

PART FOUR

Civil War and Reconstruction, 1860–1877

INTRODUCTION: A DIVIDED NATION

Abraham Lincoln's election in November 1860 precipitated the secession crisis. Before the year was out, South Carolina, convinced that the results of the election meant the death knell of slavery, seceded from the Union. By the time Lincoln took the presidential oath to preserve and protect the Union on Inauguration Day, March 4, 1861, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Georgia, and Texas had all followed suit. The Civil War broke out on April 12, when Confederate batteries opened fire on Fort Sumter in Charleston harbor. With Lincoln's call for troops to put down the rebellion, Virginia, Tennessee, Arkansas, and North Carolina seceded and joined the Confederacy. Although anger and rage led many Americans to march eagerly off to make war on one another, their opinions were not unanimous. Thousands of citizens in both sections of the country did not go along with the patriotic fervor permeating North and South, and, in varying degrees, many of these people raised their voices in protest against the war. The nation was divided, but in that divide were further divisions.

At the outset, one of President Lincoln's primary concerns was to prevent the four remaining slave states from joining the Confederacy. Lincoln felt that if Maryland, Delaware, Kentucky, and Missouri all seceded, the "game would be up" and he would be unable to fulfill his presidential oath. The Union would be dissolved. When the governor and legislature of Maryland made noises about seceding, Abraham Lincoln wasted little time. Under the "writ of habeas corpus," it is unconstitutional to keep defendants imprisoned without filing charges against them; nevertheless, Lincoln, suspending the writ, had the 31 Maryland

legislators with secessionist leanings incarcerated. It was necessary, he explained, to bend the Constitution temporarily in order to preserve it. Naturally, this action met with a great deal of opposition, especially among the so-called "Peace Democrats," who opposed the war and were willing to let the South go if a compromise could not be negotiated. Ohio Congressman Clement L. Vallandigham was the most vocal member of the radical wing of Peace Democrats, the Copperheads.

In the South, too, there was opposition to the war. Southern dissenters were primarily those who lived in the mountain regions, where slavery had never been profitable, and who therefore did not own slaves. These mountain folk were not abolitionists (meaning they did not care one iota about black rights), but they deeply resented the economic and political power that slavery brought the lowland elite, and they were not willing to break up the Union to preserve slavery.

Both President Lincoln and President Jefferson Davis were hampered by enormous opposition to their policies and military strategy. In the Confederacy, as in the United States, there were scores of congressmen and generals in the army who believed they knew far more than their commanders-in-chief. Lincoln and Davis faced a barrage of savage criticism not only from them but also from their own cabinets and from the press.

Laws establishing conscription were resented by citizens in both the North and the South. Especially infuriating to many was the clause that allowed conscripts to pay substitutes to take their places. Above and below the Mason-Dixon line, people cynically complained that it was a "rich man's war and a poor man's fight." Some were sufficiently incensed that they did everything they could to avoid being drafted; some even encouraged men in the army to desert. The New York City draft riots of July 11-15, 1863, were a vivid and violent testimony to the fact that the North was not fully unified behind the effort to save the Union. A Pennsylvania newspaper quoted one anticonscription protestor as saying he'd fight for Uncle Sam "but not for Uncle Sambo." Many Northern workers, fearing job competition from freed blacks, viewed the Civil War as a no-win situation. For them, it made no sense to fight and die to free blacks, who would then compete with them in the labor market. For several days, thousands of protesting workers, many of them Irish immigrants, took to the streets and targeted the homes of the rich as well as the black neighborhoods of New York City. When the frenzied rioting ended (quelled only after exhausted Union troops arrived from Gettysburg), 105 people lay dead—many of them free blacks who had been strung up on lamp-posts and burned to death.

There were, however, people who dissented nonviolently. Quakers like Cyrus Pringle refused to fight on grounds of conscience and moral principles. Black soldiers in the Union army challenged their unequal treatment, especially with respect to the War Department's policy of paying them less than white soldiers, by engaging in an effective protest campaign of refusing all money until their salaries equaled that of their white comrades in arms.

At the end of the war, as Congress began dealing with the problem of reconstructing the Union, many of those who had fought against slavery now took up the cause of the rights of the freedmen. Civil rights, citizenship, and suffrage all became significant issues. Women, who had championed abolition and black rights, began to lobby more vigorously for women's suffrage and engaged energetically in the debate over the Fifteenth Amendment. There were high hopes that the amendment guaranteeing the right to vote would include *all* citizens. But when the Fifteenth Amendment extended the suffrage only to black men, the women's movement split into moderates who supported the amendment and radicals who denounced it and heatedly agitated against its ratification. For the next 50 years, women like Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, leading the National Woman's Suffrage Association; and Lucy Stone, leading the more moderate American Woman's Suffrage Association, carried on the struggle for suffrage.

During the 1870s, the issue of former slaves' civil and political rights began fading from public awareness. The fact that African American men now had the right to vote seemed to convince even the most ardent former abolitionists and advocates of civil rights that nothing more needed to be done to ease the transition of freedmen into the mainstream. Slaves were now free, black men could vote—what more was necessary? The nation's reply seemed to be "nothing." The presidential election of 1876 settled the issue. Although the Democratic candidate, New York Governor Samuel J. Tilden, won 51 percent of the popular vote, his 184 electoral votes were one shy of the majority he needed to be declared the victor. Twenty electoral votes from Florida, South Carolina, Louisiana, and Oregon were disputed, and those states submitted two sets of returns. From November 1876 to March 1877, an electoral commission debated how to resolve the issue. Democrats finally agreed, a few days before inauguration day, to acquiesce in granting all twenty of the disputed electoral votes to the Republican candidate, Rutherford B. Hayes. In return, Republicans agreed to several conditions, among which was the withdrawal of the remaining federal troops stationed in the South. This in effect ended Reconstruction. It removed the freedmen from the protection of the U.S. Army, put their fate into the hands of local politicians, and put conservative Southern Democrats back in power in the South. Southern state officials lost no time in establishing literacy tests and poll taxes to prevent freedmen from voting. They also set up Jim Crow apartheid, imposing the second-class citizenship on African Americans that would last for nearly a century.

In the aftermath of the Civil War, many Americans began moving west. The Homestead Act of 1862 and the completion of the Transcontinental Railroad in 1869 were two factors that made the West enormously attractive to many who sought to improve their lives after the tumult and dislocation of the Civil War. But as settlers poured into the Great Plains, erecting homesteads and wantonly killing the buffalo herds, the lives and livelihoods of Native Americans were so disrupted that Indian grievances and protests against white encroachment boiled over. In the Fort Laramie Treaty of 1868, the United States promised—in exchange for Sioux assurances not to attack whites traveling through the Great Plains—that the Black Hills

would forever belong to the Sioux. Sitting Bull and Crazy Horse, believing that whites could not be trusted, refused to abide by any treaty. In 1873, Sioux warriors loyal to Sitting Bull and Crazy Horse violated the treaty by hunting on lands off the Sioux reservation and by attacking survey parties belonging to the Northern Pacific Railroad. Lieutenant Colonel George Armstrong Custer skirmished twice with these Indians while escorting Northern Pacific Railroad personnel, and because of this, the U.S. government sent him the following year to survey the Black Hills. The encroachment of Custer's Seventh Cavalry Regiment in the Black Hills deeply angered the Sioux, while simultaneously the Grant administration, eager to make the Black Hills safe for gold hunters, issued an ultimatum to all nontreaty Sioux to report to their agencies during the winter of 1875-1876. In March 1876, after a U.S. Army column attacked a Cheyenne camp, the Cheyenne joined up with Crazy Horse and Sitting Bull. The Arapaho also joined the Lakota and Cheyenne once the war had begun. The greatest Indian victory of the plains wars took place in June 1876 on the banks of the Greasy Grass in eastern Montana—whites called it the Little Big Horn—when Custer and the 210 officers and men under his immediate command, were wiped out by Sitting Bull and Crazy Horse's confederation. But Custer's Last Stand was, in reality, one of the final blows for Indian hopes to maintain their way of life. Washington cracked down so severely that in spite of the Nez Percé's heroic run for freedom in 1877 and continued skirmishes with the Cheyenne and the Apache well into the 1880s, Indian resistance was effectively subdued.

Clement L. Vallandigham (1820-1871)

When the Civil War broke out, there was a great deal of antiwar dissent in the North. Northern Democrats divided into two factions: War Democrats favored a war (if necessary) to preserve the Union but not to abolish slavery. Peace Democrats were unwilling to go to war even if it meant the dissolution of the Union; if negotiations could save the Union, fine, but if not, then so be it. The most radical faction of the Peace Democrats, irrevocably opposed to war, were derisively labeled Copperheads by Republicans. By equating them with poisonous snakes, the Republicans were declaring that the Peace Democrat stance was unmistakably treasonous.

The most notorious Copperhead was Ohio Congressman Clement L. Vallandigham, who, from the moment Lincoln was inaugurated on March 4, opposed the administration's policies that, he was convinced, would lead only to war. Vallandigham wanted to preserve the Union but not through war. He argued that compromise and negotiation would work and that the Union would prevail. Once war broke out, he became particularly concerned with Lincoln's policies for stifling secessionist and antiwar

sentiment, policies Vallandigham believed, that would destroy the civil liberties guaranteed by the Constitution. Throughout the Civil War, Vallandigham was a thorn in the side of the Lincoln administration. In 1863, after Vallandigham declared in a fiery speech that Lincoln's agenda was not to save the Union but merely to free the blacks and enslave the whites, he was arrested, tried, and convicted by a military court. (Lincoln saw to it, however, that rather than serving his sentence, Vallandigham was deported to the Confederacy.) Soon thereafter, Vallandigham went to Canada and from there campaigned for governor of Ohio. He lost the election, but Lincoln, in order to defuse negative public opinion, shrewdly allowed the Copperhead to return the following year to Ohio, where, with the end of the war in sight, the furor around him subsided.

As a congressman, Vallandigham accused Lincoln of abusing his constitutional authority by issuing a call for recruits and proclaimed that the president was a tyrant. He was especially alarmed by Lincoln's disregard for free speech and civil liberties and by his suspension of habeas corpus—an act that Lincoln himself admitted was overstepping his constitutional authority. Lincoln's view was that he had to "bend" the Constitution temporarily in order to save it. (For more of Vallandigham's attack on Lincoln, see the full edition of Dissent in America: The Voices That Shaped a Nation.)

RESPONSE TO LINCOLN'S ADDRESS TO CONGRESS, JULY 10, 1861

... Sir, the Constitution not only confines to Congress the right to declare war, but expressly provides that "Congress (not the President) shall have power to raise and support armies," and to "provide and maintain a navy." In pursuance of this authority, Congress, years ago, had fixed the number of officers, and of the regiments, of the different kinds of service; and also, the number of ships, officers, marines, and seamen which should compose the navy. Not only that, but Congress has repeatedly, within the last five years, refused to increase the regular army. More than that still: in February and March last, the House, upon several test votes, repeatedly and expressly refused to authorize the President to accept the service of volunteers for the very purpose of protecting the public property, enforcing the laws, and collecting the revenue. And, yet, the President, of his own mere will and authority, and without the shadow of right, has proceeded to increase, and has increased, the standing army by twenty-five thousand men; the navy by eighteen thousand; and has called for, and accepted the services of, forty regiments of volunteers for three years, numbering forty-two thousand men, and making thus a grand army, or military force, raised by executive proclamation alone, without the

SOURCE: Clement L. Vallandigham, *The Record of Hon. C. L. Vallandigham on Abolition, the Union, and the Civil War* (Cincinnati: J. Walter, 1863), passim.

sanction of Congress, without warrant of law, and in direct violation of the Constitution, and of his oath of office, of eighty-five thousand soldiers enlisted for three and five years, and already in the field. And, yet, the President now asks us to support the army which he has thus raised, to ratify his usurpations by a law ex post facto, and thus to make ourselves parties to our own degradation, and to his infractions of the Constitution. Meanwhile, however, he has taken good care not only to enlist the men, organize the regiments, and muster them into service, but to provide, in advance, for a horde of forlorn, worn-out, and broken-down politicians of his own party, by appointing, either by himself, or through the Governors of the States, major-generals, brigadier-generals, colonels, lieutenant-colonels, majors, captains, lieutenants, adjutants, quarter-masters, and surgeons, without any limit as to numbers, and without so much as once saying to Congress, "By your leave, gentlemen."

Beginning with this wide breach of the Constitution, this enormous usurpation of the most dangerous of all powers—the power of the sword—other infractions and assumptions were easy; and after public liberty, private right soon fell. The privacy of the telegraph was invaded in the search after treason and traitors; although it turns out, significantly enough, that the only victim, so far, is one of the appointees and especial pets of the Administration. The telegraphic dispatches, preserved under every pledge of secrecy for the protection and safety of the telegraph companies, were seized and carried away without search-warrant, without probable cause, without oath, and without description of the places to be searched, or of the things to be seized, and in plain violation of the right of the people to be secure in their houses, persons, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures. One step more, sir, will bring upon us search and seizure of the public mails; and, finally, as in the worst days of English oppression—as in the times of the Russells and the Sydneys of English martyrdom—of the drawers and secretaries of the private citizen; though even then tyrants had the grace to look to the forms of the law, and the execution was judicial murder, not military slaughter. But who shall say that the future Tiberius of America shall have the modesty of his Roman predecessor, in extenuation of whose character it is written by the great historian, *averti oculos, jussitque scelera non spectavit*.

Sir, the rights of property having been thus wantonly violated, it needed but a little stretch of usurpation to invade the sanctity of the person; and a victim was not long wanting. A private citizen of Maryland, not subject to the rules and articles of war—not in a case arising in the land or naval forces, nor in the militia, when in actual service—is seized in his own house, in the dead hour of the night, not by any civil officer, nor upon any civil process, but by a band of armed soldiers, under the verbal orders of a military chief, and is ruthlessly torn from his wife and his children, and hurried off to a fortress of the United States—and that fortress, as if in mockery, the very one over whose ramparts had floated that star-spangled banner immortalized in song by the patriot prisoner, who, "by dawn's early light," saw its folds gleaming amid the wreck of battle, and invoked the blessings of heaven upon it, and prayed that it might long wave "o'er the land of the free, and the home of the brave."

And, sir, when the highest judicial officer of the land, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, upon whose shoulders, "when the judicial ermine fell, it touched nothing not as spotless as itself," the aged, the venerable, the gentle, and pure-minded Taney, who, but a little while before, had administered to the President the oath to support the Constitution, and to execute the laws, issued, as by law it was his sworn duty to issue, the high prerogative writ of habeas corpus—that great writ of right, that main bulwark of personal liberty, commanding the body of the accused to be brought before him, that justice and right might be done by due course of law, and without denial or delay, the gates of the fortress, its cannon turned towards, and in plain sight of the city, where the court sat, and frowning from its ramparts, were closed against the officer of the law, and the answer returned that the officer in command has, by the authority of the President, suspended the writ of habeas corpus. And thus it is, sir, that the accused has ever since been held a prisoner without due process of law, without bail, without presentment by a grand jury, without speedy, or public trial by a petit jury, of his own State or district, or any trial at all, without information of the nature and cause of the accusation; without being confronted with the witnesses against him; without compulsory process to obtain witnesses in his favor; and without the assistance of counsel for his defense. And this is our boasted American liberty? And thus it is, too, sir, that here, here in America, in the seventy-third year of the Republic, that great writ and security of personal freedom, which it cost the patriots and freemen of England six hundred years of labor and toil and blood to extort and to hold fast from venal judges and tyrant kings; written in the great charter of Runnymede by the iron barons, who made the simple Latin and uncouth words of the times, *nullus liber homo*, in the language of Chatham, worth all the classics; recovered and confirmed a hundred times afterward, as often as violated and stolen away, and finally, and firmly secured at last by the great act of Charles II, and transferred thence to our own Constitution and laws, has been wantonly and ruthlessly trampled in the dust. Ay, sir, that great writ, bearing, by a special command of Parliament, those other uncouth, but magic words, *per statutum tricessimo primo Caroli secundi regis*, which no English judge, no English minister, no king or queen of England, dare disobey; that writ, brought over by our fathers, and cherished by them, as a priceless inheritance of liberty, an American President has contemptuously set at defiance. Nay, more, he has ordered his subordinate military chiefs to suspend it at their discretion! And, yet, after all this, he coolly comes before this House and the Senate and the country, and pleads that he is only preserving and protecting the Constitution; and demands and expects of this House and of the Senate and the country their thanks for his usurpations; while, outside of this capitol, his myrmidons are clamoring for impeachment of the Chief Justice, as engaged in a conspiracy to break down the Federal Government.

Sir, however much necessity—the tyrant's plea—may be urged in extenuation of the usurpations and infractions of the President in regard to public liberty, there can be no such apology or defense for his invasions of private right. What overruling necessity required the violation of the sanctity of private

property and private confidence? What great public danger demanded the arrest and imprisonment, without trial by common law, of one single private citizen, for an act done weeks before, openly, and by authority of his State? If guilty of treason, was not the judicial power ample enough and strong enough for his conviction and punishment? What, then, was needed in his case, but the precedent under which other men, in other places, might become the victims of executive suspicion and displeasure?

As to the pretense, sir, that the President has the Constitutional right to suspend the writ of habeas corpus, I will not waste time in arguing it. The case is as plain as words can make it. It is a legislative power; it is found only in the legislative article; it belongs to Congress only to do it. Subordinate officers have disobeyed it; General Wilkinson disobeyed it, but he sent his prisoners on for judicial trial; General Jackson disobeyed it, and was reprimanded by James Madison; but no President, nobody but Congress, ever before assumed the right to suspend it. And, sir, that other pretense of necessity, I repeat, can not be allowed. It had no existence in fact. The Constitution can not be preserved by violating it. It is an offense to the intelligence of this House, and of the country, to pretend that all this, and the other gross and multiplied infractions of the Constitution and usurpations of power were done by the President and his advisors out of pure love and devotion to the Constitution. But if so, sir, then they have but one step further to take, and declare, in the language of Sir Boyle Roche, in the Irish House of Commons, that such is the depth of their attachment to it, that they are prepared to give up, not merely a part, but the whole of the Constitution, to preserve the remainder. And yet, if indeed this pretext of necessity be well founded, then let me say, that a cause which demands the sacrifice of the Constitution and of the dearest securities of property, liberty, and life, can not be just; at least, it is not worth the sacrifice....

William Brownlow (1805-1877)

Although he supported the institution of slavery, Tennessee newspaper publisher and Methodist preacher William G. ("Parson") Brownlow became one of the most outspoken and acerbic opponents of secession in the South. His influence in eastern Tennessee was so powerful that Union sentiment remained very high in that part of the state throughout the war. In May 1861, shortly before Tennessee seceded from the Union, Parson Brownlow published a statement in his paper, the Knoxville Whig, adamantly asserting his right to fly the American flag, even though his view was the minority opinion in secessionist Tennessee. As a result, his newspaper was suppressed, his press was destroyed, and he was tried

for treason against the Confederacy. Like Vallandigham in the North, he was eventually banished behind enemy lines. In a sense, he can be regarded as Jefferson Davis's Vallandigham. (For more on Brownlow see the full edition of Dissent in America: The Voices That Shaped a Nation.)

KNOXVILLE WHIG ANTISECESSION EDITORIAL, May 25, 1861

It is known to this community and to the people of this county that I have had the Stars and Stripes, in the character of a small flag, floating over my dwelling, in East Knoxville, since February. This flag has become very offensive to certain leaders of the Secession party in this town, and to certain would-be leaders, and the more so as it is about the only one of the kind floating in the city. Squads of troops, from three to twenty, have come over to my house, within the last several days, cursing the flag in front of my house, and threatening to take it down, greatly to the annoyance of my wife and children. No attack has been made upon it, and consequently we have had no difficulty. It is due to the Tennessee troops to say that they have never made any such demonstrations. Other troops from the Southern States, passing on to Virginia, have been induced to do so, by certain cowardly, sneaking, white-livered scoundrels, residing here, who have not the *mel* to undertake what they urge strangers to do. One of the Louisiana squads proclaimed in front of my house, on Thursday, that they were told to take it down by citizens of Knoxville.

Now, I wish to say a few things to the public in connection with this subject. This flag is private property, upon a private dwelling, in a State that has *never voted herself out of the Union* or into the Southern Confederacy, and is therefore lawfully and constitutionally under these same Stars and Stripes I have floating over my house. Until the State, by her citizens, through the ballot-box, changes her Federal relations, her citizens have a right to fling this banner to the breeze. Those who are in rebellion against the Government represented by the Stars and Stripes have up the Rebel flag, and it is a high piece of work to deny loyal citizens of the Union the privilege of displaying their colors!

But there is one other feature of this tyranny and of these mobocratic assaults I wish to lay before the people, irrespective of parties. There are but a few of the leaders of this Secession movement in Knoxville—less than half a dozen—for whom I entertain any sort of respect, or whose good opinions I esteem. With one of these I had a free and full conversation, more than two weeks ago, in regard to this whole question. I told him that we Union men would make the best fight we could at the ballot-box, on the 8th of June, to keep the State in the Union; but that if we were overpowered, and a majority of the

people of the State should say in this constitutional way that she must secede, we should have to come down, and bring our flags with us, bowing to the will of the majority with the best grace we could. I made the same statement to the colonel who got up a regiment here, and to one of his subordinate officers. I made the same statement to the president of the railroad, and I have repeatedly made the same statement through my paper. The whole Secession party here know this to be the position and purpose of the Union party; but a portion of them seek to bring about personal conflicts, and to engage strangers, under the influence of whiskey, to do a dirty and villainous work they have the meanness to do, without the courage.

If these God-forsaken scoundrels and hell-deserving assassins want satisfaction out of me for what I have said about them—and it has been no little—they can find me on these streets every day of my life but Sunday. I am at all times prepared to give them satisfaction. I take back nothing I have ever said against the corrupt and unprincipled villains, but reiterate all, cast it in their dastardly faces, and hurl down their lying throats their own infamous calumnies.

