were it not for teachers trained in Negro colleges, or trained by their graduates.

This triple paradox in Mr. Washington’s position is the object of criticism by two classes of colored Americans. One class is spiritually descended from Toussaint the Savior [Haitian rebellion leader Toussaint L’Ouverture], through Gabriel, Vesey, and Turner [Gabriel Prosser, Denmark Vesey, Nat Turner], and they represent the attitude of revolt and revenge; they hate the white South blindly and distrust the white race generally, and so far as they agree on definite action, think that the Negro’s only hope lies in emigration beyond the borders of the United States. And yet, by the irony of fate, nothing has more effectually made this programme seem hopeless than the recent course of the United States toward weaker and darker peoples in the West Indies, Hawaii, and the Philippines,—for where in the world may we go and be safe from lying and brute force?

The other class of Negroes who cannot agree with Mr. Washington has hitherto said little aloud. They deprecate the sight of scattered counsels, of internal disagreement; and especially they dislike making their just criticism of a useful and earnest man an excuse for a general discharge of venom from small-minded opponents. Nevertheless, the questions involved are so fundamental and serious that it is difficult to see how men like . . . Kelly Miller, J.W.E. Bowen, and other representatives of this group, can much longer be silent. Such men feel in conscience bound to ask of this nation three things:

1. The right to vote
2. Civic equality
3. The education of youth according to ability

They acknowledge Mr. Washington’s invaluable service in counselling patience and courtesy in such demands; they do not ask that ignorant black men vote when ignorant whites are debarred, or that any reasonable restrictions in the suffrage should not be applied; they know that the low social level of the mass of the race is responsible for much discrimination against it, but they also know, and the nation knows, that relentless color-prejudice is more often a cause than a result of the Negro’s degradation; they seek the abatement of this relic of barbarism, and not its systematic encouragement and pampering by all agencies of social power from the Associated Press to the Church of Christ. They advocate, with Mr. Washington, a broad system of Negro common schools supplemented by thorough industrial training; but they are surprised that a man of Mr. Wash-
ington's insight cannot see that no such educational system ever has rested or can rest on any other basis than that of the well-equipped college and university, and they insist that there is a demand for a few such institutions throughout the South to train the best of the Negro youth as teachers, professional men, and leaders.

This group of men honor Mr. Washington for his attitude of conciliation toward the white South; they accept the "Atlanta Compromise" in its broadest interpretation; they recognize, with him, many signs of promise, many men of high purpose and fair judgment, in this section; they know that no easy task has been laid upon a region already tottering under heavy burdens. But, nevertheless, they insist that the way to truth and right lies in straightforward honesty, not in indiscriminate flattery; in praising those of the South who do well and criticising uncompromisingly those who do ill; in taking advantage of the opportunities at hand and urging their fellows to do the same, but at the same time in remembering that only a firm adherence to their higher ideals and aspirations will ever keep those ideals within the realm of possibility. They do not expect that the free right to vote, to enjoy civic rights, and to be educated, will come in a moment; they do not expect to see the bias and prejudices of years disappear at the blast of a trumpet; but they are absolutely certain that the way for a people to gain their reasonable rights is not by voluntarily throwing them away and insisting that they do not want them; that the way for a people to gain respect is not by continually belittling and ridiculing themselves; that, on the contrary, Negroes must insist continually, in season and out of season, that voting is necessary to modern manhood, that color discrimination is barbarism, and that black boys need education as well as white boys.

"By every civilized and peaceful method we must strive for the rights which the world accords to men."

In failing thus to state plainly and unequivocally the legitimate demands of their people, even at the cost of opposing an honored leader, the thinking classes of American Negroes would shirk a heavy responsibility,—a responsibility to themselves, a responsibility to the struggling masses, a responsibility to the darker races of men whose future depends so largely on this American experiment, but especially a responsibility to this nation,—this common Fatherland. It is wrong to encourage a man or a peo-
Tillman, is not only sane, but the imperative duty of thinking black men.

Half-Truths

It would be unjust to Mr. Washington not to acknowledge that in several instances he has opposed movements in the South which were unjust to the Negro; he sent memorials to the Louisiana and Alabama constitutional conventions, he has spoken against lynching, and in other ways has openly or silently set his influence against sinister schemes and unfortunate happenings. Notwithstanding this, it is equally true to assert that on the whole the distinct impression left by Mr. Washington’s propaganda is, first, that the South is justified in its present attitude toward the Negro because of the Negro’s degradation; secondly, that the prime cause of the Negro’s failure to rise more quickly is his wrong education in the past; and, thirdly, that his future rise depends primarily on his own efforts. Each of these propositions is a dangerous half-truth. The supplementary truths must never be lost sight of first, slavery and race-prejudice are potent if not sufficient causes of the Negro’s position; second, industrial and common-school training were necessarily slow in planting because they had to await the black teachers trained by higher institutions,—it being extremely doubtful if any essentially different development was possible, and certainly a Tuskegee was unthinkable before 1880; and, third, while it is a great truth to say that the Negro must strive and strive mightily to help himself, it is equally true that unless his striving be not simply seconded, but rather aroused and encouraged, by the initiative of the richer and wiser envir- oning group, he cannot hope for great success.

In his failure to realize and impress this last point, Mr. Washington is especially to be criticised. His doctrine has tended to make the whites, North and South, shift the burden of the Negro problem to the Negro’s shoulders and stand aside as critical and rather pessimistic spectators; when in fact the burden belongs to the nation, and the hands of none of us are clean if we bend not our energies to righting these great wrongs.

The South ought to be led, by candid and honest criticism, to assert her better self and do her full duty to the race she has cruelly wronged and is still wronging. The North—her co-partner in guilt—cannot salve her conscience by plastering it with gold. We cannot settle this problem by diplomacy and suaveness, by “policy” alone. If worse comes to worst, can the moral fibre of this country survive the slow throttling and murder of nine millions of men?

The black men of America have a duty to perform, a duty stern and delicate,—a forward movement to oppose a part of the work of their greatest leader. So far as Mr. Washington preaches Thrift, Patience, and Industrial Training for the masses, we must hold up his hands and strive with him, rejoicing in his honors and glorying in the strength of this Joshua called of God and of man to lead the headless host. But so far as Mr. Washington apologizes for injustice, North or South, does not rightly value the privilege and duty of voting, belittles the emasculating effects of caste distinctions, and opposes the higher training and ambition of our brighter minds,—so far as he, the South, or the Nation, does this,—we must unceasingly and firmly oppose them. By every civilized and peaceful method we must strive for the rights which the world accords to men, clinging unwaveringly to those great words which the sons of the Fathers would fain forget: “We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.”

