HISTORY 576:CONTEMPORARY AMERICA

Course Syllabus

History 576.01
CID#8659
Summer II, 2008
James S. Olson

Course Focus

The course on will focus on nativism and ethnic relations in the United States since 1830. For our purposes, we will define ethnicity as an individual's sense of loyalty to or identification with a group based on shared physical (racial), characteristics, national origins, religious ideas, and language. Ethnic identities can be based on any or all of the above items. Nativism, therefore is based on fear of another ethnic groups, especially an immigrant ethnic group and attempts to marginalize them through persecution or anti-immigrant legislation.

1. Students will become familiar with the historiographical trends concerning slavery, ethnicity, and immigration during the twentieth century.
2. Students will become familiar with the history of U.S. immigration policy since 1789.
3. Students will improve their writing.

Required Texts

Oscar Handlin, *The Uprooted.*
John Higham, *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1880-1925.*
James S. Olson. *Equality Deferred: Race and Ethnicity in America Since 1945.*

Lesson One

For Lesson One, please read the material below as background to the course. The essays are part of an unpublished U.S. history Dr. Olson is writing. Please write a 500-word essay summarizing the major themes of the chapter as they relate to Jacksonian democracy and ethnic relations.

THE AGE OF JACKSON, 1824-1840

Andrew Jackson was a man of the people, or so the people thought. He was not like George Washington, always a bit distant and aloof as if he were perpetually posing for a marble statue. Nor was he like Thomas Jefferson, an intensely private man capable of putting the most tender or elevated thought on paper but who turned crimson over the prospects of speaking in public. And he was not like John Adams or John Quincy Adams, in thought and action two New England Yankees. No, Jackson was like so many Americans of his generation--poorly educated, quick to rile, slow to forget, a true friend, and a dreaded enemy. Take what most Americans

were and what they hoped to be, multiply it by ten, and you had a rough approximation of Andrew Jackson.

Born in 1767 in the Tennessee backwoods, he became, after George Washington, America's second great military hero, the man who chased Spaniards out of Florida, Indians out of the Southeast, and the British out of New Orleans. Stubbornly opinionated, he was known to Americans as the "man of iron." Part of that hero worship emanated from his duel with Charles Dickinson. Jackson prepared for the confrontation wearing a thick, loose-fitting coat to disguise his slender figure, hoping to confuse Dickinson's aim. He also allowed Dickinson, an expert marksman, to shoot first. From a distance of only 24 feet, Dickinson fired a round into Jackson's chest. The bullet lodged next to Jackson's heart, but the general did not fall down. He stood his ground, took careful aim, and fired a fatal round into Dickinson's groin. Jackson then walked away. A spectator later remarked, "His astonishing self-command appeared almost superhuman to his friends who witnessed the scene."

This being the case, it was only natural that the people would want to see their man inaugurated president. He had easily won the presidential election of 1828, and in the weeks before the inauguration, admirers rolled into Washington, D.C., from all over the country. "I never saw such a crowd here before," observed Senator Daniel Webster, decidedly not a Jackson man. "Persons have come five hundred miles to see General Jackson, and they really seem to think that the country is rescued from some dreadful danger!" Jackson's supporters reminded one observer of the German barbarians who inundated the Roman Empire. But this new horde had come not to destroy an empire but to witness the birth of the "people's government." Checking into hotel rooms and boarding houses, sleeping under the stars, spending their days and nights looking for food and drink, slapping each other on the back, and talking about grand things to come, they treated the capital like their own home.

March 4, 1829, the day of the inauguration, was sunny and bright, unlike the cold and wet days that led up to it. It was "as if nature was willing to lend her aid towards contributing to the happiness of the thousands that crowded to behold the great ceremony," wrote one reporter. For hours "his people" waited for just a glimpse of their hero. They lined the unpaved street, grandly called Pennsylvania Avenue, which stretched from the president's mansion to the Capitol. The inauguration address would be delivered outdoors on the Capitol's East Portico, and there the people packed the tightest. Shortly after 11:00 a.m., Jackson began his walk to destiny. He was dressed simply--black suit, black tie, long black coat--and in the sea of men wearing hats that surrounded him, he himself was hatless--"the Servant in the presence of his Sovereign, the People," thought the wife of a senator. He walked stiff and tall, visible to all.

After watching his vice-president sworn in, Jackson made his way to the East Portico. The mere sight of him made the air come alive with noise. People cheered, riflemen fired a salute, cannons erupted, and the Marine band broke into "The President's March." Jackson looked at the smiling faces for a long moment, then bowed low, acknowledging that he was one of them. Then he began to speak, and at once the crowd quieted. It was a short address--no more than ten minutes--and only those close to Jackson heard much of it, though in truth those who heard nothing did not miss much. The cheers afterward lasted almost as long as the speech. Then it was time for Chief Justice John Marshall to administer the oath of office. Jackson, one hand on the Bible and the other raised toward heaven, forcefully repeated every word, fully enunciating each syllable of the phrase "preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the

United States." When he had finished, he raised the Bible to his lips and kissed it, shook Marshall's hand, and turned once again to face his smiling, cheering people and bowed.

Later, the "Jackson mob" turned a White House reception into an eating and drinking free-for-all. "[A]ll sorts of people, from the highest and most polished, down to the most vulgar and gross in the nation," shouldered next to each other. The "most polished" soon departed, while the "most vulgar" went on a rampage. They ate what was edible, drank what was drinkable, spilled food and liquor, broke china and furniture, and tramped mud everywhere. Jackson left early, and to get the mob outside of the mansion, servants dragged tubs of wine and ice cream out to the garden. After observing the scene, one guest noted, "The majesty of the people had disappeared, and the rabble, a mob of boys, negroes, women, children, screaming, fighting romping. What a pity what a pity."

Though nearly everyone had at least something to say about the reception, the most important questions went unanswered. Who were these people, Jackson's people, and what did they expect from him? Clearly they viewed their hero as a savior, but as a savior of what? And what of Jackson himself? He certainly had not presented any sort of blueprint in his short inaugural address. Did he see himself as a savior or a revolutionary--or both? Never in the nation's history had the American people faced a new president with such mixed feelings of joy, expectation, fear, and dread. A decidedly uncommon man, Andrew Jackson eventually came to symbolize the sheer vigor of democratic government, of a nation willing to trust the common sense judgement of common people.

DEMOCRACY'S IMPERATIVES

Andrew Jackson rode into the White House on the crest of a democratic tidal wave that redefined the meaning of individual rights. The logic of republicanism, first liberated during the American Revolution, continued to assault Old World notions of class and privilege, and observers on both sides of the Atlantic detected signs of another revolution. One of them was Frenchman Alexis de Tocqueville. "I have long had the greatest desire to visit North America," he wrote in 1830. "I shall go see there what a great republic is like." He spent forty-one weeks in 1831 touring the United States, and when he returned to France, he had the makings of his famous book Democracy in America (1835). "I admit," he wrote, "that I saw in America more than America; it was the shape of democracy itself...its inclinations, character, prejudices, and passions; I wanted to understand it...to know what we have to fear or hope."

Voting Rights

At the time of De Tocqueville's tour, America crackled with talk of individual rights, a discussion that now transcended the revolutionary generation's vision. During the 1770s and 1780s, when Americans spoke of civil rights, they focused on protecting individuals from such government abuses as the seizure of private property, double jeopardy, unreasonable searches, cruel and unusual punishments, and arbitrary arrest. The framers of the Constitution did not include voting rights within the rubric of civil liberties. On the eve of the Constitutional Convention, John Adams warned delegates to avoid the issue. If they open a discussion on suffrage, "There will be no end of it. New claims will arise; women will demand a vote...and every man who has not a farthing, will demand an equal voice with any other." Voting was and always should be, the Founding Fathers believed, confined to an elite of propertied white men. In 1800 less than half of white men paid enough taxes or owned enough property to vote.

By the early 1800s, however, large numbers of Americans broadened the umbrella of individual liberties to include voting rights. The best way to prevent government from abusing "the people" was for "the people" to participate in the electoral process. For that to happen, reformers insisted, property requirements for voting had to be repealed. Only then could the Declaration of Independence and its "all men are created equal" ideology be fulfilled. Kentucky had entered the Union in 1792 with no property requirement. When a large landowner at the state constitutional convention suggested "limiting the vote to those with substantial interests to protect," delegates shouted him down. Tennessee entered the Union in 1706 and Ohio in 1803, both with low property requirements. Between 1816 and 1821 Indiana, Maine, Mississippi, Illinois, Alabama, and Missouri entered the Union with no limits on white male suffrage.

The civil rights movement then spread east. In 1807 New Jersey abolished property requirements for voting, and Maryland followed suit three years later. Connecticut amended the state constitution in 1818, and so did Massachusetts and New York in 1821. By 1828 only three states--Virginia, Louisiana, and Rhode Island--still denied some white men the right to vote. Just over 250,000 men voted in the election of 1824; four years later, the number jumped to more than 1.25 million. The trend continued throughout the 1830s. In the presidential election of 1840, more than 78 percent of white men cast ballots. Never again would so many Americans take national and local politics so seriously.

The Culture of Democracy

Like large, diesel-fired heavy equipment moving tons of earth, democracy bulldozed its way across the cultural landscape, bringing elitism and snobbery into disrepute. A comparison of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century portraits is revealing. Prominent men sitting for portraits in the 1700s dressed lavishly to display aristocratic roots and distinguished pedigrees. Silk coats and slacks, ruffled white shirts, white stockings, shiny belt buckles, fancy jewelry, and lacquered black shoes testified of breeding and good taste. They sported white powdered wigs, manicured fingernails, lipstick, rouge, and beauty marks. A century later no self-respecting man would be caught dead in such an outfit. Wigs and facial makeup were for women. Shiny black shoes gave way to polished leather boots, ruffles to simple collars and cuffs, and silk suits to cotton and wool. Elegance took a back seat to simplicity and pomposity to humility. Americans had become, in the words of one newspaper, "[citizens of] the plain dark democracy of broadcloth." De Tocqueville noted that public officials, unlike much of the rest of the world, could not be distinguished by dress. "American public officials blend with the mass of citizens; they have neither palaces nor guards nor ceremonial clothes. This external simplicity of persons in authority is not due to some peculiar twist in the American character but derives from the fundamental principles of their society."

Political deference, in which the poor acquiesced passively to the wisdom of the well-to-do, succumbed as well. De Tocqueville remarked, "Equality, which makes men independent of one another, naturally gives them the habit and taste to follow nobody's will but their own. This...independence makes them suspicious of all authority... This love of independence is the first and most striking feature of the political effects of equality." The absence of deference startled snooty European visitors. They complained about the lack of first-class accommodations in steamboats and railroads, sharing rooms with "uncouth scoundrels" in roadside inns, and eating family style with poor farmers and laborers in hotels and boardinghouses. They could not find "servants" to take care of them. Americans acknowledged "free labor" and slavery but

nothing in between. The word "servant" fell into disuse during the 1830s. Those who cooked someone else's food, washed someone else's clothes, or tilled someone else's land called themselves "hired help" but never "servant."

In other ways too, Americans repudiated elitism. Medical societies had long licensed only physicians with formal training. Nontraditional healers protested, labeling such regulations elitist, and states responded by outlawing licensing. Medicine opened to every charlatan with a medical bag and a good line. Bar associations, facing the same pressures, lowered standards and opened the practice of law to people with the leanest of credentials. Communities hired anyone who could read and write as teachers, and ministers suffered whims of congregations that hired and fired with abandon. To survive, preachers had to be men of God and good politicians.

Even government jobs were no longer reserved for experts. In 1829, when Andrew Jackson entered the White House, he gave government posts to political loyalists. Critics labeled it a "Spoils System," but Jackson only symbolized a new political reality: government was not just "of the people," it was also "for the people" and "by the people." De Tocqueville was impressed: "In the United States those who are entrusted with the direction of public affairs are often inferior to those whom an aristocracy might bring to power; but their interest is identified with that of the majority of their fellow citizens. Hence they may often... make great mistakes, but they will never systematically follow a tendency hostile to the majority."

The Public School Movement

Americans also decided that education, like voting, should not be the province of a few. Jackson's inauguration terrified well-to-do Americans, who feared that illiterate masses with power could turn democracy into anarchy. A cousin of John Quincy Adams worried that the "disturbing events in Washington of the past few days may be a harbinger of things to come. Can 'the people' really be trusted with the power we have given them?" The Rev. Lyman Beecher worried that "our intelligence and virtue will falter and fall back into a dark minded, vicious populace--a poor, uneducated reckless mass of infuriated animalism. We must educate! We must educate! Or we must perish by our own prosperity."

Other Americans agreed. In 1829 a pamphlet of the Philadelphia Working Men's party proclaimed that "the original element of despotism is a monopoly of talent, which consigns the multitude to comparative ignorance, and secures the balance of knowledge on the side of the rich and the rulers." Evangelicals supported public education because they wanted everyone to read the Bible. Feminists wanted to make sure that girls and young women had access to education. Backed by broad-based support, the campaign for public schools became one of the most successful reform movements in American history.

In 1837 Horace Mann of Massachusetts became secretary of the state board of education. He was unique, a man who condemned with equal intensity the evils of slavery, violence, alcoholism, cursing, and ballet dancing. He adopted public schools as the reform most likely to improve society. "A republican form of government," Mann preached in 1848, "without intelligence in the people, must be, on a vast scale, what a mad-house, without superintendent or keepers, would be on a small one--the despotism of a few succeeded by universal anarchy, and anarchy by despotism." Mann led the crusade for free, tax-supported public schools, state-funded normal colleges to train teachers, and compulsory school attendance for all children. He also wanted no student excluded because of "race, color or religious opinions." By 1855 Massachusetts had acted on Mann's vision. Other states soon followed.

Defining Equality in the 1830s

Jacksonians revered "equality" but defined it quite narrowly. Few white men included women, blacks, and Indians under democracy's umbrella, and the idea of equality of condition was completely alien. "I know of no country where profounder contempt is expressed for the theory of permanent equality of property," wrote De Tocqueville. Equality of condition was impossible, for most Americans, because equality of ability did not exist. Some people were simply smarter or harder-working than others. For Andrew Jackson, "Distinctions in society will always exist under every just government. Equality of talents, or education, or of wealth cannot be produced by human institutions."

Jacksonians extolled equality of opportunity, not equality of condition, and called for the removal of artificial obstacles to individual success. Poor, hardworking people were just as entitled as the rich to make the most of their lives. State laws keeping the right to vote from men who did not own property or pay taxes posed an unnecessary barrier to equality. "True Republicanism," pronounced one Jacksonian, "requires that every man shall have an equal chance--that every man shall be free to become as unequal as he can."

Ironically, just as Jacksonians obliterated property requirements, they erected new obstacles based on race and gender. In the 1780s state governments had adopted new constitutions reflecting the contagion of republicanism. Black men with sufficient property, just like their white neighbors, were allowed to vote, and New Jersey's 1776 constitution extended the franchise to propertied widows and single women. The United States teetered on a democratic revolution that might actually transcend property, race, and gender.

It was not to be. Early in the 1800s, in state after state where new constitutions were written or old ones amended, blacks and women learned just how fleeting equality could be. In 1807 New Jersey adopted a constitution that extended voting rights to all white men and denied them to all women. Not one of the ten states that entered the Union between 1821 and 1861 allowed blacks to vote. Most free blacks shared the frustration of a black New Yorker who wondered why recent immigrants received all of the privileges of citizenship while "we <u>native</u> born Americans...are most of us shut out?"

Although Jacksonian democracy ignored the rights of women and blacks, it still managed to broaden the scope of the franchise in the United States, empowering working-class white men who until then had functioned on the margins of Anglo-American politics. Democracy is, indeed, more of a process than an event, and by the close of the Jacksonian era, the arena of American politics had filled with millions of white men who had not been there a generation before.

THE ERA OF BAD FEELINGS

At the national level, political debate also reflected deep divisions about the constitutional authority of the federa chartered the Second Bank of the United States and passed protective tariffs, and ended in 1819, when the high-flying economy crashed. Its demise precipitated a new, fierce struggle over the power and scope of the federal government.

The Panic of 1819

The economy boomed in 1815. Commodity prices soared; cotton in 1818 reached the unheard of price of 32.5 cents a pound. Land-hungry farmers and profit-hungry speculators hounded the federal government, which sold 3.5 million acres of public land that year. To encourage the boom, the Second Bank of the United States employed liberal credit policies,

encouraging businessmen and farmers to go deep in debt to expand operations. In such a climate of easy money, new banks--called "wildcat banks"--multiplied. By 1818, 392 state banks dotted the landscape, and each printed its own money. "Starting a bank," bragged an Ohio banker, "is easier than saddling an old mare." And every banker assured listeners that a dollar of gold or silver backed each dollar of paper money.

In 1819, however, the bottom fell out of the cotton market. Within weeks, land values had dropped by 50 to 75 percent. The Second Bank of the United States then made a fateful decision, refusing to accept paper money for land payments. Only gold and silver would do, and when debtors tried to trade bank notes for hard currency, they learned what con artists bankers had become. Bank vaults held precious little gold or silver. Poor farmers unable to come up with the cash to pay debts lost their land. Businesses closed by the thousands, and tens of thousands of workers lost their jobs. The West and the South were hardest hit. Dispossessed farmers targeted their wrath on easterners, blaming money lenders and the national bank for their plight. Once again the national bank entered the lexicon of political debate, with small farmers and workers condemning the federal government for using its resources to underwrite the rich and erase the resources of the poor. "We have been raped and pillaged," complained a Louisiana sugar planter.

The Missouri Compromise

The Missouri Controversy further aggravated hostilities when northern congressman tried to secure federal legislation outlawing slavery in Missouri. In 1819 the Missouri Territory petitioned Congress to be admitted to the Union as a slave state. Within the larger context of the Panic of 1819, the request struck a raw sectional nerve. North and South viewed western lands as critical to their economic futures. Most northerners hoped to see the West home to millions of free family farms. Southerners expected to transplant slavery there. In 1819 the Union included eleven free states and eleven slave states, a reassuring balance of power. Admitting Missouri would tip the scales southward. The House of Representatives, with a North-South split of 105 votes to 81, was already in northern hands. Missouri would deliver the U.S. Senate to the South.

The debate became more shrill when Congressman James Talmadge of New York proposed the gradual abolition of slavery in Missouri. As Congress debated the morality of slavery, southern slave owners panicked, and when the House of Representatives approved the amendment, they shuddered in fear and anger. For the first time Congress had attacked slavery. The amendment failed in the Senate, and Congress froze into grid-locked stalemate. Southerners now saw the federal government as a direct threat to their way of life. Congressman Henry Clay then engineered the "Missouri Compromise." Maine had separated from Massachusetts and wanted statehood, so Clay proposed that Maine be admitted as a free state and Missouri as a slave state, preserving a balance of power. To prevent future disputes, he recommended drawing a line across what remained of the Louisiana Purchase at 36 30'. Henceforth, slavery would be permitted south of the line but not north of it. Since few thought slavery would be profitable there anyway, Congress approved the compromise, ending the crisis.

Most astute observers, however, knew that the Missouri controversy had opened a pandora's box of recrimination. Slavery was destined to fracture America. Like a fortuneteller, Thomas Jefferson predicted, "A geographical line, coinciding with a marked principle, moral and political, once conceived and held up to angry passions of men, will never be obliterated; and

every new irritation will mark it deeper and deeper." The Panic of 1819 and the Missouri controversy had reignited the flames of sectionalism, ending the “Era of Good Feelings” and launching the nation on a course that would eventually lead to the Civil War.

THE AMERICAN SYSTEM

After the Panic of 1819 and the Missouri controversy, notions of democracy and equality also became enmeshed in particular views of political economy. As President James Monroe's second term sputtered to a close, presidential hopefuls positioned themselves for a run at the White House. Debate revolved around the "American System," a term Henry Clay coined to promote his own economic vision. Economic strength depended upon high tariffs to protect American industry, a national bank to stabilize the monetary system, and internal improvements–highways, canals, and railroads--to create a single national market. Each of these required the assistance of a strong federal government.

Others opposed the American System, which they associated with rich, privileged businessmen and bankers. Common working people would end up paying higher taxes and higher prices while handing the federal government over to the rich and well-to-do, who would use it to acquire more money. The American System was the antithesis of freedom and equality. Preservation of democracy, many insisted, depended upon limiting the powers of the federal government, reducing tariff rates, abolishing the national bank, and resisting the temptation to sponsor a federally-financed program of internal improvements.

Geography and Destiny

Geographic reality guaranteed acrimony. Dozens of navigable rivers drained the South, and from the early 1600s colonists built homes, cleared trees, and plowed land nearby, steadily carving deeper into the hinterland. In Texas, farmers shipped crops down the Trinity, Red, Brazos, and Colorado rivers to the Gulf of Mexico. Arkansas, Missouri, Tennessee, and Louisiana planters used the Mississippi. Other "water highways" included the Tombigbee, Savannah, Charleston, and Potomac rivers. The South felt little urgency to develop other transportation systems. Commerce flowed along rivers--south to the Gulf Coast and east to the Atlantic. Where rivers became too shallow for barge traffic, population dwindled. Rivers served as the South's and West's lifeline, eliminating the need for big investments in internal improvements.

Northerners did not enjoy a natural infrastructure. The Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River offered a commercial avenue to the Atlantic; the Hudson River drained upstate New York; and the Ohio River gave lower Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Kentucky outlets to the Gulf of Mexico. But linking up the rest of the North into a single market required roads, railroads, and canals, and between 1820 and 1860 northern states, with the help of the federal government, invested millions in transportation improvements. Along with protective tariffs and the national bank, North and South now had more to argue about--federally-financed internal improvements. Those three issues--the bank, tariffs, and internal improvements--supplied fodder for political debate throughout the 1820s and 1830s.

The Election of 1824

The presidential election of 1824 served as a forum for the American System. John Quincy Adams, son of the second president of the United States, threw his hat into the ring, and so did Henry Clay. Senator John C. Calhoun of South Carolina announced his candidacy. William Crawford hoped to become the fourth Virginian in a row--after Jefferson, Madison, and

Monroe--to sit in the oval office. Andrew Jackson of Tennessee, hero of the Battle of New Orleans, rounded out the field.

The field soon thinned. A stroke paralyzed Crawford, and although he remained in the race, his campaign was effectively dead. Calhoun backed out when it became obvious that his support was confined to the South. His departure handed much of the South to Jackson, making him the frontrunner because of his widespread support out West. Adams and Clay were ideological mirror images of one another--both backed high tariffs, internal improvements, and the national bank. Although Jackson's views on political economy were not well known, most Americans preferred vagueness to the economic certainties of Clay and Adams. The final election tally gave 151,271 votes to Jackson, 113,122 to Adams, and 47,531 to Clay. Crawford attracted 40,856 votes.

Unfortunately for Jackson, taking the popular vote was not enough. The winning candidate in a presidential election must secure a majority of electoral votes, and Jackson came up 32 votes short. He had 99, Adams 84, Clay 37, and Crawford 41. Constitutional mandate shifted the election to the House of Representatives. Behind closed doors, congressmen traded insults and deals. Clay then brokered a compromise, throwing his votes to Adams. With only 30 percent of the popular vote, John Quincy Adams became president.

The Adams Administration

Adams possessed the charisma of a department store mannequin and the smug self-confidence and arrogance associated with membership in the country's most illustrious family. The United States never had an aristocracy, but the Adams family came about as close as any. They studied at Harvard and worshiped in white-shingled churches built by Puritan ancestors. Heroes of the Revolution and Constitution, their name appeared and reappeared in the history books. In an age of democracy, however, Adams alienated too many people. His proposal for a tax-supported national university, headquartered in Washington, D.C., exposed his political ineptitude and ignorance of the rising tide of democracy. At a time when Americans resented anything smacking of elitism, he proposed an elitist, public university. One critic accused Adams of wanting to "swipe bread off my table to put cake on his own!"

Tariff controversies complicated matters. By the 1820s, tariffs had become litmus tests of political identity. The South despised high tariffs on imported manufactured goods because they had to pay top dollar for expensive northern products. In addition, tariffs invited foreign retaliation. If Congress raised tariffs on British imports, might not Parliament slap similar levies on U.S. imports? Since the only U.S. exports of any value were cotton and tobacco, southerners feared losing a rich export market. British mills might locate new cotton sources, and the prices planters received for crops would decline. The South felt vulnerable to both edges of the tariff sword: higher expenses and lower income. Southerners sounded the alarm in 1824 when Congress increased by one-third the levies on iron, iron products, hemp, wool, glass, and woolen products. A Georgia congressman moaned, "This infamous measure threatens us with economic ruin. It burdens the South and saps us of our capital. Greedy northern manufacturers surely take great pleasure in our misfortunes."

The Tariff of 1828 was more than "infamous." For southerners, it was a regional catastrophe. The product of Machiavellian political maneuvering by congressmen of every persuasion, the legislation elevated tariff rates by an average of 50 percent and added dozens of commodities to the protected list. Southerners howled in protest. One northern textile

manufacturer, almost incredulous at the bill's excesses, told a friend, "[The bill] will keep the South and West in debt to New England the next hundred years." Incensed southerners dubbed the act the "Tariff of Abominations."

The Election of 1828

By 1828 John Quincy Adams had squandered all chances for reelection. Public resentment had steadily accumulated, eroding what little remained of his already marginal political capital. Time caught up with John Quincy Adams and then passed him by. Being an elitist in the age of democracy was bad enough; he was also a nationalist who refused to recognize the groundswell of localism and states rights sentiment. Many Americans recalled with bitterness the Panic of 1819 and held the Second Bank of the United States responsible. Land and life savings went up in a puff of inflationary smoke. Consternation over the "Tariff of Abominations" convinced the unconverted that Adams had to go.

Jackson's supporters approached the election with self-righteous, missionary zeal. In 1824, they charged, an Adams-Clay cabal stole the election; they were determined not to let it happen again. Not a day passed without them reminding voters of the "conspiracy of 1824," and Jackson spared no expense giving voters what they wanted--barbecues, parades, and booze.

In the hard-bitten, free-for-all of 1820s politics, Jackson was fair game. He had moved to Nashville, Tennessee, in 1788 and rented a room at a boardinghouse owned by Rachel Donelson. Her daughter and son-in-law--Rachel and Lewis Robards--boarded there as well. Robards soon became jealous of Jackson, moved to Kentucky, and started divorce proceedings. His suspicions were not unfounded; as soon as Jackson learned of the divorce, he proposed to Rachel and they were married. Some time later, the Jacksons discovered that Robards had never followed through on the divorce. Technically, under Tennessee law, the Robards were still married, Rachel was a bigamist, and Jackson was an adulterer. The divorce was not filed until 1794, at which time Andrew and Rachel remarried.

During the election campaign of 1828, opponents crossed the line between politics and personal life. "Ought a convicted adulteress and her paramour husband," the editor of the Cincinnati Gazette asked, "be placed in the highest office of this free and Christian land?" Another rag sheet charged that "General Jackson's mother was a common prostitute brought to this country by British soldiers! She afterwards married a mulatto man, with whom she had several children, of which General Jackson is one!!" The abuse cut Jackson to the core. "Myself I can defend," he told Rachel. "You I can defend; but now they have assailed even the memory of my mother."

Rachel was not as thick-skinned. A deeply religious woman, she endured a clinical depression during the campaign, and aggravated an already serious cardiac condition. She suffered several small heart attacks in October and November. Democrats portrayed Jackson as a man of the people, a war hero, frontiersman, and Indian fighter who understood hard work, poverty, and the blessings of opportunity. Jackson's promise to relocate the remaining Indian tribes to reservations west of the Mississippi solidified his support in the South. When the time came to cast their votes, Americans looked beyond the trumped up, flimsy charges about his marriage. Andrew Jackson and his running mate John C. Calhoun won by a margin of 647,231 to 509,097. John Quincy Adams retired to his home in Braintree, Massachusetts.

The victory was bittersweet. Rachel Jackson never saw the inside of the White House. On December 17, 1828, she had another seizure. Bedridden for several days, she drifted in and

out of consciousness and then died suddenly, clutching at her chest and letting out one last, loud groan. Beside himself with grief, Jackson went into an extended period of mourning and held his political enemies responsible for Rachel's demise. In March 1829, still enveloped in grief, he took the oath of office.

Along with his clothes, papers, and personal effects, Andrew Jackson carried political baggage into the White House, a distinct set of opinions and biases about the exercise of power in the United States. A westerner by birth and temperament, he held eastern elites in contempt, certain that in their effete snobbery they disdained the common people of America’s farms, mills, and wharves. A Jeffersonian Democrat, he distrusted concentrated political and economic power, especially when the two joined forces against common people, and believed that the best way to prevent such a conspiracy was to keep the federal government at bay. The proper political economy was no political economy at all–or at least no on-going relationship between the federal government and the private sector. High tariffs, federally-financed internal improvements, and a national bank gave unfair economic advantage to banks and business at the expense of small farmers and poor workers.

MARGARET O'NEALE AND THE WORLD OF JACKSONIAN WOMEN

The inaugural festivities were barely over when Jackson found himself embroiled in a nasty political controversy, one that revealed a great deal about the status of women in early nineteenth-century America and about the limits of democracy and individual rights.

The Margaret O'Neale Affair

Margaret O'Neale Timberlake was the daughter of William O'Neale, owner of a popular Washington boardinghouse. Her husband was a navy purser frequently at sea. Margaret helped run the boardinghouse. John Eaton, a widower and U.S. Senator from Tennessee, boarded there, and in 1821 he began a long affair with Margaret that produced one miscarriage, several children, and a bundle of salacious gossip. The gossip turned ugly in September 1828 when Washingtonians learned of Mr. Timberlake's suicide. Tongue-waggers attributed his death to Margaret's indiscretions. Eaton wasted no time proposing to O'Neale, and they were married on January 1, 1829, hardly a decent period of mourning according to the scions of Washington society. The two were soon butts of jokes and ridicule. Because of Rachel's pain, the president sympathized with the Eatons.

Jackson elevated a minor political issue into a major conflagration when he appointed Eaton to his cabinet as secretary of war. Vice-President John C. Calhoun's wife Floride joined forces with the wives of Secretary of the Navy John Branch, Attorney General John Berrien, and Secretary of the Treasury Samuel Ingham and ostracized the Eatons. They refused to invite Margaret to their parties, to attend hers, or be seen in public with her. Such elitism enraged Jackson, and at a cabinet meeting soon after his inauguration, he pronounced Margaret O'Neale "chaste as a virgin" and urged his associates to "guard virtuous female character with vestal vigilance." Margaret Bayard Smith, a friend of the president, admitted that Jackson was "completely under the government of Mrs. Eaton, one of the most ambitious, violent, malignant, yet silly women you ever heard of." Only Secretary of State Martin Van Buren, a bachelor, extended a hand of friendship to the Eatons.

The cabinet wives proved absolutely resolute. Jackson ranted, cajoled, and threatened, but they steadfastly refused to back down. Margaret Eaton, they concluded, deserved neither tolerance nor forgiveness. Andrew Jackson was the most popular man in the country, the icon of

democracy and equality, but he was powerless to move the women closest to him. The controversy did not subside until 1831 when Eaton resigned. By then, the affair had reconfigured Washington politics. Vice-President John C. Calhoun, in the eyes of the president at least, had fallen out of favor, and Secretary of State Martin Van Buren had become a presidential favorite.

The Cult of Domesticity

Male historians have usually marginalized the Eaton controversy, blaming it on the narrow-minded, silly machinations of gossipy, backstabbing cabinet wives. They even trivialize Margaret O'Neale, referring to her as "Peggy" even though it was a nickname she never used. But the Margaret O'Neale incident actually provides a valuable lens for viewing the world of Jacksonian women.

Women then had to deal with the "cult of domesticity," an ideology that dictated separate spheres of influence, confining women to hearth, home, and pew and leaving business, politics, and war to men. Books and magazines preached female submissiveness, innocence, and piety. Real joy resided in the home, where obedience to husbands guaranteed bliss. One advice giver urged, "Oh, young and lovely bride, watch well the first moments when your will conflicts with his to whom God and society have given the control. Reverence his <u>wishes</u> even when you do not his <u>opinions</u>." Passivity was another virtue. One columnist urged women to submit to fortune. "To bear the evils and sorrows which may be appointed us, with a patient mind, should be the continual effort of our sex." "True women" did needlework, arranged flowers, read good books, nursed the sick, coiffed their hair, dressed elegantly, wrote in journals, and taught Sunday School.