Finally, the destroying of my small flag or of my town-property is a small matter. The carrying out of the State upon the mad wave of Secession is also a small matter, compared with the great PRINCIPLE involved. Sink or swim, live or die, survive or perish, I am a Union man, and owe my allegiance to the Stars and Stripes of my country. Nor can I, in any possible contingency, have any respect for the Government of the Confederate States, originating as it did with, and being controlled by, the worst men in the South. And any man saying—whether of high or low degree—that I am an Abolitionist or a Black Republican, is a LIAR and a SCOUNDREL.

The Arkansas Peace Society

Just as there was antiwar sentiment in the North during the Civil War, a large number of Southerners resisted the war. Indeed, during the first year of the Civil War, Confederate authorities became aware of a secret antiwar organization in Arkansas. More than a thousand Unionists opposed to secession had formed the Arkansas Peace Society in 1861, vowing to resist the war effort. But Confederate authorities got wind of the society, and hundreds of people were arrested and forced either to stand trial for treason or to suffer conscription into the Confederate army. Many of those impressed into Confederate service wound up deserting to Union lines at the first opportunity. (More documents are in the full edition of Dissent in America: The Voices That Shaped a Nation.)

ARKANSAS PEACE SOCIETY DOCUMENTS, 1861

IZARD COUNTY COMMITTEE OF INVESTIGATION

To His Excellency H. M. Rector Govr. and Prest. Military Board of the State of Arkansas. . . .

Some ten days ago it became a matter of publicity in this county that a secret conspiracy against the laws and liberties of the people of this state was on foot extending from Fulton county this State quite through this and perhaps Searcy and Van Buren Counties.

Immediately the citizens of this county were in arms to quell the same. Scouting parties were sent out in every direction in search of those suspected of having connections with the organization; and a committee of investigation was elected to enquire into the existence, objects, and purposes of the aforesaid secret conspiracy which committee is composed of the undersigned, who have proceeded to examine and have examined all the persons apprehended and brought before us all of whose names are hereto attached.

And after a full and fair investigation of the matter with all the lights before us, we find that the persons above named together with others we have not found, had formed themselves into a secret organization having a constitution and by laws and secret signs a copy of which constitution is herewith submitted to your excellency and marked A. and we considered that the organization is a secret thing dangerous in its operations and subversive of the rights and liberties of the people of this State, and of the Confederate States; and if not treason itself, at least treasonable, and being acquainted with most if not all of the persons examined, and many of them being young, mere boys, who were doubtless led ignorantly into the society, that is led into it not being informed of its objects and purposes, and feeling willing in our minds that they should wipe out the foul stain, by enlisting in the service of the Confederate States for and during the war, we accordingly gave them an opportunity of so enlisting, whereupon the whole of them, that is to say forty seven the same whose names are hereunto attached immediately enrolled their names as volunteers in the Confederate Service for and during the war. This we think is a matter of lenity toward them and that they may possibly do good service to our country. They leave here as soon as transportation can be had, for Genl Borland's headquarters at Pocahontas Ark. Should it appear to your Excellency that we have not taken the proper steps in this matter we have reserved the right of your Excellency to do with them as you may deem proper, and have so informed Genl Borland with regard thereto. . . .

Sylamore Ark Nov 28 1861

SOURCE: Ted R. Worley, ed., "Documents Relating to the Arkansas Peace Society of 1861," *The Arkansas Historical Quarterly*, vol. 17, Spring 1958, no. 1. The original documents are located in the Kie Oldham Collection, at the Arkansas History Commission.

CONSTITUTION OF THE MILL CREEK PEACE ORGANIZATION SOCIETY

We the undersigned subscribers agree to form ourselves into an association call and known by the name and style of the Mill Creek peace organization society. Self preservation being an undisputed natural right, and the right of communities to combine together for the mutual protection of themselves their families and their property being well established. This being the sole purpose for which we met for this purpose alone we do adopt the following resolutions by which we expect to be governed in all our proceedings.

Resolved 1st. That each member before entering into this society shall take an oath as follows I do solemnly swear in the presence of Almighty God and these witnesses that I will well and truly keep all the secrets of this society that I will ever hail always conceal and never reveal anything. I will on the shortest notice go to the assistance of any other brother So help me God.

2nd As it is a matter of life or death with us any member of this society who shall betray to our enemies the existence of this society he shall forfeit his life and it shall be the duty of each member of this society having received knowledge of such betrayal to forthwith inform the brethren each of whose duty it shall be to follow such traitor and take his life at the price of their own. The manner of admitting members shall be in strict accordance with the foregoing preamble and resolutions and by such members as the society may select.

COMMITMENT OF PRISONERS IN CARROLL COUNTY JUSTICE OF PEACE COURT

Head Quarters Battalion Arkansas Cavalry Volunteers Camp Culloden Carroll County, Arks Dec 9, 1861

Now on this day it is ordered by Honbles Kelly Featherston and William Owens associate justices of this county of Carroll Arkansas, sitting as a Court of Enquiry & Investigation into a certain secret Treasonable and Insurrectionary Society said to exist in this and the adjoining counties of the State of Arkansas and which society is said to be held together by secret oaths signed and pass words with the penalty of Death attached if revealed.

That the following named persons be committed for further trial and that Capt Jno R. H. Scott commanding Battalion Arks Cavalry Volunteers C. S. A be requested to convey them or have them conveyed under guard to Little Rock. . . .

HEAD QUARTERS BURROWSVILLE, 11ARK. DEC 9TH, [1861]

To His Excellency H. M. Rector Gov. of Ark.

Dear Sir:

I have this day ordered the prisoners under my care at this place to take up the line of march to Little Rock under a guard of one hundred Soldiers commanded by Lt. Brevet Lieut Col A. Ham, Maj John Bradshaw, and Agt Mager Jesse

Cypert. I have no testimony only the testimony of the prisoners in their own confessions. You will call on Brev. Lieut. Col. Ham, Maj Bra[dl]shaw, and Adj. Maj Cypert, they can point out to you such other testimony as would become necessary, the most of the prisoners came in and surrendered, acknowledging their guilt and willing to Bide by the Law of their country, there is several men implicated in this seacret order skulking about in the woods and have not been arrested. I will do all I can to have then taken and brought to Justice. It seems as if the Whole County have become ingaged in this matter to some Extent, and but for the timely discovery of it there is no telling what the can cequence would have been. Men who was considered to be amongst our best citizes has acknowledged them selves to be members of this secret order, said by some to be a home guard, by others home protection. I called on Capt Scott commanding Squadron at Camp Colodn Carroll Co. Capt Scott informs me that he would give me the aid as fer and sent a portion of his command into this and Last Week arrested several men and carrying them to his head quarters and has them in his care and informed me that he would convey them to Little Rock. So soon as I think it safe to do so I will disband the men that I ordered into service. I have been sick for the last twelve [days] not able to attend to any kind of business and am just now able to sit up and write consequently I am not prepared any report at this time. Any instructions that you think [I] should have you will please Informe by Brevet Lieut Col Ham. I also send you a list of the names of the persons I have retained three prisoners here that could [not] travle on account of their health So soon as [I can] I will send them to Little Rock unless you see proper to order some other disposition made of them.

Respectfully your Obt serv Sam Leslie Col Commanding 45th Reg
Arkansas Militia

TESTIMONY OF PETER TYLER ON THE PEACE SOCIETY

Head Qrs Battalion Arks Cav Volunteers Camp Culloden Carroll Co. Arkansas Decr. 18th, 1861 The State of Arkansas Vs Knowledge of and identity with Secret Treasonable and Insurrectionary Society Peter Tyler and Isaiah Ezell

Before the Honble Kelly Featherston Justice of the Peace within and for the County of Carroll State of Arkansas

Personally came and appeared Peter A. Tyler party in the above action said to have a knowledge of and perhaps Identity with a certain secret society hold together by certain oaths signs Tokens pass word &c & the revelation of which subjected its members to the punishment of death and upon his own voluntary request makes the following acknowledgments in relations to the matter and things wherof he has knowledge.

I am a member of a certain secret society represented to me by Long and D. Jamison who initiated me into the society in company with Samuel Grinder and Josiah Lane all taking the oath & receiving the signs tokens and pass words from Jamison at one & the same time about three weeks ago more or less as a "home protection" society and that there was no harm in it but to protect our selves our families & property and that it came from the North and that it was all over the South.

I told him I was no northern man what I have is here and he said it was for home protection & after he administered the oath to me & grinder & lane he then gave me and them the signs tokens and pass words, which as well as I remember are as follows. The first sign was placing the three fingers of the left hand angling across the nose the answer was carelessly feeling under the chin with one of the hands. The next sign was to place one finger in the shirt collar I believe left hand and the answer was to put the right hand on the left breast. The next was to raise the hat with one hand and place it back on the head the answer was turn the back to the person moving the hat.

A token was in meeting after night on speaking if anyone was with him you said "It was a very dark night" and the answer would be "Not so dark as it will be in the morning." One sign was to hang up in the front door of the house a piece of red ribbon, calico, or flannel. Another token was when they were separate to get together was to Hoot like and Owl, and the answer was to howl like a wolf I think. I heard somewhere after the noise commenced about it that it came from Washington City but Jamison did not tell me if I recollect right he said to me it was for protection when invaded by robbers, I gave the paper or obligation to David Curry & told him to take care of it for it might be of an advantage to them. I & Sam Grinder & Jo Lane were all sworn in by Jamison at the same time, and after that I rode around among the boys & swore in the following persons as members to wit Isaiah Ezell, David Curry, Peter Reeves, [and many others]. . . . I told Jamison I was not no northern man all I had was here. I told him I did not like the oath he said there was nothing wrong about it & he did not want any thing said about it, wanted it secret not to tell any body of it although it was all over the South or something to this amount. All those named above & my self and Grinder & Lane all held up our right hands when the obligations recd by us and given to them by me, all of which I am ready [to] and here verify. P. A. Tyler. Sworn and subscribed to before me this 18th day of December 1861 Kelly Featherston, J. P.

It is ordered here by this court that the said P. A. Tyler above named be committed for further trial and that he be conveyed to the city of Little Rock and surrendered to the Governor of the State of Arkansas and that he be placed in the hands of Capt'n Jno R. H. Scott commanding Squadron Arks Cavalry Volunteers C. S. A. with a request that he send him under guard to the City of Little Rock with such number of means he may deem sufficient to prevent his escape from custody in accordance with this order. Given under my hand and seal this 18th day of December 1861 Kelly Featherston, J. P.

Joseph E. Brown (1821-1894)

Not only in the North did concerned citizens protest their government's tendency to step on civil liberties during the wartime emergency. In the South, too, many people were critical of the Confederacy's disregard of civil

liberties and its fondness for martial law. One of the ironies of the Civil War is that the Confederacy, in order to strengthen the war effort, which it claimed was to preserve and defend the principle of states' rights, was obliged to extend the power of the central government in Richmond. In this way, the Confederacy began to resemble the Union it was fighting against. In the first selection here, Georgia Governor Joseph E. Brown, in an 1864 address delivered to the Georgia State Legislature, denounces conscription and the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus. Brown was a Jacksonian Democrat who so staunchly defended states' rights that it could be argued that he was a hindrance to Jefferson Davis and the Confederate government, damaging the South's chances of winning the war. To Brown, martial law decreed by the Davis government infringed on both states' rights and individual rights.

MESSAGE TO THE LEGISLATURE, MARCH 10, 1864

THE NEW MILITIA ORGANIZATION AND CONSCRIPTION

At this stage in our proceedings, we are met with formidable obstacles, thrown in our way by the late act of Congress, which subjects those between 17 and 50 to enrollment as Conscripts, for Confederate service. This act of Congress proposes to take from the State, as was done on a former occasion, her entire military force, who belong to the active list, and to leave her without a force, in the different counties, sufficient to execute her laws or suppress servile insurrection. Our Supreme Court has ruled, that the Confederate government has the power to raise armies by conscription, but it has not decided that it also has the power to enroll the whole population of the State who remain at home, so as to place the whole people under the military control of the Confederate government, and thereby take from the States all command over their own citizens, to execute their own laws, and place the internal police regulations of the States in the hands of the President. It is one thing to "raise armies," and another, and quite a different thing, to put the whole population at home under military law, and compel every man to obtain a military detail, upon such terms as the central government may dictate, and to carry a military pass in his pocket while he cultivates his farm, or attends to his other necessary avocations at home.

Neither a planter nor an overseer engaged upon the farm, nor a blacksmith making agricultural implements, nor a miller grinding for the people at home, belongs to, or constitutes any part of the armies of the Confederacy; and there is not the shadow of Constitutional power, vested in the Confederate government, for conscribing and putting these classes, and others engaged in home pursuits, under military rule, while they remain at home to discharge these duties.

SOURCE: *Message of His Excellency Joseph E. Brown, to the Extra Session of the Legislature, Convened March 10th, 1864. . . .* (Milledgeville, GA: Boughton, Nisbet, Barnes & Moore, 1864), 11-21.

If conscription were constitutional as a means of raising armies by the Confederate government, it could not be constitutional to conscribe those not *actually* needed, and to be *employed* in the army, and the constitutional power to "raise armies," could never carry with it the power in Congress to conscribe the whole people, who are not needed for the armies, but are left at home, because more useful there, and place them under military government and compel them to get military details to plough in their fields, shoe their farm horses, or to go to mill.

Conscription carried to this extent, is the essence of military despotism; placing all civil rights in a state of subordination to military power, and putting the personal freedom of each individual, in civil life, at the will of the chief of the military power. But it may be said that conscription may act upon one class as legally as another, and that all classes are equally subject to it. This is undoubtedly true. If the government has a right to conscribe at all, it has a right to conscribe persons of all classes, till it has raised enough to supply its armies. But it has no right to go farther and conscribe all, who are, by its own consent, to remain at home to make supplies. If it considers supplies necessary, somebody must make them, and those who do it, being no part of the army, should be exempt from conscription, and the annoyance of military dictation, while engaged in civil, and not military pursuits.

If all between 17 and 50 are to be enrolled and placed in constant military service, we must conquer the enemy while we are consuming our present crop of provisions, or we are ruined; as it will be impossible for the old men over 50, and the boys under 17, to make supplies enough to feed our armies and people another year. I think every practical man in the Confederacy who knows anything about our agricultural interests and resources, will readily admit this. If, on the other hand, it is not the intention to put those between 17 and 18, and between 45 and 50, into service, as *soldiers*, but to leave them at home to produce supplies, and occasionally to do police and other duties, within the State, which properly belong to the militia of a State; or in other words, if it is the intention simply to take the control of them from the State, so as to deprive her of all power, and leave her without sufficient force to execute her own laws, or suppress servile insurrection, and place the whole militia of the State, not needed for constant service, in the Confederate armies, under the control of the President, while engaged in their civil pursuits, the act, is unconstitutional and oppressive, and ought not to be executed.

If the act is executed in this State, it deprives her of her whole *active* militia, as Congress has so shaped it as to include the identical persons embraced in the act passed at your late session, and to transfer the control of them all from the State to the Confederate government.

The State has already enrolled these persons under the solemn act of her Legislature, for her own defense, and it is a question for you to determine, whether the necessities of the State, her sovereignty and dignity, and justice to those who are to be affected by the act, do not forbid that she should permit her organization to be broken up, and her means of self-preservation to be taken out of her hands. If this is done, what will be our condition? I prefer to answer by adopting the language of the present able and patriotic Governor of Virginia: "A sovereign State without a soldier, and without the dignity of strength—stripped of all her men, and with

only the form and pageantry of power—would indeed be nothing more than a wretched dependency, to which I should grieve to see our proud old Commonwealth reduced...."

CONFLICT WITH THE CONFEDERATE GOVERNMENT

But it may be said that an attempt to maintain the rights of the State will produce conflict with the Confederate Government. I am aware that there are those who, from motives not necessary to be here mentioned, are ever ready to raise the cry of *conflict*, and to criticise and condemn the action of Georgia, in every case where her constituted authorities protest against the encroachments of the central power, and seek to maintain her dignity and sovereignty as a State, and the constitutional rights and liberties of her people.

Those who are unfriendly to State sovereignty, and desire to consolidate all power in the hands of the Confederate Government, hoping to promote their undertaking by operating upon the fears of the timid, after each new aggression upon the constitutional rights of the States, fill the newspaper presses with the cry of *conflict*, and warn the people to beware of those who seek to maintain their constitutional rights, as *agitators* or *partisans* who may embarrass the Confederate Government in the prosecution of the war.

Let not the people be deceived by this false clamor. It is the same cry of *conflict* which the Lincoln Government raised against all who defended the rights of the Southern States against its tyranny. It is the cry which the usurpers of power have ever raised against those who rebuke their encroachments and refuse to yield to their aggressions....

SUSPENSION OF THE HABEAS CORPUS

I cannot withhold the expression of the deep mortification I feel at the late action of Congress, in attempting to suspend the privilege of the writ of *Habeas Corpus*, and to confer upon the President powers expressly denied to him by the Constitution of the Confederate States. Under pretext of a *necessity* which our whole people know does not exist in this case whatever may have been the motives, our Congress, with the assent, and at the *request* of the Executive, has struck a fell blow at the liberties of these States.

The Constitution of the Confederate States declares that, "The privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus* shall not be suspended, unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it." The power to suspend the *habeas corpus* at all, is derived, not from express and direct delegation, but from implication only, and an implication can never be raised in opposition to an express restriction. In case of any conflict between the two, an implied power must always yield to express restrictions upon its exercise. The power to suspend the privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus* derived by implication, must therefore be always limited by the *express* declaration in the Constitution that:

"The right of the people to be secure in their *persons*, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated;

and *no warrants shall issue* but upon probable cause, supported by *oath or affirmation*, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the *persons* or things to be seized," and the further declaration that, "no person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law."

And that,

"In all *criminal prosecutions* the accused shall enjoy the right of a *speedy* and public trial by an *impartial jury* of the State or District where the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law; and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor; and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense."

Thus it is an express guaranty of the Constitution, that the "*persons*" of the people shall be secure, and "*no warrants* shall issue," but upon probable cause, supported by "*oath or affirmation*," particularly describing "*the persons* to be seized;" that, "*no person* shall be deprived of *liberty*, without due process of law," and that, in "all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right of a *speedy* and *public* trial, by an *impartial jury*..."

The only suspension of the privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus*, known to our Constitution, and compatible with the provisions already stated, goes to the simple extent of preventing the release, under it, of persons whose arrests have been ordered under constitutional warrants from judicial authority. To this extent the Constitution allows the suspension, in case of rebellion or invasion, in order that the accused may be certainly and safely held for trial; but Congress has no right, under pretext of exercising this power, to authorize the President to make *illegal arrests*, prohibited by the Constitution; and when Congress has attempted to confer such powers on the President, if he should order such illegal arrests, it would be the imperative duty of the judges, who have solemnly sworn to support the Constitution, to disregard such unconstitutional legislation, and grant relief to persons so illegally imprisoned; and it would be the duty of the Legislative and Executive departments of the States to sustain and protect the judiciary in the discharge of this obligation.

By an examination of the act of Congress, now under consideration, it will be seen that it is not an act to suspend the privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus* in case of warrants issued by *judicial authority*; but the main purpose of the act seems to be to authorize the President to issue warrants, supported by neither *oath nor affirmation*, and to make arrests of persons not in military service, upon charges of a nature proper for investigation in the judicial tribunals only, and to prevent the Courts from inquiring into such arrests, or granting relief against such illegal usurpations of power, which are in direct and palpable violation of the Constitution....

This then is not an act to suspend the privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus*, in the manner authorized by implication by the Constitution; but it is an act to authorize the President to make *illegal and unconstitutional arrests*, in cases which the Constitution gives to the judiciary, and denies to the Executive; and to prohibit all judicial interference for the relief of the citizen, when tyrannized over by illegal arrest, under letters *de cachet* issued by Executive authority.

Instead of the legality of the arrest being examined in the judicial tribunals appointed by the Constitution, it is to be examined in the Confederate Star Chamber; that is, by *officers* appointed by the President. Why say that the "*President shall cause proper officers* to investigate" the legality of arrests ordered by him? Why not permit the Judges, whose constitutional right and duty it is to do it?

We are witnessing with too much indifference assumptions of power by the Confederate Government which in ordinary times would arouse the whole country to indignant rebuke and stern resistance. History teaches us that submission to one encroachment upon constitutional liberty is always followed by another; and we should not forget that important rights, yielded to those in power, without rebuke or protest, are never recovered by the people without revolution....

When such bold strides towards military despotism and absolute authority, are taken, by those in whom we have confided, and who have been placed in high official position to guard and protect constitutional and personal liberty, it is the duty of every patriotic citizen to sound the alarm, and of the State Legislatures to say, in thunder tones, to those who assume to govern us by absolute power, that there is a point beyond which freemen will not permit encroachments to go....

Cyrus Pringle (1838-1911)

Throughout history, dissenters have opposed war for a variety of reasons. Often the reasons are political and connected to a specific war, such as Henry David Thoreau's opposition to the Mexican War. Thoreau was not necessarily a pacifist opposed to all wars. He was opposed to the war with Mexico because of its intention to extend slavery. There are individuals, however, who for moral or religious reasons are opposed to war in general. In both cases, whether the individual is a pacifist or a political dissenter, the antiwar stance is ultimately a question of conscience.

During the Civil War, Cyrus Pringle was drafted into the Union Army but, because of his Quaker convictions, refused to serve and even refused, when the option was offered to him, to pay for a substitute. His diary, discovered and published 50 years after the war, has been a source of inspiration for pacifists objecting to the First World War, the Second

World War, and the Vietnam War in the twentieth century. (For more of his diary, see the full edition of Dissent in America: The Voices That Shaped a Nation.)