For Further Reading


VIEWPOINT 12A

Racial Segregation Is Constitutional (1896)

Henry B. Brown (1836–1913)

In 1890 the state of Louisiana passed a law requiring the segregation of white and colored races on passenger trains (many states passed similar laws at this time). Homer A. Plessy, a person of mixed racial background, was forcibly ejected from a train, arrested, and tried for breaking the law after attempting to sit in a whites-only passenger coach. He challenged the constitutionality of the state law, and his case made it to the U.S. Supreme Court. The Court ruled 8–1 in 1896 to uphold the state law, arguing that state-imposed racial segregation laws were constitutional as long as equal facilities were provided for whites and blacks. The following viewpoint is taken from the majority opinion, written by Henry B. Brown, an associate justice of the Supreme Court from 1890 to 1906. The opinion established the “sep-
The result of the whole matter is, that while this court has frequently adjudged, and at the present term has recognized the doctrine, that a State cannot, consistently with the Constitution of the United States, prevent white and black citizens, having the required qualifications for jury service, from sitting in the same jury box, it is now solemnly held that a State may prohibit white and black citizens from sitting in the same passenger coach on a public highway, or may require that they be separated by a "partition," when in the same passenger coach. May it not now be reasonably expected that astute men of the dominant race, who affect to be disturbed at the possibility that the integrity of the white race may be corrupted, or that its supremacy will be imperilled, by contact on public highways with black people, will endeavor to procure statutes requiring white and black jurors to be separated in the jury box by a "partition," and that, upon retiring from the court room to consult as to their verdict, such partition, if it be a moveable one, shall be taken to their consultation room, and set up in such way as to prevent black jurors from coming too close to their brother jurors of the white race. If the "partition" used in the court room happens to be stationary, provision could be made for screens with openings through which jurors of the two races could confer as to their verdict without coming into personal contact with each other. I cannot see but that, according to the principles this day announced, such state legislation, although conceived in hostility to, and enacted for the purpose of humiliating citizens of the United States of a particular race, would be held to be consistent with the Constitution.

I do not deem it necessary to review the decisions of state courts to which reference was made in argument. Some, and the most important, of them are wholly inapplicable, because rendered prior to the adoption of the last amendments of the Constitution, when colored people had very few rights which the dominant race felt obliged to respect. Others were made at a time when public opinion, in many localities, was dominated by the institution of slavery; when it would not have been safe to do justice to the black man; and when, so far as the rights of blacks were concerned, race prejudice was, practically, the supreme law of the land. Those decisions cannot be guides in the era introduced by the recent amendments of the supreme law, which established universal civil freedom, gave citizenship to all born or naturalized in the United States and residing here, obliterated the race line from our systems of governments, National and State, and placed our free institutions upon the broad and sure foundation of the equality of all men before the law.

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

For the reasons stated, I am constrained to withhold my assent from the opinion and judgment of the majority.

For Further Reading

---

American Empire: Debate over the Philippines

VIEWPOINT 13A

America Should Retain the Philippines (1900)
Albert J. Beveridge (1862–1937)

America's victory in the Spanish-American War in 1898 left the United States in possession of former...

From Albert J. Beveridge, Congressional Record, 55th Cong., 1st sess., 1900, pp. 704–12.
Spanish colonies Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Philippine Islands. Some Americans, known as anti-imperialists, were disturbed by the idea of their country's holding foreign colonies, and the treaty with Spain was ratified by the Senate in February 1899 by only a one-vote margin. The Philippine Islands, located across the Pacific Ocean from the United States, were the central focus of American anti-imperialist sentiment, which intensified in 1899 when Filipino nationalists, led by Emilio Aguinaldo, engaged in guerrilla warfare against U.S. soldiers in the Philippines.

One of the leading opponents of the anti-imperialist movement was Albert J. Beveridge, author of the following viewpoint. Elected by the state of Indiana to the U.S. Senate in 1899 at the age of 36, Beveridge toured the Philippines just prior to taking office, and was in favor of their annexation by the United States. On January 9, 1900, he addressed the Senate in support of the following proposition: "Resolved . . . that the Philippine Islands are territory belonging to the United States; that it is the intention of the United States to retain them as such and to establish and maintain such governmental control throughout the archipelago as the situation may demand."

Are the reasons for retaining the Philippines primarily economic, moral, or both, according to Beveridge? Does racial prejudice provide the foundation for his arguments? Beveridge is considered one of the most Progressive senators of his era. What does this say about progressivism?

I address the Senate at this time because Senators and Members of the House on both sides have asked that I give to Congress and the country my observations in the Philippines and the far East, and the conclusions which those observations compel; and because of hurtful resolutions introduced and utterances made in the Senate, every word of which will cost and is costing the lives of American soldiers.

The times call for candor. The Philippines are ours forever, "territory belonging to the United States," as the Constitution calls them. And just beyond the Philippines are China's illimitable markets. We will not retreat from either. We will not repudiate our duty in the archipelago. We will not abandon our opportunity in the Orient. We will not renounce our part in the mission of our race, trustee, under God, of the civilization of the world. And we will move forward to our work, not bowing out regrets like slaves whipped to their burdens, but with gratitude for a task worthy of our strength, and thanksgiving to Almighty God that He has marked us as His chosen people, henceforth to lead in the regeneration of the world.

This island empire is the last land left in all the oceans. If it should prove a mistake to abandon it, the blunder once made would be irretrievable. If it proves a mistake to hold it, the error can be corrected when we will. Every other progressive nation stands ready to relieve us.

But to hold it will be no mistake. Our largest trade henceforth must be with Asia. The Pacific is our ocean. More and more Europe will manufacture the most it needs, secure from its colonies the most it consumes. Where shall we turn for consumers of our surplus? Geography answers the question. China is our natural customer. She is nearer to us than to England, Germany, or Russia, the commercial powers of the present and the future. They have moved nearer to China by securing permanent bases on her borders. The Philippines give us a base at the door of all the East.