Poverty, of course, made "true womanhood" difficult to achieve. Many women might have longed for time to arrange flowers, read poetry, and engage in recreational needlework, but lower-class and frontier women could not afford such luxuries. They lived in dirty urban hovels or tiny farmhouses, scratching out a marginal existence, growing old before their time. Out west, women lived in dugouts, sod houses, lean-tos, small shacks, or cabins. Every penny went into farm equipment and livestock. Women fought constant, losing battles with dirt and wind. They kept stoves hot all day long, summer and winter, for cooking, bottling, washing clothes and dishes, and heating bath water. They often engaged in heavy labor alongside their husbands. The cult of domesticity was as foreign to them as live-in maids and breakfast-in-bed.

Property law reinforced domesticity. Although single women and widows owned property on the same terms as men, married women could not. With the final "I do" of the marriage ceremony, a husband assumed complete ownership of his wife's assets. Since a wife owned nothing, she had no need of such legal rights as entering into contracts, filing lawsuits, and executing wills. Most women acquiesced in the tyranny, suffering in silence as if second-class legal status was the natural order of things. Those who objected did so quietly, among themselves at afternoon tea or late nights over desks in private journals. In 1834, Lillie Carpenter, a young mother in Hartford, Connecticut, confided to her diary, "Did our angry God, in consigning us to heaven or hell, give us no earthy choices? Are we here for nothing more than suckling babes and serving men? Am I doomed forever to the confines of these walls?"

The Margaret O'Neale affair must be viewed in the context of domesticity. Political success had exacted a heavy price from cabinet wives. Over the years, they had paid their dues to domesticity, accepting confinement to a separate sphere and suppressing their own identities. In the process, they became the most politically influential women in the country. Margaret

O'Neale, on the other hand, had not paid the price. On the contrary, she had indulged her own sexual needs and flaunted her rebellion. Guardians of domesticity were not about to let her enjoy the power that came with official position. Since Margaret O'Neale had not played by the rules, she could not be allowed to taste the fruits of victory.

Loopholes in the Cult of Domesticity

In spite of domesticity's heavy-handedness, Jacksonian women projected considerable power outside the boundaries of "their world." One way to retain economic clout was to avoid marriage. The percentage of single women grew steadily during the first half of the nineteenth century. Many widows and spinsters, realizing that marriage implied "civil death," chose to remain single. By 1860 in Petersburg, Virginia, for example, nearly a third of white women and half of free black women were widows or had never married.

Economic reality loosened domesticity's hold. Before industrialization, the home was a center of production. Women played key roles in family economic survival, producing goods to sustain life and to generate cash. They smoked beef, rendered lard, milked cows, processed butter and cheese, cured pork, shaved sheep, gathered eggs, sold fruits and vegetables, spun cloth, and sewed clothes. According to one historian, "Housework could be frustrating and exhausting, but because it was still productive and not yet divorced from money, it was not as difficult as it has since become for women to believe that their work was important." Women performed essential labor.

Women also found themselves controlling increasing amounts of property, not because Jacksonian men extended the logic of equality to women but because men hoped to protect their own assets. In a precarious boom and bust economy, where bankruptcy always loomed on the horizon, some men calculated that allowing married women to own property might help prevent economic ruin. Samuel Morton, a Virginian, wrote a friend during the economic downturn of 1837: "I have in imagination seen all my property taken and sold for almost nothing--my family turned out of doors, without a shelter or bed, without the necessaries of life or the means of procuring them--destitute and friendless." If wives held assets in their own names, recession might not lead to destitution and homelessness. In 1839, Mississippi awarded married women absolute legal control of their own property. Before the Civil War, thirteen states passed similar laws. In 1860 New York passed the Married Women's Property Act.

Although the right to own property did not bestow complete equality, a separate estate was, according to one historian, "better than nothing." Separate estates offered protection from economic disaster and gave married women a measure of leverage in family politics. Women were quick to make use of the new laws to help and protect other women. Mothers frequently established separate estates for daughters, and so did sisters for sisters, aunts for nieces, cousins for cousins, and friends for friends. By the time of the Civil War, 25 percent of all property owners in Petersburg, Virginia, were women.

In spite of domesticity's tightly drawn boundaries, women managed to make their political mark. Tax-paying, property-owning women, even though they could not vote, signed petitions and wrote letters to state legislators expressing opinions and making demands. They also engaged in "benevolent" activities--all women organizations designed to promote Sunday Schools, build schools, fight crime and alcoholism, and care for the poor. They established and ran societies to campaign against prostitution, sexual abuse, homelessness, and poverty. In doing

so they built networks that helped them become conscious of themselves as a group and set the stage for subsequent feminist crusades.

THE POLITICS OF DEMOCRACY

The O'Neale controversy initially distracted official Washington, but political economy soon asserted itself to become the marrow of debate during the Jackson administration. Once again, Americans found themselves arguing about internal improvements, tariffs, the national bank, and the larger question of the power and authority of the federal government.

The Maysville Road Veto

In 1829 Congress approved construction of the Maysville Road, which lay within the boundaries of Kentucky. Jackson opposed the bill for personal and philosophical reasons. Senator Henry Clay, his long-time political nemesis, hailed from Kentucky, and Jackson vetoed the bill so Clay could not brag to constituents about bringing home bagfuls of federal money. Conviction also dictated a veto. Jackson admitted the constitutionality of using federal money for interstate commerce, even though he had difficulty warming to the idea. But he could not justify spending federal money within a single state; such a measure was sure to benefit bankers, contractors, and businessmen more than common people. So with a flair of democratic rhetoric, "Old Hickory" sent the Maysville Road Bill back to Congress, where it was impossible to muster enough votes to override.

The Webster-Haynes Debate

The first salvo in the Jacksonian debate over states rights was fired in 1829. The battle started innocently enough with a debate in Congress over land policy. Westerners seemed ready to join hands with southerners--the West backing lower tariffs and the South supporting cheap federal land. Both offended people in the Northeast, who could see a conspiracy afoot. Senator Daniel Webster of Massachusetts spoke for them, denying that the East "has ever manifested hostility to the West, and I deny that she has adopted any policy that would naturally have led her in such a course."

Senator Robert Y. Haynes of South Carolina disagreed. Too many times, he claimed, the federal government had exceeded its constitutional limits. To protect themselves, states enjoyed the power of "interposition"--a fancy word for the right to nullify federal laws. Webster could not let Haynes's arguments go unanswered. The national interest, he claimed, exceeds that of any state or cluster of states. "Interposition" carried to its logical extreme meant national disintegration. Webster closed his speech with an eloquent plea for unity and an unnerving prediction of what could happen. "When my eyes shall be turned to behold, for the last time, the sun in heaven, may I not see him shining on the broken and dishonored fragments of a once glorious Union; on States dissevered, discordant, belligerent; on a land rent with civil feuds, or drenched, it may be, in fraternal blood!" As for the southern faith in "liberty before union," Webster replied, "Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable."

The Nullification Controversy

The debate over states rights escalated into a constitutional crisis. Personal feelings between President Andrew Jackson and Vice-President John C. Calhoun had soured quickly after the inauguration. Floride Calhoun's role in ostracizing Margaret O'Neale irritated the president, and Jackson still harbored a ten-year-old grudge against Calhoun. In 1818, when Jackson invaded Florida, then Secretary of War Calhoun had privately urged President Monroe to court-martial the general. Jackson suspected Calhoun of conspiring against him, but he had never been

able to prove the rumors. Soon after the inauguration, however, Calhoun's political enemies supplied the president with documents confirming Jackson's suspicions. Within a year of their landslide political victory, the president and vice-president were mortal political enemies.

Calhoun relished a fight. He exhibited the cocky self-assurance of a banty rooster and the tenacity of a pit bull. Lean and tight, with a thin face and high, gaunt cheeks, Calhoun's beady eyes and shock of long, straight hair gave him harsh, sober visage. Jackson was going to betray the South, Calhoun feared, and states rights needed a new champion. For John C. Calhoun, patriotism meant loyalty to South Carolina first, not to the United States.

Both men threw down the gauntlet at the Jefferson Day Dinner in 1830. Since Thomas Jefferson's death in 1824, the annual dinner had become a premier event for Democrats. Knowing exactly what he was doing, Jackson hoisted a drink and offered a toast: "Our Union: It must be preserved." Calhoun clinked glasses with the others but decided to upstage Jackson: "The Union next to liberty most dear," he toasted. "May we always remember that it can only be preserved by distributing equally the benefits and the burdens of the Union."

Calhoun then continued his political maneuvering, resigning as vice-president in 1832 and conspiring to set a philosophical trap for the president. Opposition to the Tariff of Abominations had assumed religious dimensions in South Carolina, and Congress made matters worse that summer, reducing rates but confirming the principle of protective tariffs. In November 1832, at Calhoun's urging, South Carolina passed nullification ordinances renouncing the tariffs of 1828 and 1832 and prohibiting the collection of customs duties inside the state. "Nullification" proclaimed the right of a state legislature to negate federal laws within state boundaries. If Jackson let nullification stand, Calhoun surmised, the states rights philosophy would gain new constitutional footing; if he denounced nullification, he would loose political support in the South.

Though an enemy of unbridled federal power, Jackson did not hold died-in-the-wool, states rights sympathies. The federal government, he believed, was sovereign, not the states; otherwise, the United States was destined to disintegrate. On the day each of the original thirteen states ratified the Constitution, it surrendered sovereignty. State governments did not enjoy the authority to nullify federal legislation, no matter how obnoxious the law. The president grasped the implications of nullification and planned to put Calhoun in his place. To the people of South Carolina, Jackson warned, "Be not deceived by names. Disunion by armed force is treason. Are you really ready to incur its guilt?" He issued a proclamation likening nullification to treason and informed South Carolina authorities that he would spare no power in enforcing federal tariffs, including military occupation.

Worried that neither man had the sense to back down, Henry Clay worked out a compromise. Congress passed a Force Bill, authorizing Jackson to invade South Carolina, and the Tariff of 1833, which reduced tariff rates. Even Calhoun knew it was time for temperance. In January 1833 South Carolina suspended the nullification ordinances and, to get in the last word, nullified the Force Bill. Jackson judiciously decided to ignore such petulance. The crisis was over, for a while at least, but South Carolinians had made it abundantly clear that they had little patience for federal interference. Although few Americans at the time understood the full portent of the nullification, the constitutional stage for the Civil War was under construction.

The Bank War

Jackson only threatened war against South Carolina; he waged war against the Second Bank of the United States. More than a decade had passed since the Panic of 1819, when the bank's retrenchment sent tens of thousands of banks, businesses, and farms into bankruptcy. Bankers personified elitism, and Jackson viewed them as leeches sucking out the life blood of working people. Much of the hostility was personal. In 1804, he had committed his personal assets to a Tennessee land deal that went sour, leaving him with a mountain of debt. He held bankers responsible and empathized with people who had lost everything in the Panic of 1819.

The Second Bank of the United States became the target for his wrath. During the 1820s, with Nicholas Biddle at the helm, the bank had been a model of fiscal prudence and an engine of economic growth. The bank held a third of all bank deposits, made nearly 25 percent of all bank loans, and issued nearly 20 percent of all bank notes. As the official depository for U.S. government funds, the bank wielded great financial power, a reality Biddle acknowledged when he bragged, "There are very few [state banks] which might have been destroyed by an exertion of the powers of the bank." To the president, the bank was a "monster," the enemy of democracy, an agent of privilege that rendered "the rich richer and the powerful more powerful." According to Jackson, the bank had become a "vast electioneering machine [with enough] power to control the Government and change its character." It was, he was convinced, a "hydra of corruption--dangerous to our liberties by its corrupting influence everywhere." He vowed to prevent "the advancement of the few at the expense of the many."

Jackson could not act immediately because the bank's charter did not expire until 1836. Then Henry Clay, who viewed the bank as the heart and soul of his American System, advanced the schedule. He convinced Biddle to ask Congress for a new charter. If Jackson went along, America would have a national bank for another twenty years; if the president vetoed the recharter, Clay might have an issue capable of carrying him to the White House. But Jackson played political hardball. "The bank...is trying to kill me," he confided to Martin Van Buren, "but I will kill it." The recharter sailed through Congress, reaching Jackson's desk in July; he gave it a resounding veto. To Clay's surprise, the veto played well with voters, and his grand scheme for winning the presidency backfired. In the election of 1832, Jackson won 55 percent of the popular vote and 219 electoral votes to Clay's measly 49.

But Jackson was not done yet. Adding insult to injury, in September 1833 he let go another volley in the bank war, refusing to deposit government revenues in the national bank and channeling them instead to 89 state-chartered financial institutions, soon dubbed "pet banks." By the end of the year, the national bank's deposits had shrunk from more than $10 million to less than $4 million. Andrew Jackson emerged on top again. He had successfully negotiated his way through the great political debate of the era–strengthening the sovereignty and authority of the federal government vis-a-vis the states while limiting its interference in the economy.

LAND, TITLE, RIGHTS, AND FREEDOM

For most Jacksonians, individual rights and land ownership were as irrevocably connected as conjoined twins. "We are the free born sons of America," Andrew Jackson told his troops in 1812, "the only people on earth who possess rights, liberties, and property which they dare call their own." Alexis de Tocqueville grasped the political significance of land as soon as he arrived in the United States. "Among the lucky circumstances that favored the establishment... of a democratic republic in the United States," he wrote, "the most important was the choice of the land itself in which the Americans live. Their fathers gave them a love of equality and

liberty, but it was God who, by handing a limitless continent over to them, gave them the means of long remaining equal and free."

Land Rights and Land Policy

The federal government actively promoted individual land ownership and westward migration. In 1811, Congress approved construction of the Cumberland Road, which later became known as the National Road. Cumberland, Maryland, constituted the eastern terminus, and construction continued west until 1838, when the road reached Vandalia, Illinois. In between, it connected Wheeling in what is today West Virginia; Zanesville, Columbus, and Springfield, Ohio; and Richmond, Indianapolis, and Terre Haute, Indiana. The Cumberland Road, and the Ohio and Tennessee rivers, became America's highway to the west, or at least to the northwest, in the 1820s and 1830s. From New England, New York, and Pennsylvania, settlers ended up in the northern and central reaches of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. Many southern immigrants left the Tidewater and Piedmont regions, traveled west, and settled along the Kanawha, Kentucky, Tennessee, Kentucky, Cumberland, Ohio, and Mississippi rivers.

To make sure that large numbers of people acquired land of their own, the federal government auctioned the public domain at bargain prices. In 1796 Congress set the price $2 an acre, with a minimum purchase of 640 acres. The measure proved too expensive for small farmers, who pressed for more liberal rules. The Land Act of 1800 reduced the minimum tract to 320 acres; beginning in 1805, land went for $1.64 an acre, with a minimum purchase of 160 acres. In the Land Act of 1820, Congress agreed to $1.25 an acre, with a minimum purchase of eighty acres. In 1841 a German immigrant in Illinois wrote home, "Imagine. Eighty acres of the richest soil in the world. For only $100." In 1818, poet James K. Paulding had put to verse what millions believed:

> Hence comes it, that our meanest farmer's boy
> Aspires to taste the proud and manly joy
> That springs from holding in his own dear right
> The land he plows, the homes he seeks at night;
> And hence it comes, he leaves his friends and home,
> Mid distant wilds and dangers drear to roam,
> To seek a competence or find a grave,
> Rather than live a hireling or a slave.

The results were stunning. In 1810, approximately 550,000 people, or 14 percent of the total U.S. population, lived west of the Appalachian Mountains; ten years later, more than 1,327,000 people, or 25 percent of the population, had planted roots there. Ohio had become a state in 1803, followed by Louisiana (1812), Indiana (1816), Mississippi (1817), Illinois (1818), Alabama (1819), Maine (1820), and Missouri (1821).

The Doctrines of Discovery and Superior Use

As white settlers, seeking freedom and fortune, swarmed across the Appalachians in the first decades of the nineteenth century, they collided with hundreds of thousands of Native Americans already there. From the very beginning of the age of exploration, Europeans had vigorously debated the questions of sovereignty and rightful ownership, fighting with each other and with hundreds of Indian tribes over title to New World territory. The first explorers always

claimed their "discovery" in the name of a king or queen, and European monarchs agreed that a discovering country secured absolute rights to the area. Since Spain and Portugal appeared first on the New World scene, they laid claim all of it. By the early 1600s, however, the Dutch, English, and French contested such broad strokes of a cartographer's brush, arguing that "effective occupation" outweighed the doctrine of discovery. Simple discovery was not enough. Real sovereignty required "effective occupation." Only by colonizing a territory could such an occupation be proven and title established. Spain and England argued over the issue until 1670, when they signed the American Treaty establishing the principle of effective occupation.

Resolving disputed titles between European nations meant little to Native Americans. The French and English treated tribes as sovereign nations and negotiated treaties with them. Few legal problems existed as long as Indians cooperated and signed away the land, but Europeans faced a dilemma when tribal leaders refused. In 1758 legal scholar Emmerich Von Vattel offered a solution. In Law of Nations, he proclaimed the principle of "superior use," arguing that Europeans, because they were politically centralized and economically developed, could make better use of land than native peoples and therefore deserved sovereignty. According to Vattel, "Civilized man enjoys a higher claim to the land." Within a few decades, the principle of "superior use" acquired the force of international law. The discovering power, or the power occupying a territory, enjoyed free and clear title to the land of the Indians in the eyes of the European world.

American leaders claimed that English sovereignty over the land had been transferred to the United States. Native Americans rejected such claims, but in 1823 the Supreme Court decided the issue. Johnson v. M'Intosh involved two individuals with conflicting titles to the same tract. One had purchased his land from an Indian tribe; the other from the federal government. Chief Justice John Marshall awarded title to the individual who had purchased it from the federal government. "Discovery" and "superior use," he contended, gave the U.S. government right to dispose of Indian lands. Indian tribes could not sell land without permission. Johnson v. M'Intosh prepared the way for Manifest Destiny.

The Trail of Tears

The law, of course, with its majestic language and superficial logic, masked the racism and greed embedded in European culture. One way or another, European settlers intended to seize the land, and few felt any guilt about sacking the assets of Indian peoples they considered racially inferior. Now sustained by a body of law, the United States decided to relocate Indians to free up the land for white settlers. Since 1789 such distinguished Americans as Thomas Jefferson and George Washington had suggested that eastern tribes be moved across the Mississippi River. Whites would get the land one way or another, and moving the Indians might prevent bloody confrontations. Only by getting Indians off the main thoroughfares of white migration and settlement could a holocaust of violence be avoided. Humanitarianism and materialism made common cause. When Andrew Jackson entered the White House in 1829, relocation gained a powerful advocate. He had made his reputation fighting Indians. In 1830, to open land for whites and to protect Native Americans, Jackson signed the Indian Removal Act. "Doubtless it will be painful to leave the graves of their fathers," he concluded, "but what do they do more than our ancestors did...To better their condition in an unknown land our forefathers left all that was dear in earthly objects. Our children by thousands yearly leave the land of their birth to seek new homes in distant regions...Can it be cruel in the Government, when, by events it

cannot control, the Indian is made discontent in his ancient home to purchase his lands [and] to give him a new and extensive territory?"

Jackson neglected to mention the obvious--his forefathers had voluntarily left their homelands. Indians had no choice. In what is remembered as "The Trail of Tears," the U.S. Army drove 100,000 Indians to lands across the Mississippi. In the winter of 1831, the peaceful Choctaws in Alabama went first. Many died of hunger and disease along the way. De Tocqueville watched them cross the Mississippi. "Among them [were] the wounded, the sick, new born babies, and old men on the point of death. They had neither tents nor wagons...I saw them embark to cross the river, and the sight will never fade from my memory." The Creeks departed four years later. The army supervised the Chickasaw removal from Alabama and Mississippi in 1837. The Cherokees in Georgis fought removal in the federal courts, and in 1832, in Worcester v. Georgia, the Supreme Court upheld their claims, but Jackson refused to enforce the decision. Rumor has it that upon being informed of the decision, Jackson calmly replied, "John Marshall has made his decision. Now let him enforce it." The Cherokees held out for several years, but in 1838 soldiers evicted them; four thousand died on the way west. Only the Seminoles resisted violently. Under Chief Osceola they waged a guerrilla war in Florida between 1835 and 1842 that cost the U.S. government two thousand soldiers and $55 million. In 1843, however, they too were defeated and relocated.

Removal was equally relentless in the North. The Iroquois managed to stay in upstate New York, but dozens of other tribes had to go. Only the Sauk and Fox resisted. Under Chief Black Hawk they fought back in 1832, and in what is known as the Black Hawk War, U.S. troops chased them across Illinois and Wisconsin and finally defeated them at the Battle of Bad Axe. The removal treaties, of course, guaranteed perpetual ownership of the new land to the Indians, but only a permanent end to the westward movement could have preserved Indian land tenure, and that would never be. De Tocqueville wrote, "There is famine behind them, war in front, and misery everywhere." Chief Black Hawk captured the sentiments of most Indian peoples: “I surveyed the country that had cost us so much trouble, anxiety, and blood . . . I reflected on the ingratitude of the whites . . . [A]ll this land had been ours, for which we and my people never received a dollar . . . [T]he whites were not satisfied until they took our village and our grave-yards from us, and removed us across the Mississippi.”

Jacksonian democracy had overlooked blacks and women, but its blindness for Native Americans was absolute and complete. Dispossessing them of their land, denying them any place in the body politic, and bargaining away their heritage seemed as natural to most whites as spring wildflowers. Even those Americans willing to debate the civil rights of women and blacks could not even conceive of Indian peoples enjoying constitutional protections.

THE SECOND AMERICAN PARTY SYSTEM

After the War of 1812, as Federalists disappeared from the political radar screen, the two-party system entered a transition period. By the late 1820s, the terms "Democratic Republicans" and "Republicans" had given way to "Democrats" as the label of choice for Jacksonians. Opponents called themselves "National Republicans." As always, political debate revolved around the power of the federal government.

The Whig Party

The bank war and nullification crisis then gave rise to the Whig Party. Actually, Whigs were united more by a hatred of Jackson--"King Andrew I" as they referred to him--than by any

well-defined political convictions. They likened him to the "Tory" backers of King George III during the American Revolution. "Whigs," by definition, opposed tyranny. The president, Whigs passionately proclaimed, appealed to the worst instincts of the masses. One Jackson opponent captured those sentiments in 1833: "When we see a nation so infatuated in spite of all evidence and all reason, in spite of the grossest mismanagement, the vilest fraud & corruption... to worship such a creature as Andrew Jackson, ignorant, passionate and imbecile...the tool of low adventurers & swindlers...it is enough to destroy all hope in the power of the people for self-government."

The new party included New Englanders like Daniel Webster, who favored industrial expansion, and National Republicans committed to the American System. Followers of the short-lived Anti-Masonic Party flocked to the Whigs as well. They believed that Freemasons, a popular fraternal lodge with tens of thousands of members, were engaged in a secret conspiracy to seize control of the United States; since Jackson was a Mason, they wanted him out of office. For a time, Whigs even enjoyed the support of states rights Democrats like John C. Calhoun. In the congressional elections of 1834, "Whig" candidates appeared for the first time on the ballots in a number of states, and they made a surprisingly good showing, winning 98 seats in the House of Representatives and 25 in the Senate.

The Panic of 1837

But the Whigs had no match for Old Hickory. In 1836 Jackson tabbed Vice-President Martin Van Buren to succeed him, and the election was his for the taking. The Whig Party, not yet coalesced into a national body, pushed four candidates, hoping to deny Van Buren an Electoral College majority and throw the election into the House of Representatives, where they could broker one of their own into the White House. The two most famous Whigs were William Henry Harrison, former U.S. Senator from Ohio, and Senator Daniel Webster of Massachusetts. Whigs called for a national bank and government-financed internal improvements, but the election was not issue-oriented. Van Buren eked out a razor-thin victory, taking 50.9 percent of the popular vote, but it was enough to deliver him the Electoral College. He became the eighth president of the United States.

Within months of his inauguration, disgusted voters had nicknamed him "Martin Van Ruin." Early in 1836 Henry Clay had pushed through Congress the Distribution Bill, providing $37 million for internal improvements. The money fueled a boom of construction projects and land sales. State banks issued tens of millions of dollars in bank notes, most of which had only marginal value, and prices skyrocketed. Anxious to get in on the bonanza, businessmen chartered hundreds of new banks. Compared to 1830, when there were only 330 state banks in the United States, 1837 boasted nearly 800.

Over the course of a long life, Jackson had witnessed more than his share of real estate mania, and he was certain that a bust was just around the corner. In July 1836, to stem the unbridled issuance of paper money, he had slammed the door on the boom, issuing his Specie Circular, which required western settlers to pay for public lands in gold or silver instead of inflated paper money. British bankers, similarly concerned about the enthusiasm with which many bankers printed money and loaned it to poor western settlers, decided to call in their American loans. Debtors who could not pay went bankrupt, and the economy went into a tailspin. Hundreds of banks failed in 1837, and thousands of businesses went down with them. Unemployment in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia exceeded 30 percent, and state militias

mobilized to put down food riots. The depression lasted throughout Van Buren's term. Times were hard, and he possessed none of Jackson's charisma. When the time came for reelection, voters could hardly wait to boot him out of office.

The Election of 1840

By 1840 Whigs had become absolutely merciless in their attacks on Van Buren. To the epithet "Martin Van Ruin" they added "Matty," "Sweet Sandy Whiskers," and "His Royal Splendor," accusing him of living in White House opulence while much of America starved. Van Buren, they said, hoisted champagne to himself while denying even a mug of beer to the rest of the country. Leave him in office, Whigs warned voters, and "what you'll get is fifty cents a day and French soup. Elect a Whig and prosper on two dollars a day and roast beef."

Getting the right candidate to challenge Van Buren preoccupied Whig leaders. Henry Clay had tried and failed too many times. Senator Daniel Webster of Massachusetts was a possibility, but he carried too much sectional baggage. Southerners did not trust him. The nod finally went to Governor William Henry Harrison of Ohio. He had political liabilities. At the time when most men did not live much beyond fifty-five, Harrison was sixty-seven and showing it. Offsetting that disadvantage was his reputation as a military hero, winner of the Battle of Tippecanoe during the War of 1812. The fact that he was a northerner worried southerners until Whigs picked slave owner and states rightist Senator John Tyler of Virginia as his running mate.

Whigs worked on packaging Harrison, and their campaign demonstrated just how deeply the spirit of democracy had affected American culture. They painted him in Jacksonian hues. "Old Tip," they exaggerated, was a poor frontiersman who still lived in a log cabin. He had earned success through hard work, pluck, and courage. A man of the people--God-fearing, honest, and gracious--he never closed his door to a stranger. Whigs extolled Harrison's health and vigor. A Whig newspaper in Massachusetts promised that if he defeated Van Buren, "then will the farmer of North Bend strike his plough into the soil of corruption at Washington, and turn it to the light of the sun." Voters bought the rhetoric. A record 2,408,630 ballots were cast, and "Tippecanoe and Tyler Too" won a clear majority. The Springfield Republican toasted the Whig triumph: "The honest old Farmer of Ohio takes the reins of government into his own pure hands. The voice of the people wills it...the chains of despotic government are broken...Let the People--the whole People--rejoice."

American politics in the 1830s was inhabited by larger-than-life figures–the likes of Andrew Jackson, John Quincy Adams, Henry Clay, Martin Van Buren, and William Henry Harrison–whose personalities stamped the era, but political debate also revolved around substantive issues, of which the role and scope of the federal government loomed the largest. The merits of high tariffs, a national bank, and internal improvements reverberated through the halls of Congress and state legislatures, with most Whigs backing an active, expanded federal government and most Democrats preaching the virtues of laissez-faire and the prerogatives of the states. That debate, first inspired by the work of Alexander Hamilton in the 1790s, would continue for the next two decades to shape American politics.

CONCLUSION

During the Age of Jackson, Americans vigorously debated the meaning of of individual rights and eventually decided that property ownership would no longer serve as a prerequisite to political activity. As property requirements for voting and holding office crumbled, political participation increased. Between the presidential elections of 1824 and 1840, the number of

American voters jumped tenfold. Real democracy, of course, remained a pipedream. Blacks, Indians, and women could not vote or hold public office, and few Americans even recognized the inconsistencies inherent in a political system that worshiped equality while offering it only to white men. In spite of this, American society in 1840 was far more democratic than it had been in 1800.

Not surprisingly, questions about sovereignty and political economy became deeply enmeshed in the debate over democracy and individual rights. Southerners equated democracy with states rights, arguing that the federal government had never enjoyed constitutional supremacy. Andrew Jackson believed otherwise, and the nullification controversy pitted one group of Americans against another. Jacksonians also rejected the American System--with its high tariffs, national bank, and internal improvements--because the federal government, they believed, had no business marshaling its resources behind the already considerable power of commercial, financial, and industrial elites.

Lesson Two

For Lesson Two, please read the material below as background to the course. The essays are part of an unpublished U.S. history Dr. Olson is writing. Please write a 500-word essay summarizing the major themes of the chapter as they relate to Jacksonian democracy and ethnic relations.

Also, read David Brion Davis, “Some Themes of Counter-Subversion: An Analysis of Anti-Masonic, Anti-Catholic, and Anti-Mormon Literature.” *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 47 (Sept. 1960), 205-224. In a 400-word essay, summarize the author’s theses.

DEMOCRACY'S LEGACY: FREEDOM, EQUALITY, AND PERFECTION, 1820-1860

Sleep often escaped the fourteen-year-old boy. During long nights in 1820, he tossed and turned, agitated by eternal things, pondering heaven and hell, and wondering, as he wrote years later, which of the churches "are right; or, are they all wrong together? If any one of them be right, which is it, and how shall I know it?" Doubts tormented him, and finally he turned to the Bible for comfort. One evening, while leafing through the New Testament, he came upon upon James 1:5, which promised, "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him." Comforted, Joseph Smith climbed into bed and slept soundly.

The boy was hardly alone. The Smiths worked a small plot in Ontario County, upstate New York, scratching out a hard-scrabble existence with little more than grit and mettle. In the early 1800s, Ontario County swelled with refugees from Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Connecticut--"salt-of-the-earth" types schooled in the fiery theologies of the Great Awakening and driven west by lust for land. Religious questions intrigued them, and preachers of every persuasion overran Ontario County, vying for converts with promises of redemption and warnings of Armageddon. Historians labeled the region the "burned-over district" because clouds of "hellfire" rhetoric polluted the atmosphere, and Joseph Smith remembered that "the whole district...seemed affected by it, and great multitudes united themselves to the different religious parties, which created no small stir and division amongst the people."

Religion divided the Smiths. His parents became Presbyterians, but Joseph would not go along. "In the process of time," he later recalled, "my mind became somewhat partial to the Methodist[s], but so great were the confusion and strife among the different denominations, that it was impossible for a young person as I was...to come to any certain conclusion [about] who was right and who was wrong." Early one morning he walked into the woods and dropped to his knees, pleading to God for answers. Then, he later wrote, "I saw a pillar of light exactly over my head, above the brightness of the sun. When the light rested upon me I saw two personages ... standing above me in the air. One of them spake unto me, calling me by name and said, pointing to the other--'This is my beloved son. Hear him!'"

He later identified the two visitors as God the Father and his son Jesus Christ, who instructed Smith to join none of the churches. The ancient gospel of Jesus Christ had long since vanished from the earth, he was told, and the boy was to await its restoration. The vision seemed so real that Smith had no compunctions about sharing it widely, first with his own family, who

readily believed him, and then with local preachers, who were not so accomodating. "They treated my communication not only lightly, but with great contempt, saying it was all of the devil." Opposition failed to deter him. "I had seen a vision; I knew it, and I knew that God knew it, and I could not deny it...at least I knew that by so doing I would offend God, and come under condemnation."