THE RECORD OF A QUAKER CONSCIENCE, 1863

At Burlington, Vt., on the 13th of the seventh month, 1863, I was drafted. . . .

With ardent zeal for our Faith and the cause of our peaceable principles; and almost disgusted at the lukewarmness and unfaithfulness of very many who profess these; and considering how heavily slight crosses bore upon their shoulders, I felt to say, "Here am I, Father, for thy service. As thou wilt." May I trust it was He who called me and sent me forth with the consolation: "My grace is sufficient for thee." Deeply have I felt many times since that I am nothing without the companionship of the Spirit.

. . . [We] were urged by our acquaintances to pay our commutation money; by some through well-meant kindness and sympathy; by others through interest in the war; and by others still through a belief they entertained it was our duty. But we confess a higher duty than that to country; and, asking no military protection of our Government and grateful for none, deny any obligation to support so unlawful a system, as we hold a war to be even when waged in opposition to an evil and oppressive power and ostensibly in defence of liberty, virtue, and free institutions; and, though touched by the kind interest of friends, we could not relieve their distress by a means we held even more sinful than that of serving ourselves, as by supplying money to hire a substitute we would not only be responsible for the result, but be the agents in bringing others into evil. So looking to our Father alone for help, and remembering that "Whoso loseth his life for my sake shall find it; but whoso saveth it shall lose it," we presented ourselves again before the Board, as we had promised to do when released. . . .

Herded into a car by ourselves, we conscripts, substitutes, and the rest, through the greater part of the day, swept over the fertile meadows along the banks of the White River and the Connecticut, through pleasant scenes that had little of delight for us. At Woodstock we were joined by the conscripts from the 1st District—together an inferior company from those before with us, who were honest yeomen from the northern and mountainous towns, while these were many of them substitutes from the cities.

At Brattleboro we were marched up to the camp; our knapsacks and persons searched; and any articles of citizen's dress taken from us; and then shut up in a rough board building under a guard. . . .

. . . I addressed the following letter to Governor Holbrook and hired a corporal to forward it to him.

Brattleboro, Vt., 26th, 8th month, 1863.

Frederick Holbrook,

Governor of Vermont:—

We, the undersigned members of the Society of Friends, beg leave to represent to thee, that we were lately drafted in the 3d Dist. of Vermont, have been forced into the army and reached the camp near: this town yesterday.

That in the language of the elders of our New York Yearly Meeting, "We love our country and acknowledge with gratitude to our Heavenly Father the many blessings we have been favoured with under the government; and can feel no sympathy with any who seek its overthrow."

But that, true to well-known principles of our Society, we cannot violate our religious convictions either by complying with military requisitions or by the equivalents of this compliance, the furnishing of a substitute or payment of commutation money. That, therefore, we are brought into suffering and exposed to insult and contempt from those who have us in charge, as well as to the penalties of insubordination, though liberty of conscience is granted us by the Constitution of Vermont as well as that of the United States.

Therefore, we beg of thee as Governor of our State any assistance thou may be able to render, should it be no more than the influence of thy position interceding in our behalf.

Truly Thy Friend,
Cyrus G. Pringle.

. . .

Camp Vermont: Long Island, Boston Harbour. 28th—In the early morning damp and cool we marched down off the heights of Brattleboro to take train for this place. Once in the car the dashing young cavalry officer, who had us in charge, gave notice he had placed men through the cars, with loaded revolvers, who had orders to shoot any person attempting to escape, or jump from the window, and that any one would be shot if he even put his head out of the window. Down the beautiful valley of the Connecticut, all through its broad intervals, heavy with its crops of corn or tobacco, or shaven smooth by the summer harvest; over the hard and stony counties of northern Massachusetts, through its suburbs and under the shadow of Bunker Hill Monument we came into the City of Boston, "the Hub of the Universe." . . .

Here are many troops gathering daily from all the New England States except Connecticut and Rhode Island. Their white tents are dotting the green slopes and hilltops of the island and spreading wider and wider. This is the flow of military tide here just now. The ebb went out to sea in the shape of a great shipload just as we came in, and another load will be sent before many days. All is war here. We are surrounded by the pomp and circumstance of war, and enveloped in the cloud thereof. The cloud settles down over the minds and souls of all; they cannot see beyond nor do they try; but with the clearer eye of Christian faith I try to look beyond

all this error unto Truth and Holiness immaculate; and thanks to our Father, I am favoured with glimpses that are sweet consolation amid this darkness. . . .

Regimental Hospital, 4th Vermont, 29th—On the evening of the 26th the Colonel came to us apologizing for the roughness with which he treated us at first, which was, as he insisted, through ignorance of our real character and position. He told us if we persisted in our course, death would probably follow; though at another time he confessed to P. D. that this would only be the extreme sentence of court-martial. He urged us to go into the hospital, stating that this course was advised by Friends about New York. We were too well aware of such a fact to make any denial, though it was a subject of surprise to us that he should be informed of it. He pleaded with us long and earnestly, urging us with many promises of indulgence and favour and attentions we found afterwards to be untrue. He gave us till the next morning to consider the question and report our decision. In our discussion of the subject among ourselves, we were very much perplexed. If all his statements concerning the ground taken by our Society were true, we seemed to be liable, if we persisted in the course which alone seemed to us to be in accordance with Truth, to be exposed to the charge of over-zeal and fanaticism even among our own brethren. Regarding the work to be done in hospital as one of mercy and benevolence, we asked if we had any right to refuse its performance; and questioned whether we could do more good by deavouring to bear to the end a clear testimony against war, than by labouring by word and deed among the needy in the hospitals and camps. We saw around us a rich field for usefulness in which there were scarce any labourers and toward whose work our hands had often started involuntarily and unbidden. At last we consented to a trial, at least till we could make inquiries concerning the Colonel's allegations, and ask the counsel of our friends, reserving the privilege of returning to our former position. . . .

When lately I have seen dear L. M. M. in the thoroughness and patience of his trial to perform service in hospital, his uneasiness and the intensity of his struggle as manifested by his silence and disposition to avoid the company of his friends, and seen him fail and declare to us, "I cannot stay here," I have received a new proof, and to me a strong one, because it is from the experimental knowledge of an honest man, that no Friend, who is really such, desiring to keep himself clear of complicity with this system of war and to bear a perfect testimony against it, can lawfully perform service in the hospitals of the Army in lieu of bearing arms. . . .

I went back to my tent and lay down for a season of retirement, endeavouring to gain resignation to any event. I dreaded torture and desired strength of flesh and spirit. My trial soon came. The lieutenant called me out, and pointing to the gun that lay near by, asked if I was going to clean it. I replied to him, that I could not comply with military requisitions, and felt resigned to the consequences. "I do not ask about your feelings; I want to know if you are going to clean that gun?" "I cannot do it," was my answer. He went away, saying, "Very well," and I crawled into the tent again. Two sergeants soon called for me, and taking me a little aside, bid me lie down on my back, and stretching my limbs apart tied cords to my wrists and ankles and these to four stakes driven in the ground somewhat in the form of an X.

I was very quiet in my mind as I lay there on the ground with the rain of the previous day, exposed to the heat of the sun, and suffering keenly from the cords binding my wrists and straining my muscles. And, if I dared the presumption, I should say that I caught a glimpse of heavenly pity. I wept, not so much from my own suffering as from sorrow that such things should be in our own country, where Justice and Freedom and Liberty of Conscience have been the annual boast of Fourth-of-July orators so many years. It seemed that our forefathers in the faith had wrought and suffered in vain, when the privileges they so dearly bought were so soon set aside. And I was sad, that one endeavouring to follow our dear Master should be so generally regarded as a despicable and stubborn culprit.

After something like an hour had passed, the lieutenant came with his orderly to ask me if I was ready to clean the gun. I replied to the orderly asking the question, that it could but give me pain to be asked or required to do anything I believed wrong. He repeated it to the lieutenant just behind him, who advanced and addressed me. I was favoured to improve the opportunity to say to him a few things I wished. He said little; and, when I had finished, he withdrew with the others who had gathered around. About the end of another hour his orderly came and released me.

I arose and sat on the ground. I did not rise to go away. I had not where to go, nothing to do. As I sat there my heart swelled with joy from above. The consolation and sweet fruit of tribulation patiently endured. But I also grieved, that the world was so far gone astray, so cruel and blind. It seemed as if the gospel of Christ had never been preached upon earth, and the beautiful example of his life had been utterly lost sight of.

Some of the men came about me, advising me to yield, and among them one of those who had tied me down, telling me what I had already suffered was nothing to what I must yet suffer unless I yielded; that human flesh could not endure what they would put upon me. I wondered if it, could be that they could force me to obedience by torture, and examined myself closely to see if they had advanced as yet one step toward the accomplishment of their purposes. Though weaker in body, I believed I found myself, through divine strength, as firm in my resolution to maintain my allegiance to my Master.

The relaxation of my nerves and muscles after having been so tensely strained left me that afternoon so weak that I could hardly walk or perform any mental exertion.

I had not yet eaten the mean and scanty breakfast I had prepared, when I was ordered to pack up my things and report myself at the lieutenant's tent. I was accustomed to such orders and complied, little moved.

The lieutenant received me politely with, "Good-morning, Mr. Pringle," and desiring me to be seated, proceeded with the writing with which he was engaged. I sat down in some wonderment and sought to be quiet and prepared for any event. "You are ordered to report to Washington," said he; "I do not know what it is for." I assured him that neither did I know. . . .

At the War Office we were soon admitted to an audience with the Adjutant General, Colonel Townsend, whom we found to be a very fine man, mild and kind.

He referred our cases to the Secretary of War, Stanton, by whom we were ordered to report for service to Surgeon General Hammond. Here we met Isaac Newton, Commissioner of Agriculture, waiting for our arrival, and James Austin of Nantucket, expecting his son, Charles L. Austin, and Edward W. Holway of Sandwich, Mass., conscripted Friends like ourselves, and ordered here from the 22nd Massachusetts.

We understand it is through the influence of Isaac Newton that Friends have been able to approach the heads of Government in our behalf and to prevail with them to so great an extent. He explained to us the circumstance in which we are placed. That the Secretary of War and President sympathized with Friends in their present suffering, and would grant them full release, but that they felt themselves bound by their oaths that they would execute the laws, to carry out to its full extent the Conscription Act. That there appeared but one door of relief open, that was to parole us and allow us to go home, but subjected to their call again ostensibly, though this they neither wished nor proposed to do. That the fact of Friends in the Army and refusing service had attracted public attention so that it was not expedient to parole us at present. That, therefore, we were to be sent to one of the hospitals for a short time, where it was hoped and expressly requested that we would consent to remain quiet and acquiesce, if possible, in whatever might be required of us. That our work there would be quite free from objection, being for the direct relief of the sick; and that there we would release none for active service in the field, as the nurses were hired civilians.

These requirements being so much less objectionable than we had feared, we felt relief, and consented to them. I.N. went with us himself to the Surgeon General's office, where he procured peculiar favours for us: that we should be sent to a hospital in the city, where he could see us often; and that orders should be given that nothing should interfere with our comfort, or our enjoyment of our consciences. . . .

Last evening E.W.H. saw I.N. particularly on my behalf, I suppose. He left at once for the President. This morning he called to inform us of his interview at the White House. The President was moved to sympathy in my behalf, when I.N. gave him a letter from one of our Friends in New York. After its perusal he exclaimed to our friend, "I want you to go and tell Stanton that it is my wish all those young men be sent home at once." He was on his way to the Secretary this morning as he called.

Later—I.N. has just called again informing us in joy that we are free. At the War Office he was urging the Secretary to consent to our paroles, when the President entered. "It is my urgent wish," said he. The Secretary yielded; the order was given; and we were released. What we had waited for so many weeks was accomplished in a few moments by a Providential ordering of circumstances.

African American Soldiers of the Union Army

Because of the prevalent racist beliefs that blacks would not make good soldiers, there was considerable resistance to the idea of forming black units. But after more than a year of fighting and the administration's

extreme frustration that the war seemed to be going nowhere, President Lincoln began to support the idea of "colored regiments." More than 200,000 African Americans served in the Union army during the Civil War. The first black regiments were mustered in the autumn of 1862, and after the Emancipation Proclamation went into effect on January 1, 1863, Lincoln authorized the formation of black regiments in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island. The most famous of these was the Massachusetts 54th, which, in July 1863, led a valiant yet futile attack on Fort Wagner in South Carolina.

Although African American troops were demonstrating that they could fight as well and as heroically as any white regiment, they still faced prejudicial treatment. One of the most passionate grievances that swept through their ranks was that they received about half the pay of white troops—only \$7 a month. A number of black soldiers refused their duties in an effort to gain equal pay. Some were court-martialed and shot for treason. But most protestors adopted the tactic of continuing to perform their soldierly duties while refusing any pay at all. This tactic finally achieved some success in August 1864, when blacks who were already free before enlisting were granted equal pay. Eventually, in March 1865, all black soldiers were given equal pay, backdated to their enlistment.

During their fight for equal pay, many soldiers wrote letters to newspapers, friends, and relatives to make the case for their position. In the first letter, George E. Stephens, a sergeant in the 54th Massachusetts Infantry, several weeks after his regiment's assault on Fort Wagner, criticizes the federal government for overruling Governor John A. Andrews's announcement that black troops would receive equal pay. In the second letter, another soldier in the 54th argues that the equal pay issue is not merely an economic issue. In the next letter, another member of the 54th (E. W. D.) eloquently questions the justness of a government that will keep a gallant regiment in the field without remuneration. And in the final letter, J. H. Hall of the 54th wants to know why the soldiers are not recognized as lawful citizens and brave soldiers but instead are disparaged "as an inferior sort of laborer" paid \$7 a month. (For more letters see the full edition of *Dissent in America: The Voices That Shaped a Nation*.)

CORRESPONDENCE PROTESTING UNEQUAL PAY, 1863-1864

A LETTER FROM GEORGE E. STEPHENS

. . . The question of our pay continues to be the topic of conversation and correspondence. Numerous letters have reached us from distinguished friends in the State of Massachusetts, all expressing the utmost confidence that we will receive all of our

pay, and have secured to us every right that other Massachusetts soldiers enjoy. His Excellency Gov. Andrew, in a letter dated, "Executive Department, Boston, August 24th," and addressed to Mr. Frederick Johnson, an officer in the regiment, says:

"I have this day received your letter of the 10th of August, and in reply desire, in the first place, to express to you the lively interest with which I have watched every step of the fifty-fourth Regiment since it left Massachusetts, and the feelings of pride and admiration with which I have learned and read of the accounts of the heroic conduct of the regiment in the attack upon Fort Wagner, when you and your brave soldiers so well proved their manhood, and showed themselves to be true soldiers of Massachusetts. As to the matter inquired about in your letter, you may rest assured that I shall not rest until you have secured all of your rights, and that I have no doubt whatever of ultimate success. I have no doubt, by law, you are entitled to the same pay as other soldiers, and on the authority of the Secretary of War, I promised that you should be paid and treated in all respects like other soldiers of Massachusetts. Till this is done I feel that my promise is dishonored by the government. The whole difficulty arises from a misapprehension, the correction of which will no doubt be made as soon as I can get the subject fully examined by the Secretary of War. I have the honor to be your obedient servant,

JOHN A. ANDREW, Governor of Massachusetts."

The trouble seems to be something like this: The Paymaster General, whoever that may be, has directed the paymasters to pay all negro troops of African descent, \$10 per month, the pay allowed to contrabands by statute when employed in the Commissary or Quartermaster's Department. There seems to have been no provision made to pay colored soldiers. There may be some reason for making a distinction between armed and unarmed men in the service of the government, but when the nationality of a man takes away his title to pay it become another thing. Suppose a regiment of Spaniards should be mustered into the service of the United States, would Congress have to pass a special law to pay Spaniards? Or, suppose, a regiment of Sandwich Islanders should do duty as soldiers of the United States, would it be necessary to pass a law to pay Sandwich Islanders? Does not the deed of muster secure the services and even life of the man mustered into the service to the government? And does not this same deed of muster give a man title to all pay and bounties awarded to soldiers bearing arms? I believe that, "by law, we are entitled to the same pay as other soldiers," and "misapprehension arises" from this: The Paymaster General will not have the colored soldiers paid under the law which pay[s] white soldiers, and virtually creates in his own mind the necessity for the passage of a special law authorizing them to be paid. Is there a special law on the statute books of the National Legislature touching the payment of colored men employed in the naval service? . . .

A LETTER FROM A MASSACHUSETTS SOLDIER

A strange misapprehension . . . exists as to the matter of pay; and it pains us deeply. We came forward at the call of Gov. Andrew, in which call he distinctly

same as other Massachusetts soldiers. Again, on the presentation of flags to the regiment, at Camp Meigs, the Governor reiterated this promise, on the strength of which we marched through Boston, holding our heads high, as men and as soldiers. Nor did we grumble because we were not paid the portion of United States bounty paid to other volunteer regiments in advance.

Now that we have gained some reputation as soldiers, we claim the right to be heard.

Three times have we been mustered in for pay. Twice have we swallowed the insult offered us by the United States paymaster, contenting ourselves with a simple refusal to acknowledge ourselves, in this matter, different from other Massachusetts soldiers. Once, in the face of insult and intimidation, such as no body of men and soldiers were ever subjected to before, we quietly refused, and continued to do our duty.

For four months we've been steadily working, night and day, under fire. And such work! Up to our knees in mud half the time—causing the tearing and wearing out of more than the volunteer's yearly allowance of clothing—denied time to repair and wash (what we might by that means have saved), denied time to drill and perfect ourselves in soldierly quality, denied the privilege of burying our dead decently! All this we've borne patiently, waiting for justice.

Imagine our surprise and disappointment, on the receipt by the last mail of the Governor's Address to the General Court, to find him making a proposition to them to pay this regiment the difference between what the United States Government offers us and what they are legally bound to pay us, which, in effect, advertises us to the world as holding out for *money* and not from *principle*—that we sink our manhood in consideration of a few more dollars. How has this come about? What false friend has been misrepresenting us to the Governor, to make him think that our necessities outweigh our self-respect? I am sure no representation of *ours* ever impelled him to this action.

ARMY CORRESPONDENCE

Morris Island, S. C., June 9, 1864.

Mr. Editor:

It is with pleasure I write these few lines concerning things here at present. We have had a few shells fired from Sullivan's Island on our fleet, though no damage was done, and the old ram came down to Sumpter and was fired on by our batteries on the 7th of this month.

The Fifty-fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteers is still in the field without pay, and the Government shows no disposition to pay us. We have declined doing active field service, except in cases of the greatest emergency, and we are, therefore, divided into four departments, doing garrison duty, we have

SOURCE: *The Boston Journal* (c. December 15, 1863).

SOURCE: *The Christian Recorder*, Philadelphia (June 25, 1864).

served our country manfully for over twelve months without receiving one cent from the Government, and all that we have for our bravery is the credit of fighting well, but we are deprived of our wages and the rights of soldiers. We are glad to see the success of our regiment, and feel thankful that so many have escaped the soldier's grave, through the instrumentality of God, who is the giver of all good. God has fought our battles for us, and in His own good time He will avenge our wrongs. We still do the duty assigned us, and trust to God for future events; but, if our merits will not warrant our acknowledgment as men, veterans and soldiers, the hand of God may send forth His destroying angel and slay our enemies. No nation has ever risen to dignity without self-sacrifice, none has ever triumphed in victory without undergoing great hardships and long forbearance; but we still abide in faith, and look forward to the time when Ethiopia shall stretch forth her hand and rise from obscurity with healing in her wings.

If the Fifty-fourth must be as the leaders of Israel, let us suffer in the wilderness until a second Moses shall rise up and smite the rock, that we may drink of the spring of freedom, and the spring of learning.

We all cry, "Union!" and shout for the battle. It is a question whether we can call this a Union Government—a free Government—that will keep a regiment in the field fifteen or sixteen months without pay because they are black. Will you call it an honorable and just Government that gives for a reason that there has been no act passed of Congress to pay negro soldiers? If we understand the Declaration of Independence, it asserts the freedom and equality of all men. We ask nothing more. Give us equality and acknowledge us as men, and we are willing to stand by the flag of our Union and support the leaders of this great Government until every traitor shall be banished from our shore, out of the North as well as the South.

Look at our families, reduced to the necessities of the almshouse for want of the support of their wounded and bleeding husbands, who have fallen before the enemy! We hope that our liberal Government will not be guilty of such atrocious robbery. When we enlisted, it was not for a large bounty nor great salary. We thought that we could help to put down the rebellion. We anticipated future benefits. We intended to distinguish ourselves as heroes and supporters of the Government, and to share alike their rights and privileges, to have the same opportunity for promotion as our bravery and ability would warrant. But our bravery is always in vain, our heroism discountenanced, our patriotism disregarded, and we are offered the paltry sum of seven dollars per month, and are given the insulting reason, that the negro is not worth as much as the white man. They cannot tell us that we do not fight as well nor die as freely as the white man, but they can tell us they are a majority, and, therefore, assume presumption of their power, and intend to compel us to involuntary servitude, or, in other words, compel us to work for half pay, which is involuntary servitude. Under such wrongs no nation can prosper. If a strong power crush the weak and deprive them of the blessings which God has ordained for them, it must fall. God's supreme power will break them into pieces that will not obey His righteous laws. Let the hand of Justice have the ruling power, and his omniscience will ever guide our path and direct us in the establishment of the most pure Government.

Let the rulers of our country consult the God of nations and reconsider His instructions with the dictates of their consciences, and every soldier will receive equal compensation according to his merits. If those at the White House were compelled to encounter what the Fifty-fourth have undergone, they would not only allow the negro his rights and acknowledge his citizenship, but, in my humble opinion, they would acknowledge the independence of the Southern Confederacy. But it is not so with many brave negro troops that are in the field. We do not allow a traitor one inch of ground. Give us our rights—acknowledge us as men and citizens—and we are willing to flood the rebellious cities with pools of our blood, and never lay down our arms until every vestige of rebellion is driven from our land.