Lines of navigation from our ports to the Orient and Australia; from the Isthmian Canal to Asia; from all Oriental ports to Australia, converge at and separate from the Philippines. They are a self-supporting, dividend-paying fleet, permanently anchored at a spot selected by the strategy of Providence, commanding the Pacific. And the Pacific is the ocean of the commerce of the future. Most future wars will be conflicts for commerce. The power that rules the Pacific, therefore, is the power that rules the world. And, with the Philippines, that power is and will forever be the American Republic . . .

The Philippines command the commercial situation of the entire East. Can America best trade with China from San Francisco or New York? From San Francisco, of course. But if San Francisco were closer to China than New York is to Pittsburgh, what then? And Manila is nearer Hongkong than Habana [Havana] is to Washington. And yet American statesmen plan to surrender this commercial throne of the Orient where Providence and our soldiers' lives have placed us. When history comes to write the story of that suggested treason to American supremacy and therefore to the spread of American civilization, let her in mercy write that those who so proposed were merely blind and nothing more.

**Resources of the Islands**

But if they did not command China, India, the Orient, the whole Pacific for purposes of offense, defense, and trade, the Philippines are so valuable in themselves that we should hold them. I have cruised more than 2,000 miles through the archipelago, every moment a surprise at its loveliness and wealth. I have ridden hundreds of miles on the islands, every foot of the way a revelation of vegetable and mineral riches . . .

Luzon is larger and richer than New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, or Ohio. Mindanao is larger and
richer than all New England, exclusive of Maine. Manila, as a port of call and exchange, will, in the
time of men now living, far surpass Liverpool.
Behold the exhaustless markets they command. It is
as if a half dozen of our States were set down
between Oceania [islands of the South Pacific] and
the Orient, and those States themselves undeveloped
and unspoiled of their primitive wealth and
resources.

Nothing is so natural as trade with one's neighbors.
The Philippines make us the nearest neighbors of all
the East. Nothing is more natural than to trade with
those you know. This is the philosophy of all adver-
tising. The Philippines bring us permanently face
to face with the most sought-for customers of the
world. National prestige, national propinquity, these
and commercial activity are the elements of com-
mercial success. The Philippines give the first; the
character of the American people supply the last. It
is a providential conjunction of all the elements of
trade, of duty, and of power. If we are willing to go to
war rather than let England have a few feet of frozen
Alaska, which affords no market and commands
none, what should we not do rather than let
England, Germany, Russia, or Japan have all the
Philippines? And no man on the spot can fail to see
that this would be their fate if we retired.

The Character of the People

It will be hard for Americans who have not studied
them to understand the people. They are a bar-
barous race, modified by three centuries of contact
with a decadent race. The Filipino is the South Sea
Malay, put through a process of three hundred years
of superstition in religion, dishonesty in dealing, dis-
order in habits of industry; and cruelty, caprice, and
corruption in government. It is barely possible that
1,000 men in all the archipelago are capable of self-
government in the Anglo-Saxon sense.

My own belief is that there are not 100 men
among them who comprehend what Anglo-Saxon
self-government even means, and there are over
5,000,000 people to be governed. . . . [Emilio]
Aguinaldo is a clever, popular leader, able, brave,
resourceful, cunning, ambitious, unscrupulous, and
masterful. He is full of decision, initiative, and
authority, and had the confidence of the masses. He
is a natural dictator. His ideas of government are
absolute orders, implicit obedience, or immediate
death. He understands the character of his country
men. He is . . . not a Filipino Washington . . .

Abandonment Impossible

Here, then, Senators, is the situation. Two years
ago there was no land in all the world which we
could occupy for any purpose. Our commerce was
daily turning toward the Orient, and geography and
trade developments made necessary our commercial
empire over the Pacific. And in that ocean we had no
commercial, naval, or military base. To-day we have
one of the three great ocean possessions of the globe,
located at the most commanding commercial, naval,
and military points in the eastern seas, within hail of
India, shoulder to shoulder with China, richer in its
own resources than any equal body of land on the
entire globe, and peopled by a race which civilization
demands shall be improved. Shall we abandon it?
That man little knows the common people of the
Republic, little understands the instincts of our race,
who thinks we will not hold it fast and hold it forev-
er, administering just government by simplest meth-
ods. We may trick up devices to shift our burden and
lessen our opportunity; they will avail us nothing but
delay. We may tangle conditions by applying acade-
mic arrangements of self-government to a crude sit-
uation; their failure will drive us to our duty in the
end.

The military situation, past, present, and prospec-
tive, is no reason for abandonment. Our campaign
has been as perfect as possible with the force at
hand. We have been delayed, first, by a failure to
comprehend the immensity of our acquisition; and,
second, by insufficient force; and, third, by our
efforts for peace . . .

This war is like all other wars. It needs to be fin-
ished before it is stopped. I am prepared to vote
either to make our work thorough or even now to
abandon it. A lasting peace can be secured only by
overwhelming forces in ceaseless action until univer-
sal and absolutely final defeat is inflicted on the
enemy. To halt before every armed force, every guer-
illa band, opposing us is dispersed or exterminated
will prolong hostilities and leave alive the seeds of
perpetual insurrection.

__________________________________________________________

"We will not repudiate our duty in
the archipelago. We will not abandon
our opportunity in the Orient."

__________________________________________________________

Even then we should not treat [negotiate]. To treat
at all is to admit that we are wrong. And any quiet so
secured will be delusive and fleeting. And a false
peace will betray us; a sham truce will curse us. It is
not to serve the purposes of the hour, it is not to save
a present situation, that peace should be established.
It is for the tranquillity of the archipelago forever. It
is for an orderly government for the Filipinos for all
the future. It is to give this problem to posterity
solved and settled; not vexed and involved. It is to establish the supremacy of the American Republic over the Pacific and throughout the East till the end of time.

It has been charged that our conduct of the war has been cruel. Senators, it has been the reverse. I have been in our hospitals and seen the Filipino wounded as carefully, tenderly cared for as our own. Within our lines they may plow and sow and reap and go about the affairs of peace with absolute liberty. And yet all this kindness was misunderstood, or rather not understood. Senators must remember that we are not dealing with Americans or Europeans. We are dealing with Orientals. We are dealing with Malays who are Malays. We are dealing with Malays instructed in Spanish methods. They mistake kindness for weakness, forbearance for fear. It could not be otherwise unless you could erase hundreds of years of savagery, other hundreds of years of orientalism, and still other hundreds of years of Spanish character and custom.