The visions ceased for a time, and Joseph Smith returned to chopping wood, milking cows, pulling weeds, slopping pigs, and harvesting crops. He continued to sleep soundly, confident that God did not make idle promises. On September 21, 1823, another being of light, Smith told his parents, appeared in his bedroom and identified himself as Moroni, an angel of the Lord. Moroni had lived and died in America centuries before. His ancestors had migrated to the New World from Palestine, arriving in tiny clusters and multiplying over generations into major civilizations--the ancestors of American Indians. Ancient Americans recorded their history on a heavy bundle of golden plates, which Moroni, just before his death around 420 A.D., had buried in a hillside near the Smith farm.

The plates contained, Moroni explained, the complete gospel of Jesus Christ, who had visited America after his resurrection. In fact, Christianity had existed in the New World long before Columbus arrived in 1492. The golden plates provided another witness, or "testament," of Jesus Christ. But after a few centuries, New World Christians drifted from the Lord's teachings and fell into bloody civil wars. Moroni, the son of a prophet named Mormon, was the last Christian survivor. Joseph Smith's heavenly calling would be to translate the writings on the plates and reestablish the true church. Those obligations, however, remained a few years in the future, the angel said, because Joseph was not mature enough yet for the imposing task.

According to Smith's recollection, the angel returned four years later, on September 22, 1827, and handed over the plates, admonishing him to be "responsible for them...until he, the messenger, should call for them." When word leaked that Smith possessed golden tablets, persecution intensified. Neighbors clamored to see the plates, and ministers demanded that Smith hand them over. "The most strenuous exertions were used to get them from me...[and] the persecution became more bitter and severe than before...but they [the plates] remained safe in my hands..."

Convinced that heavenly beings visited their son, family members rallied around Joseph Smith, as did a few close friends. Over the course of the next two years, he translated the plates into English and published The Book of Mormon. Moroni then retrieved the plates. On August 6, 1830, the twenty-five year-old Smith, now considered a prophet of God by several others, founded the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, soon nicknamed the Mormons, and proclaimed that the true gospel, lost to the world soon after the death of Jesus Christ and the original disciples, had been restored to the earth.

The Second Great Awakening produced other visionaries, but Joseph Smith was unique, an American original whose legacy endures. In December 1997, Mormon officials in Salt Lake City announced that church membership surpassed ten million people in 135 countries. A prominent non-Mormon sociologist even mused, "Perhaps a historical phenomenon is at work here. Maybe, for the first time since Muhammad rode out of the desert from Mecca bearing the Holy Koran, a new world religion has appeared, complete with its own sacred text and a theology that appeals to millions."

THE SECOND GREAT AWAKENING

Joseph Smith was only one of tens of thousands of Americans searching for ultimate answers to life's mysteries. During the 1820s religious camp meetings appeared on the landscape like bees on a hive. Ministers worked the crowds better than charismatic politicians, whipping them into spiritual ecstasy. As preachers described the unspeakable horrors of hell and the exquisite blessings of heaven, listeners fell into paroxysms of joy, some shreeking to the heavens, others dropping to their knees and weeping in silent prayer; some simply "Amen-ed" the sermons, while others lapsed into "tongues," mumbling what jaded observers considered gibberish but what true believers
interpreted as the Holy Ghost. A British traveller, attending a revival outside of Paducah, Kentucky, in 1827, remembered, "The participants behaved more like late-night revelers in a Dublin pub than church-goers. They shouted, groaned and swooned, hanging on every word, crying and praising 'The Lord.' Many fell to the ground in fits, foaming at the mouth like mad dogs."

Historians termed such revivalism the "Second Great Awakening," but it was another step toward democracy. Universal suffrage for white men had its religious counterpart in the revival, where salvation rested within everyone's reach. The unbending Puritan God who saved only a select few had gone the way of powdered wigs. Rich and poor, professional and artisan, and farmer and worker now enjoyed the power to grasp salvation on their own. Church membership jumped dramatically in the 1820s and 1830s, particularly among Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians, as millions cast their votes for heaven.

Charles Finney's Revivalism

The most charismatic preacher was Charles Finney, a New York attorney who was "saved" in 1821, accepting Jesus Christ as his "personal Savior" and
abandoning law books and court appearances for the revival circuit. Within a few years he had earned a reputation as the best show in town, the only preacher in America who could keep a revival going for weeks and months at a time. What Andrew Jackson did for political rights, Charles Finney did for salvation. Everyone was entitled to heaven, he proclaimed. Everyone was equal in the eys of God. A Rochester, New York, newspaper in 1831 printed one of Finney's sermons: "The choice is yours alone. God offers each the key to heaven's golden door, but He will not force you to enter therein. Straight is the path and narrow is the gate to redemption. Make up your minds and enter into covenant with the Lord!" Hundreds of thousands did just that, crediting Charles Finney with keeping them from Satan's fiery clutches.

Finney knew exactly what he was doing. Subdued, scholarly sermons, founded on carefully reasoned arguments, might satisfy well-dressed elites, but he preached to a different choir--to millions of common farmers and workers with high expectations. "God has found it necessary," he once explained, "to take advantage of the excitablity...in mankind, to produce powerful excitements among them, before he can lead them to obey...there are so many things to lead their minds off from religion...that it is necessary to raise an excitement among them, till the tide rises so high as to sweep away the opposing obstacles." Out to perfect the world, he started by getting everyone to vote "for the Lord Jesus Christ as the governor of the universe."

Evangelical women enthusiastically accepted his call; some even took to the preaching circuit themselves. Elizabeth Stoddard, a Methodist who later converted to Mormonism, preached throughout upstate New York in the early 1830s, promising salvation to everyone. "Heaven," she declared, "ought to become a crowded place." In a world of castes and classes, of

the privileged few against the underprivileged masses, Americans chose equality on earth and in heaven.

Other women promoted Sunday School, encouraging ministers to establish weekly sabbath schools, where children could receive formal Christian instruction. Women activists formed the backbone of the American Bible and Tract Society, which printed millions of Bibles and religious pamphlets and urged hotel owners to place them in every room, teachers in every desk, and businessmen in every office. A hurricane of Bibles flooded America in the 1830s and 1840s. By 1850 the United States had more Bibles in print than citizens.

Religious women also founded hundreds of chapters of Maternal Associations, which provided a moral curriculum and encouraged mothers to use it in teaching proper religious values to their children. "In the next generation," promised a missionary matron in 1838, "this generation of morally redeemed children will save the nation. Their children shall save the world!"

Moral Crusades

In addition to converting millions, evangelicals also concluded that perfection demanded the elimination of social ills, with alcohol the number one offender. By 1830 the typical American consumed forty gallons of alcohol annually, and since large numbers of people abstained from strong drink, the country had to be littered with alcoholics. Alcohol was as American as apple pie, and evangelicals traced the roots of poverty, adultery, crime, and family abuse back to a bottle. To rid America of booze, they launched the temperance movement. In 1826 Congregational minister Lyman Beecher founded the American Temperence Society (ATS). Within several years more than a million people attended regular ATS meetings in six thousand chapters, pledging to abstain and demanding that employers ban liquor from the workplace. The crusade worked. Alcohol consumption fell by half over the next ten years. Moral suasion then gave way to politics as temperance crusaders laid siege to state legislatures. Maine surrendered in 1851, prohibiting the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages. Soon many other states did so as well.

What men did in saloons or taverns, or behind the woodshed with hidden bottles, was bad enough; what they did in beds and boudoirs was even worse. For every four men converted during the Second Great Awakening, ten women won salvation, and many of them decided to rein in the most primitive of male passions. "Male lust," a middle-aged Ohio woman said in 1841, "knows no boundaries; not age or color or social place. A stiffened member has no conscience." The time had arrived to take on male sexuality, the ultimate bastion of selfishness and power.

In 1833 Charles Finney's half-sister Amanda, joined by several women friends, founded the New York Female Moral Reform Society, and by 1837 the group had gone national, setting up more than 4,000 chapters. They published The Advocate of Moral Reform, the first U.S. newspaper controlled by women, and urged men to forego "self-abuse," or masturbation, as "a sin certain to sap moral energy and undermine the foundations of society." Reserving special condemnation for prostitution, they placed real blame where blame was due, on the "selfish beasts" whose passions allowed such iniquity to thrive. "Unbridled passion," one editorial in the Advocate argued, "threatens virtue everywhere." To discourage the exploitation of "fallen women," the society posted women sentries, protected by male security, outside brothels. In a few cases, the Advocate engaged in an early form of "outing," publishing the names of

prominent men known to frequent red light districts. The Advocate also highlighted women who signed pledges to marry only virtuous, chaste men.

Not surprisingly, the crusade failed miserably. Waging war against alcohol was simple math compared to the calculus of wiping out masturbation, fornication, and adultery. Early in the 1840s, because of opposition from men unwilling to sacrifice sexual freedom and cynicism among women about the prospects of reining in male sexuality, the movement evaporated. Chapters of the Female Moral Reform Society shut their doors by the thousands.

"My Brother's Keeper"

For some reformers, perfection demanded protection of the weak and helpless. Just as Jesus healed the sick, elevated the downtrodden, and fed the poor, modern Christians should do the same. Years of blaming the victim and assuming that individual problems originated in the will of God had created general insensitivity about human suffering.

Among the most prominent reformers was Dorothea Dix, a Massachusetts teacher shocked by the treatment of the mentally ill at the Cambridge House of Correction, where officials confined the insane to unheated rooms, cages, and outdoor livestock pens. She embarked on a personal quest to end such suffering. In a 1843 letter to the state legislature, Dix pleaded, "I proceed, gentlemen, to call your attention to the state of insane persons within this Commonwealth in cages, closets, cellars, stalls, pens! Chained, naked, beaten with rods, and lashed into obedience." She shared her outrage in colleges, churches, and tea-party circles until Massachusetts established hospitals for the mentally ill. She campaigned in other regions as well until fifteen states followed suit.

Other disabilities cried out for attention too. Thomas Gallaudet adopted deafness as his cause. An Episcopal clergymen, Gallaudet in 1817 established the American Asylum, a free school for deaf children, in Hartford, Connecticut. In Europe he learned lipreading techniques and sign language and recruited teachers of both to his American Asylum. He also lobbied state legislatures to fund education programs for the deaf. The plight of the blind concerned Samuel Gridley Howe, who established the Perkins Institute for the Blind in Boston. Part-crusader, part-carnival barker, Howe staged rallies throughout the country, often in the company of Laura Bridgman, a deaf and blind woman. Most Americans in the 1820s thought that Bridgman was helpless, but Howe's workshops demonstrated that the two could communicate with one another. When Congress passed the Americans With Disabilities Act in 1990, the hearing and visually-impaired hailed Galllaudet, Howe, and Bridgman as the founding parents of the movement to end discrimination against those with disabilities.

Anti-Catholicism

But the Second Great Awakening and the moral crusades it spawned had a dark side, particularly its anti-Catholic crusade. The arrival of more than one million Irish Cathoic immigrants during the 1840s and early 1850s alarmed large numbers of Protestants. Newspapers, books, and pamphlets ridiculing Catholics became bestsellers, and frightened Protestants avidly consumed the most sensational propaganda. The Awful Disclosures of Maria Monk (1836)--allegedly the confessions of a former nun, who described depraved priests, licentious nuns, and monastic orgies--was a piece of religious pornography that sold 300,000 copies before the Civil War.

Many Americans repeated Irish jokes and gleefully passed on rumors that Irish Catholics were sexually irresponsible alcoholics subject to the dictates of Rome. Occasionally anti-

Catholicism turned violent. In August 1834 arsonists torched the Ursuline convent in Charlestown, Massachusetts. When Catholics in Philadelphia protested sectarian instruction in public schools and requested tax support for church schools, controversy exploded into the Philadelphia Riots of 1844. Priests and nuns were attacked, homes burned, and churches vandalized. In 1854 a mob razed the Irish ghetto in Lawrence, Massachusetts. Except for the most menial, low-paying jobs, many Americans preferred not to hire Catholics. Newspaper ads in New York and Boston during the 1840s and 1850s commonly asked for Protestant workers or stated flatly that "Irish need not apply."

FREEDOM AND LIBERATION

Evangelical reform and Jacksonian democracy also set their sights on slavery. The American Revolution unleashed powerful forces that eventually changed the country and the world. Many people took Thomas Jefferson at his word, insisting that all men really were "created equal" and condemning human bondage. What could be more antithetical to equality than slavery? Quakers had denounced slavery for decades. "Black or white, bond or free," wrote James Carpenter, a Philadelphia Quaker, in 1773, "all men are sons of God and entitled to liberty." In the context of natural rights and Christian charity, he continued, "slavery is an unspeakable evil." Other prominent Americans agreed. After 1776 Thomas Paine, Benjamin Franklin, James Otis, and Noah Webster all condemned slavery.

The military service of thousands of blacks also pricked the American conscience. Crispus Attucks, a runaway slave, died in the Boston Massacre. Peter Salem and Salem Poore, two slaves freed to fight in the Continental Army, distinguished themselves at Bunker Hill, as did Lemuel Haynes at the Battle of Ticonderoga. By war's end, more than 5,000 African Americans had fought for
their country, exposing the raw hypocrisy of fighting a revolution for freedom while turning a deaf ear to the righteous desires of black people. The ideology of individual freedom and natural rights gave birth to the antislavery movement.

African Americans in the North

Economic change reinforced ideology. Early in the 1800s, the northern economy became capital rather than labor intensive. Farms and factories did not depend on involuntary labor, and the economic rationale for slavery evaporated. Most whites did not resist abolition. Quakers organized the first antislavery society in 1775, and in 1780 Pennsylvania agreed to abolish slavery gradually. Massachusetts abolished slavery by court order in 1783, and in 1784 Connecticut and Rhode Island enacted abolition. New York and New Jersey did so in 1785 and 1786, and in 1787 the Northwest Ordinance outlawed slavery in the Ohio Valley.

But freedom did not mean equality. Northern whites segregated free blacks at every turn. Blacks could not serve on juries or vote, and black immigration from other states was barred. Between 1807 and 1837 New Jersey, Connecticut, New York, Rhode Island, and Pennsylvania disfranchised African Americans. Segregation was a common feature of public facilities in the North. Faced with withering bigotry, blacks turned inward for respect and support, and they found both in the black church. Most joined the Methodists or Baptists because both churches permitted the ordination of black ministers. In 1787, after being asked to occupy segregated pews at St. George's Methodist Church in Philadelphia, Richard Allen and Absolom Jones established the African Methodist Episcopal (AME) Church. In 1816 AME churches in Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania joined into a national convocation and named Allen

bishop. Several black Baptist churches appeared between 1805 and 1810. Churches served as forums where leadership could be developed and grievances expressed. In selecting officers and ministers, members exercised voting rights unavailable in the larger society. Churches also promoted educational and fraternal programs. Richard Allen, for example, played a leading role in the Free African Society and the Black Masons. When African Americans became active in their churches, they helped build important collateral institutions. Even in our own time, the most influential black leaders--including Martin Luther King, Jr., Louis Farrakhan, and Jesse Jackson--have come from black churches.

Black People in the South

Abolition faced strong opposition in the South. Antislavery sentiments developed there during the 1770s but died out after 1800. Southern whites feared abolition more than bubonic plague. Just as the economic need for slaves disappeared up North, southern dependence increased. With world markets glutted in the 1790s, tobacco farmers searched for a new crop. The Industrial Revolution had stimulated demand for cotton, but the expense of removing seeds by hand from the fiber posed a daunting obstacle. In 1793 Eli Whitney solved the problem by inventing the cotton gin, a machine that removed seeds without destroying the fiber. Annual production skyrocketed in the South from 4,000 bales in 1790 to more than 5 million in 1860. Plantation owners then needed millions of slaves, and abolition became synonymous with economic extermination.

Southerners also opposed abolition for social reasons. Unlike the North, where whites in 1860 outnumberd blacks by 20 million to 250,000, the southern population was more evenly balanced racially. By 1860 seven million whites outnumbered four million blacks in the South. In Virginia, Texas, and Arkansas, whites outnumbered blacks three to one, but in Mississippi and South Carolina blacks outnumbered whites. The population was divided almost equally in Louisiana, Alabama, Florida, and Georgia. Nightmares of slave uprisings disturbed white sleep and made emancipation unthinkable.

Blacks disagreed, pointing out the many evils of the institution. Slavery eviscerated family privacy. Slaves did not enjoy unfettered power in their own homes, and white men often sexually abused black women. Children worked in the fields from an early age, and family members could be sold separately. Living conditions were primitive, even though planters provided a subsistence living, if only to protect their investment. Individual food rations included four pounds of pork fat, a peck of corn meal, and a small amount of coffee and molasses each week. Slaves lived in damp, small shanties in the "quarters."

Few slaves tolerated bondage. To avoid field work, many convinced whites that blacks were lazy people from whom little could be expected. Others injured farm animals, broke tools, and disabled wagons to postpone work. Some slaves even hurt themselves, inflicting wounds on hands or legs to avoid being overworked or sold. Feigning illness was common. Thousands of slaves tried to escape, hoping to reach the North or Canada on the "Underground Railroad"--a group of whites and free blacks who assisted runaway slaves. Others abandoned caution altogether and adopted more violent methods. In 1831 Nat Turner's rebellion shed the most blood, killing sixty Virginia whites. Still, rebellions were rare; resistance was more often directed at ameliorating slavery than at liberation. After all, Turner's rampage cost him his life.

To survive the barbarities of bondage, slaves on large plantations constructed a universe of their own. In the "quarters," a world away from the big house, a resilient culture emerged--

part American and part African--that eased the trauma of bondage, reinforced group solidarity, and released pent-up frustrations. At home, at night and after work, blacks developed their own a language, ethical and family values, positive self-images, and group unity. In the evenings they gathered to visit, sing, or dance; on Sundays and holidays they hunted, fished, gambled, attended church, or picnicked. Music filled their lives, underwriting group unity and expressing individual aspirations. In song, slaves retained the spirit of Africa, fashioning special modes for dealing with the New World. Spirituals and secular songs expressed feelings that whites would not have tolerated in speech. One slave song captured lament and hope at the same time:

> See wives and husbands sold apart,
> Their children's screams will break my heart-- There's a better day a coming,
> Will you go along with me?
> There's a better day a coming,
> Go sound the jubilee!

By the 1700s a distinct culture had appeared. Although slaves spoke English, it was unique in grammar, pronunciation, and morphology. Black English tended to eliminate predicate verbs, so that such statements as "He is fat" or "He is bad" became "He fat" or "He bad." Black grammar neglected possessive constructions, saying "Jim hat" rather than "Jim's hat," and it ignored gender pronouns and used "him" and "he" for both the masculine and the feminine. Slaves placed English words in a grammatical context that was both English and Africa. Black English provided slaves with a measure of privacy, since most whites understood slave talk only with difficulty.

Religion too liberated slaves from the white world. Black Christianity permitted few distinctions between the secular and the spiritual and projected slaves into a more benign future, assuring them that there was justice in the universe. Except for proud first-generation Africans tenaciously holding on to the faiths of their fathers, most slaves converted to Christianity and imbued it with an emotional spirit all their own. African musical rhythms and dances, voodooism and folk culture, and grave decorations thrived. The enthusiasm of fundamental Protestantism--with its handclapping, rhythmic body movements, public testimonies, and conscious presence of the Holy Ghost--appealed to them. Some planters encouraged religion as a tool of social control, and white ministers cooperated. Patience, obedience, submission, gratitude--these were the themes of white-sponsored slave religion. Lunsford Lane, an escaped slave, recalled in 1848 that he had often heard white preachers tell slaves "how good God was in bringing us over to this country from dark Africa, and permitting us to listen to the sound of the gospel....The first commandment was to obey our masters, and the second was to do as much work when they...were not watching us as when they were." Not about to be fooled, slaves altered Christianity. In white churches they went through the motions of reverence but rarely accepted the messages of submission. Instead they used white services to visit friends and family on other farms or plantations, which they could rarely do because rigid laws confined them to their masters' property.

When worshipping on their own, they abandoned Calvinist notions of predestination and damnation. Spirituals resonated with redemption, freedom, and justice. African American culture was not obsessed with guilt and depravity, and black preachers spoke of equality and God's bountiful love for everyone. Slave religion united this world with the next and fused into a single community, a

"chosen people" loved by God. Theirs was a spiritual world of deliverance, of Moses leading a special people out of bondage and Jesus saving them from their oppressors.

In their families blacks found love and companionship--blessings slavery often denied them. Despite the breakup of families through the sale, sexual exploitation, and incursions on the authority of black parents, the family was the basic institution of slave society. Typical slave households had two parents. Fathers exercised discipline and supplemented the family diet by hunting and fishing, and mothers took care of household duties and raised young children. Most slave marriages were sound--when husband and wife were allowed to remain together. That former slaves eagerly had marriages legalized after the Civil War and searched the country over to reunite families confirms the loyalty of parents, children, and spouses.

Slave women found themselves in uniquely difficult circumstances. They were vulnerable to sexual exploitation and always faced the threat of losing husbands and children at the auction. At the same time, as women, they lived in nuclear family settings where patriarchical authority was very real. A few radical historians have argued that slavery, by emasculating African American men, truly liberated African American women, but consensus opinion agrees that African American women had to deal with the power of white men and black men on the plantations. Because of that reality, they developed complex networks with other black women, a sisterhood that assisted them in dealing with life.

The Abolition Movement

Southern whites tolerated the abolition of slavery in the northern states and squelched it in their own, but when m
David Walker, a free black in Boston, wrote Walker's Appeal encouraging slaves to rise up in rebellion, launching the northern attack on southern slavery. "Wo, wo, will be to you [whites] if we have to obtain our freedom by fighting... treat us like men, and we will like you more than we do now hate you." Walker was hardly the only northern black to begin telling southern whites what to do with their slaves and their plantations. Robert Young, Theodore Wright, Sojourner Truth, Harriet Tubman, and Charles Remond became well-known black abolitionists. Frederick Douglass was especially influential. An escaped Maryland slave who taught himself to read and write, he became the most prominent black abolitionist.

In 1831 William Lloyd Garrison published the first edition of The Liberator, an uncompromising journal calling for immediate abolition. At a time when more politic whites hesitatingly suggested gradual emancipation, Garrison eloquently responded, "No! No! Tell a man whose house is on fire to give a moderate alarm; tell him to moderately rescue his wife from the hands of the ravisher; tell the mother to gradually extricate her babe from the fire into which it has fallen;--but urge me not to use moderation in a cause like the present." He organized the New England Anti-Slavery Society in 1833, and by 1838 more than 1,350 antislavery organizations flourished throughout the North.

Schooled in the emotionalism of the Second Great Awakening, abolitionists held meetings where antislavery rhetoric flowed like revivalist sermons. They swamped the country in a tidal wave of antislavery books, newspapers, and pamphlets, always couching their arguments in the language of freedom, equality, and democracy. But they ran into a wall of opposition in the South, and even in North racism left most whites quite unsympathetic. But the seeds of liberty had been planted; almost inconceivable in 1835, the harvest would require thirty years and more than 600,000 dead men.

THE DEMANDS OF GENDER

In the early 1800s, the legal status of women still closely resembled that of their mothers and grandmothers. Under Engish common law, as the great jurist William Blackstone wrote, "The husband and the wife are one, and that one is the husband." Women could not serve on juries, sue or be sued in court, inherit property and own property, or claim their own earnings as their own. Divorced women rarely received custody of children. Women could not vote, and because most colleges excluded them, they had little access to careers in law, medicine, or the ministry. "The power of woman," according to an 1837 pastoral letter of the Congregational Church, "is in her dependence, flowing from the consciousness of that weakness that God has given her for her protection."

But the seeds of reform often germinate in gardens of oppression, and the cult of domesticity, for all of its cultural heavy-handedness and the limits it imposed on women in the Jacksonian era, helped lay a foundation for female activism in early America. Among educated, middle-class who could afford to cultivate hearth, home, and the company of like-minded women, a unique network of religion and reform emerged. Women talked over tea and coffee about husbands, children, churches, and social ills, and it was not long before they exchanged ideas about solutions to the problems of the day. Coincidence along cannot explain the fact that middle-class women were at the forefront of the great antebellum reform movements. In promoting Sunday Schools, Bible distribution, temperance, marital fidelity, abolition, literacy, public schools, and mental health reform, women like Dorothea Dix and Amanda Finney helped Americans refine the meaning of equality and individual rights.

Women's Rights

Nor could reform-minded women ignore their own plight as second-class citizens. A few women breached the bulwarks of oppression through audacity, determination, and pluck. Harriot Hunt, a young Bostonian, had yearned to be a doctor since girlhood. Denied admission in 1832 to medical schools throughout New England, she took up alternative medicine and opened a practice, which became quite successful. She promptly protested a city attempt to tax her on the grounds that the right to vote was denied her. She denounced the "injustice and inequality of levying taxes upon women, and at the same time refusing them any voice or vote in the imposition and expenditure of the same. The only classes of male persons required to pay taxes, and not at the same time allowed the privilege of voting, are aliens and minors." City fathers did not respond, but Hunt took some satisfaction in writing it. After all, "even drunkards, idiots, and lunatics, if men, may still enjoy that right of voting to which no woman, however large amount of taxes she pays, however respectable of character, or useful her life, can ever attain. Wherein, your remonstrance would inquire, is the justice, equality, or wisdom of this?"

Lucy Stone's protest took a different twist. She married Henry Blackwell in 1855 but insisted on drawing up a legal agreement guaranteeing her equality. The document acknowledged their mutual love but denounced the "present laws of marriage...[which] refuse to recognize the wife as an independent, rational being, while conferring upon the husband an injurious and unnatural superiority, investing him with legal powers which no honorable man would exercise." The document condemned the inability of divorced women to secure custody of children, to own personal property, to sue in court, to inherit property, to draft a will, and to receive payment for work outside the home. The Blackwells also objected to "laws which give to the widower so much larger and more permanent an interest in the property of his deceased wife, than they give to the widow in that of the deceased husband." The whole body of marriage law, based on gender inequity, cried out for reform. "We believe," they attested, "that personal independence and equal human rights can never be

forfeited...that marriage should be an equal and permanent partnership." They even issued a call to arms: "Married partners should provide against the radical injustice of present laws, by every means in their power."

Such strident rhetoric struck many men as intemperate and dangerous. One journalist decided that Lucy Stone and her ilk--women who did not believe that "[their] rights, like [their] duties, are bounded by her household"--should be dispatched quickly to a "lunatic asylum, where medicine and soothing treatment will extract from [their] brain[s] that maggot of desire to exhibit herself at the polls." Ever unflappable, Stone made sure that her marriage contract went public, mailing copies of the document to newspapers throughout New England, hoping to stir up controversy and generate publicity. A veteran of the tempernce and antislavery crusades, she was well-known to conservative men, who hoped that marriage would domesticate her. The editor of the Boston Post put those hopes to verse:

A name like Curtius' shall be his, On Fame's loud trumpet blown,
Who with a wedding's kiss shuts up the mouth of Lucy Stone!

Wishful thinking! Nothing could still the tongue of Lucy Stone.

The number of women airing grievances escalated, and a few barricades were breached. Oberlin College admitted women in 1837, as did Antioch in 1853. Women's colleges, like lone green plants in a vast desert, grew sporadically. Mount Holyoke opened for women in 1837 and Vasser in 1865. Quakers often led the way because their theology revered equality and because women had long been allowed to speak in Quaker meetings. Women like Angelina Grimke and her sister Sarah shopped in the supermarket of democratic ideals, adopting the antislavery movement and speaking out about the evils of human bondage. More often than not, their boldness offended male listeners, who were not accustomed, publicly at least, to assertive women. One Massachusetts clergymen condemned the Grimkes for "falling victim to earthly enticements, seeking the flattery of the world, and taking Lucifer's mission as their own." Several New England clerics concluded that the Grimkes, in "assuming the posture and the tone of man as a public reformer...[yield] the power which God has given [them] for protection, and [their] character becomes weak."

The 1840 World Antislavery Convention proved to be a watershed for
the women's rights. Abolitionists gathered in London to protest slavery, but controversy soon engulfed the conference. When the time came to seat voting delegates, convention organizers barred women. Several hours of debate ended in a vote segregating women to a balcony, where they could observe the proceedings but not speak. Wendell Phillips, one of America's most prominent abolitionists, pleaded for reconsideration, but a chorus of catcalls and boos drowned him out. When William Lloyd Garrison arrived in London, he boycotted the convention, choosing instead to sit in the women's gallery. An English woman remembered Garrison taking a seat near her. "Never has a man been clothed with so much dignity," she wrote. "If ever my Maker permits me to witness such nobility again, I will consider my life blessed."

The hypocrisy of battling slavery while condoning the suppression of women could not have been more more conspicuous, overnight making dedicated feminists out of committed abolitionists. Abby Kelley wrote, "In striving to cut [the slave's] irons off, we found most surely that we were manacled ourselves." In 1908, Candy Stanton remembered, "The events in London so long ago changed my life irrevocably. The image of men--white and Negro--locking the chains of bondage on

my sisters still remains indelibly imprinted on my vision!" During the 1840s, wherever women activists assembled, the World Antislavery Convention always climbed to the top of the agenda. The segregation of women that day in London inadvertently promoted American feminism.

Two generations before, the Declaration of Independence had opened the door to democracy, and all forms of paternalism, fixed hierarchy, social castes, and aristocracies would soon fall to its compelling logic. Jacksonian rhetoric, with its insistence on voting rights for all white men, with or without land, pushed the franchise beyond the confines of property. In 1831 De Tocqueville saw it coming: "Once a people begins to interfere with the voting qualification, one can be sure that sooner or later it will abolish altogether...The further the limit of voting rights is extended, the stronger is the need felt to spread them still wider...The ambition of those left below the qualifying limit increases in proportion to the number of those above it. Finally, the exception becomes the rule; concessions follow one another without interruption, and there is no halting place until universal suffrage has been attained."

In 1848 Lucretia Mott, a temperance crusader interested as well in women's rights, found herself on vacation in Seneca Falls, New York, where Cady Stanton was living and raising seven children. Mott sought out Stanton for a friendly visit, and their conversation soon drifted back to London. They reminisced about the convention, and Stanton, inspired with a stroke of genius, grabbed a book and opened it to the Declaration of Independence. Thomas Jefferson had written that "all men are created equal and endowed with certain unalienable rights," but the two women were fully prepared to scrap the gender distinction and expand on the Founding Fathers. They spent several days toying with the language, finding ways to substitute men in general for King George III in particular and sexist abuses for imperialist outrages.

When they finished writing, they labeled their essay the "Declaration of Rights and Grievances" and assembled a convention of like-minded women. The declaration charged that "the history of mankind is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations on the part of man toward woman, having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over her." About 100 people attended and passed resolutions demanding the right to vote and equality before the law. Although the right to vote escaped the first generation of American feminists, the Seneca Falls convention became the launching platform for the nineteenth-century women's movement.

EXPERIMENTS IN PERFECTION

Social experiments germinated in Jacksonian America like fresh flowers in spring garden. The cult of democracy planted the seeds of optimism, and a number of Americans set out to build the perfect society. Some communities were purely religious, and others quite secular. Several identified individualism and capitalism as the source of evil, while others insisted on changing the structure of sexuality and marriage. De Tocqueville had perceived the link between democracy and perfectionism. "When castes disappear and classes are brought together...when old conceptions vanish and new ones take their place," he wrote, "then the human mind imagines the possibility of an ideal but always fugitive perfection."

The Shakers

Mother Ann Lee came up with a unique solution. "The physical union of man and woman," she wrote, "was ordained of God to perpetuate the species, but men have abused the gift." Since the second coming of Jesus Christ was imminent, sex was no longer necessary. Lee founded the United Society of Believers in Christ's Second Coming and built a theology based on celibacy and holding

property in common. Individual wealth no longer made sense if Jesus were returning soon. Outsiders nicknamed them "Shakers" because of their rhythmic group dances.