E.W.D.,
Co. B, 54th Mass. Vols.

LETTER FROM THE 54TH MASSACHUSETTS REGIMENT

Morris Island, South Carolina, August 3, 1864.

Dear Editor:

... I shall now endeavor to make a few remarks in reference to the condition of the 54th. It has been sixteen months since we were mustered in as a regiment, and fourteen months of that time have been spent in active service. We have been on a great many arduous and dangerous expeditions, fought three hard battles, and yet after all this, we have not received one cent of remuneration from the Government. We now would ask the Christian and law-abiding citizen, and all dignitaries in authority, if we have not performed our duty as soldiers, and maintained our dignity and honour as citizens? And have we not borne a patriotic part in every campaign, and ranked in discipline, bravery and heroism with the first regiments in the Southern department? Why, then, is it that we are not recognised as true and lawful citizens, and receive our pay as soldiers? Why are we insulted and told by the paymaster that the negro is not considered as a soldier, but rather as an inferior sort of laborer, to whom he is to pay at most not more than seven dollars per month? I would respectfully ask the question, gentlemen of the city of Boston and Commonwealth of Massachusetts, if this is fit treatment for a brave and gallant regiment of men. Will the vast city of Boston, and the generous and sympathizing State of Massachusetts stand by unmoved, and with unplying eye permit this foul opprobrium and scorn to be cast upon them? Or will they stand in our defence, even if that derision be heaped upon them which was cast upon that stern old patriot, Andrew Jackson, when he acknowledged the negroes as soldiers, as brethren, and as fellow-citizens—to incur the same dangers and share the same glory alike with their white fellow-citizens? The city of Boston has made the same kind of promises, guaranteeing

that every colored recruit shall have all the rights and privileges, and receive the same pay, bounty, clothing, etc., as the white troops—but, alas! like Andrew Jackson, they too have promised the negroes every thing pertaining to a citizenship, in order to get them into the field, and then they keep them there, without pay, without the stipulated bounty, and not even deigning to treat them in a Christian and civil manner. No promise has been regarded by them. . . .

If we are to be recognized as citizens, we want the rights of citizens! Have we lost ground or receded any in the advanced stage of this nineteenth century, or has our race degenerated on account of living in this enlightened and free country?

If we are less worthy as soldiers, as brothers, or as citizens, which has so nobly been set forth by Washington, Madison, Jefferson and Jackson, acknowledging our dignity, honor, bravery and love of country, if we have become so degenerated in this enlightened country that our ability is less worthy our acknowledgment as citizens than they were at the time of the Revolutionary War against Great Britain, it would be better if we had been left in the States of Barbary or on the coast of Niger. Much better would it have been.

But, gentlemen, I am gratified to know that the descendants of Africa, and the so-called adopted sons of America have more than kept pace with the Anglo-Saxon. We do not claim that we are more intelligent than our so-called superior race, but we are nearly equal in intelligence, and have acquired a knowledge of science and literature that would surprise the world, if they only knew of the difficulties we have had to encounter to acquire it for ourselves and for our children.

The Anglo-Saxon in America claims that if we are acknowledged citizens, we will covet their wives, daughters and sisters—but it is to the contrary. The respectable part of the colored race consider that their own kind would make the most affectionate companions, and in the case of the so-called aristocracy, if any were known to thus sinfully amalgamate, or should cause their race to be degenerated, the same should be cut off from his inheritance. We do not covet your wives nor your daughters, nor the position of the political orator. All we ask is the proper enjoyment of the rights of citizenship, and a free title and acknowledged share in our own noble birthplace, which we are ready and willing to defend while a single drop of blood courses through our veins.

The negro has a mind susceptible and alive to improvement, and a manly spirit that aspires to dignity and refinement, and is well competent to discern when his services or society are depreciated. These are true facts which cannot be denied.

We, as a regiment, have bound ourselves together with one accord and as one man to protect our own rights: those rights which are now denied us should be given us. There is but one course left for us to pursue. If we are still persistently held and treated as aliens, we must, as a necessary and inevitable consequence, apply to aliens for redress! . . .

Yours, &c.,

J.H. HALL, Co. B.,

Fifty-fourth Mass. Col. Troops.

Frederick Douglass (1818-1895)

At the close of the Civil War, Frederick Douglass was no less restrained in his political activism on behalf of African Americans than he was when he traveled throughout the country calling for the abolition of slavery. To be sure, slavery would no longer be legal in the United States, but he was quite aware that there would still be a struggle for equal rights, economic opportunity, and suffrage. Douglass dove into this struggle with the same fervor he displayed for the abolitionist crusade. He delivered this persuasive demand for the rights and privileges of full citizenship for the freedmen at the 1865 annual meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society.

WHAT THE BLACK MAN WANTS, APRIL 1865

. . . I have had but one idea for the last three years to present to the American people, and the phraseology in which I clothe it is the old abolition phraseology. I am for the "immediate, unconditional, and universal" enfranchisement of the black man, in every State in the Union. Without this, his liberty is a mockery; without this, you might as well almost retain the old name of slavery for his condition; for in fact, if he is not the slave of the individual master, he is the slave of society, and holds his liberty as a privilege, not as a right. He is at the mercy of the mob, and has no means of protecting himself.

It may be objected, however, that this pressing of the Negro's right to suffrage is premature. Let us have slavery abolished, it may be said, let us have labor organized, and then, in the natural course of events, the right of suffrage will be extended to the Negro. I do not agree with this. The constitution of the human mind is such, that if it once disregards the conviction forced upon it by a revelation of truth, it requires the exercise of a higher power to produce the same conviction afterwards. The American people are now in tears. The Shenandoah has run blood—the best blood of the North. All around Richmond, the blood of New England and of the North has been shed—of your sons, your brothers and your fathers. We all feel, in the existence of this Rebellion, that judgments terrible, widespread, far-reaching, overwhelming, are abroad in the land; and we feel, in view of these judgments, just now, a disposition to learn righteousness. This is the hour. Our streets are in mourning, tears are falling at every fireside, and under the chastisement of this Rebellion we have almost come up to the point of conceding this great, this all-important right of suffrage. I fear that if we fail to do it now, if abolitionists fail to press it now, we may not see, for centuries to come, the same disposition that exists at this moment. Hence, I say, now is the time to press this right.

It may be asked, "Why do you want it? Some men have got along very well without it. Women have not this right." Shall we justify one wrong by another? This is the sufficient answer. Shall we at this moment justify the deprivation of the Negro of the right to vote, because some one else is deprived of that privilege? I hold that women, as well as men, have the right to vote, and my heart and voice go with the movement to extend suffrage to woman; but that question rests upon another basis than which our right rests. We may be asked, I say, why we want it. I will tell you why we want it. We want it because it is our right, first of all. No class of men can, without insulting their own nature, be content with any deprivation of their rights. We want it again, as a means for educating our race. Men are so constituted that they derive their conviction of their own possibilities largely by the estimate formed of them by others. If nothing is expected of a people, that people will find it difficult to contradict that expectation. By depriving us of suffrage, you affirm our incapacity to form an intelligent judgment respecting public men and public measures; you declare before the world that we are unfit to exercise the elective franchise, and by this means lead us to undervalue ourselves, to put a low estimate upon ourselves, and to feel that we have no possibilities like other men. Again, I want the elective franchise, for one, as a colored man, because ours is a peculiar government, based upon a peculiar idea, and that idea is universal suffrage. If I were in a monarchical government, or an autocratic or aristocratic government, where the few bore rule and the many were subject, there would be no special stigma resting upon me, because I did not exercise the elective franchise. It would do me no great violence. Mingling with the mass I should partake of the strength of the mass; I should be supported by the mass, and I should have the same incentives to endeavor with the mass of my fellow-men; it would be no particular burden, no particular deprivation; but here where universal suffrage is the rule, where that is the fundamental idea of the Government, to rule us out is to make us an exception, to brand us with the stigma of inferiority, and to invite to our heads the missiles of those about us; therefore, I want the franchise for the black man....

I know that we are inferior to you in some things—virtually inferior. We walk about you like dwarfs among giants. Our heads are scarcely seen above the great sea of humanity. The Germans are superior to us; the Irish are superior to us; the Yankees are superior to us; they can do what we cannot, that is, what we have not hitherto been allowed to do. But while I make this admission, I utterly deny, that we are originally, or naturally, or practically, or in any way, or in any important sense, inferior to anybody on this globe. This charge of inferiority is an old dodge. It has been made available for oppression on many occasions. It is only about six centuries since the blue-eyed and fair-haired Anglo-Saxons were considered inferior by the haughty Normans, who once trampled upon them. If you read the history of the Norman Conquest, you will find that this proud Anglo-Saxon was once looked upon as of coarser clay than his Norman master, and might be found in the highways and byways of Old England laboring with a brass collar on his neck, and the name of his master marked upon it. You were down then! You are up now. I am glad you are up, and I want you to be glad to help us up also.

The story of our inferiority is an old dodge, as I have said; for wherever men oppress their fellows, wherever they enslave them, they will endeavor to find the needed apology for such enslavement and oppression in the character of the people oppressed and enslaved. When we wanted, a few years ago, a slice of Mexico, it was hinted that the Mexicans were an inferior race, that the old Castilian blood had become so weak that it would scarcely run down hill, and that Mexico needed the long, strong and beneficent arm of the Anglo-Saxon care extended over it. We said that it was necessary to its salvation, and a part of the "manifest destiny" of this Republic, to extend our arm over that dilapidated government. So, too, when Russia wanted to take possession of a part of the Ottoman Empire, the Turks were an "inferior race." So, too, when England wants to set the heel of her power more firmly in the quivering heart of old Ireland, the Celts are an "inferior race." So, too, the Negro, when he is to be robbed of any right which is justly his, is an "inferior man." It is said that we are ignorant; I admit it. But if we know enough to be hung, we know enough to vote. If the Negro knows enough to pay taxes to support the government, he knows enough to vote; taxation and representation should go together. If he knows enough to shoulder a musket and fight for the flag, fight for the government, he knows enough to vote. If he knows as much when he is sober as an Irishman knows when drunk, he knows enough to vote, on good American principles....

Zion Presbyterian Church

The African American Zion Presbyterian Church of Charleston, South Carolina, submitted a petition to Congress several months after the end of the Civil War, in which the parishioners demanded that the black people of South Carolina be accorded all the rights and privileges of U.S. citizens.

PETITION TO THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS, NOVEMBER 24, 1865

Gentlemen:

We, the colored people of the State of South Carolina, in Convention assembled, respectfully present for your attention some prominent facts in relation to our present condition, and make a modest yet earnest appeal to your considerate judgment....

Conscious of the difficulties that surround our position we would ask for no rights or privileges but such as rest upon the strong basis of justice and expediency, in view of the best interests of our entire country.

SOURCE: James S. Allen, *Reconstruction: The Battle for Democracy, 1865-1876* (New York: International Publishers, 1937), 228-229.

We ask first, that the strong arm of law and order be placed alike over the entire people of this State; that life and property be secured, and the laborer free to sell his labor as the merchant his goods.

We ask that a fair and impartial instruction be given to the pledges of the government to us concerning the land question.

We ask that the three great agents of civilized society—the school, the pulpit, the press—be as secure in South Carolina as in Massachusetts or Vermont.

We ask that equal suffrage be conferred upon us, in common with the white men of this State. This we ask, because “all free governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed”; and we are largely in the majority in this State, bearing for a long period the burden of onerous taxation, without a just representation. We ask for equal suffrage as a protection for the hostility evoked by our known faithfulness to our country and flag under all circumstances.

We ask that colored men shall not in every instance be tried by white men; and that neither by custom nor enactment shall we be excluded from the jury box.

We ask that, inasmuch as the Constitution of the United States explicitly declares that the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed and the Constitution is the Supreme law of the land—that the late efforts of the Legislature of this State to pass an act to deprive us of arms be forbidden, as a plain violation of the Constitution, and unjust to many of us in the highest degree, who have been soldiers, and purchased our muskets from the United States Government when mustered out of service.

We protest against any code of black laws the Legislature of this State may enact, and pray to be governed by the same laws that control other men. The right to assemble in peaceful convention, to discuss the political questions of the day; the right to enter upon all the avenues of agriculture, commerce, trade; to amass wealth by thrift and industry; the right to develop our whole being by all the appliances that belong to civilized society, cannot be questioned by any class of intelligent legislators.

We solemnly affirm and desire to live orderly and peacefully with all the people of this State; and commending this memorial to your considerate judgment. Thus we ever pray.

Charleston, S.C. November 24, 1865
Zion Presbyterian Church

American Equal Rights Association

During congressional debates on the proposed Fifteenth Amendment, many people who had been involved in the abolitionist and feminist crusades argued fervently that the suffrage amendment should include women. The American Equal Rights Association (founded in 1866) issued the following resolution arguing its position on the topic. Although

such influential people as Frederick Douglass, Susan B. Anthony, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton signed the resolution, the amendment approved by Congress in 1869 granted the suffrage to only African American men: “The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.” In a bitter aftermath, the ratification process wound up splitting the feminist movement into those who supported the amendment with the intention of continuing the struggle for women’s suffrage and those more radical women (and men) who fought energetically against ratification until women were included. The Fifteenth Amendment was ratified in 1870. It would be another 50 years before the Nineteenth Amendment opened the suffrage to women.

NATIONAL CONVENTION RESOLUTIONS, NEW YORK, MAY 1867

RESOLVED, That as republican institutions are based on individual rights, and not on the rights of races or sexes, the first question for the American people to settle in the reconstruction of the government, is the RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS.

RESOLVED, That the present claim for “manhood suffrage,” marked with the words “equal,” “impartial,” “universal,” is a cruel abandonment of the slave women of the South, a fraud on the tax paying women of the North, and an insult to the civilization of the nineteenth century.

RESOLVED, That the [Republican Party] proposal to reconstruct our government on the basis of manhood suffrage . . . [which] has received the recent sanction of the American Anti-Slavery Society, is but a continuation of the old system of class and caste legislation, always cruel and proscriptive in itself, and ending in all ages in national degradation and revolution.

MEMORIAL OF THE AMERICAN EQUAL RIGHTS ASSOCIATION TO CONGRESS

The undersigned . . . respectfully but earnestly protest against any change in the Constitution of the United States, or legislation by Congress, which shall longer violate the principle of Republican Government, by proscriptive distinctions in rights of suffrage or citizenship, on account of color or sex. Your Memorialists would respectfully represent, that neither the colored man’s loyalty, bravery on the battle field and general good conduct, nor woman’s heroic devotion to liberty and her country, in peace and war, have yet availed to admit them to equal citizenship . . .

SOURCE: Retrieved on 3/11/2003 from the 19th-Century American Women Writers Web Etext Library at <http://womenhistory.about.com/gi/dynamic/offsite.htm?site=http://www.unl.edu/legacy/19cwww/books/elibe/documents/suffrage/PURITAN6.HTM>.

We believe that humanity is one in all those intellectual, moral and spiritual attributes, out of which grow human responsibilities. The Scripture declaration is, "so God created man in his own image: male and female created he them." And all divine legislation throughout the realm of nature recognizes the perfect equality of the two conditions. For male and female are but different conditions, neither color nor sex is ever discharged from obedience to law, natural or moral; written or unwritten. The commands, thou shalt not steal, nor kill, nor commit adultery, know nothing of sex in their demands; nothing in their penalty. And hence we believe that all human legislation which is at variance with the divine code, is essentially unrighteous and unjust. Woman and the colored man are taxed. . . . Woman has been fined, whipped, branded with red-hot irons, imprisoned and hung; but when was woman ever tried by a jury of her peers? . . .

Woman and the colored man are loyal, patriotic, property-holding, tax-paying, liberty-loving citizens; and we can not believe that sex or complexion should be any ground for civil or political degradation. In our government, one-half the citizens are disfranchised by their sex, and about one-eighth by the color of their skin; and thus a large majority have no voice in enacting or executing the laws they are taxed to support and compelled to obey. . . . Against such outrages on the very name of republican freedoms, your memorialists do and must ever protest. And is not our protest pre-eminently as just against the tyranny of "taxation without representation," as was that thundered from Bunker Hill . . . ?

And your Memorialists especially remember . . . that our country is still reeling [from] . . . a terrible civil war. . . . [I]n restoring the foundations of our nationality, [we] . . . pray that all discriminations on account of sex or race may be removed; and that our Government may be republican in fact as well as form; A GOVERNMENT BY THE PEOPLE, AND THE WHOLE PEOPLE; FOR THE PEOPLE, AND THE WHOLE PEOPLE. . . .

[Signed by Theodore Tilton, Frederick Douglass, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucretia Mott, and Susan B. Anthony].

Susan B. Anthony (1820-1906)

Susan B. Anthony fought for temperance, abolition, labor reform, educational reform, and, most notably, women's rights. A close friend of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, she became by mid-century a driving force in nineteenth-century feminism and perhaps the most important person in the struggle for women's suffrage. At the end of the Civil War, she cofounded with Stanton the American Equal Rights Association and campaigned vigorously for women to be included in the amendment that would give black men the vote. In 1870, after the Fifteenth Amendment was ratified, indignant that women had been excluded, Anthony stepped

up her campaign. In 1872, she was arrested in Rochester, New York, when she voted in the presidential election. She was tried and fined \$100 in June 1873. When she refused to pay the fine, the judge, not wanting to create more publicity for her cause, shrewdly chose not to sentence her to a jail term. It was Susan B. Anthony who wrote the women's suffrage constitutional amendment that was introduced in Congress, where it was repeatedly debated, tabled, defeated, reintroduced, rejected, and eventually, more than a decade after her death, approved and ratified as the Nineteenth Amendment to the Constitution.

There is no accurate account of her comments at the trial. The first document here is an excerpt from one of three separate accounts reported after the event. The second document is a speech she gave on more than twenty occasions between her arrest and her trial.

FROM AN ACCOUNT OF THE TRIAL OF SUSAN B. ANTHONY, JULY 3, 1873

As a matter of outward form the defendant was asked if she had anything to say why the sentence of the court should not be pronounced upon her.

"Yes, your honor," replied Miss Anthony, "I have many things to say. My every right, constitutional, civil, political and judicial has been trampled upon. I have not only had no jury of my peers, but I have had no jury at all."

COURT—"Sit down Miss Anthony. I cannot allow you to argue the question."

MISS ANTHONY—"I shall not sit down. I will not lose my only chance to speak."

COURT—"You have been tried, Miss Anthony, by the forms of law, and my decision has been rendered by law."

MISS ANTHONY—"Yes, but laws made by men, under a government of men, interpreted by men and for the benefit of men. The only chance women have for justice in this country is to violate the law, as I have done, and as I shall continue to do," and she struck her hand heavily on the table in emphasis of what she said. "Does your honor suppose that we obeyed the infamous fugitive slave law which forbade to give a cup of cold water to a slave fleeing from his master? I tell you we did not obey it; we fed him and clothed him, and sent him on his way to Canada. So shall we trample all unjust laws under foot. I do not ask the clemency of the court. I came into it to get justice, having failed in this, I demand the full rigors of the law."

COURT—"The sentence of the court is \$100 fine and the costs of the prosecution."

MISS ANTHONY—"I have no money to pay with, but am \$10,000 in debt."

COURT—"You are not ordered to stand committed till it is paid."

Is It a Crime for a U.S. Citizen to Vote?, 1873

Friends and Fellow-citizens: I stand before you to-night, under indictment for the alleged crime of having voted at the last Presidential election, without having a lawful right to vote. It shall be my work this evening to prove to you that in thus voting, I not only committed no crime, but, instead, simply exercised my citizen's right, guaranteed to me and all United States citizens by the National Constitution, beyond the power of any State to deny.

Our democratic-republican government is based on the idea of the natural right of every individual member thereof to a voice and a vote in making and executing the laws. We assert the province of government to be to secure the people in the enjoyment of their unalienable rights. We throw to the winds the old dogma that governments can give rights. Before governments were organized, no one denies that each individual possessed the right to protect his own life, liberty and property. And when 100 or 1,000,000 people enter into a free government, they do not barter away their natural rights; they simply pledge themselves to protect each other in the enjoyment of them, through prescribed judicial and legislative tribunals. They agree to abandon the methods of brute force in the adjustment of their differences, and adopt those of civilization.

Nor can you find a word in any of the grand documents left us by the fathers that assumes for government the power to create or to confer rights. The Declaration of Independence, the United States Constitution, the constitutions of the several states and the organic laws of the territories, all alike propose to protect the people in the exercise of their God-given rights. Not one of them pretends to bestow rights.

"All men are created equal, and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights. Among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Here is no shadow of government authority over rights, nor exclusion of any from their full and equal enjoyment. Here is pronounced the right of all men, and "consequently," as the Quaker preacher said, "of all women," to a voice in the government. And here, in this very first paragraph of the declaration, is the assertion of the natural right of all to the ballot; for, how can "the consent of the governed" be given, if the right to vote be denied? Again: "That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundations on such principles, and organizing its powers in such forms as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

SOURCE: Retrieved on 10/19/2003 from www.pbs.org/stantonanthony/resources/index.html?body=crime_to_vote.html. For the full text of another copy of this address, see Ann D. Gordon, ed., *The Selected Papers of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony* (New Brunswick, NJ: Dickinson Publishing, 2000), vol. 7.

Surely, the right of the whole people to vote is here clearly implied. For however destructive in their happiness this government might become, a disfranchised class could neither alter nor abolish it, nor institute a new one, except by the old brute force method of insurrection and rebellion. One-half of the people of this nation to-day are utterly powerless to blot from the statute books an unjust law, or to write there a new and a just one. The women, dissatisfied as they are with this form of government, that enforces taxation without representation, that compels them to obey laws to which they have never given their consent, that imprisons and hangs them without a trial by a jury of their peers, that robs them, in marriage, of the custody of their own persons, wages and children, are this half of the people left wholly at the mercy of the other half, in direct violation of the spirit and letter of the declarations of the framers of this government, every one of which was based on the immutable principle of equal rights to all. By those declarations, kings, priests, popes, aristocrats, were all alike dethroned, and placed on a common level politically, with the lowliest born subject or serf. By them, too, men, as such, were deprived of their divine right to rule, and placed on a political level with women. By the practice of those declarations all class and caste distinction will be abolished; and slave, serf, plebeian, wife, woman, all alike, bound from their subject position to the proud platform of equality.