Our mistake has not been cruelty; it has been kindness. . . .

The news that 60,000 American soldiers have crossed the Pacific; that, if necessary, the American Congress will make it 100,000 or 200,000 men; that, at any cost, we will establish peace and govern the islands, will do more to end the war than the soldiers themselves. But the report that we even discuss the withdrawal of a single soldier at the present time and that we even debate the possibility of not administering government throughout the archipelago ourselves will be misunderstood and misrepresented and will blow into a flame once more the fires our soldiers’ blood has almost quenched.

War Opponents Betray Soldiers

Reluctantly and only from a sense of duty am I forced to say that American opposition to the war has been the chief factor in prolonging it. Had Aguinaldo not understood that in America, even in the American Congress, even here in the Senate, he and his cause were supported; had he not known that it was proclaimed on the stump and in the press of a faction in the United States that every shot his misguided followers fired into the breasts of American soldiers was like the volleys fired by Washington’s men against the soldiers of King George his insurrection would have dissolved before it entirely crystallized.

The utterances of American opponents of the war are read to the ignorant soldiers of Aguinaldo and repeated in exaggerated form among the common people. Attempts have been made by wretches claiming American citizenship to ship arms and ammunition from Asiatic ports to the Filipinos, and these acts of infamy were coupled by the Malays with American assaults on our Government at home. The Filipinos do not understand free speech, and therefore our tolerance of American assaults on the American President and the American Government means to them that our President is in the minority or he would not permit what appears to them such treasonable criticism. It is believed and stated in Luzon, Panay, and Cebu that the Filipinos have only to fight, harass, retreat, break up into small parties, if necessary, as they are doing now, but by any means hold out until the next Presidential election, and our forces will be withdrawn.

All this has aided the enemy more than climate, arms, and battle. Senators, I have heard these reports myself; I have talked with the people; I have seen our mangled boys in the hospital and field; I have stood on the firing line and beheld our dead soldiers, their faces turned to the pitiless southern sky, and in sorrow rather than anger I say to those whose voices in America have cheered those misguided natives on to shoot our soldiers down, that the blood of those dead and wounded boys of ours is on their hands, and the flood of all the years can never wash that stain away. In sorrow rather than anger I say these words, for I earnestly believe that our brothers knew not what they did.

Filipinos and Self-Government

But, Senators, it would be better to abandon this combined garden and Gibraltar of the Pacific, and count our blood and treasure already spent a profitable loss, than to apply any academic arrangement of self-government to these children. They are not capable of self-government. How could they be? They are not of a self-governing race. They are Orientals, Malays, instructed by Spaniards in the latter’s worst estate.

They know nothing of practical government except as they have witnessed the weak, corrupt, cruel, and capricious rule of Spain. What magic will anyone employ to dissolve in their minds and characters those impressions of governors and governed which three centuries of misrule has created? What alchemy will change the oriental quality of their blood and set the self-governing currents of the American pouring through their Malay veins? How shall they, in the twinkling of an eye, be exalted to the heights of self-governing peoples which required a thousand years for us to reach, Anglo-Saxon though we are?

Let men beware how they employ the term “self-government.” It is a sacred term. It is the watchword at the door of the inner temple of liberty, for liberty does not always mean self-government. Self-government is a method of liberty—the highest, simplest, best—and it is acquired only after centuries of study and struggle and experiment and
instruction and all the elements of the progress of man. Self-government is no base and common thing, to be bestowed on the merely audacious. It is the degree which crowns the graduate of liberty, not the name of liberty’s infant class, who have not yet mastered the alphabet of freedom. Savage blood, oriental blood, Malay blood, Spanish example—are these the elements of self-government?

We must act on the situation as it exists, not as we would wish it. I have talked with hundreds of these people, getting their views as to the practical workings of self-government. The great majority simply do not understand any participation in any government whatever. The most enlightened among them declare that self-government will succeed because the employers of labor will compel their employees to vote as their employer wills and that this will insure intelligent voting. I was assured that we could depend upon good men always being in office because the officials who constitute the government will nominate their successors, choose those among the people who will do the voting, and determine how and where elections will be held.

The most ardent advocate of self-government that I met was anxious that I should know that such a government would be tranquil because, as he said, if anyone criticised it, the government would shoot the offender. A few of them have a sort of verbal understanding of the democratic theory, but the above are the examples of the ideas of the practical workings of self-government entertained by the aristocracy, the rich planters and traders, and heavy employers of labor, the men who would run the government.

An Indolent People

Example for decades will be necessary to instruct them in American ideas and methods of administration. Example, example; always example—this alone will teach them. As a race, their general ability is not excellent. Educators, both men and women, to whom I have talked in Cebu and Luzon, were unanimous in the opinion that in all solid and useful education they are, as a people, dull and stupid. In showy things, like carving and painting or embroidery or music, they have apparent aptitude, but even this is superficial and never thorough. They have facility of speech, too.

The three best educators on the island at different times made to me the same comparison, that the common people in their stupidity are like their caribou bulls. They are not even good agriculturists. Their waste of cane is inexcusable. Their destruction of hemp fiber is childish. They are incurably indolent. They have no continuity or thoroughness of industry. They will quit work without notice and amuse themselves until the money they have earned is spent. They are like children playing at men’s work.

No one need fear their competition with our labor. No reward could beguile, no force compel, these children of indolence to leave their trifling lives for the fierce and servile industry of high-wrought America. The very reverse is the fact. One great problem is the necessary labor to develop these islands—to build the roads, open the mines, clear the wilderness, drain the swamps, dredge the harbors. The natives will not supply it. A lingering prejudice against the Chinese may prevent us from letting them supply it. Ultimately, when the real truth of the climate and human conditions is known, it is barely possible that our labor will go there. Even now young men with the right moral fiber and a little capital can make fortunes there as planters.

The Declaration of Independence

The Declaration of Independence does not forbid us to do our part in the regeneration of the world. If it did, the Declaration would be wrong, just as the Articles of Confederation, drafted by the very same men who signed the Declaration, was found to be wrong. The Declaration has no application to the present situation. It was written by self-governing men for self-governing men.