By the 1830s, Lee had thousands of converts living in twenty communities in New England and upstate New York, where property was held in common and no sex allowed. Men and women lived in separate dormitories. Neighbors had few problems with the Shakers, who minded their own business, were scrupulously honest, and attracted tourists with their elegantly designed handicrafts. In the long run, Shakers could not survive as a community. Celibacy was not exactly guaranteed to attract large numbers of male converts, and when Jesus Christ did not appear as promised, many followers lost heart. The society dwindled in number after the Civil War, and by the 1990s only two centenarians, both women, still claimed to be Shakers.

The Seventh-Day Adventists

Confusion about the Lord's timetable also undermined the calling of William Miller, a Baptist who in 1831, after months of careful calculations using the Old Testament as a chronometer, predicted that Jesus would return to earth between March 21, 1843, and March 21, 1844. As March 21, 1844, approached, converts thronged to Miller, many gladly turning over everything they owned to the new sect. Donning "Ascension Robes" on the morning of the twenty-first, they spent the day looking toward the heavens. When the setting sun shattered testimonies, Miller put quill to paper and recalculated, confessing his error and resetting the date to October 22, 1844. On the scheduled day, thousands took to the hills again, only to see the sun set without the Lord on the horizon. The second disappointment finished Miller as a leader, and Hiram Edson, who simply said the second coming would occur sooner rather than later, assumed the mantle of leadership. Edson also recognized Saturday, not Sunday, as the sabbath day, and his church soon became known as Seventh-Day Adventists.

The Oneida Community

John Humphrey Noyes had a different take on perfection. The son of a prosperous New England family, he had a spiritual nature, growing up, according to his own son, with "an unmistakable and somewhat unexpected air of spiritual assurance." Noyes concluded that private property explained human misery, and that monogamous marriage amounted to little more than husbands owning wives. "When the will of God is done on earth," he argued, "as it is in heaven, there will be no marriage. The marriage supper of the Lamb is a feast at which every dish is free to every guest. ... In a holy community, there is no more reason why sexual intercourse should be restrained by law, than why eating and drinking should be..." He proclaimed the virtues of "complex marriage," in which every woman was married to every man.

Utopia took shape in Oneida, New York, during the 1840s, where Noyes established a communitarian society in which property, and women, were held in common. After all, he argued, "Men and women find universally that their susceptibility to love is not burned out by one honeymoon, or satisfied by one lover." Noyes preached that the "Lord Jesus Christ himself asks us to "banish [shame] from the company of virtue. Shame gives rise to the theory that sexual offices have no place in heaven. Anyone who has true modesty would sooner banish singing from heaven than sexual music."

Promising sex in this life and more in the next, he attracted converts to Oneida, which survived under his direction until 1879. His neighbors, taking a dim view of Oneida morality--"the ethics of the barnyard," some called it-- went after him, and to avoid arrest, the prophet of "complex marriage" fled

to Canada. His followers soon scuttled complex marriage, and two years later they gave up the practice of communal property, replacing it with a corporation in which people owned stock.

The Mormons

But Mormons constituted, by far, the most enduring of the Jacksonian era's new communities. Joseph Smith possessed one of the nineteenth century's most fertile minds. Extremely well-read and with little formal education, he taught himself Hebrew in order to read original Biblical texts, and he thought imaginatively on a variety of scientific issues. Smith told listeners that "Earth was one of countless planets in the firmament where children of God dwell." All the continents, he claimed, were once a single land mass that had cracked and separated sometime after the creation. Alcohol, tobacco, coffee, and tea were as sure to shorten lifespans as wars and predatory animals.

And from his lips flowed a remarkable theology. After his resurrection, Jesus Christ visited North and South America, teaching Indians his gospel; he then appeared in other places as well. The Bible described Jesus's mortal life; the Book of Mormon told the story of his New World ministry. Other scriptures, yet undiscovered, would someday reveal details of the Lord's visits elsewhere. Heaven and hell existed, but not in the way most Christians assumed. Hell was not a literal place of fire and brimstone; no loving God could consign his children to such a fate. Depending upon individual righteousness, the vast majority of human beings would end up in one of three "degrees of glory." Even heaven's basement, he went on, was so wonderful that people, if they could picture its reality, would commit suicide to get there. Only a handful of the most evil people would spend eternity in the presence of Satan, and even there real punishment would be the mental anguish emanating from the realization of salvation squandered. Heaven would be crowded and hell sparsely populated. The dead would even have a chance in the next life to repent and earn a greater reward.

In the pregnant theological atmosphere of the Second Great Awakening, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints gained converts rapidly. Smith commissioned hundreds of missionaries to preach the "Restored Gospel." Two by two they went, on foot, handing out copies of the Book of Mormon. In his own version of the "democracy of all believers," Smith decided that all men deserved to be ordained to the priesthood, since everyone would be expected to donate time and personal resources as lay ministers. Converts joined by the thousands, many drawn to Smith's charismatic, gregarious nature. The original six members became 20,000 by 1838. Poet John Greenleaf Whitter, with more than a little wonder, observed the geometric growth: "They speak a language of hope and promise to weak, heavy hearts, tossed and troubled, who have wandered from sect to sect, seeking in vain for the primal manifestation of divine power." And what could be more primal than the regular appearance of God and angels to a modern-day prophet?

Socially clannish and given to block voting, Mormons raised the ire of non-Mormon neighbors, who feared their success and political clout. Protestant ministers felt threatened by Mormonism's unpaid, lay clergy. The Book of Mormon's claim that Native Americans were a chosen people destined to inherit the earth irritated land grabbers anxious to relocate Indians to worthless reservations. Smith's opposition to slavery and his early attempts to convert free blacks enraged southerners. And his United Order, which hoped to eliminate poverty through the voluntary, communal redistribution of property, seemed unusually radical to capitalists. "Mormons are a cancer on the land," argued a southern Protestant, "and the excision should come sooner rather than later."

But political and social issues cannot explain the visceral hatred and violence Mormons encountered. Theology aggravated evangelical Protestants who concluded that, like Native Americans,

"the only good Mormon is a dead Mormon." Smith had taken existing hopes for progress and perfectibility and pushed them to a logical extreme, claiming that individual perfection was possible in this life and that progress would continue forever. Heaven was not an ethereal world of idle chatter, hymn-singing, and triumphant praise but a place of hard work, intellectual development, and eternal families. In heaven, men and women could achieve "all that their Father hath." Not only were humans perfectible, they could in the next life achieve godhood themselves and an eternity of creating worlds of their own. "As man now is," one of Smith's followers wrote, "God once was; as God now is, man may become." Evangelicals could not imagine anything more sacreligious.

Except for polygamy, which Smith secretly introduced to the church in the mid-1830s. Such Old Testament prophets as Abraham and Isaac had several wives, and since the restoration of the ancient gospel required the resurrection of gone but not forgotten Biblical institutions, plural marriage was a godly commandment. Although relatively few Mormon men ever participated in a plural marriage, the practice whipped up a frenzy of opposition. The Jacksonian era may have put a premium on individual male rights, but even the most tolerant democrats drew the line at polygamy. "The English language," argued one Missouri woman, "is not capable of describing the vile, blasphemous heart of Joe Smith." Governor L. W. Boggs of Missouri, sniffing votes in offended hearts, bluntly announced, "The Mormons must be exterminated."

Many Americans concurred, forcing the cycle of migration, settlement, and flight that took Mormons from New York to Ohio and then from Ohio to Missouri. From Missouri they fled to southern Illinois, where they built the city of Nauvoo. But in June 1844, after being arrested on trumped up charges, Smith reached the end of the line. On his way to jail, he confided to a friend, "I am going like a lamb to the slaughter, but I am calm as a summer's morning; I have a conscience void of offense towards God, and towards all men." A few days later, a mob stormed the jail and killed him.

CONCLUSION

Jacksonian America was fertile ground for the blossoming of reform movements and new religions, and Mormonism, although it happened to be one of the most enduring, was just one of many. Other visionaries founded secular utopias, free of private property and capitalism, in hope of generating a new moral order. The Second Great Awakening's preoccupation with good and evil inspired crusades against slavery, alcohol, prostitution, adultery, and fornication. Definitions of just what constituted evil, of course, varied widely, and many Protestant crusaders, who considered Catholicism and Mormonism to be cancers on society, targeted them for elimination as well.

Religious persecution turned out to be the dark side of the Second Great Awakening, and Mormon and Catholic pleas for freedom of religion fell on deaf ears. Controversy over individual rights has always occupied center stage in the drama of American politics, and the antebellum decades were certainly no exception. The Jacksonian conviction that the Constitution entitled all white men, not just landowners, to individual rights spread liker a contagion to other groups, who soon demanded the same. Slavery immediately found itself under siege, and feminists proclaimed that individual rights were matters of humanity, not gender. The destruction of slavery eventually required a bloody civil war, and the achievement of equality for women and ethnic minorities remains a dream, not a reality, but the stage for today's civil rights debates was constructed during the decades of the Second Great Awakening, when blacks, women, Mormons, Catholics, and the disabled first announced their demands for liberty and equality.

Lesson Three

For Lesson Three, read the material below and write a 500-word essay summarizing the major themes of the chapter as they relate to immigration, ethnic relations, and the westward movement. Also read and write a 500-word essay summarizing the primary thesis or thesis of the following article: Richard Jensen, "No Irish Need Apply: The myth of Victimization," *Journal of Social History*, (Winter 2002), 405-429.

By the autumn of 1809 Meriwether Lewis had turned increasingly to strong drink and snuff, and his behavior had become erratic. Perhaps suffering from the effects of malaria, he talked wildly, lied, deflected difficult questions, and even attempted suicide. This once great man, who along with William Clark and a handful of other brave men had crossed the continent and back, had been reduced by illness and pain and inner doubts to a state of constant mental torment.

A proud man, he worried about the money he owed others and hoped that a trip to Washington, D.C., would clear up some of his financial problems. But as Lewis travelled up the Natchez Trace it became clear to his companions that he was still haunted by demons. Again, he drank heavily and "appeared at times deranged in mind." Then one afternoon he stopped at an inn some seventy miles south of Nashville. To Mrs. Grinder, the wife of the innkeeper, Lewis appeared possessed. He paced about his room, talked to himself in a "violent manner," and looked longingly westward.

That night he had trouble sleeping. He paced. He talked to himself. He frightened Mrs. Grinder. Then, he loaded a gun and shot himself, not once but twice. He stumbled to his door, calling to Mrs. Grinder," "O madam! Give me some water, and heal my wounds." Too frightened to administer to Lewis, Mrs. Grinder waited until morning to send servants to check on him. They found him with a razor in his hand, "busily engaged in cutting himself from head to foot."

"I am no coward; but I am strong, [it is] so hard to die," he told one of his traveling companions. He begged for someone else to finish the job he had started. But there was no need. He died a short time later.

What had he been thinking about as he looked west the night before or paced about his room? What had occupied his last thoughts? Was he thinking of his creditors, the land speculations that had gone so wrong, his losing battle with the bottle, the men and women he believed he had let down? Was it the pain, the physical pain he had endured and the mental pain he had suffered?

Or, for a moment at least, did he ponder what he had accomplished? At the invitation of President Thomas Jefferson, Lewis and Clark had explored the tributaries of the Mississippi River. In the spring of 1804 they had departed Camp Dubois, across from St. Louis, and ascended the Missouri River, crossing present-day Missouri, skirting Kansas and Nebraska, and moving through the heart of the Dakotas. In the winter of 1804-1805 the expedition had camped at Fort Mandan, in the middle of North Dakota; then in the spring they had turned west, exploring several great, uncharted rivers, including the Columbia and the Yellowstone. They had spent the winter of 1805-1806 at Fort Clatsop on the Pacific Ocean, before retracing their route back to St. Louis.

Did he consider the Indian nations he had encountered, such as the Teton Sioux, Arakaras, Mandans, Flatheads, Shoshonis, Blackfeet, Nez Perce, Walla Wallas, Chinooks, and Clatsops? Some had been fierce and dangerous, others docile and friendly. The notes he had kept introduced other Americans to the people of the West. Or did he think of the animals--the thick herds of buffalo, the countless prairie dogs, the sheep, coyotes, antelope, and grizzlies--and the plants? Lewis, especially,

had collected specimens of animals and plants unknown to Anglo-Americans. He had seen things that few people even had enough knowledge to dream about, sights enough to fill the wildest imagination with awe. He had seen the snow-capped peaks of the Rocky Mountains, and found a pass through them. He had felt the rush of the undamned Snake and Columbia rivers. He had finally answered the question that had intrigued explorers since Columbus: there was no convenient Northwest Passage.

We simply do not know what Lewis was pondering at the sad end of his life. Undoubtedly he considered himself a failure. He had always been hard on himself. On August 18, 1805, he had celebrated his thirty-first birthday among the Shoshoni. After taking stock of his life, he had written in his journal that he "had as yet done but little, very little, indeed, to further the happiness of the human race, or to advance the information of the succeeding generations... I dash from me the gloomy thought, and resolve in the future, to redouble my exertions and at least to endeavor to promote those two primary objects of human existence, by giving them the aid of that portion of talents which nature and fortune have bestowed on me; or in future, to live for mankind, as I have heretofore lived for myself." But he was no failure; probably no expedition had ever been as successful. Not only did Lewis and Clark give a credible, first-hand account of the West, they also provided substance for other great dreams and adventures. As much as any two Americans, they gave the West to their young nation. They transformed a handful of myths and rumors and best guesses into a concrete body of geographical, botanical, zoological, and ethnological detail. And they advanced America's claim to a sea-to-sea empire.

Abundant land had always shaped American institutions, but Lewis and Clark gave "open spaces" a whole new meaning. Beyond the Mississippi River, they had demonstrated, lay billions of acres of the richest soil, the mightiest rivers, and the most majestic mountains in the world, a landscape without limits beckoning common people to break the chains of class and civilization and reinvent themselves, to create a future of boundless opportunities. More than fifty years after Thomas Jefferson commissioned Lewis and Clark, Henry David Thoreau summed up the revolution their expedition had set in motion: "Start now on that farthest western way," he wrote in 1854, "which does not pause at the Mississippi or the Pacific, nor conduct toward a worn-out China or Japan, but leads on direct a tangent to this sphere, summer and winter, day and night, sun down, moon down, and at last earth down too." Out West, in open spaces, destiny beckoned, ready for the taking.

YOUNG AMERICA'S MANIFEST DESTINY

When the first English colonists rejected the Old World and crossed the Atlantic, they became the first to look west for hope and regeneration. In the 1840s, Americans cashed in on their vision. In 1844, writer Ralph Waldo Emerson penned a title for the prevailing nationalism, naming it "Young America." Embellished by Jacksonian democracy's worship of "common men," American nationalism assumed the power of a political hurricane, sweeping away everything before it. In the United States, many believed, God had produced an ideal world where even common people enjoyed unlimited opportunities and bright futures.

Government Land Policy

Land formed the heart and soul of Young America. Alexis de Tocqueville grasped the political significance of land as soon as he arrived in the United States. "Among the lucky circumstances that favored the establishment...of a democratic republic in the United States," he wrote, "the most important was the choice of the land itself in which the Americans live. Their fathers gave them a love

of equality and liberty, but it was God who, by handing a limitless continent over to them, gave them the means of long remaining equal and free."

As the engine of westward expansion gained steam, the federal government stoked its fires, auctioning off the public domain at bargain prices. In 1796 Congress set the price $2 an acre, with a minimum purchase of 640 acres. The measure proved too expensive for small farmers, who pressed for more liberal policies. The Land Act of 1800 reduced the minimum tract to 320 acres; beginning in 1805, land went for $1.64 an acre, with a minimum purchase of 160 acres. With the Land Act of 1820, Congress agreed to $1.25 an acre, with a minimum purchase of eighty acres. In 1841 a German immigrant in Illinois wrote home, "Imagine. Eighty acres of the richest soil in the world. For a mere $100." Even that was not enough. Many Americans clamored for free "homesteads" out West. In 1818 poet James K. Paulding put to verse what millions believed:

> Hence comes it, that our meanest farmer's boy
> Aspires to taste the proud and manly joy
> That springs from holding in his own dear right
> The land he plows, the homes he seeks at night;
> And hence it comes, he leaves his friends and home,
> Mid distant wilds and dangers drear to roam,
> To seek a competence or find a grave,
> Rather than live a hireling or a slave.

The Economic Boom

In addition to land, a booming economy fueled Young America's dreams. In the 1830s, industrialization established a foothold in the textile mills of New England, where factories, technology, and mass production began processing millions of bales of cotton. New technologies also took over the production of woolens, firearms, and clocks. In Pennsylvania, miners gouged hundreds of thousands of tons of iron ore and coal to supply the railroad boom, which had started in 1830 when South Carolina's Charleston and Hamburg Railroad undertook commercial freight operations. A year later, the Baltimore & Ohio put steam locomotives on the tracks. Public officials and entrepreneurs then triggered a railroad construction boom. By 1840 the U.S. had 2,818 miles of track, which increased to more than 9,000 miles in 1850 and nearly 30,000 in 1860. Just as westward expansion shifted into high gear, railroads provided the means to link such vast open spaces into a single national economy. Young America passed a milestone in 1859 when industrial production reached $1,885,862,000, more than the total value of all farm products.

The Great Migration

Along with land and jobs, immigration explained Young America's bouyant optimism. During the 1840s, more than 1.4 million immigrants took their chances on America. From San Francisco to Galveston and on up the Atlantic Coast to Boston, immigrants disembarked from loaded pasenger vessels. The U.S. population surged past Britain's. "The Mother Country is no more," exulted a New York journalist. "We have outgrown her on the world stage."

Few immigrants came for religious reasons; for every pilgrim immigrating to please God, ninety-nine came to serve Mammon. Economics, not religion, fired their ambitions. Europe's population increased from 140 million in 1750 to more than 260 million in 1850. Farm sizes

dwindled, and many young men lost hope of ever owning land. Factories displaced many workers. Toiling longer hours for less money, a legion of British, German, Scandinavian, and Chinese peasants decided that emigration was the only way to improve their lives.

For the Irish, emigration was the only way to survive. Poverty had long been the common denominator of Irish life, but the Great Famine turned misery into catastrophe. In 1844 a fungus destroyed Ireland's entire potato crop. The blight continued in 1846 and 1847, bringing starvation to a million people. Bodies piled up like driftwood. One British traveller remembered, "We saw sights that will never wholly leave [our] eyes, cowering wretches almost naked in the savage weather, prowling in turnip fields, and endeavoring to grub up roots which had been left... Sometimes, I could see, in front of cottages, little children leaning against a fence...for they could not stand--their limbs fleshless, their bodies half-naked, their faces bloated yet wrinkled, and of a pale greenish hue--children who would never, it was too plain, grow up to be men and women." Emigration seemed the only hope.

Immigrant destinations varied widely. The Chinese settled along the Pacific Coast, especially in California. Immigrants from Great Britain brought industrial skills with them, settled throughout the Midwest and Northeast. Scandinavians scurried off to rural areas in Wisconsin, Illinois, Minnesota, and Michigan. Most Germans ended up in the "German Triangle," a large swath of territory between Milwaukee, Cincinnati, and St. Louis, Missouri. Irish ghettoes appeared in Boston, New York, Buffalo, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and New Orleans. The immigrants were a perfect match for Young America. Like colonists who had come before, they were restless and unhappy with stunted, Old World opportunities. They were young, hardworking risk-takers desperate enough to abandon family, custom, and tradition for the ssake of land, jobs, and freedom.

Manifest Destiny

In 1845 John L. O'Sullivan, an editor of the United States Magazine and Democratic Review, saw the hand of God at work in America. He wrote that the U.S. enjoyed a "manifest destiny to overspread the continent allotted by Providence for the free development of our yearly multiplying millions." In no time at all, "Manifest Destiny" came to imply that Americans bore a solemn responsibility to expand across North America, to make sure that the virtues of Jacksonian democracy stretched from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The equation was simple: vast, open spaces plus individual rights equaled American superiority. In 1847 poet Walt Whitman proclaimed that faith in his "Song of the Open Road":

> From this hour I ordain myself loos'd of limits
> and maginary lines,
> Going where I list, my own master total and
> absolute,
>
> I inhale great draughts of space,
> The east and west are mine, and the north
> and the south are mine.
> I am larger, better than I thought.

When Indians, Mexicans, and the British disagreed, the stage was set for a monumental continental power struggle.

In 1839 a border dispute between Maine and New Brunswick Province over 12,000 acres in the Aroostook River Valley guaranteed that the battle would be fought out west, not to the north. Lumberjacks descended on the valley to harvest timber, and militia from both sides moved in to protect their interests. Extremists hoped for war. One Maine politician told his colleagues, "This is the chance we have been waiting for, an opportunity laid before us by the hand of God, to seize what is rightfully ours! Take the Aroostook and from there on to Ontario, Quebec, and the Pacific!" In the end, London and Washington decided that 12,000 icy acres was not worth war. In 1842 Webster-Ashburton Treaty awarded 7,000 acres went to Maine and 5,000 to New Brunswick. The treaty also defined the northern boundary of the United States from Vermont to Minnesota.

LAND, TITLE, RIGHTS, AND FREEDOM

From the very beginning of the age of exploration, Europeans vigorously debated the questions of sovereignty and land title and fought with one another and with hundreds of Indian tribes over title to New World territory.

The Doctrine of Discovery

The first explorers always claimed their "discovery" in the name of a king or queen, and European monarchs agreed that the discovering country secured absolute rights to the area. Since Spain and Portugal appeared first on the New World scene, they laid claim to it all. By the early 1600s, however, the Dutch, English, and French contested such broad strokes of a mapmaker's brush, arguing that "effective occupation" upstaged the doctrine of discovery. Simple discovery was not enough. Real sovereignty required "effective occupation." Only by colonizing a territory could such an occupation be proven and title established. Spain and England argued over the issue until 1670, when they signed the American Treaty establishing the principle of effective occupation.

Doctrine of Superior Use

Resolving disputed titles between European nations meant little to Indians. The French and English treated Indian tribes as sovereign nations and negotiated treaties with them. Few legal problems existed as long as Indians cooperated and signed away their lands, but Europeans faced a dilemma when tribal leaders refused. In 1758 legal scholar Emmerich Von Vattel resolved the dilemma. In his book Law of Nations, he proclaimed the principle of "superior use," arguing that Europeans, because they were politically centralized and economically developed, could make better use of land than native peoples and therefore deserved sovereignty. "Civilized man," according to Vattel, "enjoys a higher claim to the land." Within a few decades, the principle of "superior use" acquired the force of international law. The discovering power, or the power occupying a territory, enjoyed free and clear title to the land of the Indians in the eyes of the European world.

American leaders claimed that English sovereignty over the land had been transferred to the United States. Native Americans rejected such claims, but in 1823 the Supreme Court decided the issue. Johnson v. M'Intosh involved two individuals with conflicting titles to the same tract. One had purchased his land from an Indian tribe; the other from the federal government. Chief Justice John Marshall awarded title to the individual who had purchased it from the federal government. "Discovery" and "superior use," he contended, gave the U.S. government right to dispose of Indian lands. Indian tribes could not sell land without permission. Johnson v. M'Intosh prepared the way for Manifest Destiny.

INDIAN REMOVAL

Now sustained by a body of law, the United States decided to relocate Indians, which would free up the land for white settlers. By 1820 more than one million whites had settled west of the Appalachians and more were coming.

The Indian Removal Act

Since 1789 such distinguished Americans as Thomas Jefferson and George Washington had suggested that eastern tribes be moved across the Mississippi River. Whites would get the land one way or another, and moving the Indians might prevent bloody confrontations. Materialism and humanitarianism made common cause. When Andrew Jackson entered the White House in 1829, relocation gained a powerful advocate. He had made his reputation fighting Indians, but for all of his bellicosity, he worried about Indian survival. In 1830, to open land for whites and to protect Native Americans, he signed the Indian Removal Act. "Doubtless it will be painful to leave the graves of their fathers," he concluded, "but what do they do more than our ancestors did...To better their condition in an unknown land our forefathers left all that was dear in earthly objects. Our children by thousands yearly leave the land of their birth to seek new homes in distant regions...Can it be cruel in the Government, when, by events it cannot control, the Indian is made discontent in his ancient home to purchase his lands [and] to give him a new and extensive territory?"

The Trail of Tears

Jackson neglected to mention the obvious--his forefathers and his children voluntarily left their homelands. Indians had no choice. In what is remembered as "The Trail of Tears," the U.S. Army drove 100,000 Indians to lands across the Mississippi. In the winter of 1831, the peaceful Choctaws of the Deep South went first. Many died of hunger and disease along the way. De Tocqueville watched them cross the Mississippi. "Among them [were] the wounded, the sick, new born babies, and old men on the point of death. They had neither tents nor wagons...I saw them embark to cross the river, and the sight will never fade from my memory." The Creeks departed four years later. The army supervised Chickasaw removal in 1837. Cherokees fought removal in the federal courts, and in 1832, in Worcester v. Georgia, the Supreme Court upheld their claims, but Jackson refused to enforce the decision. Rumor has it that upon being informed of the decision, Jackson calmly replied, "John Marshall has made his decision. Now let him enforce it." The Cherokees held out for several years, but in 1838 soldiers evicted them; four thousand died on the way west. Only the Seminoles resisted violently. Under Chief Osceola they waged a guerrilla war in the Florida Everglades between 1835 and 1842 that cost the government two thousand soldiers and $55 million. But In 1843 they too were defeated and relocated.

Removal was equally relentless in the Ohio Valley. The Iroquois managed to stay in upstate New York, but dozens of other tribes had to go. Only the Sauk and Fox resisted. Under Chief Black Hawk they fought back, and in what is known as the Black Hawk War, U.S. troops chased them across Illinois and Wisconsin and finally defeated them at the Battle of Bad Axe. The removal treaties, of course, guaranteed perpetual ownership of the new land to the Indians, but only a permanent end to the westward movement could have preserved Indian land tenure, and that would never be. De Tocqueville wrote, "There is famine behind them, war in front, and misery everywhere."

TROUBLE IN THE BORDERLANDS

Early in the 1800s, a series of dramatic social and economic changes upset the political balance in Spain's colonies and gave diplomatic and military teeth to Manifest Destiny's vision.

The Borderlands

New Mexico was the first of Spain's borderland colonies, and California and Texas soon followed. Spanish colonization in Texas began in 1682 after France laid claim to the Mississippi valley. To counter French expansion, New Spain founded Nacogdoches in 1716 and San Antonio in 1718. Spanish settlers, known as Tejanos, moved in Texas to raise cattle and cotton. Texas remained a focus of Franco-Spanish rivalry until 1763, when Spain seized Louisiana from France. Without the French threat, Spanish interest in Texas waned. As late as 1800 only 3,500 settlers lived there. Spain moved into California after hearing of Russian and English designs there. The Franciscan priest Junípero Serra founded San Diego in 1769, and by 1820 Franciscans had established twenty other missions, including Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, San Jose, and San Francisco. Catholic missions and private ranchos dominated an economy that revolved around corn, wheat, cotton, grapes, citrus fruits, beans, hogs, sheep, and cattle. The settlers became known as californios. In 1800 the borderlands were provincial outposts, with a population of only 25,000 people. Brown-skinned mestizos, not pure-blooded Spaniards, had led the way north late in the 1500s. By the early 1800s, except for a few people of Spanish descent, mestizos constituted the bulk of borderlands settlers.

They joined the successful uprising against Spain, but Mexicans soon learned that rebellion often begets more rebellion. Soon after winning its independence, Mexico fell under the control of wealthy landowners who believed in rule by the rich, the unity of church and state, and a strong central government. In 1834 they installed Antonio López de Santa Anna as a virtual dictator. He abolished provincial legislatures, restricted the powers of municipal governments, and ousted local officials. Upset about the loss of local power, leaders in Yucatán and the northern provinces began considering rebellion. Their restlessness coincided with a vanguard of frontier settlers arriving from the United States.

New Mexico

Mexico encouraged economic development in the borderlands, scuttling Spain's restrictive import policies and opening New Mexico to American traders. In 1822 William Becknell, a Missourian, detected opportunities in shipping goods to New Mexico. At the time, nuevo mexicanos received imports from Vera Cruz on Mexico's Gulf Coast. Teamsters carted the goods cross country to New Mexico. Becknell opened the Santa Fe Trail, shipping $15,000 in goods by covered wagon from Independence, Missouri, to Santa Fe, New Mexico. By 1829 two wagon trains a year, enjoying U.S. cavalry protection and carrying a total of $200,000 in goods, traversed the Santa Fe Trail. In 1843 more than $500,000 in imports reached New Mexico via the Santa Fe Trail. American merchants settled in Santa Fe and became an integral part of the local economy. It was cheaper to obtain goods from the United States than from central Mexico, and well-to-do nuevo mexicano merchants and ranchers drew closer to the United States. The U.S. economy, not the Mexican, seemed more likely to guarantee their prosperity. **California**

During the 1830s, a similar situation developed in California, when American settlers established farms in the rich central valleys and merchants crowded into San Francisco to profit from the Pacific trade. Although only 700 U.S. citizens lived in California in 1830, American interest in the region was no secret. In 1835 President Jackson offered to purchase northern Califronia, but Mexico spurned the suggestion. Seven years later, in 1842, Commodore T.A.C. Jones led a U.S. naval flotilla into Monterey Bay and raised the stars and stripes, claiming California for the United States. He acted on false rumors that a British fleet was about to invade California; when he learned that no such invasion was underway, Jones lowered the flag and formally apologized.

At the same time as Americans were taking an increased interest in California, many californios distanced themselves from Mexico City. In 1831 they rebelled against Governor Manuel Victoria and drove him from the province. Five years later, Governor Mariano Choco fled when he learned that californio landowners had put a bounty on his head. His replacement, Nicolás Gutiérrez, lasted only two months, telling his superiors in Mexico City that "the office of governor is not worth the risk of losing my life." Talk of independence circulated freely among californios and Americans.

Texas

In Texas politics turned violent. Anxious to develop Texas economically and block British colonial designs, Spain offered Missourian Moses Austin a huge "empresario" land grant if he could attract 300 Anglo families to settle there. Austin died a few months later, and his son Stephen inherited the project. In 1821 the new Mexican government endorsed the deal, and settlers poured in from Louisiana. The number of Americans in Texas jumped from 200 in 1821 to 20,000 in 1830 and 30,000 by 1835.

They were a "horde of infamous bandits," according to one Mexican newspaper. Abolitionist William Lloyd Garrison labeled Texas a "rendevouz of absconding villainy, desperate adventure, and lawless ruffianism--the ark of safety to swindlers, gamblers, robbers, and rogues of every size and degree." Garrison's assessment contained at least a kernal of truth. Most Texas immigrants were restless, independent southerners anxious to improve their lives. They wanted land and freedom and arrived in Texas bearing inflammatory political attitudes. Mexico's encouragement to tens of thousands of Anglo southerners could not have been more misguided. While Mexico was a Roman Catholic country, Texas immigrants were evangelical Protestants schooled in the Second Great Awakening. Although Mexico required immigrants to join the Catholic church, most Texans did so half-heartedly, at best. Many of them
detested popes and priests and rejected ceremonial liturgies. Thousands of Texas settlers shared one Texan's conviction that "Lucifer himself resides in Rome." Religious rivalries guaranteed political conflict, especially when Texans either paid mere lip service to Catholicism or, worse yet, blatantly advertised their Protestant convictions.

Political philosophy also caused trouble. Texas immigrants brought states rights attitudes just when Mexico was making the transition to more centralized control. In 1835, when Santa Anna announced the absolute supremacy of the central government, Texans revered the states rights philosophy so popular in the South. Like most southerners, they were highly suspicious of distant politicians interfering with local affairs. Anglo audacity enraged Santa Anna, who determined to put Texans in their place.

The real issues at stake sounded familiar, since individual rights and the power of the federal government defined political debate in the United States. Ever since the 1760s, when Britain first began levying taxes, Americans had debated the merits of a strong central government. When Mexico imposed tariffs on goods entering Texas from the United States, Texans protested. The tariff issue had inspired the nullification controversy in South Carolina, and most Anglo Texans sympathized with John C. Calhoun's claim that a state could cancel an unpopular law. Although Calhoun and South Carolina soon abandoned nullification, Texans did not; they refused to pay import duties to the Mexican government and engaged in a successful smuggling trade.