The preamble of the federal constitution says: "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this constitution for the United States of America."

It was we, the people, not we, the white male citizens, nor yet we, the male citizens; but we, the whole people, who formed this Union. And we formed it, not to give the blessings of liberty, but to secure them; not to the half of ourselves and the half of our posterity, but to the whole people—women as well as men. And it is downright mockery to talk to women of their enjoyment of the blessings of liberty while they are denied the use of the only means of securing them provided by this democratic-republican government—the ballot.

The early journals of Congress show that when the committee reported to that body the original articles of confederation, the very first article which became the subject of discussion was that respecting equality of suffrage. Article 4th said: "The subject to secure and perpetuate mutual friendship and intercourse between the people of the different States of this Union, the free inhabitants of each of the States, (paupers, vagabonds and fugitives from justice excepted,) shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of the free citizens of the several States."

Thus, at the very beginning, did the fathers see the necessity of the universal application of the great principle of equal rights to all—in order to produce the desired result—a harmonious union and a homogeneous people....

We no longer petition Legislature or Congress to give us the right to vote. We appeal to the women everywhere to exercise their too long neglected "citizen's right to vote." We appeal to the inspectors of election everywhere to receive the

votes of all United States citizens as it is their duty to do. We appeal to United States commissioners and marshals to arrest the inspectors who reject the names and votes of United States citizens, as it is their duty to do, and leave those alone who, like our eighth ward inspectors, perform their duties faithfully and well.

We ask the juries to fail to return verdicts of "guilty" against honest, law-abiding, tax-paying United States citizens for offering their votes at our elections. Or against intelligent, worthy young men, inspectors of elections, for receiving and counting such citizens votes.

We ask the judges to render true and unprejudiced opinions of the law, and wherever there is room for a doubt to give its benefit on the side of liberty and equal rights to women, remembering that "the true rule of interpretation under our national constitution, especially since its amendments, is that anything for human rights is constitutional, everything against human right unconstitutional."

And it is on this line that we propose to fight our battle for the ballot—all peaceably, but nevertheless persistently through to complete triumph, when all United States citizens shall be recognized as equals before the law.

PART FIVE

Industry and Reform, 1877-1912

INTRODUCTION: PROGRESS AND DISCONTENT

The Gilded Age was an era of unprecedented growth, a time of seemingly unlimited expansion of American business and industry. Huge fortunes were made by such skillful entrepreneurs as Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller, who expanded their companies into monopolies and trusts that seemed more powerful than the government in Washington. It was an age of innovation and mass marketing in which department stores, professional spectator sports like baseball, and inventions like the telephone, electric streetlights, the phonograph, the motion picture camera, electric trolleys, and subways significantly altered people's daily lives. The nation transformed rapidly from a primarily agrarian and rural society into an industrial and urban society.

Such rapid growth and prosperity, however, was not without serious problems. Workers were forced to exchange their labor for subsistence wages in grueling jobs in unsafe factories. A huge influx of immigrants from eastern and southern Europe flooded into ethnic enclaves in America's cities. Factory owners knew that this vast labor force meant that wages could remain at the subsistence level and that competition among workers would act as a brake on unionization efforts. Railroad financier Jay Gould purportedly boasted that he could easily persuade half the working class to kill the other half. The federal government, in spite of the glaring need to address innumerable complex problems, was unwilling to enact any legislation that would curb business growth.

English philosopher Herbert Spencer and Yale professor William Graham Sumner applied Darwin's theory of evolution to society by arguing that just as in nature, where only the fit survive, so, too, in the social order. The rich,

according to these "social Darwinists," were stronger and fitter than their workers. Their proof was that they had, in the struggle for survival, emerged at the top as the owners of businesses; if the workers had been fit, they, too, would have risen. "Millionaires," Sumner confidently declared in *What the Social Classes Owe Each Other*, "are a product of natural selection." This, of course, provided perfect justification to the likes of Rockefeller, Carnegie, Vanderbilt, and Morgan. It meant that whatever their exploitive practices, and however harshly they took advantage of workers, they were thoroughly and "scientifically" justified. Spencer and Sumner argued that any kind of governmental intervention in the economy would, in effect, be going against science and evolution. The poor should not be helped, for in doing so the government would be encouraging the proliferation of the "unfit." "Taxing the wealthy," Sumner reasoned, "would be like killing your generals in time of war." This harsh philosophy underlay many of the congressional debates over proposed social legislation. It was also used to justify the dispossession of the Plains tribes and the conquest of the frontier by "fitter" Americans, to justify the implementation of Jim Crow laws and the emergence of segregation, and to justify imperialism. President Theodore Roosevelt insisted that industrial "civilized" nations had a duty to dominate the backward "uncivilized" nations by bestowing on them the benefits of Western culture and Christianity.

Throughout the era, workers' organizing efforts advanced by fits and starts. Although it lasted only six years, in 1869 the National Labor Union was founded. Also in 1869, the Knights of Labor came into being. Under Terence Powderly's leadership, it became an effective advocate of workers' interests but began to disintegrate in the aftermath of the Haymarket bombing. In May 1886 more than 350,000 workers, in order to force industrialists to consider their demand for an eight-hour workday, declared a general strike. During a rally at Chicago's Haymarket Square, while members of the Knights of Labor were addressing the protestors, the police moved in to disperse the crowd. Someone threw a bomb that killed eight policemen, and in the ensuing melee more than seventy people were injured. Eight anarchists were arrested, and the subsequent trial and executions derailed the labor movement. To most Americans, it seemed proof that unions would lead to anarchy and undermine American values. In the summer of 1892, workers at Carnegie's steel mill in Homestead, Pennsylvania, went on strike, but when Carnegie's partner Henry Clay Frick employed Pinkertons as strikebreakers, violence broke out. After ten people were killed and more than sixty wounded, the strike was broken, and the effort to unionize the steel industry was set back more than 40 years.

Farmers, too, banded together to promote their interests. Based primarily in the Midwest and South, the Granges and the Alliances were cooperative societies that demanded the federal government reform the currency system through the free and unlimited coinage of silver, as well as regulate banks, insurance companies, railroads, and telegraph companies. In 1892, the Populist Party published a platform urging these reforms as well as women's suffrage and the

direct election of senators. It nominated James B. Weaver for president, who astonished complacent Washington by winning more than a million votes.

Workers and farmers were not the only groups protesting against the naratives they faced. Minorities, especially Chinese immigrants on the West Coast, African Americans, and Indians, found that their rights were disregarded—even at times taken away. Ironically, the government treated these three minority groups in three entirely disparate ways: exclusion, assimilation, and separation. The Chinese Exclusion Act, passed in 1882, prohibited further Chinese immigration into the country and denied citizenship to those already living in the United States. The Dawes Act of 1887 was Washington's attempt to assimilate the Indian tribes into the American way of life by distributing land on the reservations to individuals and educating Native American children in such private academies as the Carlisle School in Pennsylvania, where they were immersed in white culture and the English language and compelled to forget Indian ways. The literacy tests, poll taxes, and Jim Crow laws of the Southern states that prevented African Americans from enjoying the full rights of citizenship were officially validated in 1896 by the *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision, in which the Supreme Court ruled that providing "separate but equal" facilities for blacks was constitutional. Dozens of Chinese protested against policies that discriminated against them, usually unsuccessfully, by taking the government to court. Indians struggled against assimilation and frequently attempted to escape from the reservations. However, when a band of 340 Miniconjou Sioux under Big Foot fled the Pine Ridge Reservation in December 1890, the Seventh Cavalry (Custer's old command) intercepted them a few days after Christmas at Wounded Knee. When the Indians resisted the cavalry's attempt to disarm them, the soldiers returned fire with cannon and Gatling guns. Most of the 146 killed were women and children, and the survivors were forced back onto the reservation. Wounded Knee—designated a "battle" by whites and a "massacre" by Indians—marked the end of Indian resistance. W. E. B. DuBois demanded full and immediate equality for African Americans. He was one of the founders of the Niagara Movement (forerunner of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People), which began an organized campaign to overturn the *Plessy* decision. African American journalist Ida B. Wells-Barnett campaigned for the federal government to enact and enforce antilynching laws.

Middle-class reformers also spoke out in response to the problems of industrialization. Brown University Professor Lester Frank Ward turned Spencer and Sumner's application of the theory of evolution on its head in a forceful attack on social Darwinism. Because humans have intelligence, Ward wrote in *Mind as a Social Factor*, we are capable of having an effect on natural selection. We can, through government, create economic and social legislation that will benefit the masses, and further the evolution of the human race. In contrast to Spencer's "survival of the fittest," Ward argued for making as many people as possible "fit to survive." The ideas of what became known as reform Darwinism became part of the intellectual underpinnings of many progressive

reformers. Jane Addams initiated the settlement house movement. Walter Rauschenbusch, claiming that the elimination of suffering was a moral necessity, applied Christian principles to the everyday work of making life better for the downtrodden. This Social Gospel subsequently had a significant impact in the twentieth century, most notably on Martin Luther King Jr.'s tactics in the civil rights movement.

Alcohol consumption was one of the most popular forms of entertainment in nineteenth-century America. As a result alcoholism, unemployment, spousal abuse, poverty, and crime all came to be viewed as the results of "demon rum." The impetus for reform in the antebellum period gave birth to a temperance movement that grew throughout the century, becoming, by the last quarter of the century, a formidable force. Many women viewed it as a feminist issue equal in importance to women's suffrage. Women were tired of husbands who would come home from work on payday after a stopover at the local saloon, not only inebriated but also with their weekly salaries half-consumed. Many arguments ensued, many wives were beaten, and many men became alcoholics and lost their jobs, plunging their families into poverty. The Women's Christian Temperance Union, under the leadership of Frances Willard, led the fight against alcohol abuse. Temperance was a moral as well as a feminist issue, especially for millions of conservative rural Protestants, but this morality was tightly linked with nativism and xenophobia. As millions of immigrants flocked to the United States from eastern and southern Europe, many temperance advocates believed that prohibiting alcohol would somehow penalize and maybe even discourage immigration from these Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, and Jewish areas.

The census report for 1890 revealed that, for the first time in American history, there was no discernible frontier line beyond which white settlement had not penetrated. By mid-decade, industrialists and politicians, fearing that American expansion had reached a limit that would lead to a severe contraction of economic growth, began to look abroad for markets and raw materials. In 1890 Navy Captain Alfred Thayer Mahan published a widely acclaimed book, *The Influence of Seapower upon History: 1660-1783*, in which he argued that all great empires in world history had controlled the seas. The United States, with a vast coastline on both the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, was in a position to become the dominant world power if the government would expand the navy, acquire overseas bases to furnish supplies for the fleet, and construct a canal through the Isthmus of Panama. Mahan's advice was heeded. The acquisition of Hawaii and Samoa and the Spanish American War of 1898 were the first steps to a new international outlook on the part of a nation that had long remained faithful to George Washington's counsel to avoid entangling itself in international alliances. By the turn of the century, the United States had acquired Guantanamo Bay in Cuba, as well as Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Philippine Islands. There was, however, widely based and passionate protest that such exercise of imperialist power so contradicted democratic principles that the United States was in danger of negating its own highly vaunted belief in "government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

Many writers and journalists embarked on intense efforts to expose—frequently with exaggeration and sensationalism—the evils of political corruption, worker exploitation, and conning of consumers. Muckrakers like Lincoln Steffens, Frank Norris, Ida M. Tarbell, and Upton Sinclair influenced local governments to pass regulatory legislation. Indeed, Sinclair's popular novel *The Jungle* persuaded President Theodore Roosevelt to initiate the legislation that created the Food and Drug Administration.

Terence Powderly (1849-1924)

As industrialization developed during the nineteenth century, American workers, in an effort to improve their lot, formed small craft unions. By 1866, many of these small unions had combined to form the National Labor Union (NLU). Although difficulties in maintaining solidarity among NLU members caused it to collapse within seven years, one of those who was influenced by the union movement was Terence Powderly. Believing that better wages and shorter hours would enable workers to live more satisfying lives and participate more fully in the American dream, Powderly joined the Knights of Labor in 1876. As he rose to a leadership position in this national union, Powderly realized that political power was one of the keys to workers' rights. With the support of labor, he was elected mayor of Scranton, Pennsylvania in 1878 and began serving the first of three terms as a reformer. Also in 1878, he opened up the Knights of Labor, making it a more inclusive union, and helped formulate a new constitution for the organization.

When workers around the country gathered at rallies, they often sang such songs as the one appended here, "Eight Hours," by I. G. Blanchard and Jesse Jones.

PREAMBLE TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE KNIGHTS OF LABOR, JANUARY 3, 1878

The recent alarming development and aggression of aggregated wealth, which, unless checked, will inevitably lead to the pauperization and hopeless degradation of the toiling masses, render it imperative, if we desire to enjoy the blessings of life, that a check should be placed upon its power and upon unjust accumulation, and a system adopted which will secure to the laborer the fruits of his toil; and as this much-desired object can only be accomplished by the thorough

unification of labor, and the united efforts of those who obey the divine injunction that "In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread," we have formed the [Knights of Labor] with a view of securing the organization and direction, by co-operative effort, of the power of the industrial classes; and we submit to the world the objects sought to be accomplished by our organization, calling upon all who believe in securing "the greatest good to the greatest number" to aid and assist us:

- I. To bring within the folds of organization every department of productive industry, making knowledge a standpoint for action, and industrial and moral worth, not wealth, the true standard of individual and national greatness.
- II. To secure to the toilers a proper share of the wealth that they create; more of the leisure that rightfully belongs to them; more societary advantages; more of the benefits, privileges and emoluments of the world; in a word, all those rights and privileges necessary to make them capable of enjoying, appreciating, defending and perpetuating the blessings of good government.
- III. To arrive at the true condition of the producing masses in their educational, moral and financial condition, by demanding from the various governments the establishment of Bureaus of Labor Statistics.
- IV. The establishment of co-operative institutions, productive and distributive.
- V. The reserving of the public lands—the heritage of the people—for the actual settler; not another acre for railroads or speculators.
- VI. The abrogation of all laws that do not bear equally upon capital and labor, the removal of unjust technicalities, delays and discriminations in the administration of justice, and the adopting of measures providing for the health and safety of those engaged in mining, manufacturing or building pursuits.
- VII. The enactment of laws to compel chartered corporations to pay their employe[e]s weekly, in full, for labor performed during the preceding week, in the lawful money of the country.
- VIII. The enactment of laws giving mechanics and laborers a first lien on their work for their full wages.
- IX. The abolishment of the contract system on national, State and municipal work.
- X. The substitution of arbitration for strikes, whenever and wherever employers and employe[e]s are willing to meet on equitable grounds.
- XI. The prohibition of the employment of children in workshops, mines and factories before attaining their fourteenth year.

SOURCE: Terence V. Powderly, *Thirty Years of Labor, 1859 to 1889* (Philadelphia, 1890), 128-130.

XII. To abolish the system of letting out by contract the labor of convicts in our prisons and reformatory institutions.

XIII. To secure for both sexes equal pay for equal work.

XIV. The reduction of the hours of labor to eight per day, so that the laborers may have more time for social enjoyment and intellectual improvement, and be enabled to reap the advantages conferred by the labor-saving machinery which their brains have created.

XV. To prevail upon governments to establish a purely national circulating medium, based upon the faith and resources of the nation, and issued directly to the people, without the intervention of any system of banking corporations, which money shall be a legal tender in payment of all debts, public or private.

"EIGHT HOURS," BY I. G. BLANCHARD AND JESSE JONES, 1880s

We mean to make things over,

We are tired of toil for naught

With but bare enough to live upon

And ne'er an hour for thought.

We want to feel the sunshine

And we want to smell the flow'rs

We are sure that God has willed it

And we mean to have eight hours;

We're summoning our forces

From the shipyard, shop and mill

Eight hours for work, eight hours for rest

Eight hours for what we will;

Eight hours for work, eight hours for rest

Eight hours for what we will.

The beasts that graze the hillside,

And the birds that wander free,

In the life that God has meted,

Have a better life than we.

Oh, hands and hearts are weary,

And homes are heavy with dole;

If our life's to be filled with drudg'ry,

SOURCE: Margaret Bradford Boni, ed., *The Fireside Book of Favorite American Songs* (New York: Simon and Shuster, 1952.)

*What need of a human soul.
Shout, shout the lusty rally,
From shipyard, shop, and mill.*

(Refrain)

*The voice of God within us
Is calling us to stand
Erect as is becoming
To the work of His right hand.
Should he, to whom the Maker
His glorious image gave,
The meanest of His creatures crouch,
A bread-and-butter slave?
Let the shout ring down the valleys
And echo from every hill.*

(Refrain)

*Ye deem they're feeble voices
That are raised in labor's cause,
But bethink ye of the torrent,
And the wild tornado's laws.
We say not toil's uprising
In terror's shape will come,
Yet the world were wise to listen
To the monetary hum.
Soon, soon the deep toned rally
Shall all the nations thrill.*

(Refrain)

*From factories and workshops
In long and weary lines,
From all the sweltering forges,
And from out the sunless mines,
Wherever toil is wasting
The force of life to live
There the bent and battered armies
Come to claim what God doth give
And the blazon on the banner
Doth with hope the nation fill.*

(Refrain)

*Hurrah, hurrah for labor,
For it shall arise in might*

*It has filled the world with plenty,
It shall fill the world with light
Hurrah, hurrah for labor,
It is mustering all its powers
And shall march along to victory
With the banner of Eight Hours.
Shout, shout the echoing rally
Till all the welkin thrill.*

(Refrain)

Lyrics by I. G. Blanchard
Music by Rev. Jesse H. Jones

Chief Joseph (1840-1904)

Chief Joseph was the name whites gave Heimnot Tooyalakset ("Thunder Coming from the Mountain"), chief of the Nez Percé. The Nez Percé had given Lewis and Clark provisions when their expedition crossed the Continental Divide on its way to the Pacific in 1805, and the grateful explorers had promised them that the government in Washington would always be their friend. However, in 1877 the Nez Percé were told they had to leave their homes in the Wallowa Valley of eastern Oregon and settle on the Lapwai reservation in Idaho. They refused to go, and when the U.S. Army tried to force them, Chief Joseph led his tribe on an extraordinary journey of more than a thousand miles in an effort to escape to Canada. Finally overtaken 40 miles from the border, Joseph surrendered to Colonel Nelson B. Miles. "I am tired of fighting," Joseph reputedly said. "Our chiefs are killed. . . . It is cold and we have no blankets. The little children are freezing to death. My people—some of them have run away to the hills and have no blankets and no food. No one knows where they are—perhaps freezing to death. I want to have time to look for my children and see how many of them I can find. Maybe I shall find them among the dead. Hear me, my chiefs, my heart is sick and sad. From where the sun now stands I will fight no more forever." General Miles had promised Joseph that the tribe would be returned to Oregon, but instead they were sent to a reservation in Oklahoma. Within two years, many of the Nez Percé had died in the terribly unhealthy conditions of the reservation, and Chief Joseph went to Washington, where he made the following appeal to President Rutherford B. Hayes, members of his cabinet, and a number of

congressmen. Eventually the Nez Percé were returned to the Pacific Northwest, but Joseph himself was sent to a separate reservation in Washington, where, in 1904, he died, it was commonly said, of a broken heart.

APPEAL TO THE HAYES ADMINISTRATION, 1879

At last I was granted permission to come to Washington and bring my friend Yellow Bull and our interpreter with me. I am glad I came. I have shaken hands with a good many friends, but there are some things I want to know which no one seems able to explain. I cannot understand how the Government sends a man out to fight us, as it did General Miles, and then breaks his word. Such a government has something wrong about it. I cannot understand why so many chiefs are allowed to talk so many different ways, and promise so many different things. I have seen the Great Father Chief [Hayes] . . . and many other law chiefs, and they all say they are my friends, and that I shall have justice, but while all their mouths talk right I do not understand why nothing is done for my people.

I have heard talk and talk but nothing is done. Good words do not last long unless they amount to something. Words do not pay for my dead people. They do not pay for my country now overrun by white men. They do not protect my father's grave. They do not pay for my horses and cattle.

Good words do not give me back my children. Good words will not make good the promise of your war chief, General Miles. Good words will not give my people a home where they can live in peace and take care of themselves.

I am tired of talk that comes to nothing. It makes my heart sick when I remember all the good words and all the broken promises. There has been too much talking by men who had no right to talk. Too many misinterpretations have been made; too many misunderstandings have come up between the white men and the Indians.

If the white man wants to live in peace with the Indian he can live in peace. There need be no trouble. Treat all men alike. Give them the same laws. Give them all an even chance to live and grow. All men were made by the same Great Spirit Chief. They are all brothers. The earth is the mother of all people, and all people should have equal rights upon it. You might as well expect all rivers to run backward as that any man who was born a free man should be contented penned up and denied liberty to go where he pleases. If you tie a horse to a stake, do you expect he will grow fat? If you pen an Indian up on a small spot of earth and compel him to stay there, he will not be contented nor will he grow and prosper.

I have asked some of the Great White Chiefs where they get their authority to say to the Indian that he shall stay in one place, while he sees white men going where they please. They cannot tell me.

I only ask of the Government to be treated as all other men are treated. If I cannot go to my own home, let me have a home in a country where my people will not die so fast. I would like to go to Bitter Root Valley. There my people would be happy; where they are now they are dying. Three have died since I left my camp to come to Washington. When I think of our condition, my heart is heavy. I see men of my own race treated as outlaws and driven from country to country, or shot down like animals.