It was written by men who, for a century and a half, had been experimenting in self-government on this continent, and whose ancestors for hundreds of years before had been gradually developing toward that high and holy estate. The Declaration applies only to people capable of self-government. How dare any man prostitute this expression of the very elect of self-governing peoples to a race of Malay children of barbarism, schooled in Spanish methods and ideas? And you, who say the Declaration applies to all men, how dare you deny its application to the American Indian? And if you deny it to the Indian at home, how dare you grant it to the Malay abroad?

The Declaration does not contemplate that all government must have the consent of the governed. It announces that man’s “inalienable rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are established among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that when any form of government becomes destructive of those rights, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it.” “Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness” are the important things; “consent of the governed” is one of the means to those ends.

If “any form of government becomes destructive of those ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it,” says the Declaration. “Any form” includes all forms. Thus the Declaration itself recognizes other forms of government than those resting on the
consent of the governed. The word "consent" itself recognizes other forms, for "consent" means the understanding of the thing to which the "consent" is given; and there are people in the world who do not understand any form of government. And the sense in which "consent" is used in the Declaration is broader than mere understanding; for "consent" in the Declaration means participation in the government "consented" to. And yet these people who are not capable of "consenting" to any form of government must be governed.

And so the Declaration contemplates all forms of government which secure the fundamental rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Self-government, when that will best secure these ends, as in the case of people capable of self-government; other appropriate forms when people are not capable of self-government. And so the authors of the Declaration themselves governed the Indian without his consent; the inhabitants of Louisiana without their consent; and ever since the sons of the makers of the Declaration have been governing not by theory, but by practice, after the fashion of our governing race, now by one form, now by another, but always for the purpose of securing the great eternal ends of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, not in the savage, but in the civilized meaning of those terms—life according to orderly methods of civilized society; liberty regulated by law; pursuit of happiness limited by the pursuit of happiness by every other man.

Expansion and the Constitution

Senators in opposition are estopped from denying our constitutional power to govern the Philippines as circumstances may demand, for such power is admitted in the case of Florida, Louisiana, Alaska. How, then, is it denied in the Philippines? Is there a geographical interpretation to the Constitution? Do degrees of longitude fix constitutional limitations? Does a thousand miles of ocean diminish constitutional power more than a thousand miles of land?

The ocean does not separate us from the field of our duty and endeavor—it joins us, an established highway needing no repair, and landing us at any point desired. The seas do not separate the Philippine Islands from us or from each other. The seas are highways through the archipelago, which would cost hundreds of millions of dollars to construct if they were land instead of water. Land may separate men from their desire, the ocean never. Russia has been centuries in crossing Siberian wastes; the Puritans cross the Atlantic in brief and flying weeks.

No! No! The ocean unites us; steam unites us; electricity unites us; all the elements of nature unite us to the region where duty and interest call us. There is in the ocean no constitutional argument against the

march of the flag, for the oceans, too, are ours.

No; the oceans are not limitations of the power which the Constitution expressly gives Congress to govern all territory the nation may acquire. The Constitution declares that "Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory belonging to the United States." Not the Northwest Territory only; not Louisiana or Florida only; not territory on this continent only, but any territory anywhere belonging to the nation. The founders of the nation were not provincial. Theirs was the geography of the world. They were soldiers as well as landmen, and they knew that where our ships should go our flag might follow. They had the logic of progress, and they knew that the Republic they were planting must, in obedience to the laws of our expanding race, necessarily develop into the greater Republic which the world beholds today, and into the still mightier Republic which the world will finally acknowledge as the arbiter, under God, of the destinies of mankind. And so our fathers wrote into the Constitution these words of growth, of expansion, of empire, if you will, unlimited by geography or climate or by anything but the vitality and possibilities of the American people: "Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory belonging to the United States."

The power to govern all territory the nation may acquire would have been in Congress if the language affirming that power had not been written in the Constitution. For not all powers of the National Government are expressed. Its principal powers are implied. The written Constitution is but the index of the living Constitution. Had this not been true, the Constitution would have failed. For the people in any event would have developed and progressed. And if the Constitution had not had the capacity for growth corresponding with the growth of the nation, the Constitution would and should have been abandoned as the Articles of Confederation were abandoned. For the Constitution is not immortal in itself, is not useful even in itself. The Constitution is immortal and even useful only as it serves the orderly development of the nation. The nation alone is immortal. The nation alone is sacred. The Army is its servant. The Navy is its servant. The President is its servant. This Senate is its servant. Our laws are its methods. Our Constitution is its instrument.

This is the golden rule of constitutional interpretation: The Constitution was made for the people, not the people for the Constitution.

An Elemental Question

This question is deeper than any question of party politics; deeper than any question of the isolated pol-
icy of our county even; deeper even than any question of constitutional power. It is elemental. It is racial. God has not been preparing the English-speaking and Teutonic peoples for a thousand years for nothing but vain and idle self-contemplation and self-admiration. No! He has made us the master organizers of the world to establish system where chaos reigns. He has given us the spirit of progress to overwhelm the forces of reaction throughout the earth. He has made us adepts in government that we may administer government among savage and senile peoples. Were it not for such a force as this the world would relapse into barbarism and night. And of all our race He has marked the American people as His chosen nation to finally lead in the regeneration of the world. This is the divine mission of America, and it holds for us all the profit, all the glory, all the happiness possible to man. We are trustees of the world’s progress, guardians of its righteous peace. The judgment of the Master is upon us: “Ye have been faithful over a few things; I will make you ruler over many things.”

What shall history say of us? Shall it say that we renounced that holy trust, left the savage to his base condition, the wilderness to the reign of waste, deserted duty, abandoned glory, forgot our sordid profit even, because we feared our strength and read the charter of our powers with the doubter’s eye and the quibbler’s mind? Shall it say that, called by events to captain and command the proudest, ablest, purest race of history in history’s noblest work, we declined that great commission? Our fathers would not have had it so. No! They founded no paralytic government, incapable of the simplest acts of administration. They planted no slaggard people, passive while the world’s work calls them. They established no reactionary nation. They unfurled no retreating flag.

**God’s Hand in All**

That flag has never paused in its onward march. Who dares halt it now—now, when history’s largest events are carrying it forward; now, when we are at last one people, strong enough for any task, great enough for any glory destiny can bestow? How comes it that our first century closes with the process of consolidating the American people into a unit just accomplished, and quick upon the stroke of that great hour presses upon us our world opportunity, world duty, and world glory, which none but a people welded into an indivisible nation can achieve or perform?