Controversies over political sovereignty and individual rights, as they had a decade before in Missouri, erupted in 1830 when Mexico prohibited the introduction of more slaves to Texas. Texans

claimed the law violated property rights, and therefore liberty. Anglo settlers imported slaves anyway. They rejected the notion that a distant central government could exercise such controls over local matters. "When George III tried such nonsense not so long ago, we wouldn't stand for it," complained Texas planter Thomas Smithers. "Santa Anna is cut from similar cloth."

In 1835 slavery, tariffs, taxes, and states rights--the stuff from which the Civil War was later made--inspired rebellion in Texas. Early in 1836 Santa Anna moved more than 5,000 Mexican troops to San Antonio, where nearly 200 Texans--including Davy Crockett and Jim Bowie--were holding up in the Alamo. Santa Anna attacked at daylight on March 6, 1836, and within an hour or so, all of the defenders were dead, killed to the last man. Mexican soldiers piled the bodies into a heap and set them ablaze, celebrating victory around the bonfire.

Six weeks later, with the slogan "Remember the Alamo" on their lips, Texas soldiers under the command of General Sam Houston surprised Santa Anna at the Battle of San Jacinto and routed his army, killing 630 Mexican soldiers to the few Texans lost. To save his own life, Santa Anna acknowledged Texas independence, recognized the Rio Grande River as Mexico's northern frontier, and agreed to withdraw his troops. As soon as he was back in Mexico, he denounced the treaty and all of its provisions. That mattered little to the rebels, who offered up Texas to the United States for annexation. Most Americans had already adopted the Alamo dead as heroes. A poem entitled "Fall of the Alamo" appeared in The Knickerbocker, extolling the martyrs' virtues:

> Stranger! should in some distant day,
> By chance your wandering footsteps stray
> To where those heroes fought and fell,
> And some old garrulous crone should tell
> The story of a nation's birth,
> Of human ashes mixed with earth--
> The bodies of the bold and free,
> Who bled and died for liberty--

Texas annexation collided head-on with the controversy over slavery. Fifteen years had passed since the Missouri Compromise, and the balance of power remained at twelve slave states to twelve free. But two months after San Jacinto, Arkansas entered the Union as a slave state, tipping the scales south. The prospect of Texas statehood terrified many northerners. William Lloyd Garrison charged that Texans were bent on perpetuating "the most frightful form of servitude the world has ever known, and to add crime to crime." Congress refused to move on Texas, and Sam Houston had to proclaim the "Lone Star Republic," an independent nation the United States quickly recognized.

The Election of 1844

The annexation debate aroused old animosities. Slavery and westward expansion were again joined at the hip. The volatile issue needed only an ambitious politician to spark a national crisis. President John Tyler lit the match. As he pondered the election of 1844, Tyler found himself in an untenable political position. In 1840 the Whig Party, hoping to broaden its appeal, had selected Tyler as William Henry Harrison's running mate. Most Whigs loathed him because he was a slaveowning Democrat from Virginia, and Democrats considered him a traitor. Harrison's untimely death a month after the inauguration elevated Tyler to the White House as the "accidental president." His political foundation rested on quicksand.

Annexation of Texas, he concluded, might keep him in the White House. It might be popular enough among proslavery Democrats to get him the nomination. In the summer of 1843, Tyler leaked to the press fictitious rumors that Britain was offering military backing for Texas independence in return for the Lone Star Republic's abolition of slavery. Secretary of State John C. Calhoun, a proslsavery, states rightist from South Carolina, drafted an annexation treaty. Northern Whigs, opposed to the expansion of slavery, smelled a conspiracy, and when Calhoun placed the treaty before the Senate in 1844, Whigs ambushed him. Needing 35 votes for ratification, Calhoun got only 16. Tyler then changed tactics, hoping to annex Texas with a joint resolution of Congress, which required only a simple majority. But northern Whigs managed to adjourn Congress before the resolution came up for a vote.

Democrats nominated James K. Polk for president, and he made Manifest Destiny his personal campaign theme. A Tennessee Democrat, Polk bore the nickname "Young Hickory" because he so completely identified with Andrew Jackson. He possessed none of Jackson's charisma but all of his determination, and like Jackson, he promised to annex Texas, expel Britain from Oregon, and expand the United States "from sea to shining sea." He promised to enforce the Monroe Doctrine and adopted the campaign slogan "Fifty-four, Forty or Fight," reflecting his claim that the United States had a right to all of the Oregon Territory north to the 54th parallel (just south of present-day Alaska).

A number of Whigs pursued the nomination, but they all self-destructed, giving Henry Clay another chance for the White House. Most Americans rallied to Polk; 1844 was a banner year for American nationalism, and Polk played to the crowds. During the campaign southerners, determined to annex the Lone Star Republic, raised the possibility of "Texas or disunion." Calhoun had been even more blunt, claiming that annexation of Texas was "the most important question, both for the South and the Union, ever agitated since the adoption of the Constitution." Without Texas, Calhoun claimed, "the South will be lost." But Henry Clay held to old-fashioned themes, restating Whig economic doctrine and making no commitments on Oregon or Texas. When the ballots were counted, Polk defeated him 1,337,243 votes to 1,299,068. James Birney, running again on the Liberty Party ticket opposing slavery in the territories, polled 62,300 votes.

Soon after the election, southerners resurrected Texas annexation. If President James K. Polk, one of their own, was prepared to extend northern boundaries all the way to the Pacific, he should annex Texas too. In 1844, with a population of 142,000, Texas had become a jewel. Many Americans regarded annexation as the legitimate expression of popular will; the joint resolution proposed to annex Texas as a slave state. Abolitionists fought back. William Lloyd Garrison termed it "Diabolism Triumphant," a slaveowner conspiracy for the "Overthrow of the government and Dissolution of the Union," but he could not muster the votes to block annexation. Texas was the twenty-eighth state and the fourteenth slave state, and most Americans approved of equilibrium. On March 1, 1845, three days before Polk's inauguration, Congress annexed Texas. Reactions were typical. Near death, Andrew Jackson heaved a sigh of relief, uttering "All is safe at last." Former President John Quincy Adams responded differently. "The treaty for the annexation of Texas to this Union," he wrote, "was this day sent in to the Senate; and with it went the freedom of the human race."

Emboldened by the acquisition of Texas, President Polk took cautious steps toward the annexation of California by informing Thomas O. Larkin, the U.S. consul at Monterey, that the president would look favorably on a rebel movement in California. On October 17, 1845, Polk

formally charged Larkin with the responsibility of fomenting secession in California. Larkin had settled in California twelve years earlier and built a profitable mercantile business. An American patriot, he wanted nothing more than to see the Stars and Stripes waving over California. Larkin enthusiastically accepted Polk's errand.

THE OVERLAND TRAIL

While Polk conspired to steal northern Mexico, pioneers by the tens of thousands, carrying everything they owned in covered wagons, left Independence, Missouri, and snaked their way across the Great Plains and Rocky Mountains. At the end of the journey lay the virgin soils of Oregon and northern California. De Tocqueville understood their pioneer quest: "Millions of men," as he described them, "are all marching together toward the same point on the horizon; their languages, religions, and mores are different, but they have one common aim. They have been told that fortune is to be found somewhere toward the west, and they hasten to find it."

The Oregon Trail

From embarkation points at St. Joseph and Independence, Missouri, the Oregon Trail stretched west to Ft. Kearney on the Platte River in present-day Nebraska and on to Ft. Laramie in what is today southeastern Wyoming. After penetrating the continental divide via the South Pass, the Oregon Trail reached Ft. Hall on the Snake River, where it forked, its northern branch leading to the Willamette Valley of Oregon, the other down to California. In the early 1840s, Oregon was the destination of choice. Its rich soils, luxurious forests, frost-free winters, temperate summers, and abundant rainfall held out the possibilities of an agrarian paradise. Perhaps 100 settlers reached Oregon by covered wagon in 1841, and that many again arrived in 1842.

Some walked, pulled handcarts, or travelled by mule team, but most arrived via covered wagon. At first the typical caravan had twenty to thirty wagons, but large groups proved too cumbersome. Sickness, death, and mechanical breakdowns caused delays; the longer the caravans, the more time-consuming the journey. By the mid-1840s, the ideal caravan contained eight to ten wagons.

If Indian tribes left them alone, the pilgrims traversed the Great Plains relatively quickly, but the Rocky Mountains and Great Basin deserts posed formidable obstacles. Up steep inclines, wagons had to be pulled, one by one, with double or triple teams of oxens. Since wagons had no brakes, moving downhill proved equally difficult. To slow the descent, wheels had to be locked in place and weights attached to the backs of wagons, or wagons had to be lashed to trees by heavy ropes. At some points, canyon walls had to be negotiated. With ropes, pullies, and winches, the emigrants hoisted wagons up and lowered them down. To ford engorged rivers, they loaded wagons on log ferries and floated them across. The journey usually took up to six months, with wagons covering about fifteen miles a day. "To enjoy such a trip," one overlander remembered, "a man must be able to endure heat like a Salamander...dust like a toad, and labor like a jackass. He must learn to eat with his unwashed fingers, drink out of the same vessel with his mules, sleep on the ground when it rains, and share his blanket with vermin... It is a hardship without glory."

But the rewards were real. One settler promised his relatives back east that Oregon "was one of the greatest countries in the world...the whole country can be cultivated." Fired by such testimonials, the pace quickened. In 1843, 800 people made Oregon their new home. By 1845 more than 5,000 Americans had taken up farms in the Willamette Valley, and the editor of the Independence Expositor excitedly wrote: "We see a long train of wagons coming through out busy streets...now comes team after team, each drawn by six or eight oxen, and such drivers! positively sons of Anak! not one of them

less than six feet two in his stockings. Whoo ha! Go it boys! We're in a perfect Oregon fever." More than 250,000 Americans eventually made that journey during the 1800s.

Frontier Women

Although thousands of single men crossed the continent, the Oregon Trail was primarily a family adventure. For most elderly, the journey was simply too arduous, too likely to end at the bottom of a grave. The poorest of the poor did not set out, either, because they could not afford it. Outfitting a family of four for a one-way trip required $600, a substantial amount of money in the 1840s. Typical overlanders were young couples with several children.

The journey especially tested the mettle of women. Most women did not want to make the trip in the first place. Oregon seemed so far away. Speaking of her dreamy-eyed husband, one woman remembered, "Perhaps I was not quite so enthusiastic as he. I seemed to have heard all this before." Indeed, "Oregon fever" was primarily a male disease, an affliction rooted in wanderlust and dreams. Land seduced the imaginations of men; most women knew how difficult it would be to rebuild in the middle of nowhere. One women wrote home to her mother, "A woman that can not endure almost much as a horse has no business here." On the trail, gender distinctions between "men's work" and "women's work" blurred, at least as far as women were concerned. "I am a maid of all traids [sic]," wrote an Oregonian. Cooking, washing, and cleaning remained the province of women, but they also found themselves hunting, fishing, standing guard, fighting Indians, driving wagons, and caring for livestock.

Women celebrated arrival in the Willamette Valley, but the festivities did not last long. There was too much work to do. Starting from scratch was a mean business. "No house, no barn, nor corral, no garden, no nothing" cried a recent arrival in 1843. "We cook over open fire, wash in a frigid, ice-cold stream, and sleep under the wagon. I am so dirty and so tired." The work never ended, it seemed, aging women quickly. "I am a very old woman," wrote a 29-year old. "My face is thin, sunken and wrinkled, my hands bony withered and hard." Worst of all was the loneliness. Leaving home back east was bad enough. In 1852 Lodisa Frizzell described the aching pain of permanent goodbyes: "Who is there that does not recollect their first night...on a long journey, the well known voices of our friends still ring in our ears, the parting kiss feels still warm upon our lips...It may be the last we ever hear from some or all of them, and to those who start...there can be no more solemn scene of parting only at death." The loneliness persisted in Oregon. Farms in the Willamette Valley were often widely scattered, with roads few and far between. The absence of churches left a large void in women lives. They had departed the East in the midst of the Second Great Awakening, when church and religion loomed large in women's lives. "I had all I could do," a young woman wrote home to Missouri, "to keep from asking George to turn around and bring me back home."

Securing the Oregon Territory

As hard as it was, settlers kept pouring in. As early as 1836 Americans outnumbered Britons in the Willamette Valley, but Britain also claimed Oregon, and neither side appeared ready to back down. In his inaugural address, Polk boldly claimed U.S. sovereignty: "[I intend] to assert and maintain by all constitutional means the right of the United States to that portion of our territory which lies beyond the Rocky Mountains. Our title to the country of Oregon is clear and unquestionable, and already are our people preparing to perfect that title by occupying it with their wives and children." Great Britain disagreed. "We possess rights which, in our opinion," proclaimed Foreign Secretary

Lord Aberdeen, "are clear and unquestionable; and, by the blessing of God, and with your support, those rights we are fully prepared to maintain." The editor of the London Times was more direct: "Oregon will never be wrested from the British Crown, to which it belongs, but by WAR." Polk then invoked the Monroe Doctrine: "No future European colony or dominion shall without our consent be planted or established in any part of the North American continent."

Both countries forwarded legitimate claims to Oregon, the British by virtue of Captain James Cook's exploratory voyages in the 1770s and President Polk because of Lewis and Clark. British trappers with the American Fur Company and Hudson's Bay Company had worked the region for years, trading with Indians and shipping out tens of thousands of beaver pelts. By the time in the 1840s, the Oregon territory stretched from the 42nd parallel--today's Oregon-California border--all the way north to just beyond the 54th parallel--deep into what is today British Columbia.

Had the issue been submitted to international arbitration, London would probably have prevailed, but the British fell victim to their own doctrine of "effective occupation." Senator Thomas Hart Benton of Missouri understood the link between the westward movement, territorial acquisition, and expulsion of the European empires. "Let the emigrants go on; and carry their rifles," he told Congress in 1844. "We want thirty thousand rifles in the valley of the Oregon; they will make all quiet there...thirty thousand rifles in Oregon will annihilate the Hudson's Bay Company, drive them off our continent, quiet their Indians, and protect the American interests."

"Oregon Fever" swept the eastern states, bringing more than 3,000 American settlers in 1845 alone. A few hundred English trappers were no match for hordes of Yankee farmers cutting trees, furrowing soil, planting seeds, harvesting crops, and building homes. Still, Polk was not about to underestimate London. The British navy controlled world sea lanes, and London could deploy crack troops anywhere. Memories of the War of 1812 still lingered--Redcoats torching the White House and Dolley Madison clutching a U.S. flag and fleeing on foot. The British realized that the clock could not be turned back on the American presence in Oregon, and Polk agreed to abandon his 54-40 demand and settle for the 49th parallel, making Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and parts of Montana and Wyoming American territory, leaving British Columbia to Britain. The Senate ratified the Oregon Treaty on June 12, 1846.

Utah: The State of Deseret

Mormon refugees made their way west along the Oregon Trail too, but they soon turned southwest toward the Salt Lake Valley. Anti-Mormon rage hounded them out of Illinois to Iowa, where Brigham Young emerged as Joseph Smith's successor. He decided that the only way to save the church was to exit the United States. In the spring of 1847, he led a caravan of 3,700 wagons and 12,000 people across the Great Plains. Mormons likened him to Moses and themselves to the children of Israel, escaping persecution by crossing a barren wilderness to the promised land. On July 24, 1847, with an advance party descending the summit of the Wasatch Mountains in Utah, Young looked down upon the desert of the Salt Lake Valley and proclaimed, "This is the right place."

Not everyone agreed, but "Brother Brigham" was a prophet not to be disobeyed. On the same day the main body of settlers arrived, and before they had time to unload their wagons, he ordered them to work, building homes, clearing land, and constructing elaborate irrigation systems. He eventually dispatched colonists to southern Utah, Wyoming, Idaho, Nevada, California, and Canada, giving much of the Intermountain West a Mormon flavor. Hardworking, loyal, and safe in a desert oasis, they established a theocracy--the "State of Deseret." Clergymen, feminists, and politicians

continued to demand a solution to the "Mormon problem." In 1857 President James Buchanan caved in, ordering an invasion of Utah. "Why can't they let us be," wondered a Salt Lake City woman to her diary, "and leave us to the God who loves us? We are not hurting anyone." Cooler heads eventually prevailed, and the army left in 1858 after securing from Young a promise that Mormons would obey federal law.

THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN WAR, 1846-1848

While the Mormons made their way to Utah, Polk enthusiastically acted out Manifest Destiny in the Southwest. Diplomatic relations did not survive annexation. In November 1843 the Mexican minister in Washington had warned that should the "United States commit the unheard-of aggression [of seizing] an integral part of Mexican territory, [Mexico] was resolved to declare war as soon as it received information of such an act." The United States had proceeded with the annexation of Texas anyway.

A boundary dispute brought on war. The United States claimed the Rio Grande River as the border with Mexico, but Mexicans insisted on the Nueces River, the mouth of which opened on the Gulf Coast nearly 150 miles north of the Rio Grande. President Polk sent diplomat John Slidell on a last ditch mission to Mexico, arming him with the authority to cancel debts Mexico owed the United States in return for recognition of the Rio Grande boundary and to offer $30 million to buy California and New Mexico.

Early in December 1845, Slidell showed up in Mexico City, but his arrival aroused a hornet's nest of nationalist protest. Losing Texas had been bad enough; few Mexicans were ready sell more territory to insatiable "Yanquís." The United States has dispatched "a commissioner," complained one Mexican newspaper, "to make with our government an ignominious treaty on the basis of the surrender of Texas and we know not what other part of the republic." Slidell got nowhere, confiding to President Polk that "nothing is to be done with these people until they have been chastised."

The Outbreak of War

One day later, on January 13, 1846, Polk decided that the time for punishment had arrived. Certain that it would bring on war, he ordered General Zachary Taylor out of Corpus Christi, Texas, south to the Rio Grande. Within two months, over vehement Mexican protests, the U.S. army constructed a fort at the mouth of the Rio Grande near Matamoros, Mexico. On April 25, 1846, Mexican troops forayed across the river and attacked Taylor's position, killing or wounding sixteen U.S. soldiers. In a war message to Congress, Polk claimed that "Mexico has passed the boundary of the United States, has invaded our territory and shed American blood upon American soil. She has proclaimed that hostilities have commenced, and that the two nations are now at war." On May 11, 1846, Congress declared war.

The war generated intense domestic opposition. Abolitionists were certain Polk had engineered a showdown with Mexico as an excuse to acquire new slave territories. William Lloyd Garrison accused the president of "falling, not so reluctantly, into the grasp of those who profit off the blood and sweat of bonded men and women." Senator Thomas Corwin, a Whig from Ohio, sympathized with Mexicans: "Have you not room in your own country to bury your dead men? If you come into mine, we will greet you with bloody hands; and welcome you to hospitable graves." Some Americans accused the editor of the Boston Atlas of treason for saying, "It would be a sad and woeful joy, but a joy nevertheless, to hear that the hordes [U.S. troops] under Scott and Taylor [Generals Winfield Scot and Zachary Taylor] were, everyman of them, swept into the next world."

But neither abolitionists nor Mexican soldiers could stop the Americans. U.S. naval forces blockaded Mexico's major ports. Commodore John Sloat, who commanded the Pacific fleet, seized San Francisco. Capt. John Fremont, already in California on an exploring expedition, found the region pregnant with rebellion. On July 5, 1846, American settlers proclaimed independence and established the "Bear Flag Republic" with Fremont in charge. Two days later, Sloat steamed into Monterey and proclaimed California a U.S. territory.

By that time Col. Stephen Kearny already had a U.S. cavalry regiment heading for New Mexico under orders to conquer the province. On August 15, he reached Las Vegas, New Mexico, raised the U.S. flag, and announced that New Mexico was American territory. When Kearny arrived in Santa Fe three days later, local Americans and most nuevo mexicanos welcomed him, and U.S. sovereignty, with open arms. From there Kearny marched on to California.

Victory followed victory. Soon after hostilities began, General Zachary Taylor crossed the Rio Grande, took his army into northern Mexico, and defeated General Santa Anna at the Battle of Buena Vista on February 22-23, 1847. From there Taylor marched on to Monterrey, taking the city in September. General Winfield Scott had already landed a U.S. army at Vera Cruz, Mexico, and embarked on a march to the capital. Mexican forces put up heroic resistance, but political instability within the government eventually disabled them. On September 14, 1847, Scott captured Mexico City. The war was over.

The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo

The war cost the United States $97.5 million and 12,876 dead soldiers, most of whom had succumbed to disease, but Polk got exactly what he wanted. Diplomats concluded a peace treaty early in February 1848 that transferred sovereignty over one-third of Mexico to the United States. The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo awarded New Mexico and California to the U.S. and acknowledged the Rio Grande River as the border between Texas and Mexico. In return the U.S. paid Mexico $15 million and assumed $3.25 million in Mexican debts.

Concerned about the fate of 80,000 Spanish-speaking Catholics in the ceded territory, Mexico inserted several guarantees in the treaty. Mexican residents had a year to decide their loyalties; if at the end of the year they had not declared their intentions, they would automatically receive U.S. citizenship. Nearly 78,000 did just that. The treaty also guaranteed their individual rights and land titles. Forever after Mexican Americans would have difficulty enjoying their promised liberties.

Some Americans demanded more, urging Polk to seize all of Mexico. The editor of the New York Post wondered why Polk would even "contemplate recalling our troops from the territory we at present occupy...and...resign this beautiful country to the custody of the ignorant cowards and profligate ruffians who have ruled it for the last twenty-five years?" But the "All Mexico Movement" stalled. Debate over permitting slavery in New Mexico and California had already become hot, and Polk knew that taking the rest of Mexico was politically impossible.

California and the Gadsden Purchase

While the ink was drying on the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, Mexicans discovered just how much they had really lost. On January 24, days after diplomats signed the treaty, a worker at Sutter's Mill on the American River in California plucked a gold nugget from a small tributary and changed the course of history. Sutter tried to keep the discovery a secret, but the news soon leaked and then flooded out, inspiring the Gold Rush of 1849. Tens of thousands of "Forty-Niners" descended on California. Easterners headed west, some on the Overland Trail and others by ship, sailing around

Cape Horn at the tip of South America or getting off at Panama and hiking through mosquito-infested jungles to the Pacific Ocean, where they boarded northern-bound ships for San Francisco. During the next three years, more than 125,000 people came to California, and prospectors dug more than $150 million in gold from rivers, streams, and mines.

California's swelling population stimulated interest in construction of a transcontinental railroad connecting New Orleans with Los Angeles. Such a route, however, required even more land from Mexico. Late in 1853 President Franklin Pierce dispatched James Gadsden to negotiate the purchase of additional territory. In return for $15 million, which the United States subsequently reduced to $10 million, Mexico ceded 29,640 square miles of territory south of the Gila River in what is today southern Arizona and New Mexico.

CONCLUSION

During the 1840s conquest of the continent became the holy grail, and United States success in expanding from coast to coast reinforced convictions that God himself had proclaimed Manifest Destiny. In abundant land and the battles to acquire it, Americans developed a sense of superiority that continues to shape politics and foreign policy. After the 1840s, few doubts survived about America's place in the world. In 1846 William Gilpin, a writer and friend of Andrew Jackson, put it best: "The untransacted destiny of the American people is to subdue the continent...to establish a new order in human affairs...to regenerate superannuated nations...to teach old nations a new civilization...to confirm the destiny of the human race...and to shed blessings round the world!" But Manifest Destiny was not all glory and luster; dark stains of racism tarnished its luster. Native Americans discovered once again that they had no rights; Europeans possessed a body of legal dogma fully capable of rationalizing conquest. Manifest Destiny also trampled on Mexican sovereignty and eventually robbed Mexico of a third of its national estate.

And Manifest Destiny contained the seeds of civil war. The acquisition of new territory reintroduced the country's oldest and most dangerous debate--whether or not to permit slavery out West. During the Mexican-American War, David Wilmot, a Pennsylvania Whig, introduced to Congress the "Wilmot Proviso" prohibiting slavery in any territory gained from Mexico. He attached the proviso to dozens of congressional bills, which southerners blocked everytime, but the debate over each one took its toll, alienating northerner from southerner and poisoning the political climate. Ralph Waldo Emerson knew what was happening: "The United States will conquer Mexico," he wrote in 1846, "but it will be as the man who swallows the arsenic which brings him down in turn. Mexico will poison us."

Lesson Four

For Lesson Four, read Oscar Handlin, *The Uprooted*, and write a 1,000-1,500 words review of the book. The review should consist of a biography of the author and how his own intellectual and political background might have affected his point of view. It should also include a summary of the content of the book and how Handlin treats the immigrants. Are they, for example, portrayed as victims or agents with some control over their lives? According to Handlin, why did the immigrants leave the Old World and what did they find attractive in the New World? The review should also include a discussion of other review of the book to determine how it was received at the time of its publication.

Lesson Five

Employing any referencing system, such as Google, write up short (75-100 word) descriptions of the following items:

The Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798
The Know Nothing Party of the 1850s
The citizenship provisions of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo
The citizenship provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment.
Page Act of 1875
The Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882
Dillingham Commission
Madison Grant
Literacy Act of 1917
Snyder Act of 1924
National Origins Act of 1924

Also read the material below and write a 500-word essay summarizing the chapter in terms of its theses on immigration and nativism.

AMERICAN MOSAIC, 1865-1920

Their lives never intersected. One was highly educated, the other illiterate. One was well-to-do, the other poverty-stricken. One was a woman, the other a man. She was a "civilized" easterner, he a child of the Wild West. She was white, he was an Indian. And yet, in late nineteenth and early twentieth-century California, history joined them in common cause and uncommon tragedy.

The daughter of a college professor, Helen Hunt Jackson was born in Amherst, Massachusetts, in 1830. She possessed a brilliant mind and a literary elegance. "Helen was," a friend said, "a child of dangerous versatility and vivacity." As an adult, she possessed a "sweet and gracious womanhood...with candid beaming eyes, in which kindliness contended with penetration." She also had a "soul of fire," remembered one contemporary. A good friend insisted that "tenacity and impulse rule her fate... [She had] both the velvet scabbard and the sword of steel...the ability to strongly love, to frankly hate."

In 1879 Ms. Jackson attended a lecture in Boston featuring Standing Bear, chief of the Poncas. Three years earlier, the Poncas had been forcibly relocated from South Dakota to Indian Territory. In 1879 Standing Bear and ten followers escaped for home. Officials captured them in Nebraska. Standing Bear's flight captured the national imagination; newspapers tracked his movement and readers devoured every word. Reformers organized a lecture tour that brought Standing Bear to Boston. His message cut listeners to the bone. "I shall be found with 'Indians' engraved on my brain when I'm dead," she said. "A fire has been kindled within me which will never go out." A woman possessed, she adopted the Indian cause as her own. She was unable "to think of anything else from morning to night." Her first book--Century of Dishonor, published in 1881--brutally indicted United States Indian policy

and pushed her to the forefront of the Indian reform movement. Late in 1882 the Bureau of Indian Affairs appointed her special agent to the Mission Indians. In 1883, while battling cancer, she toured southern California, where the Mission Indians suffered the ravages of poverty, disease, and murder. Their population had imploded, from fifteen thousand in 1852 to less than three thousand in 1881, leaving behind, she claimed, "a record of shameless fraud and pillage."

On December 1, 1883, at the Berkeley Hotel in New York City, Helen Hunt Jackson penned the first word of Ramona, hoping to "write a story that would do for the Indian a thousandth part of what Uncle Tom's Cabin did for the Negro." She wrote feverishly, hoping to finish the book before the cancer finished her. In March 1884, when she dotted the last period on Ramona, she heaved a sigh of relief, put her head on the desk, and wept. "My life-blood went into it--all I had thought, felt, and suffered for five years on the Indian Question." She died sixteen months later, but by then Ramona was a bestseller. A romantic tragedy chronicling the decline and eventual demise of a California tribe, Ramona went through three hundred printings and became a highly popular stage play, its audiences bemoaning the disappearance of America's noble savages.

On August 9, 1911, while Ramona played to packed houses, a starving Yahi Indian named Ishi stumbled into a slaughterhouse in northern California, hoping to steal some scraps of meat. Butchers grabbed him. He knew no English, and the sheriff jailed him for protection from curious gawkers. Newspapers picked up the story. Ishi was the last "wild Indian" in America. A local scholar vaguely familiar with Yahi wrote, "This man is...wild. He has pieces of deer throng in place of ornaments in the lobes of his ears and a wooden plug in the septum of his nose." Within a month, Ishi took up residence in the Museum of Anthropology in San Francisco.

The Yahi were a Stone Age tribe. For centuries they had fished, hunted, and foraged along the small tributaries of the Sacramento River. The gold rush overwhelmed them. White settlers cleared land and depleted game animals. By the late 1800s, the remaining 400 Yahis had taken to butchering sheep and cattle and raiding farm houses for food. Whites declared war, and by 1900 only a handful of Yahi survived. Disease thinned them even more, and in 1909, a lone Yahi woman accompanying Ishi died. He was the last of his tribe.

In some ways, the white world agreed with Ishi. A steady diet of bread, beef, and beer filled his hallow cheekbones and thickened his gut. He did odd jobs around the museum, picked up some English, and made friends. A museum worker would remember that he "was the most patient man I ever knew...without trace either of self-pity or bitterness." But Ishi's quick smile always seemed a bit strained, and his dark eyes appeared to harbor deep longing for a way of life, and a world, that had vanished.

Ishi died of tuberculosis on March 25, 1916. A friend eulogized: "And so, stoic and unafraid, departed the last wild Indian of America. He looked upon us as sophisticated children--smart, but not wise...He knew nature, which is always true. His were the qualities of character that last forever. He was kind; he had courage and self-restraint, and though all had been taken from him, there was no bitterness in his heart." Had she been alive in 1916, Helen Hunt Jackson would probably have written Ishi's biography. He symbolized the plight of American minorities, and she would have been moved by his life. In the late nineteenth and

early twentieth centuries, the nation tried to understand the meaning of equality and diversity. Ishi stood as stark illustration of how much it had failed.

THE NEW IMMIGRATION

After the Civil War, industrialization created millions of jobs in the United States and upset the European economy, forcing peasant farmers to scour towns and cities for work. Many crossed the Atlantic, bringing dozens of ethnic groups collectively labeled "new immigrants." They sorely tested American notions of freedom, equality, and individual rights.

The New Immigrants

Demographic change in Europe made peasant life difficult. Population growth fragmented large farms into small ones. Between 1878 and 1910, Serbia jumped from 1.7 to 2.9 million people. Russia added a million people each year. In 1880, 225,000 acres of land in one district of Croatia supported 270,000 people. The average Polish farmer, with only five acres, could not compete with larger commercial operations. Peasants needed more land. One peasant asked an emigrant aid society in Warsaw, "How can I migrate to America with my family...I intend to buy there some land...[Here] it is very dear--a desiatina [several acres] costs as much as 500 roubles. What can I buy?" At the same time, other sources of income dried up. Peasants could no longer supplement their incomes as blacksmiths, carpenters, and cobblers; mass production wiped out those jobs. Peasant craftsmen had to leave home to find work. Slovaks found jobs in Hungarian wheat fields; Slovenes in the factories of Trieste and Fiume; Hungarians in the shops of Prague and Vienna. Poles went to coal mines and iron mills in Upper Silesia, while Ukrainians hired on in the steel mills of Tomaszow.

When peasants emigrated to America, several men from a village usually traveled together. Without wives and children, they worked in the same mine or factory and shared rooms in the same boardinghouse. Between 1880 and 1920, nearly 18 million immigrants stepped ashore in the United States. Until the 1880s, most immigrants had come from Britain, Germany, and Scandinavia. Between 1900 and 1910, however, 2.2 million arrived from Austria-Hungary, 2.1 million from Italy, 1.6 million from Russia, and 308,000 from Japan and Turkey. Britain sent only 865,000, Germany 341,000, and Scandinavia 370,000. Most "new immigrants" ended up in the cities of the Northeast and Midwest, not on rural farms. The best land had long since been claimed. Among the new immigrants, Catholics and Jews outnumbered Protestants.