I know that my race must change. We cannot hold our own with the white men as we are. We only ask an even chance to live as other men live. We ask to be recognized as men. We ask that the same law shall work alike on all men. If an Indian breaks the law, punish him by the law. If a white man breaks the law, punish him also.

Let me be a free man—free to travel, free to stop, free to work, free to trade where I choose, free to choose my own teachers, free to follow the religion of my fathers, free to talk, think and act for myself—and I will obey every law or submit to the penalty.

Whenever the white man treats the Indian as they treat each other then we shall have no more wars. We shall be all alike—brothers of one father and mother, with one sky above us and one country around us and one government for all. Then the Great Spirit Chief who rules above will smile upon this land and send rain to wash out the bloody spots made by brothers' hands upon the face of the earth. For this time the Indian race is waiting and praying. I hope no more groans of wounded men and women will ever go to the ear of the Great Spirit Chief above, and that all people may be one people.

Mary Elizabeth Lease (1850-1933)

Mary Elizabeth Lease was a charismatic and eloquent political agitator who traveled the country in the 1890s to make stirring inflammatory speeches against the exploitation of farmers and workers by industrialists, bankers, and railroads. She was active in the leadership of the Farmers' Alliance, the Knights of Labor, and the Populist Party, as well as an ardent suffragist who urged women to be politically engaged in anticapitalist agitation. Although it is apparently only a legend that she urged farmers in her speeches to "raise less corn and more hell," she truly was a firebrand, as this speech at a Women's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU) convention attests.

SPEECH TO THE WCTU, 1890

... [We] are living in a grand and wonderful time—a time when old ideas, traditions and customs have broken loose from their moorings and are hopelessly adrift on the great shoreless, boundless sea of human thought—a time when the gray old world begins to dimly comprehend that there is no difference between the brain of an intelligent woman and the brain of an intelligent man; no difference between the soul-power or brainpower that nerved the arm of Charlotte Corday [the assassin of Jean-Paul Marat during the French Revolution] to deeds of heroic patriotism and the soul-power or brain-power that swayed old John Brown behind his death-dealing barricade at Ossawatimie. We are living in an age of thought. The mighty dynamite of thought is upheaving the social and political structure and stirring the hearts of men from centre to circumference. Men, women and children are in commotion, discussing the mighty problems of the day. The agricultural classes, loyal and patriotic, slow to act and slow to think, are to-day thinking for themselves; and their thought has crystallized into action. Organization is the key-note to a mighty movement among the masses which is the protest of the patient burden-bearers of the nation against years of economic and political superstition....

The movement among the masses today is an echo of the life of Jesus of Nazareth, an honest endeavor on the part of the people to put into practical operation the basic principles of Christianity: "Whosoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them."

In an organization founded upon the eternal principles of truth and right, based upon the broad and philanthropic principle, "Injury to one is the concern of all," having for its motto, "Exact justice to all, special privileges to none,"—the farmers and laborers could not well exclude their mothers, wives and daughters, the patient burden bearers of the home, who had been their faithful companions, their tried friends and trusted counselors through long, weary years of poverty and toil. Hence the doors of the Farmers' Alliance were thrown open wide to the women of the land. They were invited into full membership, with all the privileges of promotion; actually recognized and treated as human beings. And not only the mothers, wives and daughters, but "the sisters, the cousins and the aunts," availed themselves of their newly offered liberties, till we find at the present time upward of a half-million women in the Alliance, who, because of their loyalty to home and loved ones and their intuitive and inherent sense of justice, are investigating the condition of the country, studying the great social, economic and political problems, fully realizing that the political arena is the only place where the mighty problems of to-day and tomorrow can be satisfactorily fought and settled, and amply qualified to go hand-in-hand with fathers,

husbands, sons and brothers to the polls and register their opinion against legalized robbery and corporate wrong.

George Eliot tells us that "much that we are and have is due to the untold acts of those who in life were ungathered and in death sleep in unvisited tombs." So to the women of the Alliance, who bravely trudged twice a week to the bleak country schoolhouse, literally burning midnight oil as they studied with their loved ones the economic and political problems, and helped them devise methods by which the shackles of industrial slavery might be broken, and the authors of the nation's liberties, the creators of the nation's wealth and greatness, might be made free and prosperous—to these women, unknown and uncrowned, belongs the honor of defeating for reelection to the United States Senate that man who for eighteen years has signally failed to represent his constituents, and who during that time has never once identified himself with any legislation for the oppressed and overburdened people.

Three years ago this man [John James] Ingalls [Republican Senator from Kansas] made a speech on woman suffrage at Abilene, Kan., in which he took occasion to speak in the most ignorant and vicious manner of women, declaring that "a woman could not and should not vote because she was a woman." Why? She was a woman, and that was enough; the subject was too delicate for further discussion....

I overheard yesterday morning at the hotel breakfast table a conversation between two gentlemen in regard to Ingalls. "I consider his defeat," said the first speaker, "to be a national calamity." "Your reasons," said the second. "Why, he is such a brilliantly smart man," he replied. "True," said the other; "but he must needs be a smart man to be the consummate rascal he has proven himself to be." And I thought as I heard the remarks, "Our opinion is also shared by men." You wonder, perhaps, at the zeal and enthusiasm of the Western women in this reform movement. Let me tell you why they are interested. Turn to your old school-maps and books of a quarter of a century ago, and you will find that what is now the teeming and fruitful West was then known as the Treeless Plain, the Great American Desert. To this sterile and remote region, infested by savage beasts and still more savage men, the women of the New England States, the women of the cultured East, came with husbands, sons and brothers to help them build up a home upon the broad and vernal prairies of the West. We came with the roses of health on our cheeks, the light of hope in our eyes, the fires of youth and hope burning in our hearts. We left the old familiar paths, the associations of home and the friends of childhood. We left schools and churches—all that made life dear—and turned our faces toward the setting sun. We endured hardships, dangers and privations; hours of loneliness, fear and sorrow; our little babes were born upon these wide, unsheltered prairies; and there, upon the sweeping prairies beneath the cedar trees our hands have planted to mark the sacred place, our little ones lie buried. We toiled in the cabin and in the field; we planted trees and orchards; we helped our loved ones to make the prairie blossom as the rose. The neat cottage took the place of the sod shanty, the log-cabin and the humble dug-out.

SOURCE: Mary Elizabeth Lease, "Speech to the Woman's Christian Temperance Union," in Joan M. Jensen, *With These Hands: Women Working on the Land* (Old Westbury, NY: Feminist Press and McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1981), 154-160.

Yet, after all our years of toil and privation, dangers and hardships upon the Western frontier, monopoly is taking our homes from us by an infamous system of mortgage foreclosure, the most infamous that has ever disgraced the statutes of a civilized nation. It takes from us at the rate of five hundred a month the homes that represent the best years of our life, our toil, our hopes, our happiness. How did it happen? The government, at the bid of Wall Street, repudiated its contracts with the people; the circulating medium was contracted in the interest of Shylock from \$54 per capita to less than \$8 per capita; or, as Senator [Preston] Plumb [of Kansas] tells us, "Our debts were increased, while the means to pay them was decreased," or as grand Senator [William Morris] Stewart [of Nevada] puts it, "For twenty years the market value of the dollar has gone up and the market value of labor has gone down, till today the American laborer, in bitterness and wrath, asks which is the worst—the black slavery that has gone or the white slavery that has come?"

Do you wonder the women are joining the Alliance? I wonder if there is a woman in all this broad land who can afford to stay out of the Alliance. Our loyal, white-ribbon women should be heart and hand in this Farmers' Alliance movement, for the men whom we have sent to represent us are the only men in the councils of this nation who have not been elected on a liquor platform; and I want to say here, with exultant pride, that the five farmer Congressmen and the United States Senator we have sent up from Kansas—the liquor traffic, Wall Street, "nor the gates of hell shall not prevail against them." . . .

Let no one for a moment believe that this uprising and federation of the people is but a passing episode in politics. It is a religious as well as a political movement, for we seek to put into practical operation the teachings and precepts of Jesus of Nazareth. We seek to enact justice and equity between man and man. We seek to bring the nation back to the constitutional liberties guaranteed us by our fore-fathers. The voice that is coming up today from the mystic chords of the American heart is the same voice that Lincoln heard blending with the guns of Fort Sumter and the Wilderness, and it is breaking into a clarion cry today that will be heard around the world.

Crowns will fall, thrones will tremble, kingdoms will disappear, the divine right of kings and the divine right of capital will fade away like the mists of the morning when the Angel of Liberty shall kindle the fires of justice in the hearts of men. "Exact justice to all, special privileges to none." No more millionaires, and no more paupers; no more gold kings, silver kings and oil kings, and no more little waifs of humanity starving for a crust of bread. No more gaunt faced, hollow-eyed girls in the factories, and no more little boys reared in poverty and crime for the penitentiaries and the gallows. But we shall have the golden age of which Isaiah sang and the prophets have so long foretold; when the farmers shall be prosperous and happy, dwelling under their own vine and fig tree; when the laborer shall have that for which he toils; when occupancy and use shall be the only title to land, and every one shall obey the divine injunction, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." When men shall be just and generous, little less than gods, and women shall be just and charitable toward each other,

little less than angels; when we shall have not a government of the people by capitalists, but a government of the people, by the people. . . .

The People's Party

During the 1880s and 1890s, thousands of small midwestern and southern farmers formed cooperative organizations like the Grange and the Farmers' Alliance as a united front to combat the excesses of big business and demand that the federal government overcome its unwillingness to regulate industrialists, railroads, bankers, and processors. By 1892, their discontent and frustration had led them to form a new political party—the People's Party. In July they convened in Omaha, Nebraska, nominated James B. Weaver for president, and issued the Omaha Platform, in which they proclaimed their grievances and demands as well as their solidarity with exploited industrial workers. Dubbed the Populist Party by the press, their ardent campaign for Weaver made the Populists the most successful third party in the nation up to that time. Weaver received more than a million votes in the November election and won four states with 22 electoral votes, forcing Republicans and Democrats to take notice.

THE OMAHA PLATFORM, JULY 1892

Assembled upon the 116th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, the People's Party of America, in their first national convention, invoking upon their action the blessing of Almighty God, put forth in the name and on behalf of the people of this country, the following preamble and declaration of principles:

PREAMBLE

The conditions which surround us best justify our cooperation; we meet in the midst of a nation brought to the verge of moral, political, and material ruin. Corruption dominates the ballot-box, the Legislatures, the Congress, and touches even the ermine of the bench. The people are demoralized; most of the States have been compelled to isolate the voters at the polling places to prevent universal intimidation and bribery. The newspapers are largely subsidized or muzzled, public opinion silenced, business prostrated, homes covered with

mortgages, labor impoverished, and the land concentrating in the hands of capitalists. The urban workmen are denied the right to organize for self-protection, imported pauperized labor beats down their wages, a hireling standing army, unrecognized by our laws, is established to shoot them down, and they are rapidly degenerating into European conditions. The fruits of the toil of millions are badly stolen to build up colossal fortunes for a few, unprecedented in the history of mankind; and the possessors of these, in turn, despise the Republic and endanger liberty. From the same prolific womb of governmental injustice we breed the two great classes—tramps and millionaires.

The national power to create money is appropriated to enrich bondholders; a vast public debt payable in legal-tender currency has been funded into gold-bearing bonds, thereby adding millions to the burdens of the people. Silver, which has been accepted as coin since the dawn of history, has been demonetized to add to the purchasing power of gold by decreasing the value of all forms of property as well as human labor, and the supply of currency is purposely abridged to fatten usurers, bankrupt enterprise, and enslave industry. A vast conspiracy against mankind has been organized on two continents, and it is rapidly taking possession of the world. If not met and overthrown at once it forebodes terrible social convulsions, the destruction of civilization, or the establishment of an absolute despotism.

We have witnessed for more than a quarter of a century the struggles of the two great political parties for power and plunder, while grievous wrongs have been inflicted upon the suffering people. We charge that the controlling influences dominating both these parties have permitted the existing dreadful conditions to develop without serious effort to prevent or restrain them. Neither do they now promise us any substantial reform. They have agreed together to ignore, in the coming campaign, every issue but one. They propose to drown the outcries of a plundered people with the uproar of a sham battle over the tariff, so that capitalists, corporations, national banks, rings, trusts, watered stock, the demonetization of silver and the oppressions of the usurers may all be lost sight of. They propose to sacrifice our homes, lives, and children on the altar of mammon; to destroy the multitude in order to secure corruption funds from the millionaires.

Assembled on the anniversary of the birthday of the nation, and filled with the spirit of the grand general and chief who established our independence, we seek to restore the government of the Republic to the hands of "the plain people," with which class it originated. We assert our purposes to be identical with the purposes of the National Constitution; "to form a more perfect union and establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity." We declare that this republic can only endure as a free government while built upon the love to the whole people for each other and for the nation; that it cannot be pinned together by bayonets; that the civil war is over, and that every passion and resentment which grew out of it must die with it; and that we must be in fact, as we are in name, one united brotherhood of freemen.

Our country finds itself confronted by conditions for which there is not precedent in the history of the world; our annual agricultural productions amount to billions of dollars in value, which must, within a few weeks or months, be exchanged for billions of dollars' worth of commodities consumed in their production; the existing currency supply is wholly inadequate to make this exchange; the results are falling prices, the formation of combines and rings, the impoverishment of the producing class. We pledge ourselves that if given power we will labor to correct these evils by wise and reasonable legislation, in accordance with the terms of our platform. We believe that the power of government—in other words, of the people—should be expanded (as in the case of the postal service) as rapidly and as far as the good sense of an intelligent people and the teaching of experience shall justify, to the end that oppression, injustice, and poverty shall eventually cease in the land. . . .

PLATFORM

We declare, therefore—

First.—That the union of the labor forces of the United States this day consummated shall be permanent and perpetual; may its spirit enter into all hearts for the salvation of the republic and the uplifting of mankind!

Second.—Wealth belongs to him who creates it, and every dollar taken from industry without an equivalent is robbery. "If any will not work, neither shall he eat." The interests of rural and civil labor are the same; their enemies are identical.

Third.—We believe that the time has come when the railroad corporations will either own the people or the people must own the railroads; and should the government enter upon the work of owning and managing all railroads, we should favor an amendment to the constitution by which all persons engaged in the government service shall be placed under a civil-service regulation of the most rigid character, so as to prevent the increase of the power of the national administration by the use of such additional government employees.

FIRST, *Money*.—We demand a national currency, safe, sound, and flexible issued by the general government only, a full legal tender for all debts, public and private, and that without the use of banking corporations; a just, equitable, and efficient means of distribution direct to the people, at a tax not to exceed 2 percent, per annum, to be provided as set forth in the sub-treasury plan of the Farmers' Alliance, or a better system, also by payments in discharge of its obligations for public improvements.

- a. We demand free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold at the present legal ratio of 16 to 1.
- b. We demand that the amount of circulating medium be speedily increased to not less than \$50 per capita.

- c. We demand a graduated income tax.
- d. We believe that the money of the country should be kept as much as possible in the hands of the people, and hence we demand that all State and national revenues shall be limited to the necessary expenses of the government, economically and honestly administered.
- e. We demand that postal savings banks be established by the government for the safe deposit of the earnings of the people and to facilitate exchange.

SECOND, *Transportation*—Transportation being a means of exchange and a public necessity, the government should own and operate the railroads in the interest of the people.

- a. The telegraph and telephone, like the post-office system, being a necessity for the transmission of news, should be owned and operated by the government in the interest of the people.

THIRD, *Land*—The land, including all the natural sources of wealth, is the heritage of the people, and should not be monopolized for speculative purposes, and alien ownership of land should be prohibited. All land now held by railroads and other corporations in excess of their actual needs, and all lands now owned by aliens should be reclaimed by the government and held for actual settlers only.

EXPRESSIONS OF SENTIMENTS

Your Committee on Platform and Resolutions beg leave unanimously to report the following: Whereas, Other questions have been presented for our consideration, we hereby submit the following, not as a part of the Platform of the People's Party, but as resolutions expressive of the sentiment of this Convention.

RESOLVED, That we demand a free ballot and a fair count in all elections and pledge ourselves to secure it to every legal voter without Federal Intervention, through the adoption by the States of the unperturbed Australian or secret ballot system.

RESOLVED, That the revenue derived from a graduated income tax should be applied to the reduction of the burden of taxation now levied upon the domestic industries of this country.

RESOLVED, That we pledge our support to fair and liberal pensions to ex-Union soldiers and sailors.

RESOLVED, That we condemn the fallacy of protecting American labor under the present system, which opens our ports to the pauper and criminal classes of the world and crowds out our wage-earners; and we denounce the present ineffective laws against contract labor, and demand the further restriction of undesirable emigration.

RESOLVED, That we cordially sympathize with the efforts of organized workmen to shorten the hours of labor, and demand a rigid enforcement of the existing eight-hour law on Government work, and ask that a penalty clause be added to the said law.

RESOLVED, That we regard the maintenance of a large standing army of mercenaries, known as the Pinkerton system, as a menace to our liberties, and we demand its abolition. . . .

RESOLVED, That we commend to the favorable consideration of the people and the reform press the legislative system known as the initiative and referendum.

RESOLVED, That we favor a constitutional provision limiting the office of President and Vice-President to one term, and providing for the election of Senators of the United States by a direct vote of the people.

RESOLVED, That we oppose any subsidy or national aid to any private corporation for any purpose.

RESOLVED, That this convention sympathizes with the Knights of Labor and their righteous contest with the tyrannical combine of clothing manufacturers of Rochester, and declare it to be a duty of all who hate tyranny and oppression to refuse to purchase the goods made by the said manufacturers, or to patronize any merchants who sell such goods.

Jane Addams (1860-1935)

In 1889, Jane Addams founded Hull House in Chicago. Hull House was part of the settlement house movement, which provided a place for immigrant women and children to stay while they were trying to adapt to life in the United States. Settlement houses offered English and hygiene lessons, after-school programs for children, and often training in job skills, like sewing and bookbinding. Addams, like many other reformers of her time, believed that philanthropic endeavors, such as Hull House, would ease immigrants into American life and therefore serve as a counterbalance to radical or anarchistic tendencies. Hull House was founded only three years after the Haymarket Riots frightened many middle-class Americans into believing that the influx of foreigners would inevitably lead to violent revolution. Lightening the burdens and hardships immigrants faced would give them reason to believe that they could become part of American society. Reform defuses revolution.

Addams, of course, was not only operating from this conservative view to thwart radical tendencies; she truly believed in helping people for purely humanitarian purposes. Places like Hull House also provided job opportunities for many women, and these reform-minded women later

*became significant players in the suffrage movement. Jane Addams herself was involved in both the women's suffrage and early civil rights movements. She was one of the cofounders of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). In 1931, she was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. The following excerpts are from an address Jane Addams delivered in 1892 that was later published in her book *Twenty Years at Hull House*.*

THE SUBJECTIVE NECESSITY OF SOCIAL SETTLEMENTS, 1892

In a thousand voices singing the Hallelujah Chorus in Handel's "Messiah," it is possible to distinguish the leading voices, but the differences of training and cultivation between them and the voices of the chorus, are lost in the unity of purpose and in the fact that they are all human voices lifted by a high motive. This is a weak illustration of what a Settlement attempts to do. It aims, in a measure, to develop whatever of social life its neighborhood may afford, to focus and give form to that life, to bring to bear upon it the results of cultivation and training; but it receives in exchange for the music of isolated voices the volume and strength of the chorus. It is quite impossible for me to say in what proportion or degree the subjective necessity which led to the opening of Hull-House combined the three trends: first, the desire to interpret democracy in social terms; secondly, the impulse beating at the very source of our lives, urging us to aid in the race progress; and; thirdly, the Christian movement toward humanitarianism....

The Settlement then, is an experimental effort to aid in the solution of the social and industrial problems which are engendered by the modern conditions of life in a great city. It insists that these problems are not confined to any one portion of a city. It is an attempt to relieve, at the same time, the overaccumulation at one end of society and the destitution at the other; but it assumes that this overaccumulation and destitution is most sorely felt in the things that pertain to social and educational privileges. From its very nature it can stand for no political or social propaganda. It must, in a sense, give the warm welcome of an inn to all such propaganda, if perchance one of them be found an angel. The only thing to be dreaded in the Settlement is that it lose its flexibility, its power of quick adaptation, its readiness to change its methods as its environment may demand. It must be open to conviction and must have a deep and abiding sense of tolerance. It must be hospitable and ready for experiment. It should demand from its residents a scientific patience in the accumulation of facts and the steady holding of their sympathies as one of the best instruments for that accumulation. It must be grounded in a philosophy whose foundation is on the solidarity of the human

race, a philosophy which will not waver when the race happens to be represented by a drunken woman or an idiot boy. Its residents must be emptied of all conceit of opinion and all self-assertion, and ready to arouse and interpret the public opinion of their neighborhood. They must be content to live quietly side by side with their neighbors, until they grow into a sense of relationship and mutual interests. Their neighbors are held apart by differences of race and language which the residents can more easily overcome. They are bound to see the needs of their neighborhood as a whole, to furnish data for legislation, and to use their influence to secure it. In short, residents are pledged to devote themselves to the duties of good citizenship and to the arousing of the social energies which too largely lie dormant in every neighborhood given over to industrialism. They are bound to regard the entire life of their city as organic, to make an effort to unify it, and to protest against its over-differentiation.

It is always easy to make all philosophy point one particular moral and all history adorn one particular tale; but I may be forgiven the reminder that the best speculative philosophy sets forth the solidarity of the human race; that the highest moralists have taught that without the advance and improvement of the whole, no man can hope for any lasting improvement in his own moral or material individual condition; and that the subjective necessity for Social Settlements is therefore identical with that necessity, which urges us on toward social and individual salvation.