Blind indeed is he who sees not the hand of God in events so vast, so harmonious, so benign. Reactionary indeed is the mind that perceives not that this vital people is the strongest of the saving forces of the world; that our place, therefore, is at the head of the constructing and redeeming nations of the earth; and that to stand aside while events march on is a surrender of our interests, a betrayal of our duty as blind as it is base. Craven indeed is the heart that fears to perform a work so golden and so noble; that dares not win a glory so immortal.

Do you tell me that it will cost us money? When did Americans ever measure duty by financial standards? Do you tell me of the tremendous toil required to overcome the vast difficulties of our task? What mighty work for the world, for humanity, even for ourselves, has ever been done with ease? Even our bread must we eat by the sweat of our faces. Why are we charged with power such as no people ever knew, if we are not to use it in a work such as no people ever wrought? Who will dispute the divine meaning of the [Biblical] fable of the talents?

Do you remind me of the precious blood that must be shed, the lives that must be given, the broken hearts of loved ones for their slain? And this is indeed a heavier price than all combined. And yet as a nation every historic duty we have done, every achievement we have accomplished, has been by the sacrifice of our noblest sons. Every holy memory that glorifies the flag is of those heroes who have died that its onward march might not be stayed. It is the nation’s dearest lives yielded for the flag that makes it dear to us; it is the nation’s most precious blood poured out for it that makes it precious to us. That flag is woven of heroism and grief, of the bravery of men and women’s tears, of righteousness and battle, of sacrifice and anguish, of triumph and of glory. It is these which make our flag a holy thing. Who would tear from that sacred banner the glorious legends of a single battle where it has waved on land or sea? What son of a soldier of the flag whose father fell beneath it on any field would surrender that proud record for the heraldry of a king? In the cause of civilization, in the service of the Republic anywhere on earth, Americans consider wounds the noblest decorations man can win, and count the giving of their lives a glad and precious duty.

Pray God that spirit never fails. Pray God the time may never come when Mammon and the love of ease shall so debase our blood that we will fear to shed it for the flag and its imperial destiny. Pray God the time may never come when American heroism is but a legend like the story of the Cid, American faith in our mission and our might a dream dissolved, and the glory of our mighty race departed.

And that time will never come. We will renew our youth at the fountain of new and glorious deeds. We will exalt our reverence for the flag by carrying it to a noble future as well as by remembering its ineffable past. Its immortality will not pass, because everywhere and always we will acknowledge and discharge.
the solemn responsibilities our sacred flag, in its deepest meaning, puts upon us. And so, Senators, with reverent hearts, where dwells the fear of God, the American people move forward to the future of their hope and the doing of His work.

Senators, adopt the resolution offered, that peace may quickly come and that we may begin our saving, regenerating, and uplifting work. Adopt it, and this bloodshed will cease when these deluded children of our islands learn that this is the final word of the representatives of the American people in Congress assembled. Reject it, and the world, history, and the American people will know where to forever fix the awful responsibility for the consequences that will surely follow such failure to do our manifest duty. How dare we delay when our soldiers’ blood is flowing?

---

**VIEWPOINT 13B**

**America Should Not Rule the Philippines (1900)**

Joseph Henry Crooker (1850–1931)

The American Anti-Imperialist League was founded in 1898 to protest the U.S. acquisition of Spanish colonies following the Spanish-American War. A central area of concern was the Philippines, a former Spanish colony ten thousand miles from California with a population of seven million people. In 1899 the newly annexed American colony became the site of a prolonged military struggle between American soldiers stationed there and nationalist rebels, which intensified the domestic controversy over American imperialism. The league pressed its case against colonizing the Philippines through meetings, speeches, and pamphlets. The following viewpoint is taken from a 1900 pamphlet written by league member Joseph Henry Crooker, a Unitarian clergyman and author of several books on religious issues.

What does Crooker see as most alarming about the American acquisition of the Philippines? How does he differentiate between continental and overseas expansion? Are Crooker’s views of the Filipino people, as expressed in this viewpoint, more or less prejudiced than those of Albert J. Beveridge in viewpoint 13A?

---

A political doctrine is now preached in our midst that is the most alarming evidence of moral decay that ever appeared in American history. Its baleful significance consists, not simply in its moral hatefulness, but in the fact that its advocates are so numerous and so prominent.

It is this: A powerful nation, representative of civilization, has the right, for the general good of humanity, to buy, conquer, subjugate, control, and govern feeble and backward races and peoples, without reference to their wishes or opinions.

This is preached from pulpits as the gospel of Christ. It is proclaimed in executive documents as American statesmanship. It is defended in legislative halls as the beginning of a more glorious chapter in human history. It is boastfully declaimed from the platform as the first great act in the regeneration of mankind. It is published in innumerable editorials, red with cries for blood and hot with lust for gold, as the call of God to the American people.

But how came these men to know so clearly the mind of the Almighty? Was the cant of piety ever more infamously used? Was selfishness ever more wantonly arrayed in the vestments of sanctity? Is this the modern chivalry of the strong to the weak? Then let us surrender all our fair ideals and admit that might alone makes right. Is this the duty of great nations to small peoples? Then morality is a fiction. Is this the gospel of Jesus? Then let us repudiate the Golden Rule. Is this the crowning lesson of America to the world? Then let us renounce our democracy.

**A Hateful Doctrine**

This doctrine is the maxim of bigotry, “The end justifies the means,” reshaped by the ambition of reckless politicians and enforced by the greed of selfish speculators. It is infinitely worse than the policy of the old ecclesiastics, for they had in view the salvation of others, while the advocates of this seek the subjugation of others. The colonial motive, now stirring among us, is not love for others. The mask is too thin and too black to deceive even a savage Filipino.

A similar motive and policy piled the fagots [bundled sticks] about every burning martyr. It turned every thumbscrew that tortured heretics. It laid on the lash that drew blood from the back of every suffering slave. This teaching unbars the bottomless pit and lets loose upon the world every demon that ever vexed the human race. It unchains every wild passion that has lingered in man’s blood since it flowed upward from the brute. It prepares the path by which the despot will reach his throne of tyranny and it arms him with instruments of oppression . . . .