Asian immigration differed. In 1848 California gold beckoned the Chinese, and by 1860 more than 105,000 had settled on the West Coast. At first they panned stream beds for nuggets, but as the easy pickings played out, they hired on with large mining companies. Railroads hired Chinese construction crews, and Chinese immigrants harvested crops as seasonal workers. More than 25,000 Japanese arrived in the 1890s, another 155,000 between 1900 and 1924. They were "Issei"--first-generation immigrants. The Issei took whatever jobs they could find--in railroads, mines, canneries, and factories. Some ran restaurants, dry goods shops, launderies, grocery stores, and barber shops. Most worked for at least a spell as migrant pickers. By underbidding competitors, they soon monopolized farm labor markets and threatened to strike at inconvenient times. Rather than worry about labor unrest, many growers leased their land to the Issei, who avoided livestock, citrus, and wheat because whites dominated those markets. Instead, they raised beans, celery, peppers, onions, strawberries, tomatoes, lettuce, and watermelons. They saved money and bought land.

Between 1900 and 1920, acreage owned by Issei increased from 4,700 to nearly 500,000 acres.

Mexicans also crossed the border. In 1910 a flashflood of revolution inundated Mexico. Porfirio Diaz's government collapsed, political instability reigned, and peasants fled in droves. At the same time, the economy to the north thrived. Cotton production in California, Arizona, and West Texas boomed; so did sugar beets in Utah and Idaho, and citrus and vegetables in California. Railroads recruited Mexicans to build trunk lines. In 1917 when the United States entered World War I, Mexicans found work in factories, smelters, refineries, packinghouses, and food-processing plants. Between 1900 and 1930 more than 1.5 million Mexicans immigrated. Mexican barrios (neighborhoods) appeared in Denver, El Paso, San Antonio, Albuquerque, Tucson, San Diego, Phoenix, and Los Angeles.

Throngs of black people also swelled the migrant tide. Between 1870 and 1890 nearly 80,000 blacks left the South, as did 200,000 more during the next two decades. The black migration accelerated in 1915 when the South's economy stalled. Voracious boll weevils destroyed the cotton crop, displacing tens of thousands of sharecroppers just when World War I created a boom in northern industries. Blacks streamed north. Between 1910 and 1920, the black population of the North jumped from 850,000 to 1.4 million people.

Immigrant Women

Except for Jews and other persecuted minorities, the first waves of each immigrant tide consisted mostly of men planning to work temporarily, save money, and return home to buy land. One in two Italian immigrants returned home in the 1890s; so did a half million Poles between 1900 and 1915. But as time passed, millions decided to stay and bring their families. Between 1890 and 1920, women accounted for 6.4 million immigrants--35 percent of the total. Some groups contributed a high percentage of single women. In the wake of the potato famine, many Irish women never married, especially eldest daughters caring for elderly parents. Thousands of Irish Catholic nuns immigrated to staff church schools, convents, and hospitals.

Lack of language and job skills kept most immigrant wives from the workplace. In 1900 only 3.6 percent of married immigrant women worked outside the home. The typical woman worker in turn-of-the-century industrial America was a single young adult. Nearly 61 percent of single immigrant women took outside jobs, as did 21 percent of widows and 51 percent of divorced immigrant women. They followed friends and relatives into the job market. Single Irish, Italian, and French Canadian women flocked to the textile mills of New England. By 1900, so many immigrant women had settled there that they outnumbered native white women. Single Jewish and Italian women found work in New York City's sweatshops, patching together clothing at piecework wages. Poles and Lithuanians toiled in the packinghouses of Chicago.

Poverty and discrimination pushed women of color outside the home. Black women had fled the South to escape low wages and Jim Crow segregation. The North offered high demand for domestic servants. The color line had blurred for maids, cooks, and nannies; black women had little trouble competing with immigrants for those jobs. In 1900, 26 percent of married black women worked outside the home, as did 67 percent of black widows and 82 percent of widowed black women. Married Mexican women had the highest percentage of outside employment, since they labored in the fields, side by side with husbands, parents, and children.

Ghetto Security

For blacks, immigrants, and Mexicans, urban ghettoes provided havens in a strange world. In Polonias, Chinato
clustered as Calabrians, Abruzzians, and Sicilians, and Jews grouped along Galician, Hungarian, and Russian lines. Italians on Mulberry Street in New York bought Italian cheeses and sausages in stores and attended the opera; Greeks and Syrians frequented such coffeehouses as the Acropolis or the Beirut House; Jews sat in cafes along Hester Street in New York and talked business, religion, and politics; Japanese and Chinese purchased fish and vegetables in the shops of Little Tokyo in Los Angeles or Chinatown in San Francisco; and Irish and Slavs gathered at local taverns. In Mexican barrios, immigrants adopted such American industrially-produced wooden and metal toilets, sewing machines, bathtubs, and ice coolers. Mixed border languages developed, like Calo in California and Texmex in South Texas. Mexicans adapted English words to Spanish syntax, and the result was a new vocabulary--el troque (truck), la ganga (gang), loncherias (lunch counters), huachale (watch it), and pushele (push it). In the barrios immigrants relaxed in the familiar aromas of beans, tortillas, fried rice, and peppers; the rhythms of folksongs like "La Cautiva Marcelina" or "El Vaquero Nicolas"; and the noise of children playing la pelota (ball) or el coyotito (little coyote).

Except for such large concentrations of immigrants as Italians and Jews in New York, Irish in Boston and New York, Poles in Chicago, or Chinese in San Francisco, ghettos were mixed neighborhoods. In most cities the stranger next door was real. In New England mill towns, Irish, Italians, Portuguese, and French Canadians worked together and lived near one another; so did Italians, Slovaks, and Romanians in Cleveland steel mills; Italians, Jews, and Syrians in the New York needle trades; and Poles, Irish, Lithuanians, Czechs, and Italians in Chicago. In ghetto churches, businesses, and schools, immigrants identified the differences between their own and other ethnic communities.

Just as ghetto boundaries were blurred, ghetto populations were fluid. Immigrants moved frequently from neighborhood to neighborhood. The rich had once lived downtown, close to the seats of power, while the poor lived near warehouses and railroad yards. But as streetcars and subways stretched city limits, the rich moved to suburbs. Immigrants filled the vacuum, turning large single-family homes into tenements. As soon as they could afford it, immigrants bought homes outside downtown. Although diverse neighborhoods survived in the cities, they were rarely occupied by the same people for more than a few years. New immigrants crowded into the same tenements while older immigrants moved on.

LAND, POWER, AND RIGHTS

While cities filled with newcomers, pioneers struck out for the West. Most Americans held sacred the links between individual freedom, private property, and political power. Political power flowed from land, and civil rights could be protected only with political power. To secure land, whites poured across the Mississippi, and the Homestead Act together with transcontinental railroads made the quest easier. Workers drove the final spikes on the Union Pacific-Central Pacific in 1869, the Northern Pacific in 1883, the Southern Pacific and the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe in 1884, and the Great Northern in 1893. Between 1862 and 1904 settlers took title to 755 million acres. Horace Greeley, editor of the New York Tribune, had promised that the settlers would become "working, independent, self-subsisting farmers in the land ever more...[I]f you strike off into the broad, free West, and make a farm from Uncle

Sam's generous domain...neither you nor your children need evermore beg for Something to Do." Waiting out West were hundreds of thousands of minorities who owned the land, but most would not be able to keep it, and when their land disappeared, so did <u>their</u> rights.

African Americans

Although free blacks and a few slaves acquired property before the Civil War, most confronted freedom with few economic resources. During Reconstruction, some Radical Republicans flirted with the idea of confiscating plantations and redistributing the land to former slaves. Senator Charles Sumner insisted that the great southern plantations must "be broken up and the freedmen must have the pieces." For Thaddeus Stevens of Pennsylvania, "the whole fabric of southern society must be changed. If the South is ever to be...a safe Republic let her land be cultivated by the toil of the owners, or the free labor of intelligent citizens." Only with land would blacks truly be free. But giving away forty acres and a mule to southern blacks collided with Fifth Amendment protections of private property. "For all the misery they have caused," argued an Indiana state legislator, "southern rebels don't deserve to lose their land. Two wrongs won't make a right." The editor of <u>The Nation</u> agreed. A proposal "in which provision is made for the violation of a greater number of the principles of good government and for the opening of a deeper sink of corruption has never been submitted to a legislative body." Congressmen soon balked at confiscating white property, and most emancipated slaves remained landless.

Without land, they lived at the mercy of planters. The South needed cheap labor, and the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments did not change that reality. As soon as Union troops withdrew from a southern state, the old ruling class regained power. Black horizons shrank. Fearing black equality, whites targeted voting rights, reasoning that as long as blacks cast ballots, politicians would appease them. "Until we keep them from voting," complained a Mississippi judge, "we'll never be able to turn our backs on 'em." But the Fifteenth Amendment outlawed discrimination; whites had to keep blacks from voting without saying so directly.

Physical intimidation was one way. Ku Klux Klan gangs threatened black voters with the loss of their homes and lives, and white employers reminded blacks that voting was tantamount to quitting their jobs. Most whites, however, opted for less violent but equally effective tactics. Between 1877 and 1900 southern states passed poll taxes, requiring voters to pay a fee. Poll taxes circumvented the Constitution by not mentioning race. Whites invented literacy tests to keep uneducated people from voting. Like poll taxes, literacy tests got around the Constitution because race <u>per se</u> was not the qualifying factor. Since most former slaves were poor and illiterate, they could not vote. But poll taxes and literacy tests discriminated against poor whites as well. To negotiate a way around that problem, states passed "grandfather clauses" declaring that anyone unable to pay a poll tax or pass a literacy test could still vote if his grandfather had been eligible to vote in 1860. The clause exempted whites from poll taxes and literacy tests.

Still, literate well-to-do blacks tried to vote. To keep them from the polls, whites invented the "white primary." In primary elections to choose candidates for public office, Democratic party officials banned blacks. Since the Republican Party hardly existed in the

South, Democrats always won. Not being able to vote in primaries effectively disfranchised blacks.

Disfranchisement was only a first step. Southerners also needed blacks in the fields. Klan threats kept blacks from taking skilled jobs, joining labor unions, and buying farms, and legislatures enforced these restrictions. Blacks largely disappeared from such occupations as iron worker, cooper, tailor, and skilled construction. Debt peonage trapped millions of blacks, who signed labor contracts and bought food and commodities on credit from white merchants. They planned to repay the loans after the harvest, but interest rates were high and debts usually could not be retired. Blacks then borrowed more to get through the winter, descending into a bottomless pit of debt. One Mississippi sharecropper in 1892 bemoaned his fate: "I've planted twenty crops, and I'm deeper in debt today than I was that first spring I borrowed money."

But disfranchisement and economic oppression did not satisfy whites, who increasingly wanted blacks confined to separate corners of society. To restore the social control they had once enjoyed, whites in the 1880s enacted Jim Crow laws, segregating blacks in streetcars, waiting rooms, schools, housing, public toilets, and trains. Added to disfranchisement and economic discrimination, social ostracism resurrected slavery in all but name.

Native Americans

Unlike the emancipated slaves, Indians already owned the land, but their titles had no place in law books. After the Civil War, whites went after Indian land, and race war spread across the Plains.

In 1862 the Santee Sioux killed hundreds of whites in Minnesota and drove thousands back east. But as sure as the cycles of the moon, whites returned and pushed the Santee into Canada. The Southern Cheyenne rebelled in Colorado. In 1864 after bloody engagements with white settlers, they signed a cease fire at Sand Creek, Colorado. But on November 29, 1864, Col. John Chivington and his Colorado militia ambushed them, slaughtering more than 300 and sparing none. Enraged Cheyennes, Arapahoes, and Sioux retaliated, and war erupted throughout eastern Colorado. It took four years before Lt. Col. George Custer's Seventh Cavalry finally defeated the Cheyenne.

In 1874 war erupted again after gold was discovered in the Black Hills of Dakota Territory. Thousands of white prospectors crowded in. Only six years before, the federal government had recognized "eternal" Sioux sovereignty over the Black Hills, but Washington ordered the expulsion of the Indians. Troops under General George Custer invaded the Black Hills. Sitting Bull led the Sioux and Crazy Horse the Cheyenne. In the most famous Indian battle of American military history, they trapped Custer's Seventh Cavalry near the Little Big Horn River in Montana in 1876 and killed them all. Hungry for revenge, army troops pursued the Sioux, driving Sitting Bull into Canada and the Sioux to a reservation. The Cheyenne held out until 1877, when they too moved to the Indian Territory. That year, after a dramatic but futile flight toward Canada, Chief Joseph and the Nez Perce were captured in Montana and moved to a reservation.

Late in the 1880s, the last vestiges of Indian resistance played out. High in the Arizona mountains, Apaches had fought a good fight, but in 1886 Chief Geronimo surrendered, bringing peace to the Southwest and subjugation to the Apaches. Then, in 1890, news of Sitting Bull's death raised ethnic tensions in Dakota Territory, and at Wounded Knee Creek, an

enraged Sioux warrior killed an army officer. The army retaliated, slaughtering more than 150 Sioux men, women, and children. The Wounded Knee massacre ended Sioux resistance and closed a chapter in American history.

Yet, even had there been no Wounded Knee, no Indian wars, environmental change would have brought the same result. Early in the 1800s, more than thirty million buffalo had wandered across the Great Plains. But then in a period of several decades, they all but vanished, and with them the cultures of horse-mounted hunting that indians had for a moment established on the Plains.

Overhunting depleted the herds. In the 1850s, white settlement east of the Mississippi forced thousands of Indians to relocate to the Plains, and the number of people dependent upon the herds tripled. Indians preferred the tender meat and thin hides of young buffalo cows, which made for good eating and easy processing. But these were also the most fertile animals, and birth rates dropped. White hunters added to the damage. As railroads tracked across the Plains, travel agencies organized massive hunts. Tourists laid out on flatcars slaughtered hundreds of thousands of buffalo. The popularity of buffalo robes among easterners created a huge market for hides, which white and Indian hunters supplied. Between 1850 and 1890, more than ten million buffalo hides made their way to eastern markets.

Other influences contributed to the decline. Pioneers brought cattle, oxen, sheep, goats, and mules with them, and Indians imported horses from Mexico. Along with the animals came anthrax, hoof-and-mouth, and brucellosis, diseases that decimated the buffalo. Ranchers introduced grasses more amenable to cattle. Railroads, farms, and ranches disrupted migration patterns, and cattle competed for range. Harsh weather also hurt. Drought in the 1860s and 1870s stunted summer short grasses on which buffalo thrived. Creeks, streams, and ponds dried up. Blizzards in the 1880s wiped out millions of animals. Without the buffalo, the Indians were doomed. Stripped of land, their resistance ended. And like the buffalo, Indians teetered on the brink of extermination--their land taken, their game gone.

Mexican Americans

Although the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, signed in 1848, had awarded them citizenship and recognized land titles, Hispanics in California soon found themselves hard pressed to keep their land. In 1848 nearly 12,000 Mexicans resided in California. But the discovery of gold in 1848 brought more than 80,000 white prospectors--"Forty-Niners"--to the territory, rendering californios an instant minority. In 1850 the territorial assembly passed the Foreign Miners' Act, banning Spanish-speaking people from mining, and armed vigilantes drove californios from the gold fields. When the easy pickings played out, white prospectors squatted on vacant land and began farming it. About 1,000 well-to-do californios owned 15 million acres, and squatters complained when californios evicted them. Congress responded with the Land Act of 1851, forming a board of commissioners to referee disputes. Anglos dominated the board, conducted hearings in English, and put the burden of proof on californios. Between 1852 and 1856 the board rejected 175 californio claims and awarded 3 million acres to squatters. When californios did prevail in court, squatters appealed, and the litigation averaged seventeen years before settlement. Attorney fees bankrupted many californios. What the legal system could not do, armed mobs did. Salvador Vallejo, a Napa

Valley rancher, departed after rioters slaughtered his herds. Corrupt lawyers took californio property by forcing them to sign fraudulent documents. Others went bankrupt in the 1870s when the Sonora and Texas cattle drives forced down cattle prices. By 1880 California Mexicans had lost most of their land.

Ethnic relations were even more strained in Texas. Anglo settlers, mostly from the South, snubbed dark-skinned, Catholic tejanos. By 1860 they outnumbered tejanos twenty to one. The legislature and county courts, backed by Texas Rangers, levied heavy taxes on tejano land, forcing Mexicans into default. Anglos purchased farms and ranches at auction, often for a penny an acre. White squatters settled on tejano holdings. Francisco Cavazos, a Brownsville rancher, contested title with Charles Stillman, who purchased squatter claims. Cavazos rejected a $33,000 offer because the land was worth $3 million. Stillman took him to court, and as legal costs mounted, Cavazos gave up and sold out. Environmental changes multiplied tejano problems. In the late 1860s and 1870s, after decades of abundant rainfall, drought struck the Plains, thinning range grasses and making it difficult for cattle to find water. Small-scale tejano ranchers could ill afford such losses, and even the cattle that survived had lower body weights, which cut profits. Late in the 1880s, severe blizzards wiped out whole herds, bankrupting thousands of tejano ranchers, who sold out to Anglos. In 1891 a tejano rancher near Brownsville witnessed the auction of his land for unpaid taxes. "I don't mind fighting white boys and even the Texas Rangers," he confessed. "But I can't fight God. He must be white too."

Hispanic power survived longer in New Mexico, where nuevo mexicanos outnumbered Anglos. In the 1870s, though, they began to feel the pressure of white settlement. Completion of the Southern Pacific Railroad brought New Mexico into the national economy, and the cattle, cotton, and timber industries boomed. In the 1880s, discoveries of silver, gold, and copper brought more Anglos. New settlers wanted land. In 1891, Congress created a Court of Private Land Claims to adjudicate disputes. The law placed the burden of proof on Hispanic owners, and the court found for them in only a quarter of the cases.

Hispanics also had to deal with debilitating, impersonal economic forces. The rise of large commercial farms priced many small farmers out of business. They sold out and became tenant farmers or even migrant workers. By 1900 the Hispanic population in the united States exceeded 300,000, most of whom had been reduced to near colonial status. Political impotence accompanied the loss of land. In South Texas poll taxes and literacy tests wiped out tejano as well as black voting, and in New Mexico and California, Anglo intimidation kept most Hispanics from the polls. Segregated public schools became the norm.

Japanese Americans

Like blacks, Hispanics, and Indians, Japanese immigrants had a hard time keeping their land. White farmers wanted them to be pickers, not competitors. "This year they're bagging my onions," complained a California farmer in 1916. "Next year I'll see them hauling their own onions to market." To wipe out competition, the California State Grange and the California Farm Bureau Federation demanded curbs on Japanese farms. In 1913 the legislature approved the Alien Land Act, prohibiting resident aliens from buying land. Since federal law prevented Asians from becoming citizens, the Issei could no longer buy land. Six other states

passed similar laws between 1917 and 1923. Issei holdings dropped to 300,000 acres in 1925 and 221,000 in 1940.

NATIVISM AND ASSIMILATION

Cities full of strange people, exotic foods, and crowded tenements seemed breeding grounds for social unrest alarmed many Americans. Tensions appeared just as racist theories gained popularity. Many whites accepted implicitly the inferiority of blacks, Indians, and Mexicans. Careless use of Darwinism and genetics promoted the belief that certain races were genetically more fit than others and destined for success. Scholars like John W. Burgess promoted the Teutonic origins theory--that Anglo-Saxon, Nordic, and Germanic peoples were the superior "race" and responsible for capitalism, technology, and political liberty. They claimed that Jews, Slavs, Italians, and Greeks, though superior to "colored" peoples, could not compete with Germans, English, and Scandinavians. A social movement known as "eugenics" emerged to persuade people of Northern European ancestry to marry among themselves. In the 1890s, such groups as the American Protective Association spread rumors that Jewish bankers and the pope planned to take over America.

Lynch Law and Race Riots

In the plague of hate crimes that poisoned America, in 1871 a Chinese immigrant killed two Los Angeles policemen, and a white mob raided Chinatown, burned buildings, and murdered 15 people. Dozens of other anti-Chinese riots erupted as well, the worst one in Rock Springs, Wyoming, in 1885, when white miners murdered 28 Chinese immigrants. Lynchings of Mexicans occurred frequently in Texas. In 1915 Jewish merchant Leo Frank was lynched in Georgia for the murder of a small girl, even though evidence of his guilt was razor thin. In 1921 a mob of whites beat to death a group of Japanese cantaloupe pickers in Turlock, California.

For a time, Italians were singled out. In 1874 union miners killed four Italian strikebreakers in Buena Vista, Pennsylvania. The worst incident against Italians occurred in 1891. They had long been stereotyped as participants in Mafia organized crime, and New Orleans police chief David Hennessey had built a political reputation investigating Italian crime. In 1891 he was murdered, and the public held the Mafia responsible. Nine Italians were arrested, but a jury acquitted them. An outraged mob entered the parish jail and lynched eleven Italians, three of them Italian nationals. In 1899 a mob in Tallulah, Louisiana, killed five Italian storekeepers because they paid black and white employees equal wages. Italians were also lynched in West Virginia in 1891 and 1906, Pennsylvania in 1894, North Carolina in 1906, Florida in 1910, and Illinois in 1914 and 1915.

Among the victims of hate, blacks were the major sufferers. Between 1884 and 1917, more than 3,600 were lynched, usually after being accused of crimes against whites. In 1906 in Atlanta, white mobs torched black neighborhoods and slaughtered innocent people. In 1908 a white woman in Springfield, Illinois, claimed that a local black man had raped her. Racist anger boiled over and failed to subside after she admitted her lies; white mobs invaded black neighborhoods, and it took 5,000 state militia to quell the rioting. The most deadly riots occurred in East St. Louis in 1917 and Chicago in 1919, which resulted in the murders of dozens of people. Popular culture fanned the flames of racism. D. W. Griffith's epic film Birth of a Nation, released in 1915, extolled the virtues of the Ku Klux Klan.

Immigration Restriction

Being neither white nor western, the Chinese seemed to many natives an anomaly in American society. Unlike European immigrants, most Chinese had no intention of staying in America. They worked in the United States until they were fifty or sixty. During their years abroad, they returned home several times, married a woman chosen by the family, and fathered several children. In America they lived frugally and sent money home. They then returned with honor. Few women accompanied them. Before 1880, only one Chinese immigrant in forty was female. Homophobia coursed through anti-Chinese nativism. In an all-male society, some whites concluded, homosexuality was common. For decades missionaries had reported "licentiousness and sexual immorality" among the Chinese, and many Protestants believed the most lurid rumors. "The boardinghouses of Chinatown," a San Francisco politician said in 1871, "are dens of iniquity, home to unspeakable depravities." Nativists reinforced stereotypes about Chinese proclivities for gambling, prostitution, opium, and venereal disease. The absence of women made it easier to believe that non-gay Chinese men were sexually attracted to white women. Economic considerations contributed to nativism, since many whites blamed wage cuts and unemployment on cheap Chinese labor. Demands for immigration restriction intensified. During the depression of 1873, when 115,000 Chinese reached California, the Workingmen's Party called for a ban. Another 50,000 came in 1881 and 1882. That year, under pressure from western politicians and labor unions, Congress passed the Chinese Exclusion Act, prohibiting future immigration from China.

The Japanese went unnoticed at first, but as the pace of immigration quickened, many Americans lumped them
Japanese Exclusion League, a group of prominent California politicians and the American Federation of Labor, demanded an end to Japanese immigration.

President Theodore Roosevelt took care of the problem. After the San Francisco earthquake of 1906 destroyed most public school buildings, the board of education ordered Asian students to attend makeshift, segregated schools. Japan protested, demanding equal treatment for its emigrants, and fears of war flashed on both sides of the Pacific. Aware that the school crisis reflected deeper problems, Roosevelt worked out the "Gentlemen's Agreement." In 1907 and 1908, Japan agreed to limit future emigration to nonworkers and the wives of Issei immigrants if Roosevelt would work for the equal treatment of the Issei. The president persuaded the San Francisco board of education to permit English-speaking, native-born Japanese, known as Nisei, to attend integrated schools. The number of Japanese immigrants coming to the United States fell sharply.

Congress turned on other immigrants. The Dillingham Commission Report of 1907 concluded that recent immigrants were unskilled and illiterate. To be sure, differences distinguished "old" from "new" immigrants. Most old immigrants were northern and western European Protestants, while new immigrants tended to be southern and eastern European Jews and Catholics. Other differences were not so clear. Although many Italians and Slavs were illiterate, most Jews, Syrians, and Armenians were literate workers migrating as families. The 1907 immigrants from eastern and southern Europe, where the Industrial Revolution had just taken hold, were unfairly compared that year with immigrants from Britain, Germany, and Scandinavia, where industrialization had matured. Naturally, the two groups differed in skill levels. Back in the 1840s and 1850s, most northern European immigrants had also been

unskilled peasants. Still, nativists accepted at face value the findings of the Dillingham Commission.

Such groups as the Immigration Restriction League and the American Protective Association, along with many labor unions, pressed Congress to tighten immigration law. Despite the lobbying of business groups like the National Association of Manufacturers, which hoped to keep wages low by increasing the labor supply, Congress passed restrictive laws, beginning in 1882 with the Chinese Exclusion Act and a law blocking convicts and the insane. In 1885 Congress outlawed contract labor immigrants. Polygamists, indigents, and people with contagious diseases were banned in 1891; epileptics, prostitutes, and anarchists in 1903; and the mentally ill in 1907. Overriding President Woodrow Wilson's veto, Congress approved a literacy test for new immigrants in 1917.

Assimilationist Crusades

Among minority groups already in the country toward which assimilationist pressures mounted were Mormons, who since their arrival in Utah in1847 had fanned out across the West, taking title to millions of acres and developing them. But in a nation of monogamous marriages, polygamy offended evangelical Protestants who trafficked in salacious exaggeration, titillating one another with stories of Mormon missionaries kidnaping women and transporting them to Brigham Young's brothels. One tract told of a damsel who escaped his clutches by leaping from a window in the Mormon Temple, diving into the Salt Lake, and swimming to freedom. The article failed to mention that the temple was miles from the lake. Jokes circulated widely. A common ditty had Brigham Young telling his missionaries, "I don't care how you bring 'em, just bring 'em young." Completion of the transcontinental railroad in 1869 ended Salt Lake City's isolation, and evangelical Protestants set out to subdue the Mormons. Congress passed the Edmunds Act in1882 and in 1887 the Edmund-Tucker Act (1887), making polygamy a felony. Citing freedom of religion, Mormons fought the laws in court. But federal marshals, bearing arrest warrants, descended on Utah, and polygamists went underground, emigrating to Mexico, hunkering down in Rocky Mountain hideouts, or counting on neighbors to conceal them. The harassment ended in 1890 when the church banned polygamy.

Like the Mormons, Indians encountered well-meaning reformers. The Indian population had fallen from 600,000 in 1776 to less than 275,000 in 1885; hunger and disease were as common on reservations as unused war bonnets. In 1868 Lydia Child wrote Appeal for the Indian, and Peter Cooper founded the United States Indian Commission. The American Anti-Slavery Society, now without a cause, changed its name in 1870 to the Reform League and targeted Indian suffering. Helen Hunt Jackson's 1881 indictment of Indian policy--Century of Dishonor--became a bestseller. In 1881 the Indian Rights Association was formed to change government policy.

Reformers decided that Indian salvation depended on the destruction of traditional ways. As early as 1849, a Baptist missionary journal had claimed that Indians were "deficient in intellectual and moral culture... They do not furnish their share to the advancement of society." Assimilation offered a solution. Changing Indians into Christian farmers would end the violence against them and place them on the road to modern life. Assimilationists expected Indians to surrender their warrior ideals, tribal government, and land. In 1884 Congress

authorized federal agents to suppress Indian religions. Agents punished Indians for speaking native languages and engaging in tribal dancing, drumming, and body painting. Some enforced short haircuts. Agents also worked diligently, as a Department of the Interior bulletin preached, at changing Indian women "into proper domestic beings who will raise civilized children." Indian women were to learn to spin cloth, sew, keep house, and rear children "just like white women."

Rapid assimilation, reformers believed, required dismantling the tribes, distributing reservation land to Indian families. In 1881 Secretary of the Interior Carl Schurz argued that "stubborn maintenance of large Indian reservations must eventually result in the destruction of the redmen... [We must] prepare Indians for the habits and occupations of civilized life ... to individualize them in the possession and appreciation of property by giving them a fee simple title individually to the parcels of land they cultivate. [They will] no longer stand in the way of the development of the country...but form part of it and are benefited by it."

To accelerate assimilation, Congress passed the Dawes Act. The law divided reservations into small allotments--usually 160 acres--and awarded them to each Indian family. Citizenship accompanied allotment. The government would decide when a tribe was ready for allotment. Excess land available after allotment would be sold to farmers, railroads, land developers, and timber and companies, which cloaked themselves in the rhetoric of reform and supported the legislation. In 1887, when President Grover Cleveland signed the Dawes Act, Indians owned 138 million acres. Thirty years later, only 48 million acres remained. Indian reform had fostered the most audacious land grab in history.

Mexicans lost a great deal more than land. Anglos also assaulted Mexican culture. Employers, trade associations, and chambers of commerce encouraged Mexicans to work cheaply, to labor on religious holidays, and to remain on the same job for as long as possible. Public schools forced Mexican children to abandon Spanish for English, inculcated patriotism, urged boys into vocational rather than academic studies, and told girls to discard Mexican for American ways. Protestants worked to convert Mexicans from Catholicism. And Anglos segregated Mexicans at every turn, forcing them into separate neighborhoods, schools, barber shops, theaters, restaurants, and bathrooms.

FIGHTING BACK

America's beleaguered minority groups resisted, sometimes violently, usually not. But they could not hold out against the political, economic, and environmental forces that eventually overwhelmed them.

Three African Americans

Among the leaders in whom the hopes of twelve million blacks found expression was Booker T. Washington. Born to slavery in 1856, Washington attended Hampton Institute and developed the philosophy that drove the rest of his life: through hard work and industrial education, blacks could escape tenant farming and sharecropping. As long as they were tied to someone else's land, they would remain poor and powerless; freedom would come with education. In 1881 he became president of Tuskegee Institute and built the school into a center of vocational education. He came to national attention at the Atlanta Exposition in 1895, where he told blacks to accept segregation and focus instead on economic independence. Whites could be allies as long as they did not feel threatened: "We shall prosper...as we learn

to... put brains and skill into the common occupations of life. It is at the bottom of life we must begin, not at the top... 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...agitation of questions of social equality is folly."

The Atlanta speech threw a national spotlight on Washington and made him a controversial figure. Some felt he had moved too far, too fast. On October 16, 1901, when President Theodore Roosevelt invited him to dinner in the White House, the two men became lightning rods for racist criticism. A former Alabama governor condemned Roosevelt: "No respectable white man in Alabama would ask that nigger to dinner..." The lieutenant governor of South Carolina accused Roosevelt of undermining the American future. "Social equality with the negro means decadence and damnation." The New Orleans Times-Democrat asked its readers, "White men of the South, how do you like it? White women of the South, how do you like it? When Mr. Roosevelt sits down to dinner with a negro, he declares that the negro is the social equal of the white man."

Nor was Washington universally popular among blacks. Although privately he believed in civil rights, he considered them subordinate to economics and advised his followers to avoid public demands for equality, which would only stir up racism. Washington spoke to blacks locked into rural southern poverty, and he insisted that for them, economic survival took precedence over civil rights. Only then could living standards be elevated. Economic power would then generate its own momentum for political and social equality. In some circles, such counsel made Washington an "Uncle Tom."

W.E.B. Du Bois spoke for those who believed that blacks must fight for equality. A Massachusetts native, Du Bois attended Fisk University and then received a Ph.D. from Harvard. Later he taught at the University of Pennsylvania. Calling for racial pride and solidarity, he chastised Washington for promoting "perpetual inferiority"; instead of accepting discrimination, blacks should demand equality. Rather than confining themselves to vocational education, the black "talented tenth" should pursue law, medicine, and politics. Separation meant subordination. In 1905 Du Bois and other like-minded black leaders met in Niagara Falls and launched the Niagara Movement, which culminated in 1910 with the formation of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Through legal action in the courts, the NAACP tried to overturn Jim Crow and enfranchise blacks.