Frances E. Willard (1839-1898)

After graduating from Northwestern Female College in 1859, Frances E. Willard taught for several years, traveled abroad, and eventually was offered the presidency of Evanston College for Ladies. When the college was absorbed by Northwestern University, Willard became dean of women. In 1874, however, she gave up her academic career to devote herself to the temperance crusade. As corresponding secretary for the Woman's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU), she became increasingly radical, eventually splitting with the organization's first president, Annie Wittenmeyer, over the issue of women's suffrage. Against Wittenmeyer's opposition, Willard argued that other reforms, especially women's suffrage, should be linked to the temperance issue and therefore be a central plank in the WCTU's platform. By 1879, her political struggle with Wittenmeyer ended triumphantly for Willard, when she was elected the organization's second president. In 1883, Willard founded the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union, which was the first international women's organization. She also was one of the founders of the Prohibition Party and the National Council of Women. She served as

the latter's first president from 1888 to 1890. Her attempt in 1892 to form a coalition with the Populist Party failed, however. Through persistent mobilization, political activism, lobbying of Congress, and putting political pressure on senators and other influential politicians, the WCTU was eventually instrumental in the passage and ratification in 1919 of the Eighteenth Amendment, which prohibited the sale of alcohol in the United States as of January 1, 1920. (The Twenty-first Amendment, in 1933, repealed prohibition.)

Willard's motto, "Do everything," which she refers to in this excerpt from her 1893 presidential address to the WCTU, reflects her belief that all reforms were interrelated. Throughout her activist career, she was as ardent an advocate of women's suffrage, equal pay for equal work, and other reforms as she was a champion of temperance. (For more of this speech, see the full edition of *Dissent in America: The Voices That Shaped a Nation*.)

SPEECH TO THE WORLD'S WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION, 1893

... The history of the reformer, whether man or woman, on any line of action is but this: when he sees it all alone he is a fanatic; when a good many see it with him they are enthusiasts; when all see it he is a hero. The gradations are as clearly marked by which he ascends from zero to hero, as the lines of latitude from the North Pole to the Equator....

Concerning the Temperance Movement in our land and throughout the world to-day, the pessimist says—and says truly—"There was never so much liquor manufactured in any one year since time began as in the year 1893, and as a consequence never did so much liquor flow down the people's throats as in this same year of grace." "But," says the optimist, "There is each year a larger acreage from which the brewer and distiller may gather the golden grain and luscious fruits, there are more people to imbibe the exhilarating poison; but, per contra, there was never so much intelligent thinking in any one year as to the drink delusion, there were never so many children studying in the schools the laws written in their members, there were never such gatherings together of temperance people to consult on the two great questions what to do and what not to do as in this year; there was never such a volume of experience and expert testimony and knowledge so varied, so complete, as we have had this year at the International Congress; there were never so many total abstainers in proportion to the population, never so many intelligent people who could render a reason

scientific, ethical, aesthetic, for their total abstinence faith as now; there were never so many pulpits from which to bombard the liquor traffic and the drink habit; there were never so many journalists who had a friendly word to say for the Temperance Reform; there was never such a stirring up of temperance politics; for the foremost historic nation of the world, Great Britain, has this year, for the first time, adopted as a plank in the platform of the dominant party the principle that the people shall themselves decide whether or not they want the public house; and as a natural consequence of this political action there was never a public sentiment so respectful toward the Temperance Reform. The great world-brain is becoming saturated with the idea that it is reasonable and kind to let strong drink alone. The vastness of these changes can only be measured by the remembrance that a few generations ago these same drinks were the accredited emblems in cot and palace alike, of hospitality, kindness, and good-will.

So far as the White Ribbon movement is concerned, this has been its best and brightest year from the outlook of the World's W.C.T.U., and that is the only point of view that is adequate. How little did they dream, those devoted women of the praying bands, who with their patient footsteps bridged the distance between home and saloon, and in their little despised groups poured out their souls to God, and their pitiful plea into the ears of men, that the "Movement" would be systematized twenty years later into an organization known and loved by the best men and women in every civilized nation on the earth; and that its heroic missionaries would be obliged to circumnavigate the globe in order to visit the outposts of the Society. How little did they dream that in the year of the World's Columbian Exposition well nigh half a million of children would send their autographs on the triple pledge cards of our Loyal Temperance Legions, and Sunday School Department; that we should have a publishing house, owned and conducted by the Society itself, from which more than a hundred million pages of the literature of light and leading should go forth this year; how little could they have conceived of the significance that is wrapt up in the lengthening folds of the Polyglot Petition, signed and circulated in fifty languages, and containing the signatures and attestations of between three and four million of the best people that live, praying for the abolition of the alcohol traffic, the opium traffic, and the licensed traffic in degraded women. How little they dreamed of that great movement by which the study of physiology and hygiene were to bring the arrest of thought to millions of young minds concerning the true inwardness of all narcotic poisons in their effects on the body and the brain. How "far beyond their thought" the enfranchisement of women in New Zealand and Wyoming, Kansas and "Michigan, my Michigan!" How inconceivable to them the vision of our House Beautiful reared in the heart of the world's most electric city, and sending forth its influence to the furthest corner of the globe. How little did they dream that the echo of their hymns should yet be heard and heeded by a woman whose lineage, and the prowess of whose historic name may be traced through centuries,

and that not alone from the cottage and the homestead, but from the emblazoned walls of splendid castles, should be driven the cup that seems to cheer, but at the last inebriates. But we must remember that, after all, these are but the days of small beginnings compared with what 20 more years shall show. Doubtless if we could see the power to which this movement of women's hearts for the protection of their hearthstones shall attain in the next generation, the inspiration of that knowledge would exhilarate us beyond that which is good for such steady patient workers as we have been, are, and wish to be; but I dare prophesy that twenty years from now woman will be fully panoplied in the politics and government of all English-speaking nations; she will find her glad footsteps impeded by no artificial barriers, but whatever she can do well she will be free to do in the enlightened age of worship, helpfulness and brotherhood, toward which we move with steps accelerated far beyond our ken. The momentum of the centuries is in the widening, deepening current of 19th century reform; the 20th century's dawn shall witness our compensations and reprisals, and as these increase humanity shall pay back into the mother-heart of woman its unmeasured penitence and unfathomed regret for all that she has missed (and through her, every son and daughter that she has brought into the world), by reason of the awful mistake by which, in the age of force, man substituted his "thus far and no farther," in place of the "thus far and no farther" of God; one founded in a selfish and ignorant view of woman's powers, the other giving her what every sentient being ought to have—a fair field and a free course to run and be glorified....

Booker T. Washington (1856-1915)

Booker T. Washington was one of the leading spokesmen for African Americans in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Born a slave, Washington believed deeply in the indispensable importance of education for the advancement of freedmen. In 1881, he became the first principal of the Normal School for Negroes in Tuskegee, Alabama. Over the next several years, as Washington presided over the transformation of this school into the Tuskegee Institute, he became one of the most influential voices promoting African American education.

Washington believed, however, that blacks should not seek education for education's sake, and that they should not bother learning Latin, Greek, philosophy, or other esoteric subjects. Rather, they should concern themselves with technical education, so that they could become more productive members of society and enter occupations that would advance them economically. The Tuskegee Institute emphasized mechanics and agricultural economics—subjects that were practical.

In his famous "Atlanta Compromise" speech of 1895 at the Cotton States Exposition, Washington urged blacks to accept the Jim Crow laws and acquiesce in segregation, and he urged whites to encourage black economic opportunity. This would be the surest path to achieving equality in the United States. By concentrating on economic betterment, the former slaves would rise up the ladder to such a degree that whites would eventually bestow political and civil rights upon them. "No race that has anything to contribute to the markets of the world is long in any degree ostracized." This pragmatic, compliant philosophy endeared him to whites but also earned him the opprobrium of many of his African American contemporaries. Black leaders such as Ida B. Wells-Barnett and W. E. B. DuBois, concerned with white racism and the rise in lynchings, believed that Washington's accommodationist philosophy made things worse.

CAST DOWN YOUR BUCKET WHERE YOU ARE, 1895

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

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

A ship lost at sea for many days suddenly sighted a friendly vessel. From the mast of the unfortunate vessel was seen a signal, "Water, water; we die of thirst!" The answer from the friendly vessel at once came back, "Cast down your bucket where you are." A second time the signal, "Water, water; send us water!" ran up from the distressed vessel, and was answered, "Cast down your bucket where you are." And a third and fourth signal for water was answered, "Cast down your bucket where you are." The captain of the distressed vessel, at last heeding the injunction, cast down his bucket, and it came up full of fresh, sparkling water from the mouth of the Amazon River. To those of my race who depend on bettering their condition in a foreign land or who underestimate the importance of cultivating friendly

relations with the Southern white man, who is their next-door neighbor, I would say: "Cast down your bucket where you are"—cast it down in making friends in every manly way of the people of all races by whom we are surrounded.

Cast it down in agriculture, mechanics, in commerce, in domestic service, and in the professions. And in this connection it is well to bear in mind that whatever other sins the South may be called to bear, when it comes to business, pure and simple, it is in the South that the Negro is given a man's chance in the commercial world, and in nothing is this Exposition more eloquent than in emphasizing this chance. Our greatest danger is that in the great leap from slavery to freedom we may overlook the fact that the masses of us are to live by the productions of our hands, and fail to keep in mind that we shall prosper in proportion as we learn to dignity and glorify common labour, and put brains and skill into the common occupations of life; shall prosper in proportion as we learn to draw the line between the superficial and the substantial, the ornamental gewgaws of life and the useful. No race can prosper till it learns that there is as much dignity in tilling a field as in writing a poem. It is at the bottom of life we must begin, and not at the top. Nor should we permit our grievances to overshadow our opportunities.

To those of the white race who look to the incoming of those of foreign birth and strange tongue and habits for the prosperity of the South, were I permitted I would repeat what I say to my own race, "Cast down your bucket where you are." Cast it down among the eight millions of Negroes whose habits you know, whose fidelity and love you have tested in days when to have proved treacherous meant the ruin of your firesides. Cast down your bucket among these people who have, without strikes and labour wars, tilled your fields, cleared your forests, builded your railroads and cities, and brought forth treasures from the bowels of the earth, and helped make possible this magnificent representation of the progress of the South. Casting down your bucket among my people, helping and encouraging them as you are doing on these grounds, and to education of head, hand, and heart, you will find that they will buy your surplus land, make blossom the waste places in your fields, and run your factories. While doing this, you can be sure in the future, as in the past, that you and your families will be surrounded by the most patient, faithful, law-abiding, and unresentful people that the world has seen. As we have proved our loyalty to you in the past, in nursing your children, watching by the sick-bed of your mothers and fathers, and often following them with tear-dimmed eyes to their graves, so in the future, in our humble way, we shall stand by you with a devotion that no foreigner can approach, ready to lay down our lives, if need be, in defense of yours, interlacing our industrial, commercial, civil, and religious life with yours in a way that shall make the interests of both races one. In all things that are purely social we can be as separate as the fingers, yet one as the hand in all things essential to mutual progress....

The wisest among my race understand that the agitation of questions of social equality is the extremest folly, and that progress in the enjoyment of all

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

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

W. E. B. DuBois (1868-1963)

*The first African American to earn a PhD from Harvard, W. E. B. DuBois was one of the most influential figures in the fight for African American rights. Throughout his long life, DuBois fought incessantly against racism and passionately argued that blacks should demand full and immediate political, social, and civil rights. He was a harsh critic of Booker T. Washington's accommodationist philosophy and was instrumental in the founding of the Niagara Movement, out of which the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) was formed in 1909. In his 1903 book, *The Souls of Black Folk*, DuBois called on the "talented tenth" of African Americans not to settle for anything less than a full academic education and to demand what is theirs by right. For 25 years, DuBois was the editor-in-chief of the NAACP publication *The Crisis*, in which his stinging editorials frequently caused division within the organization. DuBois had no objections to whites being active members of the NAACP, but he believed they should be in subordinate, not leadership, roles. As time went by, DuBois felt increasingly alienated*

in the United States, and toward the end of his life he moved to Ghana, became a Ghanaian citizen, and joined the Communist Party. He died on the eve of the March on Washington in August 1963, and as news of his death spread amid the marchers gathering at the Lincoln Memorial to listen to Martin Luther King Jr.'s "I Have A Dream" speech, there was a sense that the "torch had been passed."

"OF MR. BOOKER T. WASHINGTON AND OTHERS," 1903

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

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

To gain the sympathy and cooperation of the various elements comprising the white South was Mr. Washington's first task; and this, at the time Tuskegee was founded, seemed, for a black man, well-nigh impossible. And yet ten years later it was done in the word spoken at Atlanta: "In all things purely social we can be as separate as the five fingers, and yet one as the hand in all things essential to mutual progress." This "Atlanta Compromise" is by all odds the most notable thing in Mr. Washington's career. The South interpreted it in different ways: the radicals received it as a complete surrender of the demand for civil and

political equality; the conservatives, as a generously conceived working basis for mutual understanding. So both approved it, and today its author is certainly the most distinguished Southerner since Jefferson Davis, and the one with the largest personal following.

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

And yet this very singleness of vision and thorough oneness with his age is a mark of the successful man. It is as though Nature must needs make men narrow in order to give them force. So Mr. Washington's cult has gained unquestioning followers, his work has wonderfully prospered, his friends are legion, and his enemies are confounded. To-day he stands as the one recognized spokesman of his ten million fellows, and one of the most notable figures in a nation of seventy millions. One hesitates, therefore, to criticise a life which, beginning with so little has done so much. And yet the time is come when one may speak in all sincerity and utter courtesy of the mistakes and shortcomings of Mr. Washington's career, as well as of his triumphs, without being thought captious or envious, and without forgetting that it is easier to do ill than well in the world. . . .

Mr. Washington represents in Negro thought the old attitude of adjustment and submission; but adjustment at such a peculiar time as to make his programme unique. This is an age of unusual economic development, and Mr. Washington's programme naturally takes an economic cast, becoming a gospel of Work and Money to such an extent as apparently almost completely to overshadow the higher aims of life. Moreover, this is an age when the more advanced races are coming in closer contact with the less developed races, and the race-feeling is therefore intensified; and Mr. Washington's programme practically accepts the alleged inferiority of the Negro races. Again, in our own land, the reaction from the sentiment of war time has given impetus to race-prejudice against Negroes, and Mr. Washington withdraws many of the high demands of Negroes as men and American citizens. In other periods of intensified prejudice all the Negro's tendency to self-assertion has been called forth; at this period a policy of submission is advocated. In the history of nearly all other races and peoples the doctrine preached at such crises has been that manly self-respect is worth more than lands and houses, and that a people who voluntarily surrender such respect, or cease striving for it, are not worth civilizing.

In answer to this, it has been claimed that the Negro can survive only through submission. Mr. Washington distinctly asks that black people give up, at least for the present, three things,—

SOURCE: W. E. B. DuBois, *The Souls of Black Folk*, ed. David W. Blight and Robert Gooding-Williams (Boston: Bedford, 1977), 62-72. (For more of this essay see the full edition of *Dissent in America: The Voices That Shaped a Nation*.)

First, political power,
Second, insistence on civil rights,
Third, higher education of Negro youth,

—and concentrate all their energies on industrial education, the accumulation of wealth, and the conciliation of the South. This policy has been courageously and insistently advocated for over fifteen years, and has been triumphant for perhaps ten years. As a result of this tender of the palm-branch, what has been the return? In these years there have occurred:

1. The disfranchisement of the Negro.
2. The legal creation of a distinct status of civil inferiority for the Negro.
3. The steady withdrawal of aid from institutions for the higher training of the Negro.

These movements are not, to be sure, direct results of Mr. Washington's teachings; but his propaganda has, without a shadow of doubt, helped their speedier accomplishment. The question then comes: Is it possible, and probable, that nine millions of men can make effective progress in economic lines if they are deprived of political rights, made a servile caste, and allowed only the most meagre chance for developing their exceptional men? If history and reason give any distinct answer to these questions, it is an emphatic No. And Mr. Washington thus faces the triple paradox of his career:

1. He is striving nobly to make Negro artisans business men and property-owners; but it is utterly impossible, under modern competitive methods, for workmen and property-owners to defend their rights and exist without the right of suffrage.
2. He insists on thrift and self-respect, but at the same time counsels a silent submission to civic inferiority such as is bound to sap the manhood of any race in the long run.
3. He advocates common-school and industrial training, and depreciates institutions of higher learning; but neither the Negro common-schools, nor Tuskege itself, could remain open a day were it not for teachers trained in Negro colleges, or trained by their graduates.

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

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

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

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

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

away and insisting that they do not want them; that the way for a people to gain respect is not by continually belittling and ridiculing themselves; that, on the contrary, Negroes must insist continually, in season and out of season, that voting is necessary to modern manhood, that color discrimination is barbarism, and that black boys need education as well as white boys.

In failing thus to state plainly and unequivocally the legitimate demands of their people, even at the cost of opposing an honored leader, the thinking classes of American Negroes would shirk a heavy responsibility,—a responsibility to themselves, a responsibility to the struggling masses, a responsibility to the darker races of men whose future depends so largely on this American experiment, but especially a responsibility to this nation,—this common Fatherland. It is wrong to encourage a man or a people in evil-doing; it is wrong to aid and abet a national crime simply because it is unpopular not to do so. The growing spirit of kindness and reconciliation between the North and South after the frightful difference of a generation ago ought to be a source of deep congratulation to all, and especially to those whose mistreatment caused the war; but if that reconciliation is to be marked by the industrial slavery and civic death of those same black men, with permanent legislation into a position of inferiority, then those black men, if they are really men, are called upon by every consideration of patriotism and loyalty to oppose such a course by all civilized methods, even though such opposition involves disagreement with Mr. Booker T. Washington. We have no right to sit silently by while the inevitable seeds are sown for a harvest of disaster to our children, black and white.

First, it is the duty of black men to judge the South discriminatingly. The present generation of Southerners are not responsible for the past, and they should not be blindly hated or blamed for it. Furthermore, to no class is the indiscriminate endorsement of the recent course of the South toward Negroes more nauseating than to the best thought of the South. The South is not "solid"; it is a land in the ferment of social change, wherein forces of all kinds are fighting for supremacy; and to praise the ill the South is to-day perpetrating is just as wrong as to condemn the good. Discriminating and broad-minded criticism is what the South needs,—needs it for the sake of her own white sons and daughters, and for the insurance of robust, healthy mental and moral development.

To-day even the attitude of the Southern whites toward the blacks is not, as so many assume, in all cases the same; the ignorant Southerner hates the Negro, the workmen fear his competition, the money-makers wish to use him as a laborer, some of the educated see a menace in his upward development, while others—usually the sons of the masters—wish to help him to rise. National opinion has enabled this last class to maintain the Negro common schools, and to protect the Negro partially in property, life, and limb. Through the pressure of the money-makers, the Negro is in danger of being reduced to semi-slavery, especially in the country districts; the workmen, and those of the educated

who fear the Negro, have united to disfranchise him, and some have urged his deportation; while the passions of the ignorant are easily aroused to lynch and abuse any black man. To praise this intricate whirl of thought and prejudice is nonsense; to inveigh indiscriminately against "the South" is unjust; but to use the same breath in praising Governor Aycock, exposing Senator Morgan, arguing with Mr. Thomas Nelson Page, and denouncing Senator Ben Tillman, is not only sane, but the imperative duty of thinking black men.

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

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

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

The black men of America have a duty to perform, a duty stern and delicate,—a forward movement to oppose a part of the work of their greatest leader. So far as Mr. Washington preaches Thrift, Patience, and Industrial Training for the masses, we must hold up his hands and strive with him, rejoicing

in his honors and glorying in the strength of this Joshua called of God and of man to lead the headless host. But so far as Mr. Washington apologizes for injustice, North or South, does not rightly value the privilege and duty of voting, belittles the emasculating effects of caste distinctions, and opposes the higher training and ambition of our brighter minds,—so far as he, the South, or the Nation, does this,—we must unceasingly and firmly oppose them. By every civilized and peaceful method we must strive for the rights which the world accords to men, clinging unwaveringly to those great words which the sons of the Fathers would fain forget: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

ADDRESS TO THE NIAGARA CONFERENCE, HARRIS FERRY, WEST VIRGINIA, 1906

... In the past year the work of the Negro-hater has flourished in the land. Step by step the defenders of the rights of American citizens have retreated. The work of stealing the black man's ballot has progressed and the fifty and more representatives of stolen votes still sit in the nation's capital. Discrimination in travel and public accommodation has so spread that some of our weaker brethren are actually afraid to thunder against color discrimination as such and are simply whispering for ordinary decencies.

Against this the Niagara Movement eternally protests. We will not be satisfied to take one jot or tittle less than our full manhood rights. ... [We] claim for ourselves every single right that belongs to a freeborn American, political, civil and social; and until we get these rights we will never cease to protest and assail the ears of America. The battle we wage is not for ourselves alone but for all true Americans. It is a fight for ideals, lest this, our common fatherland, false to its founding, become in truth, the land of the thief and the home of the slave, a byword and a hissing among the nations for its sounding pretensions and pitiful accomplishments.

Never before in the modern age has a great and civilized folk threatened to adopt so cowardly a creed in the treatment of its fellow citizens born and bred on its soil. Stripped of verbiage and subterfuge and in its naked nastiness, the new American creed says: "Fear to let black men even try to rise lest they become the equals of the white." And this is the land that professes to follow Jesus Christ! The blasphemy of such a course is only matched by its cowardice.

In detail, our demands are clear and unequivocal. First, we would vote; with the right to vote goes everything: freedom, manhood, the honor of your wives,

the chastity of your daughters, the right to work, and the chance to rise, and let no man listen to those who deny this.

We want full manhood suffrage, and we want it now, henceforth and forever!

Second. We want discrimination in public accommodation to cease. Separation in railway and street cars, based simply on race and color, is un-American, undemocratic, and silly. We protest against all such discrimination.