To banish this theory of human affairs from the new world Washington suffered at Valley Forge and contended at Yorktown. To destroy the last vestige of this hateful policy, Grant conquered at Appomattox.

This is not true Americanism, but the contradiction of every principle for which we have contended and in which we have gloried for over a century. This is
not the upward way of civilization, but the backward
descent to barbarism.

If this be Duty, let us recite no more the Master’s
[Jesus] creed of love. If this be Destiny, let us pro-
claim no more the rights of men. If this be Patriotism,
let us sing no more “America.” We must rewrite the
“Star Spangled Banner,” and make its theme the
praise of conquest and colonization. We must erase
the motto, “E Pluribus Unum,” and inscribe instead:
“One nation in authority over many people.” We must
tear up the Declaration of Independence and put in
its place “A Summary of the Duties of Colonists to
Their Master.” But this is political atheism.

Something more than the welfare of distant peo-
oples is at stake. We condemn this teaching and policy,
not simply to secure justice for the brown man, but to
insure justice and freedom for ourselves. The motive
of our protest is more than friendship for him: it is
devotion to principles of liberty that are the necessary
conditions of universal human progress. The feelings
of sympathy and justice ought to rule us in these rela-
tions. But every advocate of our present national pol-
icy outrages these sentiments whenever he makes his
defense. His words ring false. And yet, the heart of
the matter lies far deeper. The true glory of America
is imperiled. The happiness of our descendants is
assailed. The mission of America as the representa-
tive and guardian of Liberty is in question. The per-
petuity of free institutions hangs in the balance.

Our National Shame

We cannot worship this golden calf and go un-
scourged. We cannot violate the principles of our
government and enjoy the blessings of those princi-
pies. We cannot deny freedom across the ocean and
maintain it at home. This Nation cannot endure with
part of its people citizens and part colonists. The flag
will lose all its glory if it floats at once over freemen
and subjects. We cannot long rule other men and
keep our own liberty. In the high and holy name of
humanity, we are trampling upon the rights of men.
But Nemesis will wake. The mask will fall; our joy will
turn to bitterness; we shall find ourselves in chains.

Most of all, we lament the stain that has come to
our flag, not from the soldier carrying it, but from
the policy that has compelled him to carry it in an
unjust cause. On executive hands falls, not only the
blood of the hunted islander, but the blood of the
American murdered by the ambition that sent him to
invade distant lands. What we most deplore is the
surrender that we as a nation have made of our lead-
ership in the world’s great work of human emancipa-
tion. What we most bitterly mourn is that we, by our
selfish dreams of mere commercialism, have piled
obstacles mountain high in the way of progress.

What is most surprising and most alarming is the
fact that large numbers of our people still call this
national ambition for conquest and dominion a form
of exalted patriotism. But we are surely under the
spell of a malign influence. A false Americanism has
captivated our reason and corrupted our conscience.
May this hypnotic lethargy, induced by the glit-
ttering but deceptive bauble of imperialism, speedily pass
away; and may these fellow citizens become again
true Americans, free to labor for the liberty of all
men and intent on helping the lowly of all lands to
independence.

“This Nation cannot endure with part of
its people citizens and part colonists.”

It is time that all American citizens should look
more carefully into the conditions and tendencies
which constitute what may well be called, “The Menace to America.” Let me discuss briefly certain
phases of what arises ominously before us as the
Philippine problem. It is a problem of vast impor-
tance, and yet it has not been treated as fully as its
great magnitude and inherent difficulties deserve.
One of the alarming indications of the hour is the
popular unwillingness to admit that these new pol-
cies present any serious problem. There seems to be
no general recognition that anything strange or dan-
gerous is happening. Those who raise a cry of warn-
ing are denounced as pessimists; those who enter
criticism are branded as traitors. We are told in a
jaunty manner to have faith in the American people.
This blind trust in “destiny” makes the triumph of
the demagogue easy. This indifference to political
discussion is the symptom of the paralysis of true
patriotism.

Slaughter and Destruction

The following is one phase of the popular argu-
ment in justification of our oriental aggressions: The
obligations of humanity demanded that we take pos-
session of the Philippine Islands in order to prevent
the anarchy which would certainly have followed had
we taken any other course than that which we did.
But would a little native-grown anarchy have been
as bad as the slaughter and destruction which we
have intruded? Let us remember that we ourselves
have already killed and wounded thousands of the
inhabitants. We have arrayed tribe against tribe; we
have desolated homes and burned villages; agricul-
ture and commerce have been prostrated; and finally,
we have created hatred of ourselves in the breasts
of millions of people to remain for years to plague us
and them. It is not likely that if left to themselves anything half so serious would have occurred. It is perfectly clear that some other attitude towards those Islands besides that of domination, which this Nation most unfortunately took, would have prevented these results.

And we are not yet at the end. Recurring outbreaks against us as intruders, by people desirous of independence, will undoubtedly produce more distress, and disorder in the next ten years (if our present policy is maintained) than would have resulted from native incapacity. Moreover, there are no facts in evidence that warrant the assertion that anxiety would have followed had we left them more to themselves. This is wholly an unfounded assumption. It would certainly have been well to have waited and given them a chance before interfering. That we did not, that we did not give them a chance, is proof positive that our national policy was not shaped by considerations of humanity or a reasonable desire to benefit them, but by a spirit of selfish aggrandizement.

**Whose Financial Gain?**

It is pitiful that our people, and especially the common people, should be so carried away by wild and baseless dreams of the commercial advantage of these Islands. It is bad enough to sacrifice patriotism upon the altar of Mammon; but it is clear that in this case the sacrifice will be made without securing any benefit, even from Mammon.

The annual expense our Nation will incur by the military and naval establishment in the Philippines will be at least $100,000,000. This the taxpayer of America must pay. On the other hand the trade profits from these Islands—from the very nature of the case—will go directly into the pockets of millionaire monopolists, the few speculators who will get possession of the business interests there, in the line of hemp, sugar, tobacco and lumber.

The proposition is a plain one. These Islands will cost us, the common people, a hundred million dollars a year. The profits from them, possibly an equal sum, will go directly to a few very rich men. This is a very sleek speculative scheme for transferring vast sums of money from the people at large to the bank accounts of a few monopolists. Can any one see anything very helpful to the common taxpayer in such a policy? This is a serious problem for consideration, in addition to the competition of American labor with cheap Asiatic workmen—in itself sufficiently serious.