On December 26, 1908, in Sydney, Australia, boxing champion Tommy Burns stepped into the ring with Jack Johnson, the black challenger. Until that rainy evening in Australia, the heavyweight ranks had been lily-white, the province of a succession of English, Irish, and Irish-American champions. Whites expected Burns to make short work of Johnson. After all, they claimed, "colored" people lacked stamina, skill, and ring smarts. "Just hit the ape in the belly," encouraged one sportswriter. Whites and blacks followed the fight in rapt attention. One newspaper captured the fight's import: "This battle may in the future be looked back upon as the first great battle of an inevitable race war. There is more in this fight to be considered than the mere title of pugilistic champion of the world." Another journalist speculated on the fight's implications: "Citizens who have never prayed before are supplicating Providence to give the white man a strong right arm with which to belt the coon into oblivion."

It was not to be. Johnson toyed with Burns, taunting him during the fight and then beating him badly. Novelist Jack London, covering the fight for several newspapers, cabled home his description: "The fight--there was no fight. No Armenian massacre could compare with the hopeless slaughter that took place... [The fight] was between a colossus and a toy automation [between] a playful Ethiopian and a small and futile white man...[between] a grown man and a naughty child." And the new champion was not gracious in victory. "He [Burns] is the easiest man I ever met," Johnson bragged. "I could have put him away quicker, but I wanted to punish him. I had my revenge." Whites treated the outcome like a national disaster. One sportswriter moaned, "Never before in the history of the ring has such a crisis arisen as that which faces the followers of the game tonight." Blacks reacted too, hitting the streets in joyous celebration. In the ring, on a level playing field, a black man had put a white man in his place. "No event in forty years," said the editor of the black newspaper Richmond Planet," has given more genuine satisfaction to the colored people of this country than has the signal victory of Jack Johnson."

With the distinction of being heavyweight champion, Jackson continued to thrill African Americans. Strong, proud, and outspoken, he refused to accept racism. He married a white woman, bedecked her in the finest jewels and fashions, and took her with him as he toured the United States. By the tens of thousands, blacks lined railroad tracks as his train passed and filled theaters and stadiums to watch him speak and fight. He was a genuine folk hero, a black man who had triumphed in white America without selling his soul.

Mexican Americans

Nor did Hispanics passively submit. In 1859 Francisco Ramírez, editor of Los Angeles's El Clamor Público, condemned Anglo oppression: "We are Native California Americans born on the soil and...this is 'OUR OWN, OUR NATIVE LAND'." Bandit heroes appeared. Juan Flores escaped from San Quentin Prison in 1851, recruited fifty followers, and raided several county courthouses. During the 1850s, Joaquin Murieta terrorized Anglo landowners in Calaveras County. So did Tiburcio Vasquez. Local californios made political heroes out of all three. In Texas, Juan Cortina killed Anglos accused of harassing tejanos. When Texas Rangers closed in, he slipped across the border, taking refuge in Tamaulipas state, where he was elected governor. In 1859 he issued a manifesto: "Mexicans! To me is entrusted the work of breaking the chains of your slavery. [We] are ready to shed blood and suffer the deaths of martyrs." New Mexico had its own bandit hero. When his father was murdered in Santa Fe, Sostenes L'Archeveque retaliated by killing 23 whites. But Hispanic resistance proved futile. Whites poured into the Southwest by the millions, overwhelming the Hispanic population and seizing the reins of political power.

Native Americans

Bereft of land and badly outgunned, Indians turned inward. On the Great Plains, new religions sprouted. The peyote cult spread like a grassfire. An hallucenogenic derivative of cactus, peyote induced spectacular visions and a sense of well-being among hopeless warriors. Peyotism originated in Mexico and by 1900 had reached Mescalero Apaches, Kiowas, Osages, Comanches, Shawnees, Arapahos, and Pawnees. Peyotism eventually evolved into the Native American Church. A new version of the Sun Dance appeared. Before whites appeared on the Plains, many tribes had practiced the Sun Dance, a ceremony to guarantee good hunting,

individual courage, and military victory. Days of dancing, fasting, and self-mutilation, Indians believed, would bring personal peace and tribal prosperity. Sun Dancers were also supposed to avoid alcohol and sexual infidelity. Finally, the Paiute shaman Wovoka, leader of another cult, preached that the Great Spirit had punished Indians for their sins by dispatching hordes of whites. Once Indians repented, God would destroy whites, resurrect the Indian dead, and restore the buffalo. By performing the Ghost Dance--four days of physically-exhausting dancing--Indians could bring on the day of redemption. The Ghost Dance religion also involved wearing sacred garments, which Wovoka claimed could shield them from bullets. The Ghost Dance gained converts across the Great Plains.

CONCLUSION

Sacred garments helped Wovoka no better than museum officials protected Ishi. In America at the turn of the century, minorities of every persuasion were under siege, fighting to keep their land and hold on to their rights. Marshaled against them were the political and economic resources of white society. It was a losing battle. At every turn, courts sanctioned oppression. In 1875, during the last gasps of Reconstruction, Radical Republicans passed a new Civil Rights Act prohibiting racial discrimination in such public facilities as theaters, restaurants, and trains. But in 1883, in what were called the Civil Rights Cases, the Supreme Court held the law unconstitutional because it protected social, not political rights. Individuals unaided by the state were free to discriminate whenever they wished. In 1881 Omaha, Nebraska, denied John Elk, an Indian, the right to vote. He sued, but in 1884 the Supreme Court disagreed, arguing in Elk v. Wilkins that Elk had been "born to an Indian nation" and could not vote. In Lone Wolf v. Hitchcock, the Court in 1903 upheld the constitutionality of allotment. In 1867, Ah Kin refused to pay an Idaho tax that, by imposing higher levies on Chinese than on whites, violated the Civil Rights Act of 1866. But in the Ah Kin case, a district court decided that the Civil Rights Act did not protect Chinese, who were not citizens. Two generations later, the same held true for the Japanese. Tadeo Ozawa, an immigrant in California who had graduated from Berkeley High School, had his citizenship application denied. He sued, but in Ozawa v. United States, the Supreme Court said in 1922 that he was ineligible for citizenship because the Constitution prohibited the naturalization of "non-whites." In Plessy v. Ferguson, The Court in 1896 approved separate facilities for blacks, endorsing the principle that so long as states made provisions for black people equal to that for whites–“separate but equal”–the requirement for equality established by the Fourteenth Amendment was not violated. The Supreme Court decision in Independent School District v. Salvatierra, pronounced in 1931, extended the principle of separate facilities to Mexicans. Not until Brown v. Board of Education in 1954 did the Court reverse its earlier decisions and hold that segregation is inherently discriminatory.

For large segments of the American population, civil rights was an illusion. The federal government, with all of its resources, had made into official national policy the alienation of land and the denial of civil rights. Before their deaths, Helen Hunt Jackson and Ishi, in addressing their own concerns, had inadvertently represented millions of blacks, Mexicans, Italians, Indians, Mormons, Japanese, and Chinese. What happened to the Indians, Ms. Jackson contended, constituted a "shameful record of broken treaties and unfulfilled promise...[a] sickening record of murder, outrage, robbery, and wrongs." Ishi warned his friends that white

society, though technically advanced, suffered from an absence of wisdom. "Sooner or later," he warned, "you must learn to respect the earth and all of its inhabitants."

Lesson Six

For Lesson Six, read John Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, and write a 1,000-1,500 word review of the book. The review should consist of a biography of the author and how his own intellectual and political background might have affected his point of view. It should also include a summary of the content of the book and how Higham views immigrants, nativists, and what forces in American life give rise to nativism. How are immigrants and nativists portrayed? To what extend are Higham's theories relevant in today's debates over immigration? Why or Why not? The review should also include a discussion of other review of the book to determine how it was received at the time of its publication.

Lesson 7

For Lesson Seven, read the material below and write a 500-word essay summarizing the major themes of the chapter as they relate to immigration and ethnic relations. Also, employing any referencing system, such as Google, write up short (75-100 word) descriptions of the following items:

National Origins Act of 1924
McCarran-Walter Act of 1953
Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965
Illegal Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986
Immigration Reform and Responsibility Act of 1996

COLD WAR AMERICA, 1945-1963

It was an improbable moment, brought about by the confluence of the two most powerful forces of the post-World War II era--civil rights and anti-communism. On July 18, 1949, Jackie Robinson, the African American who a few years before had broken the "color line" in major league baseball, sat down in a Washington, D.C. hearing room to address the House Un-American Activities Committee. More specifically, he had come to criticize and refute a statement made by another African American, Paul Robeson, a former professional athlete himself who had spent his adult life fighting for equal rights for all Americans. Three months before in Paris, Robeson, an American communist as well as a renowned singer, had suggested that it was "unthinkable" that black men in the United States would ever take up arms against the Soviet Union, a country that believed in the "full dignity" of all people of all races.

Now the Committee wanted to hear Robinson's opinion. Did Paul Robeson speak for all African Americans, or were his words the idle rantings of a communist sympathizer? Speaking in a pinched, high-pitched voice, Robinson observed, "Paul Robeson's statement in Paris to the effect that American Negroes would refuse to fight in any way against Russia . . . sounds very silly to me. . . . I've

got too much invested for my wife and child and myself in the future of this country . . . to throw it away because of a siren song sung in bass."

How had it come to this—two members of the same minority pitted against each other in front of microphones and cameras? In part it was a case of the times, or more precisely different times. Paul Robeson was born in 1898 and had lived through some of the most difficult years for African Americans since the time of slavery. He was raised in an America that considered blacks mentally and athletically inferior to whites, an America that barred African Americans from "major" league baseball and many other athletic and professional avenues. But Robeson's parents taught him that the stereotypes, the unchallenged "collective wisdom," were wrong. And he proved they were wrong. Although there were only three blacks in his high school graduating class of 250, Robeson finished first, and he finished first in a statewide examination for a scholarship to attend Rutgers College. He also excelled in debating, sports, singing, and acting. "Equality might be denied," he later wrote, "but I knew I was not inferior."

This he proved again and again. At Rutgers he was an all-American football player, won varsity letters in three other sports, and entered Phi Beta Kappa, the distinguished academic fraternity. After graduating, he played professional football, earned a law degree at Columbia University, and became a singer and a Shakespearean actor. But he knew that in America he was viewed more in terms of his race than his accomplishments, a realization that drove him to search for a political solution. Traveling the world, comparing other societies to his own, he was eventually impressed with the Soviet Union, where, he wrote, "I, the son of a slave, walk this earth with complete dignity." Later he told the House Un-American Activities Committee, "I would say in Russia I felt for the first time a full human being, and no colored prejudice like in Mississippi and no colored prejudice like in Washington and it was the first time I felt like a human being, where I did not feel the pressure of color as I feel in this committee today."

During World War II, Robeson spoke up for the Soviet Union and against the racism of his own country. He also worked to get the "major" leagues to integrate baseball. While the United States and the Soviet Union were wartime allies, Robeson's pro-Russian comments did not strike most Americans as treasonous, but after the conflict, when the Cold War colored all other issues, Robeson was seen as a threat.

At the same time Jackie Robinson was seen as a hope. Twenty-one years younger than Robeson, he had a different view of America. To be sure, he too had known the bitter taste of racism. His mother had left Georgia for California to give her children more opportunities, and Robinson had taken advantage of the move. He became a star athlete at UCLA, fought against racism during World War II, and played professional baseball in the "Negro Leagues." Then social forces beyond his control swung in his favor. Organized professional baseball—that is, white professional baseball—made the decision to integrate, and Robinson became the man to do it. And he did it with grace, determination, and an iron will. Confronted by pitchers who threw at him, players who spiked him, and opposing coaches and white fans who shouted racial insults at him, Robinson took it all and played the game. As his wife later wrote, Robinson knew that he was carrying a "big weight," that if he failed the entire integration effort would suffer a terrible setback, that he would let down his people. But he did not fail. He became one of the greatest players of his day, and baseball led American society in the area of integration.

But during the Cold War just being a symbol of America's loftiest ideal of equality was not enough. When Robeson, one of Robinson's people, spoke out in favor of America's Cold War rival, Robinson was called upon to respond. And he did, at once both opposing Robeson's specific comment but affirming Robeson's general criticism of American society. Asserting his loyalty to America did not mean, Robinson said, that "we're going to stop fighting race discrimination in this country until

we've got it licked. It means we're going to fight it all the harder because our stake in the future is so big. We can win our fight without the Communists and we don't want their help." In the end, the Robeson-Robinson conflict boiled down to two men who knew racism first hand. Robeson had seen too many closed doors in America to believe American politicians would open them. Robinson had seen one door cracked open, and it had given him faith in the system.

During the next twenty years, the issues of racism, communism, and big government would define American politics. After 1933, the federal government had assumed a key role in the political economy, but Americans were about to engage in a ferocious debate over the future about it. While the United States waged a "Cold War" against the Soviet Union and promoted the virtues of democracy and individual freedom, civil rights advocates insisted that true reform must begin at home, that the promise of the Declaration of Independence still needed to be fulfilled in the lives of all Americans, black and white. Otherwise, proclamations of American moral superiority would ring hollow.

RECONSIDERING THE NEW DEAL

In the late 1940s, as the Cold War developed between the United States and the Soviet Union, debate over the virtues of big government, all but dormant during World War II, reignited. Conservatives believed that FDR and the New Deal had started America on a journey toward socialism, and they were anxious to turn the country around and head back in the right direction. Others were just as interested in building on the New Deal legacy.

Harry Truman and the Fair Deal

Harry S Truman became president on April 12, 1945, the day FDR died. The two men were strikingly different. Roosevelt was to the manor born—Eastern, aristocratic, Harvard-educated, charming, sophisticated. Truman was a son of the middle border, a farm boy from Missouri who was well-read and well-liked but had attended no college and did not have the smooth manners and distinctive cadence of Roosevelt. He had been placed on the Democratic ticket in 1944 to appeal to midwestern voters and until Roosevelt's death had been pretty much of an afterthought to leading party officials. He became president at a crucial moment in history. Germany was in flames, the war against Japan was far from over, a meeting with Joseph Stalin was scheduled for the summer, and men were working feverishly to construct an atomic bomb and organize a United Nations. The president of the United States would have a spoon in every one of those pots, and Americans wondered if Truman was cook enough to handle the job.

He was. "If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen," he liked to say. He maneuvered through the minefields of international politics and played a central role in the last months of the war. What was not as clear was how well he would handle domestic peacetime politics. When the war ended, the uneasy unity between Democrats and Republicans fell apart, and older battles over the goals and meaning of the New Deal resumed. Republicans had never been committed to Roosevelt's New Deal programs, nor had many Southern Democrats. They disagreed with the larger role of government in everyday life, questioning Washington's support of organized labor, criticizing the need for social security, and arguing against any extension of the social umbrella. It was Truman's job to defend and secure what Roosevelt had gained.

One thing Truman firmly believed: the federal government had a decisive role to play in the economy. Although more conservative congressmen wanted to end wartime government controls, such as the Office of Price Administration (OPA), which held inflation in check, Truman urged Congress to maintain price controls. He also asked Congress to raise the minimum wage, nationalize the housing industry, and pass a stronger fair employment practices act. Congress responded with the Employment Act of 1946, less than Truman wished but an important confirmation of the role of the government in national economy. It accepted the New Deal philosophy, created the Council of Economic Advisors to help manage the economy, and for the first time in United States history acknowledged that the federal

government was responsible for full employment and stable prices. Initially weak, the Council would later play an important role in managing the economy.

Truman's plans to extend the reach of the New Deal, however, collided with voters' fears. In the congressional elections of 1946, Republicans picked up thirteen seats in the Senate and fifty-six in the House, giving them control of Congress for the first time since 1932. The new GOP Congress pulled back on some "New Dealism."   It eliminated the OPA, and it passed the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, better known Taft-Hartley Act, which outlawed the closed shop, in which a business or an industry require all workers to join a union, gave presidents the right to delay strikes by declaring a "cooling off" period, and generally attacked the power that the unions had acquired during the New Deal. Ironically, even a conservative Congress was willing to use big government to limit the power of unions.

In the election of 1948, Truman criticized the conservative Congress, and most pundits expected him to lose to Republican Governor Thomas Dewey of New York, particularly when the Democratic party had splintered. Governor Strom Thurmond of South Carolina, an avowed segregationist, bolted the Democratic convention and established the States Rights Party, a third party effort confined largely to the Deep South. More liberal Democrats followed Henry Wallace, FDR's former secretary of agriculture and vice-president, out of the party as well and joined his Progressive party movement, which was committed to civil rights and accommodation with the Soviet Union. Truman's reelection seemed doomed. But his spunky tenacity and outspoken honesty resonated with many Americans. Governor Dewey, in contrast, looked "like the little man on a wedding cake," according to one critic. When the votes were counted, Truman had won 49.5 percent of the popular vote to 45.1 percent for Dewey, 2.4 percent for Thurmond, and 2.4 percent for Wallace.

But Truman was unable to transform victory into legislative achievement. In 1949 his "Fair Deal" plan–a program that included extension of Social Security, federal aid to education and funding for housing projects, an increase in the minimum wage, civil rights legislation, and national health insurance—was rebuffed by Congress. What emerged from the legislative fight was a small extension in Social Security, a small raise in the minimum wage, and little more. The heart of the Fair Deal—aid and support for farmers, minorities, students, and those in need of medical treatment—was left on the floor of Congress.

Abandoning the Indian New Deal

Conservatives also managed to dismantle the so-called '"Indian New Deal" of the 1930s, which had ended the allotment program, restored Indian land, empowered tribal governments, and ended federal programs destructive of tribal cultures and languages. But in the growing atmosphere of the Cold War and increasing suspicion of the federal government, the Indian New Deal came under attack. Political conservatives, allied with business interests in the West, resented federal Indian policy, which kept tribal land out of the hands of developers and perpetuated ethnic differences. Dillon S. Myer, commissioner of Indian affairs, insisted that the "time has come for the federal government to get out of the 'Indian business.' Indians would be a lot better off if they could escape the cycle of reservation dependency."

To implement Myers's vision, Congress launched the termination and relocation programs. Relocation moved tens of thousands of Indians off the reservations and into cities, where children could go to public schools, families could live in racially integrated housing, and men and women could work in factories–in short, where Indians would assimilate and disappear. Termination removed all federal authority over many Indian tribes and subjected them to local and state legal jurisdictions. Most tribal leaders denounced termination. Between 1953 and 1960, nearly 1.7 million acres of reservation land was auctioned off to white business interests because Indians could not afford to pay local and state

property taxes. Earl Old Person, a Blackfeet leader, noted, "In our language the only translation for termination is to 'wipe out' or 'kill off'. . . how can we plan our future when the Indian Bureau threatens to wipe us out as a race?" In the postwar years, many Democrats hoped to expand on the New Deal, but they encountered stiff resistance from other Americans suspicious of social engineering and big government. The best the Truman administration could do was to consolidate the New Deal and make it a permanent part of the American political economy.

FIGHTING A COLD WAR

Events in the Soviet Union, where ideologues had implemented big government and social engineering on a truly epic scale, did little to assuage the fears of conservatives. Unlike Paul Robeson, who saw in "the Soviet Union the future of mankind," most Americans did not see in the Russian Revolution and the Soviet Union the promise of a classless future, one devoid of discrimination, poverty, imperialism, or war. Instead, they perceived a mortal threat to their own way of life, identified the Soviet Union as the embodiment of evil, and launched a global crusade to keep communism at bay.

Confronting the Soviet Union

At its roots, communism was a hopeful movement promising the greatest good for the greatest number and a world without strife or exploitation. During the 1930s, communism won some converts, but most Americans, and almost every influential politician, distrusted both the promise and the practice of communism. Although many recognized some problems inherent in American capitalism and democracy, they were not anxious to scrap it for communism and dictatorship. They saw communism as a movement that was anti-religion, anti-property, and anti-tradition, a movement that rejected the ideals upon which America had been built. In addition, they were concerned about the internationalist rhetoric of Soviet leaders, who wanted to erect a global foreign policy stage on where the Soviet Union would play the lead role. As a result, America's initial response to the Soviet Union wavered between outright hostility and a policy of watchful neutrality. In 1919-1920 Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer and Bureau of Investigations agent J. Edgar Hoover engaged in a crusade against communists in the United States. When their campaign, known as the Red Scare, ended, politicians continued to regard communists as a species similar to a poisonous snake. Between 1919 and 1933, four presidents refused to extend diplomatic recognition to the Soviet Union. And when recognition came in 1933 under President Franklin Roosevelt, it was more the result of the desire to help the depression-torn economy than any sense of support for the Soviets.

World War II brought the U.S. and the Soviet Union together in an alliance against Nazi Germany. During the course of the war, the Soviets enjoyed good press in the United States. Newspaper editorialists lauded the heroic Soviet fight against Hitler's forces, and Hollywood producers, directors, and screenwriters turned the Soviet Union into a country of happy people, ever ready to laugh, drink, dance, and kill Nazis. Even Joseph Stalin was given a facelift. The man responsible for the deaths of millions of his own citizens was suddenly Uncle Joe, the wise caring father to Mother Russia, the benign pipe-smoking friend of the United States.

With the successful conclusion of the war against the Nazis came an unsuccessful conclusion to the American-Soviet alliance. Throughout the war both sides had been suspicious of the other. Stalin complained about Britain and America's delays in launching a Second Front against Germany, and Roosevelt and Truman expressed concern about the fate of the lands the Soviet Red Army "liberated." Would Poland and the rest of Eastern Europe be free to develop their own political institutions or would they become pawns of the Soviet Union? The answer was not long in coming. Stalin insisted that Eastern Europe was important to Soviet security, and while the nations were nominally independent they all marched to orders filtering out of Moscow. Truman tried to sway Stalin with

threats and bribes, but the dictator remained inflexible. Stalin wanted his own sphere of influence and a guarantee of Soviet security and no amount of American dollars or foreign aid could alter his designs.

What was evident in the dispute over the future of Poland was that American and Soviet leaders had two different views of international relations. The United States supported free trade, the end of military alliances, and world organizations like the United Nations to prevent future disputes. The Soviet Union had no faith in world organization, believed free trade would only make the U.S. richer and more powerful, and insisted that security rested in a powerful army and alliances strong alliances. While they preached that the future belonged to them and that the eventual triumph of communism was a historical certainty, the Soviet leaders were under no illusion that capitalism would just die a quiet death or that Russia was safe from western aggression. Trust in the future, Stalin said, but remain strong for the present. And keeping Germany weak and Eastern Europe under his thumb would mean a more powerful Soviet Union.

What quickly emerged was a Cold War, an ideological conflict between East and West, between the United States and its allies and the Soviet Union and its allies, between capitalism and communism. It was a war that would last almost fifty years, alternating periods of actual warfare with stretches of relative peace. Although the United States and the Soviet Union would never fight each other directly, the Cold War would draw America into costly conflicts in Korea and Vietnam, and lure the Soviets into fighting in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Afghanistan. It would also shape American politics and culture, defining for several generations "us" and "them." From television series such as *Mission Impossible* and *The Man From U.N.C.L.E.* to movies such as *Dr. Strangelove* and *Fail Safe* to novels and clashes in the Olympics, the Cold War, the struggle between Russia and America, would be an inescapable part of American life

The Truman Doctrine

By the end of the twentieth century, the causes of the Cold War seemed obvious, but at mid-century few Americans sensed an impending crisis. At the conclusion of World War II, most Americans and their political representatives assumed that the United States would return to its traditional foreign policy. Politicians feared the return of economic depression more than the Soviet Union and expressed few desires to launch any more crusades for freedom. Greece and Turkey, however, desperately needed aid in their fight against communist insurgents, and Great Britain, the traditional advocate for the balance of power in Europe, was in no shape economically or militarily to support the countries. Truman talked with British diplomats and his own advisors, who warned him that communists in power in Greece and Turkey would give Stalin control of the eastern Mediterranean and pose a threat to Italy and France. He decided to act. In March 1947, he went before Congress and outlined what became known as the Truman Doctrine. He described the conflict between communist and non-communist in simplistic terms as a battle between good and evil, freedom and dictatorship. "I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or outside pressures." Congress then voted $400 million in aid to Greece and Turkey.

Containment

The Truman Doctrine was the beginning of the U.S. foreign policy of "containment." Originally formulated in an article by George Kennan, a Soviet expert in the state department, the containment policy suggested that the best way to fight the Soviet Union was to prevent it from expanding and allow it to die under its own weight. Resistance to communist expansion could take many forms, from economic aid and moral support to military aid and even military intervention, and each case would have to be considered on it own terms.

In 1948 Congress appropriated $17 billion for the European Recovery Program, better known as the Marshall Plan. First proposed by Secretary of State George Marshall, the plan aimed at

eliminating European political instability by helping to restore a lasting prosperity. It followed the theory that communism thrived in poor and unstable countries. Eliminate poverty and communism would lose its appeal. The Marshall Plan worked as planned, and in the process it produced ample goodwill toward the United States in Western Europe.

In 1948 and 1949 the Berlin Airlift demonstrated another facet of containment. When the Soviet Union closed the roads and railways from democratic West Germany into West Berlin, the United States responded with an airlift, flying in the supplies Berlin needed to survive on an around-the-clock basis. During the peak of the airlift, nearly 5,000 tons of food, fuel, coal, and other necessities were flown into Berlin each day, and after ten months Stalin reopened the roads. But by then Berlin had become a symbol to the commitment of the United States to free peoples. As if to formalize this commitment, in 1949 the United States, Canada, and eleven Western European democracies signed the North Atlantic Treaty Organization treaty (NATO), promising jointly to resist the spread of communism.

Atomic Bombs and Red Chinese

The successes of the Marshall Plan, Berlin Airlift, and NATO did not end the threat of communism, at least not in the minds of American policy makers. In 1949 two events frightened Americans. In September, U.S. pilots taking air samples in the North Pacific detected traces of radioactivity, which, when analyzed, indicated that the Soviets had detonated an atomic bomb. Truman responded in part by authorizing construction of the more powerful and deadly hydrogen bomb, and the Soviets followed suit. The result was a more expensive arms race. The US and the USSR, said a leading American physicist, were like "two scorpions in a bottle, each capable of killing the other, but only at the risk of his own life."

The second event was the communist triumph in China. Civil war between the nationalist forces of Chiang Kai-shek and communist forces of Mao Tse-tung had been a fact of life for several decades, although it had been put on hold during World War II. After the war, the fight resumed, and although the United States aided Chiang, his regime was corrupt, inefficient, incompetent, and lacking in general popular support. Finally, Chiang fled China for Formosa (Taiwan), giving control of the mainland to Mao. In a world of containment, where peoples and nations were divided between good and evil, the "fall" of China shocked and disturbed Americans. How had it all happened, Americans asked? Were there limits to American power? Secretary of State Dean Acheson tried to explain that "China lost itself," but many Americans, backed by the influential China Lobby, maintained that communists in the State Department had secretly aided the communists in China, that the United States had an enemy within.

The depth of American hostility toward the Soviet Union was revealed in April 1950, when the National Security Council, with President Truman's approval, adopted NSC-68, a document that described communism as a "fanatic faith . . . [that] seeks to impose its absolute authority over the rest of the world." The United States would use its political, economic, and military resources to stop communist aggression and would work "to foster the seeds of destruction within the Soviet Union." Global politics had become a struggle for survival between two nuclear superpowers.

The Korean Conflict

Events in China forced America to shift more attention and aid away from Europe and toward Asia, especially the case after June 25, 1950, when communist North Korea crossed the 38th parallel and invaded non-communist South Korea. At the time, Americans assumed that the orders for the attack came from Moscow, but actually the North Korean dictator Kim Il Sung launched the offensive to maintain his own power base. His army was larger, better equipped, and better trained than that President Syngman Rhee in the South, and Kim believed that he could unify the country, which had

been divided after World War II. The invasion faced little serious opposition, and within days South Korea seemed on the verge of defeat.

Coming on the heels of the communist victory in China, Truman knew that it would be political suicide if he did not act. Containment demanded an American response, and he took his case to the United Nations Security Council. By a vote of 9 to 0 (the Soviet Union was not present for the vote), the UN condemned the invasion and demanded an immediate cease-fire. Encouraged by this mandate, Truman committed U.S. military support to South Korea, ordering occupation troops in Japan to Korea. What followed were six painful weeks, as American GI's joined South Koreans in a long retreat to the southeastern port of Pusan. There they established a defensive perimeter and held firm, but the majority of the country was in communist hands.

While American soldiers grumbled about their sad lot of being sent to Korea, General Douglas MacArthur, the bold commander of the U.S. forces, planned a major offensive. On September 15, he launched an amphibious attack behind enemy lines at the port of Inchon, near Seoul and the 38th parallel. It was a high-risk operation, but it succeeded. Confronted by an enemy to their rear and their front, North Korea retreated above the 38th parallel. Then Truman changed American policy from containment to liberation. He ordered MacArthur to follow the communists north, deep into North Korea and toward the border of China. Implicit in the decision was the assumption that China would not intervene and widen the scope of the war.

China, however, was not privy to the American assumptions, and in late November Mao sent 300,000 Chinese troops across the border into Korea. Now, short of introducing nuclear warfare, the United States was involved in a disastrous land war in Asia, one where victory was out of the question. For the next three years, the United States and their UN allies would fight with no victory in sight. On the front lines, some 36,568 U.S. servicemen Americans died in the war and another 103,000 were wounded. Back home Truman was criticized for getting the United States in a war that could not be won, and in Korea, General Douglas MacArthur was itching to redeem himself and inflict a massive military defeat on the Chinese. He urged Truman to launch strategic bombing raids on China and allow Chiang Kai-shek's National Chinese troops to attack the mainland. Truman shied away from such an escalation of the conflict, and when General MacArthur publically criticized the president, Truman in April 1951 relieved him of command.

Containment, Americans learned, could be a deadly, frustrating policy. Not until Truman was out of office and Dwight Eisenhower was the new president did the war end. On July 26, 1953, the war came to a conclusion much like it began, with the communists in power in the North and the non-communists in control of the South. For another generation, the Cold War would be a standoff, forcing Americans to redefine their place in the world and inspiring a global rivalry, with the United States and the Soviet Union marketing weapons and ideologies everywhere, each competing to prove the virtues of its system.

THE COLD WAR AT HOME

Like all major wars, the Cold War was not simply a matter of foreign and military policy. It shaped and dominated the home front as well, often creating friends out of enemies and enemies out of friends. In a very real sense, it cast a pall over America, a cloth of fear and suspicion. Communists, not murderers or thieves, became America's number one enemies. In 1951, for example, Bob Raymondi, an associate for Murder, Inc. (an informal group of mob hit-men) who had served seventeen years in prison, met George Charney, former chairman of New York's state communist party. Both men were in prison, and they spent some time engaged in conversations. When Raymondi's sister found out, she told her mobster brother to stop talking to the communist: "My God, Bob, you'll get in trouble." The episode, as much as any, defined the temper of the times.

The Second Red Scare

The hysteria and fear of communists in the United States, known as the Second Red Scare, was certainly out of proportion to the actual number of communists in America. There were probably not more than 100,000 members of the Communist Party United States of America (CPUSA), and there was not much of a communist conspiracy within the country. To be sure, there were a few communists in the government, some holding sensitive positions, but there were limits to the damage that they could do. Politicians generated much of the fuel for the Great Scare. For Republicans, anti-communism was an issue they could use to win votes. And Truman and the Democrats, who had helped inflame American minds to gain support for their foreign policy, could not reverse themselves and say that a threat did not exist. The result was a political consensus. In March 1947, Truman signed an executive order setting up an employee loyalty program which barred Communists from federal government jobs. The House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC) conducted hearings in Hollywood on the spread of communism, and studio heads promised that actors, screenwriters, technicians, producers, and directors who refused to denounce communism would no longer be employed.