The question I press is this: Can such a policy work anything but financial harm to the average American citizen? For one, I do not care to pay this tribute money every time I draw a check or buy a bottle of medicine, tribute money that means oppression to those distant islanders, unnecessary burdens to our own people, and a still larger store for speculators to be used in corrupting American politics!

**What Is “Expansion?”**

A passionate demand for expansion has taken possession of the American imagination. It is contended, We must come out of our little corner and take our place on the worldstage of the nations.

But what has been the real expansion of our Nation for over a century? It has been two-fold. (1) The extension of our free institutions westward across the continent to the Pacific coast; (2) the powerful influence of our republican principles throughout the world. Our political ideals have modified the sentiments of great nations; our people have flowed over contiguous territories and planted there the same civic, social, religious and educational institutions that they possessed in their Eastern home. All this has been a normal and natural growth of true Americanism.

The policy that now popularly bears the name “expansion” is something radically different; and it is in no sense the expansion of America. Our people have been so far deceived by something far worse than an optical illusion—a deceptive phrase has lured them into danger and toward despotism. To buy 10,000,000 distant islanders is the expansion of Jefferson Davis, not the expansion of Abraham Lincoln. To tax far-off colonists without their consent is the expansion of the policy of [British king] George III, not the expansion of the patriotism of George Washington. To rule without representation subject peoples is not the expansion of Americanism, but the triumph of imperialism.

The policy advocated is the suppression of American principles, the surrender of our sublime ideals, and the end of our beneficent ministry of liberty among the nations. Just because I want to see America expand I condemn the policy as unpatriotic. Let us not deceive ourselves; the expansion of military rule and sordid commercialism is not the expansion of our real strength or true glory. Let us not mistake the renunciation of American ideals for the expansion of American institutions.

**Flag and Constitution**

Wherever the flag goes, there the constitution must go. Wherever the flag waves, there the whole of the flag must be present. Wherever the constitution is extended, there the entire constitution must rule. If any one does not wish to accept these consequences, then let the flag be brought back to the spot where it can represent true Americanism, and Americanism in its entirety. What shall our banner be to the Filipinos? A symbol of his own liberty or the hated emblem of a foreign oppressor? Shall it float over him in Manila as
a mere subject and say to him when he lands in San Francisco that he is an alien? Then that flag will become the object of the world's derision!

If it does not symbolize American institutions in their fulness wherever it floats, then our starry banner becomes false to America and oppressive to those who may fear its authority, but do not share its freedom. Disgrace and harm will not come from taking the flag down, but rather from keeping it where it loses all that our statesmen, prophets and soldiers have put into it. The only way to keep "Old Glory" from becoming a falsehood is to give all under it the liberty that it represents. Nowhere must it remain simply to represent a power to be dreaded, but everywhere it must symbolize rights and privileges shared by all.

Among the many bad things bound up with this unfortunate business none is worse than the degradation of America, sure to follow in more ways than one, if we persist in the course that we are now following. No stronger or sadder proof of the unwise and harmful character of this policy is needed than the fact that its defenders are led so quickly to part company with sober argument and truthful statement and rush into virulent abuse and deceptive sophistries. Who would have believed two years ago that any sane man would have appealed to Washington in support of a policy so abhorrent to the Father of his Country? What ignoble unveracity in twisting his words into the approval of foreign conquest! Who would have thought it possible that scholars and statesmen would so soon become mere jugglers with words, pretending that our previous territorial expansion furnishes analogy and warrant for a colonial system far across the ocean, entered upon by warfare and maintained by Congress without constitutional safeguards! These facts show how virulent a poison is at work upon the national mind. We have here already a perversion of patriotism and a loss of political sagacity and veracity.

It is bad enough to hear men exclaim: "There is money in it and that is sufficient"—but a national venture that leads men to scoff at the Declaration of Independence, to ridicule the constitution as outgrown, to denounce the wisdom of the fathers as foolishness, and to declare that American glory dates from Manila bay: Is there not something ominous in such talk? If a brief experience in the expansion of America that scoffs at American principles produces such results, is it not time to sound the alarm? If the defense of a policy compels men to take such positions, there is something infinitely dangerous in that policy.

For Further Reading

Social Issues of the Progressive Era

VIEWPOINT 14A

American Women Should Have the Right to Vote (1909)
Julia Ward Howe (1819–1910)

Julia Ward Howe, a noted writer, lecturer, and social reformer, is perhaps best known as the author of "The Battle Hymn of the Republic," written during the Civil War. In 1869 she helped found the American Woman Suffrage Association, an organization that worked to gain the vote for women in individual states. She also was the first president of the New England Woman Suffrage Association. In the following viewpoint, taken from a 1909 article in Outlook magazine, she describes the positive results of woman suffrage in Colorado and other places, and argues for the right to vote for all American women.

Does Howe exhibit racial prejudice in her comments on black suffrage? What examples of the positive impact of woman suffrage on society does she stress? Does Howe argue that woman suffrage would cause radical changes in American society?

When the stripling David, having rashly undertaken to encounter the Philistine giant [Goliath], found himself obliged to choose a weapon for the unequal fight, he dismissed the costly armament offered him by the king, and went back to the simple stone and sling with which he was familiar. Even in like manner will I, pledged just now to make a plain statement of the claims of woman to suffrage, trust myself to state the case as it appeared to me when, after a delay of some years, I finally gave it my adhesion [assent].

Having a quick and rather preponderating sense of

New Deal Programs, a.k.a. “Alphabet Soup” (1933 – 1939)
(* agencies that are still used today)

The First New Deal (1933-1934)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Name &amp; Years in Use</th>
<th>Relief, Recovery or Reform?</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Effects: Positive and/or Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EBA</td>
<td>Emergency Banking Act 1933</td>
<td>Relief</td>
<td>Created a week-long bank holiday to keep people from withdrawing money. Govt. examined banks and only allowed secure ones to reopen.</td>
<td>Pos: Americans regained confidence in the banking industry. Neg: No cash withdraws for a week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NRA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FDIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Second New Deal (1935 – 1938) After Democrats won a huge victory in the 1934 Congressional Elections**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FHA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WPA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SSA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **NLRB** | National Labor Relations Board  
“The Wagner Act”  
1935 - |   |