The Alger Hiss trial gave some credence to the charges of communists in government. In 1949 Whittaker Chambers, an editor for Time magazine, charged Hiss, a top New Deal lawyer, of being a communist spy. Chambers said he knew this because he too had been a communist and had received government documents from Hiss. A handsome, distinguished man, well-liked and well-connected, Hiss denied the charges, but Chambers produced documents that Hiss had clearly passed to him. Although the statute of limitations had expired on any espionage charge, Hiss was tried on the charge of perjury before HUAC. The first trial ended in a hung jury, but in a second trial, which ended in January 1950, a jury found Hiss guilty, and the judge sentenced him to five years. The conviction shocked Americans. If Hiss was a communist spy--well-dressed, seemingly loyal and normal Hiss—then who else in government might be spies?

In September 1950, Congress passed the Internal Security Act (McCarran Act), which President Truman vetoed on the grounds that it was the "greatest danger to freedom of the press, speech, and assembly since the Sedition Act of 1798." The bill provided for registration of Communist and Communist-front organizations, authorized the internment of Communists during national emergencies, and banned Communists from work in defense industries. Congress overrode the veto and the bill became law. In 1952, the McCarran-Walter Act prohibited Communists from immigrating to the United States and authorized the deportation of immigrants who had been or had become Communists, even if they were U.S. citizens.

Certainly there were communist spies in the United States, just as there were spies working for the United States in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Thanks to a defection by a Soviet spy, U.S. officials learned that there were communist spies in the Manhattan Project to build an atomic bomb program. Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, a husband and wife who had a relative working in the Manhattan Project, were arrested. Although they both proclaimed their claimed innocence, both were communists, and there was strong evidence that at least Julius was guilty. But both were found guilty and sentenced to death, the first time such a punishment was called for in a case of espionage during peacetime. Protests for clemency came from many liberal groups, and even from the Pope, but the government was unmoved. On June 19, 1953, the two were executed in the electric chair. The Rosenberg case, coming soon after the conviction of Hiss, seemed positive proof for many Americans that the country was awash with communist spies. It seemed logical to ask who "lost" China and who "gave" the "atomic secrets" to the Soviet Union. In this atmosphere of suspicion and distrust, Americans looked for a politician they could trust.

McCarthyism

Joseph McCarthy, a first term Senator from Wisconsin, said they could trust him. A son of poor farmers, awkward socially but with a driving ambition, he had worked his way through high

school and college, become a judge, joined the Marines, and won an upset senatorial victory in 1946. From 1946 to 1950, he had served in the senate without distinction, gaining a reputation for hard-drinking and partying. Then in early 1950, shortly after the verdict in the Hiss case, McCarthy turned his attention to anti-communism. He gave a Lincoln's Birthday speech to the Ohio County Women's Republican Club in Wheeling, West Virginia, where he held high a piece of paper and claimed, "I have here in my hand a list of 205 [communists in the State Department] that were known to the Secretary of State as being members of the Communist Party and who nevertheless are still working and shaping the policy of the State Department." It was an inaccurate charge, one McCarthy could neither prove nor defend. And it should have ended his political career. But it did not. By the summer the U.S. was at war in Korea, and McCarthy's accusations struck a chord.

During the next four years McCarthy was often in the headlines. He investigated communist activities, talked about who "lost" China, and spun a conspiracy tale of communist espionage that enthralled millions of Americans. He attacked Democrats, helped Republicans get elected, and was one of the most powerful and feared politicians in the country. But in 1954 he went too far, charging that the U.S. Army was shielding communists in the military. In the Army-McCarthy hearings, which lasted 36 days and were nationally televised, the senator's bullying tactics and indecent charges led to his downfall. The war in Korea was over, the government was clearly not full of communists, and Americans realized that McCarthy was not worthy of their trust. Censored by the senate, ignored by the press, McCarthy spent the last three years of his life in political oblivion. But his career represented the extremes of the Red Scare. In this age of suspicion, guilt was assumed and innocence nearly impossible to prove.

As the election of 1952 approached, President Harry Truman toyed with the idea of seeking reelection, but he had lost ground with voters. The shrill rhetoric of the Cold War and the fighting in Korea had frightened voters, and his handling of the steel strike earlier in the year had cost him political capital. When the steel workers went on strike in April 1952, Truman used federal marshals to seize the steel mills and forced workers to maintain production. Two months later, the Supreme Court ruled the seizure unconstitutional, tarnishing Truman's political career. He decided not to run for another term. The Democrats nominated Governor Adlai Stevenson of Illinois, and the Republicans selected former General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower. With the country at war in Korea, Eisenhower played on his military career and promised, if elected, to personally visit Korea and negotiate an end to the war. Voters decided to let him try, giving Eisenhower 33.9 million votes to Stevenson's 27.3 million.

Eisenhower's World

The election of Republican Dwight "Ike" Eisenhower as president in 1952 helped return a balance to public life. Born in Texas, raised in Kansas, and educated at West Point, Ike had served his country with great distinction during World War II. He had led the planning and execution of the invasions of North Africa, Italy, and Normandy; he had commanded millions of men, conferred with presidents and world leaders, and conducted himself always with dignity and integrity. He had earned the respect of his country. And as president he worked to restore sanity and harmony. He did not make wild charges like McCarthy, nor did he attack Democrats like a rabid dog. Instead, he emphasized a governmental philosophy of "dynamic conservatism," a combination of liberal social activism with conservative economic planning. Often working quietly behind the scenes, he oversaw spending cuts and the reduction of the federal deficit and bureaucracies. Like traditional conservatives, he encouraged private enterprise and opposed such major governmental undertakings as a national health program.

But not all of his programs were conservative. He did not reject the achievements of the New Deal, and he even expanded social security to include members of the armed forces, domestic and

clerical workers, and farm laborers. He increased benefits, raised the minimum wage, and demonstrated a concern for poorer Americans. Although not entirely of his doing, the economy flourished under Ike's two terms as president (1953-1961). Between 1954 and 1960 the Gross National Product (GNP) rose from $200 billion to $500 billion, unemployment stayed around 5 percent, and inflation near 3 percent. Economically for most Americans—but by no means all—the 1950s were good years. In 1956, he easily won reelection, handing Adlai Stevenson another stinging defeat.

In foreign policy Eisenhower worked to maintain America's dominant position in the world and to keep the country out of war. Although he accepted the basic assumptions of containment, he wanted a less expensive Cold War strategy. With this in mind, he and his Secretary of State John Foster Dulles advanced the policy of "massive retaliation." It threatened to use nuclear weapons to resolve military conflict. This policy also allowed him to reduce military budgets. Eisenhower similarly placed more emphasis on the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). In Iran in 1953 and Guatemala in 1954, the CIA engineered political coups that resulted in pro-American governments. Though many questioned the ethics of CIA activities, Eisenhower believed that covert activities were significantly more acceptable than another conventional war. They cost less lives and were less expensive.

Eisenhower responded to other Cold War challenges as well. In 1957 when the Soviet Union launched an artificial satellite named Sputnik—Russian for "fellow traveler from earth"— in orbit around the globe, Ike responded by spending more money on the American space program. Although the program had several early embarrassing failures, it eventually proved a striking success. In addition, Congress responded to Sputnik by passing the National Defense Education Act (1958). It helped finance undergraduate and graduate education for millions of Americans, demonstrating that the US was committed to advancement through education.

The Cold War heated up again in May1960 when Soviet surface-to-air missiles brought down the U-2, an aircraft flown by a pilot for the Central Intelligence Agency. At first, U.S. officials claimed that the U-2 was merely a weather aircraft that had unwittingly drifted into Soviet airspace, but the Russians would have none of it, and President Eisenhower eventually admitted that he had personally authorized such reconnaissance flights. Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev demanded an end to "such blatant violations of Soviet sovereignty" and cancelled an invitation he had extended to Eisenhower to visit Moscow.

By the time Eisenhower left office, the Cold War rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union had reached epic proportions, and in the process the United States had assumed global responsibilities. American foreign policy, once focused on hemispheric affairs and then in the twentieth century with winning two world wars, now operated on a global scale, policing the planet to protect the weak from communist aggression. It was an awesome responsibility whose limits would soon become abundantly clear in the jungles of Southeast Asia.

HIGHWAYS, HOMES, AND ENGINEERED ENVIRONMENTS

The image of Dwight Eisenhower playing golf in a cardigan sweater and speaking softly at a press conference, an image of peace and harmony, obscured an America of churning activity. Rapid economic growth, spurred by dramatic improvements in the nation's transportation system, altered the American landscape, changed the way tens of millions of people lived, and planted the seeds of an environmental movement.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

From the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries, adventurous European explorers had engaged in a quest for the maritime holy grail--the elusive Northwest Passage, a rumored water passage in North America linking the Atlantic and Pacific oceans. The Northwest Passage, of course, did not exist, but in 1959, after a gargantuan engineering project by the United States and Canada, a northwest passage

reached nearly halfway to the Pacific.

Back in 1896, the United States, Great Britain, and Canada first began discussing the possibility of making the St. Lawrence River navigable all the way from the Atlantic to the Great Lakes. Opposition erupted quickly from railroads and Atlantic seaports, which feared losing commercial traffic, but in 1932 the participating countries signed a treaty providing for construction of the seaway. World War II stalled the project, but in May 1954, Congress passed the Wiley-Donder Act, which authorized the U.S. government to enter into a cooperative agreement with Canada to construct a twenty-seven-foot deep canal connecting Montreal and Lake Ontario. Construction began late in 1954 when nearly 59,000 laborers went to work.

Subsequent legislation extended the project. A workforce of more than 22,000 people spent nearly six years on the seaway. They dug canals, dredged river bottoms, constructed dams, dikes, and levees along 2,300 miles of waterway. In June 1959, Queen Elizabeth II and President Dwight Eisenhower dedicated the St. Lawrence Seaway. Products built or harvested from the American interior could now be shipped by sea anywhere in the world. The queen hailed it as "one of the outstanding engineering accomplishments of modern times," and a journalist noted that "American ingenuity has given the country a fourth coastline." Commercial traffic, as well as cities and towns, mushroomed all along the waterway.

Federal Interstate Highways

Even more significant for the economy and American society was the impact of the federal interstate highway system. After World War II, America witnessed the "baby boom," an era of extraordinary fertility. Between 1945 and 1960, the number of births per 1,000 women between the ages of 15 and 44 jumped from 80 to 121. Those growing families needed housing, and millions of white Americans fled the cities for the suburbs. During the 1950s the suburbs grew six times faster than the cities, and by 1960 one-third of all Americans lived in them. More than anything, the suburbs offered Americans room, security, and privacy. In places like Levittown, New York, a suburb of mass-produced houses developed by William Levitt, a family could buy a two-bedroom home on a 60 by 100 foot lot for $7,999, or about $58 a month. Where once a home in the country was the privilege of the rich, now average Americans could enjoy aspects of country life. But again, all Americans did not have an equal opportunity to share in the suburbs. Developers often excluded African Americans from suburban communities.

The growth of the suburbs indicated a profound change in the nation, one with social and political consequences. The growth was fueled at least partially by the federal government. The Highway Act of 1956 appropriated $26 billion to construct 41,000 (later expanded to 42,500) miles of interstate highways. It took longer to complete and was more expensive than originally planned, but the act changed America. It made the suburbs easier to reach, facilitating flight from the cities. At the same time, money spent on interstates was money not spent on urban infrastructures. As Americans moved to the suburbs, city roads, bridges, railway systems, and subways declined. This decline added to the impulse to move. And over the years, cities—especially the inner cities—languished, victims of new priorities and different dreams.

Far more than cities, suburbs became a land of automobiles, and in the suburbs cars became as important as homes. Fathers drove to work, mothers drove their children to school and drove to shop for food, adolescents when they turned sixteen drove because they could. They were people on wheels, part of a nation on wheels. The process gave rise to a land of drive-in theaters, gasoline service stations, mobile homes, multicar garages, and shopping malls. Between 1952 and 1972 the number of automobiles on American highways doubled, pollution increased, and mass transportation declined. Probably no politician who voted for the highway bill could have predicted the revolutionary results of the act.

From Conservation to Environmentalism

Although the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Highway Act of 1956 engineered massive environmental changes, other federal government projects generated intense opposition, especially those that threatened national monuments and national parks. In 1948-1949, the Bureau of Reclamation's plans to dam the outlet stream of Lake Solitude in the Cloud Peak Primitive Area of the Big Horn National Forest brought down the wrath of the Wilderness Society and the National Parks Association, as did a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers proposal to build Glacier View Dam in Glacier National Park.

But the biggest environmental battle of the 1950s involved Echo Park Dam, part of the Colorado River Storage Project's (CRSP) plan to construct a series of dams along the Colorado River, which would allocate water for agriculture, ranching, and urban use and provide for the construction of hydroelectric facilities. The project would be an economic boon for the region– providing cheaper electricity and more abundant water supplies--but Echo Park Dam would inundate Dinosaur National Monument on the Colorado-Utah border. The project needed the approval of Congress, and the Sierra Club and Wilderness Society marshaled nationwide opposition. A total of 236 state and 78 national conservation groups across the country lobbied against the proposal; tens of millions of American homes received pamphlets entitled "What is Your Stake in Dinosaur? and "Will You DAM the Scenic Wildlands of Our National Park System?"; and newspaper headlines, news magazines, and radio covered the controversy. The battle took six years, but in 1956, when Congress finally approved the Colorado River Storage Project, it did not contain provisions for the Echo Park Dam.

For two reasons, historians view the Echo Park Dam as a pivotal point in the transition from conservation to environmentalism in the United States. First, the early twentieth century conservation movement had revolved around the idea of managing environmental resources in order to sustain economic growth indefinitely. But in the demise of the Echo Park Dam project, aesthetics triumphed over economics; Dinosaur National Monument was preserved for its own sake, its own beauty, regardless of the economic consequences. Second, the Echo Park Dam controversy heralded the advent of modern environmentalism because a nationwide coalition of environmental and conservation groups joined forces to block a local or at best regional project.

Because of Cold War-inspired defense spending and large-scale construction projects like the St. Lawrence Seaway, the federal interstate highway system, and the Colorado River Storage Project, the economy boomed during the 1950s. Except for an occasional blip, unemployment remained low and prices level, the best of all possible economic worlds. Most Americans, in spite of Cold War tensions, remembered the era as a time of progress and prosperity.

TIRED OF BEING TIRED

African Americans did not share fully in the prosperity and harmony of Ike's America. During World War II roughly one million African Americans served their country in uniform, and a half million served overseas. During the years between the bombing of Pearl Harbor in 1941 and the surrender of Germany and Japan in 1945, thousands of African Americans died defending their country. And when the war was over, there was a growing sense in the African- American community, a feeling so real that it seemed visible, that the ideological fruits of victory should be shared equally regardless of race, gender, or religion. In a speech in 1941, before the United States entered the war, President Franklin Roosevelt said that four freedoms were worth fighting and dying for: freedom of speech and expression, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. For millions of African Americans, those four freedoms represented a good starting point for full entry into American society.

Desegregation

"Nothing is so powerful as an idea whose time has come," French novelist Victor Hugo

wrote in the nineteenth century, and in the second half of the twentieth century the idea whose time had come was equality and full participation for black people in the promise of America. The Civil War and the 13th Amendment had ended slavery. The Era of Reconstruction and the 14th and 15th Amendments had—in theory—extended citizenship, due process, and the franchise to African Americans. But in the years after the end of Reconstruction, blacks had been stripped of many of their recently won rights. In the South, whites curtailed African-American voting rights by a combination of literacy tests, poll taxes, grandfather clauses, and white primaries, all backed by physical intimidation and the always lurking threat of violence. In the 1890s white southerners had passed a series of Jim Crow laws that segregated the races in schools and public places, and the 1896 Supreme Court decision of Plessy v. Ferguson had made the "separate but equal" doctrine the law of the land. And in both the South and the North, African Americans often confronted implacable resistance in employment and housing. In short, the years between 1865 and 1945 had seen almost no progress for African Americans. More often than not, they could not vote, were restricted to housing in certain areas, barred from employment in many businesses, and daily subjected to racial slurs and second-class citizenship. Freedom of speech, freedom from fear, and freedom of speech were decidedly not theirs. In the midst of the 1947 baseball season, when Jackie Robinson was enduring racist jeers from white crowds, the silent treatment from some of his own teammates, and spikings and intentional collisions from opponents, he had wondered, "How did it all get to this? What has happened to the land of the free and the home of the brave?"

But times were beginning to change. World War II had profoundly altered the racial equilibrium in America. During the war more than two million black workers obtained employment in war plants, most of which were located in the northern and western industrial cities. With the migration of African Americans from the South where they could not vote to the North where they could came a growing base of political power. Since most blacks shifted their political alliance from the Republican to the Democratic Party during the decade of the Great Depression, the northern migration gave them greater strength in the Democratic Party. In addition, during World War II the black middle class, like the white middle class, enjoyed greater prosperity. Influential African American leaders and spokesmen, a combination of ministers, educators, and professionals, became more vocal about the yawning gap between the promise of America and the reality of America. They noted the fight against fascism abroad and the sanctioning of racism at home, the struggle for liberation overseas and the existence of two separate and unequal peoples in the land of the free. During World War II, Jackie Robinson had served in the U.S. Army, but he had refused to accept second-class treatment, even from superiors. "I was not going to let a bunch of crackers treat me like dirt just because I was a Negro," he later remarked. Robinson's pride cost him a court-martial, but he was acquitted and later earned an honorable discharge from the army.

After the war other factors increased the demand for change. American leaders during the Cold War emphasized the ideological advantages of the United States over the Soviet Union, and FDR's Four Freedoms figured prominently in their arguments. But while white spokesmen extolled America's virtues, many black leaders became increasingly aware of the limitations of America. Were they free to attend the same schools as whites, to eat in the same restaurants as whites, to work on equally footing with whites, to join the same clubs as whites?

The answer was a resounding “no”. The advent of television reinforced for many African Americans the gap between white and black America. It showed an America from which they were excluded, a parade of situation comedies, soap operas, dramas, sporting events, news shows, and commercials featuring white actors, athletes, and commentators, aimed at white consumption and hawking the illusion of an uncomplicated, self-satisfied, white America.

The image was so compelling, the ideal so satisfying, that black Americans wanted a part of it. They wanted the chance to win or fail on the dint of their own efforts, to obtain the best education possible, to raise their families in safe neighborhoods, to be judged by who they were and not by their color. But during the late 1940s and early 1950s the gains were slow and meager. On a largely symbolic level, Jackie Robinson broke the “color line” in major league baseball, showing that given the chance, African Americans could perform and excel. President Harry Truman banned racial discrimination in federal hiring and ended segregation in the armed forces, and President Dwight Eisenhower stopped the segregation of public services in the District of Columbia, navy ship yards, and veterans’ hospitals. But in other areas and professions, the “color line” proved more intractable.

Brown v. Board of Education

During the same years the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) worked to legally undermine the entire Jim Crow system, especially as it applied to housing and education. In 1946, the Supreme Court’s decision in *Morgan v. Virginia* banned segregation in interstate buses. In *Shelley v. Kraemer* (1948) the Supreme Court ruled that racially restrictive covenants were unconstitutional, then in 1950 in *McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Board of Regents* and *Sweatt v. Painter* the Court struck down segregation in graduate and law schools. Each case signaled that the Jim Crow system had been built on false assumptions.

Then came arguably the most important Supreme Court decision of the twentieth century. The case involved an African-American girl forced to travel several miles to attend a black school when she lived only a few blocks from a white school. In taking up her case and others of a similar nature, the Supreme Court considered not only the logistics of segregated schools, but also the historical, psychological, and sociological impact of the system. *In Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* (1954), they completely overturned *Plessy v. Ferguson*, concluding that segregation was just plain wrong, and that the policy of “separate but equal” resulted in “separate educational facilities [that were] inherently unequal.” “To separate [African American children] from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way very unlikely ever to be undone,” the court concluded in the unanimous decision.

The Washington Post labeled the *Brown* decision “a new birth of freedom,” but it was not a freedom that would be easily realized. The court’s later ruling that the desegregation should take place “with all deliberate speed” was vague at best, meaningless at worst. And President Eisenhower did little to aid the problem by providing forceful leadership. Ike had lived most of his life in a segregated army, was unresponsive to African American demands for equality, and believed the *Brown* decision was a mistake. Making the problem even worse, leaders in the South spoke out against desegregation, often in the most racist tones.

Confrontation in Little Rock

The lingering issue became a crisis in 1957 when the courts ordered Little Rock, Arkansas, to desegregate its schools. Arkansas authorities were prepared to obey, but Governor Orval Faubus intervened, sending the National Guard to Little Rock to prevent desegregation.
The image of black children, scrubbed and dressed in new clothes, entering school doors through a gauntlet of epithet-shrieking, racist white people profoundly moved Jackie Robinson, who had retired from baseball the year before. “When I looked at the faces of those boys and girls,” Robinson said, “I was so proud of them and so ashamed of my country. Nothing I went through matched the terror those children faced and the courage with which they faced it.”

Such open defiance of the Supreme Court’s ruling and the law of the land, which was covered by television cameras, forced Eisenhower’s hand. He federalized the Arkansas National Guard, sent regular army troops to Little Rock, and ordered desegregation. Faubus had no choice but to comply, but the next year he closed the Little Rock public schools, saying that he was “in opposition to integration by force of bayonet point.” The Little Rock crisis highlighted the difficulty of the Supreme Court changing entrenched attitudes and institutions without forceful and progressive political leadership. At the end of 1956, in six southern states, not a single black child attended a school with whites, and as late as 1965, 75 percent of southern school districts were still segregated.

It was clear was that the ideal of an integrated society would take more than a ruling by the Supreme Court. It would take thousands, even millions, of people, black and white, standing up for what was right and just. In December 1955, Rosa Parks, an African American seamstress in Montgomery, Alabama, had done just that. Tired after a long day of work and ready to challenge the color barrier, she boarded a Montgomery bus, took a seat in the designated “colored” section in the back, and headed home. But soon the bus filled, and there were not enough seats for all the passengers. At that point, Rosa Parks, who was seated in the front of the African American section, was expected to give up her seat to a white passenger. She refused, even after the bus driver had ordered her to vacate her seat. For this simple, passive act of refusal, she was arrested.

African Americans in Montgomery came to her defense. They too were tired of riding in the back of buses, giving up seats to whites, and living the life of a second class citizen. They wanted America to live up to its ideals. Led by Martin Luther King, Jr., a young black minister from the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church who had earned a doctorate in theology, they organized and participated in a boycott of the Montgomery Jim Crow buses. King was an ideal leader. Raised secure in the African American middle class, he was sensitive to the suffering of his less fortunate brothers and sisters but also angry at the indignities of the Jim Crow South, where everything was segregated, from drinking fountains and restrooms to schools and theaters. At a meeting, that compassion and quiet anger spilled out when King told his followers, “There comes a time when people get tired. We are here . . . to say to those who have mistreated us so long that we are tired—tired of being segregated and humiliated, tired of being kicked about by the brutal feet of oppression. . . . We have come here tonight to be saved from the patience that makes us patient with anything less than freedom and justice.”

King did not counsel violence or destruction; he preached a philosophy of nonviolent protest. For 381 days the vast majority of African Americans in Montgomery remained firm, refusing to ride the Jim Crow buses. They car-pooled, hitchhiked, rode bikes, and walked, but they stayed off the buses. The boycott was an effective economic tool, and it dramatized King’s message to the rest of America. It was also successful, indicating to others that similar nonviolent, economic pressure would have positive results. In the years ahead African Americans and their white supporters would actively engage in a wide variety of protests to achieve their ends of an integrated, just society.

The Election of 1960

By 1960 a new America was taking form, one very different from the nation of Dwight Eisenhower. It was a nation of automobiles and television sets, prosperity and consumption. The

presidential election of 1960 underscored the changes. Richard Nixon was the Republican candidate. A child of depression poverty, bootstrap ambitious and blindingly focused on victory, Nixon was an American prototype, a cross between Horatio Alger and Andrew Carnegie. The Democratic candidate was John F. Kennedy. Born Catholic and wealthy, he was handsome, socially at ease, but every bit as ambitious as Nixon. And he understood the new America better than Nixon. In several televised debates, Nixon labored to impress Americans with his grasp of statistics and the issues. On stage he appeared physically worked, and the sweat on his face seemed to prove as much. Kennedy just wanted to impress Americans with himself, with his charm, wit, and looks. In a close election, image won out over substance. Kennedy became the first elected president born in the twentieth century. In image and substance, he was a generation apart from Dwight Eisenhower.

Kennedy's margin of victory came from overwhelming support in the black community. On October 19, 1960, just three weeks before the election, Martin Luther King, Jr., and fifty other blacks had been arrested trying to desegregate the Magnolia Room of Rich's Department Store in Atlanta. Although the other blacks were released, King was tried, convicted and sentenced to four months hard labor at the Reidsville State Prison. Senator John F. Kennedy made a sympathy phone call to Coretta King, the reverend's wife, and Robert Kennedy, the senator's campaign manager and soon to be attorney-general of the United States, phoned a Georgia judge who secured King's release. The Democratic Party then distributed more than one million pamphlets to black churches explaining how the Kennedys had helped King. It worked. Jackie Robinson was impressed. "Do you suppose," he mused to a friend, "that we're actually going to have someone in the White House who will worry about black folk?"

CONCLUSION

The Cold War forced most Americans to reevaluate their most fundamental assumptions. World War II had robbed isolationism of its credibility and, in the nuclear age, had spawned a near Darwinian struggle for survival between the United States and the Soviet Union. Every region of the world became a potential battlefield between good and evil, between the light of democracy and capitalism and the darkness of communism. It was as if the United States had taken the Monroe Doctrine and tried to superimpose it on the entire planet, staking out each corner of the globe as an American sphere of influence and warning the Soviet Union to keep its distance. No single nation, regardless of its power and wealth, could carry such a burden indefinitely, but in the 1950s, the United States could not yet see any limits to its power.

Global issues inevitably intruded on domestic affairs. A booming economy reinforced American faith in the virtues of capitalism. Between 1945 and 1960, the U.S. gross national product more than doubled, from $215 billion to $440 billion, with consumers enjoying stable prices and workers finding jobs abundant. At the same time, a budding environmental movement forced Americans to consider the long-term effects of unbridled economic growth. Finally, the prevailing fear of the Soviet Union, with its heavy-handed bureaucracy and state-controlled economy, left most Americans wary of their own federal government and prevented liberals in Congress from extending the reach of the New Deal.

The Cold War also pushed Americans into a vigorous debate over civil liberties and civil rights. At home, misgivings about communism escalated from fear to paranoia, and Americans with left-wing political views often found themselves under special scrutiny and facing political persecution. The modern civil rights movement also emerged during the Cold War. To contrast American democracy with Soviet dictatorship, many people trafficked in the rhetoric of liberty and equality, which exposed in sharp detail the plight of African Americans in the United States. To condemn political oppression in the Soviet Union while tolerating racial discrimination at home smacked of hypocrisy, and civil rights activists made the most of it. Perhaps Jackie Robinson said it best, "I

cherish democratic ideals and have no faith in communism, but unless we can fulfill the promise for every American, I fear for the future of my country."

Lesson Eight

Write an annotated bibliography describing the main thesis (theses) of the following books:

Acuna, Rodolfo. *Occupied America: The Chicano's Struggle Toward Liberation*. 1972.
Aptheker, *American Negro Slave Revolts*. 1943.
Berlin, Ira. *Generations Gone: A History of African-American Slaves*. 2003.
Berlin, Ira. *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America.* 1998.
Bulosan. *America in the Heart: A Personal History*. 1946.
Brooks, James F. *Captives and Cousins: Slavery, Kinship, and Community*. 2002.
Cather, Willa. *My Antonia*. 1919.
Crimm, Caroline Castillo. *De Leon: A Tejano Family History*. 2003.
Crosby, Alfred W. *The Columbian Exchange: Biological and Cultural Consequences of 1492.* 1972.
Crosby, Alfred W. *Ecological Imperialism: The Biological Expansion of Europe, 900-1900.* 2004.
De Leon, Arnoldo. *The Tejano Community, 1836-1900*. 1982.
Elkins, Stanley. *Slavery: A Problem in American Institutional Life*. 1959.
Fogel, Robert W. And Stanley L. Engerman. *Time on the Cross: The Economics of American Negro Slavery*. 1974.
Genovese, Eugene. *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made*. 1974.
Guttmann, Herbert. *The Black Family in Slavery and Freedom.* 1976.
Handlin, Oscar. *The Uprooted*: *The Epic Story of the Great Migrations that Made the American People*. 1951.
Higham, John. *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1880-1925*. 1955.
Krech, Shepherd. *The Ecological Indian: Myths and History*. 1999.
McWilliams, Carey. *North From Mexico. 1949.*
Morgan, Edmund S. *American Slavery, American Freedom*. 1975.
Moynihan, Daniel Patrick. *The Moynihan Report*. 1966.
Olson, James S. *Equality Deferred: Race and Ethnicity in America Since 1945*. 2002.
Phillips, Ulrich B.
Puzo, Mario. *The Fortunate Pilgrim.* 1964.
Rawick, George. *From Sunup to Sundown: The Making of the Black Community*. 1972.
Richter, Daniel K. *Facing East from Indian Country*. 2001.
Rolvaag, Ole E. *Giants in the Earth.* 1927.
Rodriguez, Richard. *Hunger of Memory*: *The Education of Richard Rodriguez.* 1982.
Sinclair, Upton. *The Jungle*. 1906.
Stampp, Kenneth. *The Peculiar Institution: Slavery in the Antebellum South.* 1956.

Acuna, Rodolfo. *Occupied America: The Chicano's Struggle Toward Liberation*. 1972.

Aptheker, *American Negro Slave Revolts*. 1943.
Berlin, Ira. *Generations Gone: A History of African-American Slaves*. 2003.
Berlin, Ira. *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America.* 1998.
Bulosan. *America in the Heart: A Personal History*. 1946.
Brooks, James F. *Captives and Cousins: Slavery, Kinship, and Community*. 2002.
Cather, Willa. *My Antonia*. 1919.
Crimm, Caroline Castillo. *De Leon: A Tejano Family History*. 2003.
Crosby, Alfred W. *The Columbian Exchange: Biological and Cultural Consequences of 1492.* 1972.
Crosby, Alfred W. *Ecological Imperialism: The Biological Expansion of Europe, 900-1900.* 2004.
De Leon, Arnoldo. *The Tejano Community, 1836-1900*. 1982.
Elkins, Stanley. *Slavery: A Problem in American Institutional Life*. 1959.
Fogel, Robert W. And Stanley L. Engerman. *Time on the Cross: The Economics of American Negro Slavery*. 1974.
Genovese, Eugene. *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made*. 1974.
Guttmann, Herbert. *The Black Family in Slavery and Freedom*. 1976.
Handlin, Oscar. *The Uprooted*: *The Epic Story of the Great Migrations that Made the American People*. 1951.
Higham, John. *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1880-1925*. 1955.
Krech, Shepherd. *The Ecological Indian: Myths and History*. 1999.
McWilliams, Carey. *North From Mexico. 1949.*
Morgan, Edmund S. *American Slavery, American Freedom*. 1975.
Moynihan, Daniel Patrick. *The Moynihan Report*. 1966.
Olson, James S. *Equality Deferred: Race and Ethnicity in America Since 1945*. 2002.
Phillips, Ulrich B.
Puzo, Mario. *The Fortunate Pilgrim*. 1964.
Rawick, George. *From Sunup to Sundown: The Making of the Black Community*. 1972.
Richter, Daniel K. *Facing East from Indian Country*. 2001.
Rolvaag, Ole E. *Giants in the Earth*. 1927.
Rodriguez, Richard. *Hunger of Memory*: *The Education of Richard Rodriguez*. 1982.
Sinclair, Upton. *The Jungle*. 1906.
Stampp, Kenneth. *The Peculiar Institution: Slavery in the Antebellum South.* 1956.

Lesson 9

Each student, after consulting Dr. Olson, will write for publication an approximately 1,000 word essay which will be published in ***On the Move: An Encyclopedia of Immigration, Migration, and Nativism in United States History***