Third. We claim the right of freemen to walk, talk, and be with them that wish to be with us. No man has a right to choose another man's friends, and to attempt to do so is an impudent interference with the most fundamental human privilege.

Fourth. We want the laws enforced against rich as well as poor; against capitalist as well as laborer; against white as well as black. We are not more lawless than the white race: We are more often arrested, convicted and mobbed. We want Congress to take charge of Congressional elections. We want the Fourteenth Amendment carried out to the letter and every state disfranchised in Congress which attempts to disfranchise its rightful voters. We want the Fifteenth Amendment enforced and no state allowed to base its franchise simply on color. ...

Fifth. We want our children educated. The school system in the country districts of the South is a disgrace, and in few towns and cities are the Negro schools what they ought to be. We want the national government to step in and wipe out illiteracy in the South. Either the United States will destroy ignorance, or ignorance will destroy the United States. ...

These are some of the chief things which we want. How shall we get them? By voting where we may vote, by persistent, unceasing agitation, by hammering at the truth, by sacrifice and work.

We do not believe in violence, neither in the despised violence of the raid nor the lauded violence of the soldier, nor the barbarous violence of the mob, but we do believe in John Brown, in that incarnate spirit of justice, that hatred of a lie, that willingness to sacrifice money, reputation, and life itself on the altar of right. And here on the scene of John Brown's martyrdom, we reconsecrate ourselves, our honor, our property to the final emancipation of the race which John Brown died to make free.

Our enemies, triumphant for the present, are fighting the stars in their courses. Justice and humanity must prevail. We live to tell these dark brothers of ours—scattered in counsel, wavering, and weak—that no bribe of money or notoriety, no promise of wealth or fame, is worth the surrender of a people's manhood or the loss of a man's self-respect. We refuse to surrender the leadership of this race to cowards and trucklers. We are men; we will be treated as men. ...

And we shall win! The past promised it. The present foretells it. Thank God for John Brown. Thank God for Garrison and Douglass, Sumner and Phillips, Nat Turner and Robert Gould Shaw, and all the hallowed dead who died for freedom. Thank God for all those today, few though their voices be, who have

not forgotten the divine brotherhood of all men, white and black, rich and poor, fortunate and unfortunate.

We appeal to the young men and women of this nation, to those whose nostrils are not yet befouled by greed and snobbery and racial narrowness: Stand up for the right, prove yourselves worthy of your heritage and, whether born North or South, dare to treat men as men. . . .

Ida B. Wells-Barnett (1862-1931)

Ida B. Wells-Barnett was born a slave in Mississippi during the Civil War. She attended Rust University in Mississippi and later Fisk University in Memphis. After she earned her college degree, she became first a teacher and, by the end of the 1880s, a journalist. In 1889, she began working as an editor of the Memphis Free Speech, a weekly newspaper, for which she contributed many articles on education and self-help for African Americans. Living in the South, she was, of course, afflicted by the Jim Crow laws. Once, in 1884, she refused to sit in the black car of a train and was consequently physically ejected from the train. She sued the railroad and eventually lost her case.

Segregation laws were hardly the only evils African Americans had to endure. In 1892, three of Wells-Barnett's friends who owned a small, prosperous grocery store were lynched. Booker T. Washington had argued that if blacks would achieve economic success, they would be respected by whites and eventually achieve civil and political equality. The lynching of small business owners was an appalling and indisputable refutation of this notion. This event had a powerful impact on Wells-Barnett, and from this point on, she began using her position as a writer to denounce lynching and expose the truth behind the racial stereotypes that whites used to subjugate blacks. She contended that whites' reliance on the charge of rape as a justification for lynching black men was a lie. It was merely a subterfuge, both an excuse to murder African Americans who were becoming an economic threat to whites and a very effective way to keep them down. Her editorials in the Free Speech antagonized the white community so thoroughly that the offices and presses of the newspaper were destroyed and Wells-Barnett driven out of town. She moved to New York, where she began writing primarily investigative articles on lynching for the New York Age. By the end of 1892, she had published a pamphlet, "Southern Horrors," and had begun giving speeches in both the United States and Europe in which she militantly protested against lynching and advocated that the federal government enact strong laws against the

practice. In 1895, she published A Red Record and in 1899, Lynch Law in Georgia. Through her determined antilynching campaign Ida B. Wells-Barnett became a prominent and effective figure in the early civil rights movement.

LYNCH LAW IN GEORGIA, JUNE 20, 1899

Consider The Facts.

During six weeks of the months of March and April just past, twelve colored men were lynched in Georgia, the reign of outlawry culminating in the torture and hanging of the colored preacher, Elijah Strickland, and the burning alive of Samuel Wilkes, alias Hose, Sunday, April 23, 1899.

The real purpose of these savage demonstrations is to teach the Negro that in the South he has no rights that the law will enforce. Samuel Hose was burned to teach the Negroes that no matter what a white man does to them, they must not resist. Hose, a servant, had killed Cranford, his employer. An example must be made. Ordinary punishment was deemed inadequate. This Negro must be burned alive. To make the burning a certainty the charge of outrage was invented, and added to the charge of murder. The daily press offered reward for the capture of Hose and then openly incited the people to burn him as soon as caught. The mob carried out the plan in every savage detail.

Of the twelve men lynched during that reign of unspeakable barbarism, only one was even charged with an assault upon a woman. Yet Southern apologists justify their savagery on the ground that Negroes are lynched only because of their crimes against women.

The Southern press champions burning men alive, and says, "Consider the facts." The colored people join issue and also say, "Consider the fact." The colored people of Chicago employed a detective to go to Georgia, and his report in this pamphlet gives the facts. We give here the details of the lynching as they were reported in the Southern papers, then follows the report of the true facts as to the cause of the lynchings, as learned by the investigation. We submit all to the sober judgment of the Nation, confident that, in this cause, as well as all others, "Truth is mighty and will prevail."

SOURCE: Ida B. Wells-Barnett, *Lynch Law in Georgia: A Six-Weeks' Record in the Center of Southern Civilization, As Faithfully Chronicled by the "Atlanta Journal" and the "Atlanta Constitution."* Also the Full Report of Louis P. Le Vin, *The Chicago Detective Sent to Investigate the Burning of Samuel Hose, the Torture and Hanging of Elijah Strickland, the Colored Preacher, and the Lynching of Nine Men for Alleged Arson* (Chicago: Chicago Colored Citizens, 1899), 1-11.

"TORTURED AND BURNED ALIVE," 1899

... The burning of Samuel Hose, or, to give his right name, Samuel Wilkes, gave to the United States the distinction of having burned alive seven human beings during the past ten years. The details of this deed of unspeakable barbarism have shocked the civilized world, for it is conceded universally that no other nation on earth, civilized or savage, has put to death any human being with such atrocious cruelty as that inflicted upon Samuel Hose by the Christian white people of Georgia.

The charge is generally made that lynch law is condemned by the best white people of the South, and that lynching is the work of the lowest and lawless class. Those who seek the truth know the fact to be, that all classes are equally guilty, for what the one class does the other encourages, excuses and condones.

This was clearly shown in the burning of Hose. This awful deed was suggested, encouraged and made possible by the daily press of Atlanta, Georgia, until the burning actually occurred, and then it immediately condoned the burning by a hysterical plea to "consider the facts."...

Preparations for the execution were not necessarily elaborate, and it required only a few minutes to arrange to make Sam Hose pay the penalty of his crime. To the sapling Sam Hose was tied, and he watched the cool, determined men who went about arranging to burn him.

First he was made to remove his clothing, and when the flames began to eat into his body it was almost nude. Before the fire was lighted his left ear was severed from his body. Then his right ear was cut away. During this proceeding he uttered not a groan. Other portions of his body were mutilated by the knives of those who gathered about him, but he was not wounded to such an extent that he was not fully conscious and could feel the excruciating pain. Oil was poured over the wood that was placed about him and this was ignited.

The scene that followed is one that never will be forgotten by those who saw it, and while Sam Hose writhed and performed contortions in his agony, many of those present turned away from the sickening sight, and others could hardly look at it. Not a sound but the crackling of the flames broke the stillness of the place, and the situation grew more sickening as it proceeded.

The stake bent under the strains of the Negro in his agony and his sufferings cannot be described, although he uttered not a sound. After his ears had been cut off he was asked about the crime, and then it was he made a full confession. At one juncture, before the flames had begun to get in their work well, the fastenings that held him to the stake broke and he fell forward partially out of the fire.

He writhed in agony and his sufferings can be imagined when it is said that several blood vessels burst during the contortions of his body. When he fell from the stake he was kicked back and the flames renewed. Then it was that the flames consumed his body and in a few minutes only a few bones and a small part of the body was all that was left of Sam Hose.

One of the most sickening sights of the day was the eagerness with which the people grabbed after souvenirs, and they almost fought over the ashes of the dead criminal. Large pieces of his flesh were carried away, and persons were seen walking through the streets carrying bones in their hands.

When all the larger bones, together with the flesh, had been carried away by the early comers, others scraped in the ashes, and for a great length of time a crowd was about the place scraping in the ashes. Not even the stake to which the Negro was tied when burned was left, but it was promptly chopped down and carried away as the largest souvenir of the burning.

Carl Schurz (1829-1906)

Carl Schurz was a German immigrant who served as a brigadier general during the Civil War, Republican senator from Missouri during Reconstruction, and secretary of the interior during the Hayes administration. He later moved to New York, where he helped found the New York Evening Post and wrote extensive political columns for Harper's Weekly. At the turn of the century, just as the United States was beginning to redefine its notion of manifest destiny, Schurz became an outspoken critic of American expansionism. "My Country!" he once wrote, "when right keep it right; when wrong, set it right!" In June 1898, believing that the war with Spain was wrong, he became very active (along with such diverse celebrated individuals as Jane Adams, William Jennings Bryan, Andrew Carnegie, William James, and Mark Twain) in the Anti-Imperialist League. As soon as the United States began exerting authority in the Philippines, Filipino nationalist Emilio Aguinaldo resumed his guerrilla activity. This time, instead of fighting the Spanish, Aguinaldo led the fight against the American occupying forces. As the Filipino insurrection picked up steam, anti-imperialists grew louder in their denunciation of American policy. Addams, Bryan, Twain, Schurz, and many other anti-imperialists believed that the American attempt to conquer the Philippines and impose American principles and democracy on an unwilling people was contrary to the values of the founding fathers and the very principles on which this nation was founded. (For Bryan's speech on "The Paralyzing Influence of Imperialism" see the full edition of Dissent in America: The Voices That Shaped a Nation.) Early in 1899, Carl Schurz delivered the following speech at the University of Chicago in which he emphatically denounced the acquisition of the Philippines and Puerto Rico as a result of the Spanish-American War.

ADDRESS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO DENOUNCING U.S. IMPERIALISM, JANUARY 4, 1899

It is proposed to embark this republic in a course of imperialistic policy by permanently annexing to it certain islands taken, or partly taken, from Spain in the late war. The matter is near its decision, but not yet ratified by the Senate; but even if it were, the question whether those islands, although ceded by Spain, shall be permanently incorporated in the territory of the United States would still be open for final determination by Congress. As an open question therefore I shall discuss it.

If ever, it behooves the American people to think and act with calm deliberation, for the character and future of the republic and the welfare of its people now living and yet to be born are in unprecedented jeopardy....

According to the solemn proclamation of our government, [the Spanish-American War] had been undertaken solely for the liberation of Cuba, as a war of humanity and not of conquest. But our easy victories had put conquest within our reach, and when our arms occupied foreign territory, a loud demand arose that, pledge or no pledge to the contrary, the conquests should be kept, even the Philippines on the other side of the globe, and that as to Cuba herself, independence would only be a provisional formality. Why not? was the cry. Has not the career of the republic almost from its very beginning been one of territorial expansion?...

Compare now with our old acquisitions as to all these important points those at present in view.

They are not continental, not contiguous to our present domain, but beyond seas, the Philippines many thousand miles distant from our coast. They are all situated in the tropics, where people of the northern races, such as Anglo-Saxons, or generally speaking, people of Germanic blood, have never migrated in mass to stay; and they are more or less densely populated, parts of them as densely as Massachusetts—their populations consisting almost exclusively of races to whom the tropical climate is congenial—Spanish creoles mixed with negroes in the West Indies, and Malays, Tagals, Filipinos, Chinese, Japanese, Negritos, and various more or less barbarous tribes in the Philippines....

If we [become an imperialist power], we shall transform the government of the people, for the people, and by the people, for which Abraham Lincoln lived, into a government of one part of the people, the strong, over another part, the weak. Such an abandonment of a fundamental principle as a permanent policy may at first seem to bear only upon more or less distant dependencies, but it can hardly fail in its ultimate effects to disturb the rule of the same principle in the conduct of democratic government at home. And I warn the American people that a democracy cannot so deny its faith as to the vital conditions of its being—it cannot long play the king over subject populations without creating within itself ways of thinking and habits of action most dangerous to its own vitality....

SOURCE: *Speeches, Correspondence, and Political Papers of Carl Schurz*, ed. by Frederic Bancroft, vol. 6 (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1913), 2, 4, 6, 8, 10–11, 14–15, 26–29.

What can there be to justify a change of policy fraught with such direful consequences? Let us pass the arguments of the advocates of such imperialism candidly in review.

The cry suddenly raised that this great country has become too small for us is too ridiculous to demand an answer, in view of the fact that our present population may be tripled and still have ample elbow-room, with resources to support many more. But we are told that our industries are gasping for breath; that we are suffering from over production; that our products must have new outlets, and that we need colonies and dependencies the world over to give us more markets. More markets? Certainly. But do we, civilized beings, indulge in the absurd and barbarous notion that we must own the countries with which we wish to trade?...

"But the Pacific Ocean," we are mysteriously told, "will be the great commercial battlefield of the future, and we must quickly use the present opportunity to secure our position on it. The visible presence of great power is necessary for us to get our share of the trade of China. Therefore, we must have the Philippines." Well, the China trade is worth having, although for a time out of sight the Atlantic Ocean will be an infinitely more important battlefield of commerce.... But does the trade of China really require that we should have the Philippines and make a great display of power to get our share?...

"But we must have coaling stations for our navy!" Well, can we not get as many coaling stations as we need without owning populous countries behind them that would entangle us in dangerous political responsibilities and complications? Must Great Britain own the whole of Spain in order to hold Gibraltar? "But we must civilize those poor people!" Are we not ingenious and charitable enough to do much for their civilization without subjugating and ruling them by criminal aggression?...

The American flag, we are told, whenever once raised, must never be hauled down. Certainly, every patriotic citizen will always be ready, if need be, to fight and to die under his flag wherever it may wave in justice and for the best interests of the country. But I say to you, woe to the republic if it should ever be without citizens patriotic and brave enough to defy the demagogues' cry and to haul down the flag wherever it may be raised not in justice and not for the best interests of the country. Such a republic would not last long....

Mother Jones (1830–1930)

Throughout her long life, Mary Harris (Mother) Jones was a leading activist in the labor movement. When she was 37, her husband and four children died in a yellow fever epidemic. Soon thereafter, she involved herself in the union cause and became active as a strike organizer with the Knights of Labor and the United Mine Workers. By the twentieth

century, she had joined the Socialist Party, and was one of the founders of the Industrial Workers of the World. Even in her nineties, she was still active in helping to organize strikes. As she strove to alleviate the hardships faced by all victims of industrialization, she became especially dedicated to the abolition of child labor. In 1903, at the age of 73, she led a march of more than a hundred miles from Philadelphia to Sagamore Hill to confront President Theodore Roosevelt with the harsh realities of the exploitation of children, which she describes in this chapter from her autobiography.

"THE MARCH OF THE MILL CHILDREN," 1903

In the spring of 1903 I went to Kensington, Pennsylvania, where seventy-five thousand textile workers were on strike. Of this number at least ten thousand were little children. The workers were striking for more pay and shorter hours. Every day little children came into Union Headquarters, some with their hands off, some with the thumb missing, some with their fingers off at the knuckle. They were stooped things, round shouldered and skinny. Many of them were not over ten years of age, the state law prohibited their working before they were twelve years of age.

The law was poorly enforced and the mothers of these children often swore falsely as to their children's age. In a single block in Kensington, fourteen women, mothers of twenty-two children all under twelve, explained it was a question of starvation or perjury. That the fathers had been killed or maimed at the mines.

I asked the newspaper men why they didn't publish the facts about child labor in Pennsylvania. They said they couldn't because the mill owners had stock in the papers.

"Well, I've got stock in these little children," said I, "and I'll arrange a little publicity."

We assembled a number of boys and girls one morning in Independence Park and from there we arranged to parade with banners to the court house where we would hold a meeting. A great crowd gathered in the public square in front of the city hall. I put the little boys with their fingers off and hands crushed and maimed on a platform. I held up their mutilated hands and showed them to the crowd and made the statement that Philadelphia's mansions were built on the broken bones, the quivering hearts and drooping heads of these children. That their little lives went out to make wealth for others. That neither state or city officials paid any attention to these wrongs. That they did not care that these children were to be the future citizens of the nation.

The officials of the city hall were standing in the open windows. I held the little ones of the mills high up above the heads of the crowd and pointed to their puny arms and legs and hollow chests. They were light to lift.

I called upon the millionaire manufactures to cease their moral murders, and I cried to the officials in the open windows opposite, "Some day the workers will take possession of your city hall, and when we do, no child will be sacrificed on the altar of profit."

The officials quickly closed the windows, as they had closed their eyes and hearts.

The reporters quoted my statement that Philadelphia mansions were built on the broken bones and quivering hearts of children. The Philadelphia papers and the New York papers got into a squabble with each other over the question. The universities discussed it. Preachers began talking. That was what I wanted. Public attention on the subject of child labor.

The matter quieted down for a while and I concluded the people needed stirring up again. The Liberty Bell that a century ago rang out for freedom against tyranny was touring the country and crowds were coming to see it everywhere. That gave me an idea. These little children were striking for some of the freedom that childhood ought to have, and I decided that the children and I would go on a tour.

I asked some of the parents if they would let me have their little boys and girls for a week or ten days, promising to bring them back safe and sound. They consented. A man named Sweeny was marshal for our "army." A few men and women went with me to help with the children. They were on strike and I thought, they might well have a little recreation.

The children carried knapsacks on their backs which had a knife and fork, a tin cup and plate. We took along a wash boiler in which to cook the food on the road. One little fellow had drum and another had a fife. That was our band. We carried banners that said, "We want more schools and less hospitals." "We want time to play." "Prosperity is here. Where is ours?"

We started from Philadelphia where we held a great mass meeting. I decided to go with the children to see President Roosevelt to ask him to have Congress pass a law prohibiting the exploitation of childhood. I thought that President Roosevelt might see these mill children and compare them with his own little ones who were spending the summer on the seashore at Oyster Bay. I thought too, out of politeness, we might call on Morgan in Wall Street who owned the mines where many of these children's fathers worked.

The children were very happy, having plenty to eat, taking baths in the brooks and rivers every day. I thought when the strike is over and they go back to the mills, they will never have another holiday like this. All along the line of march the farmers drove out to meet us with wagon loads of fruit and vegetables. Their wives brought the children clothes and money. The interurban trainmen would stop their trains and give us free rides.

Marshal Sweeny and I would go ahead to the towns and arrange sleeping quarters for the children, and secure meeting halls. As we marched on, it grew

terribly hot. There was no rain and the roads were heavy with dust. From time to time we had to send some of the children back to their homes. They were too weak to stand the march.

We were on the outskirts of New Trenton, New Jersey, cooking our lunch in the wash boiler, when the conductor on the interurban car stopped and told us the police were coming down to notify us that we could not enter the town. There were mills in the town and the mill owners didn't like our coming.

I said, "All right, the police will be just in time for lunch."

Sure enough, the police came and we invited them to dine with us. They looked at the little gathering of children with their tin plates and cups around the wash boiler. They just smiled and spoke kindly to the children, and said nothing at all about not going into the city.

We went in, held our meeting, and it was the wives of the police who took the little children and cared for them that night, sending them back in the morning with a nice lunch rolled up in paper napkins.

Everywhere we had meetings, showing up with living children, the horrors of child labor. . . .

I called on the mayor of Princeton and asked for permission to speak opposite the campus of the University. I said I wanted to speak on higher education. The mayor gave me permission. A great crowd gathered, professors and students and the people; and I told them that the rich robbed these little children of any education of the lowest order that they might send their sons and daughters to places of higher education. That they used the hands and feet of little children that they might buy automobiles for their wives and police dogs for their daughters to talk French to. I said the mill owners take babies almost from the cradle. And I showed those professors children in our army who could scarcely read or write because they were working ten hours a day in the silk mills of Pennsylvania.

"Here's a text book on economics," I said pointing to a little chap, James Ashworth, who was ten years old and who was stooped over like an old man from carrying bundles of yarn that weighed seventy-five pounds. "He gets three dollars a week and his sister who is fourteen gets six dollars. They work in a carpet factory ten hours a day while the children of the rich are getting their higher education. . . ."

. . . [We] went to Coney Island at the invitation of Mr. Bostick who owned the wild animal show. The children had a wonderful day such as they never had in all their lives. After the exhibition of the trained animals, Mr. Bostick let me speak to the audience. . . . Right in front of the emperors were the empty iron cages of the animals. I put my little children in the cages and they clung to the iron bars while I talked.

I told the crowd that the scene was typical of the aristocracy of employers with their thumb down to the little ones of the mills and factories, and people sitting dumbly by.

"We want President Roosevelt to hear the wail of the children who never have a chance to go to school but work eleven and twelve hours a day in the

textile mills of Pennsylvania; who weave the carpets that he and you walk upon and the lace curtains in your windows, and the clothes of the people. Fifty years ago there was a cry against slavery and men gave up their lives to stop the selling of black children on the block. Today the white child is sold for two dollars a week to the manufacturers. Fifty years ago the black babies were sold C.O.D. Today the white baby is sold on the installment plan. . . .

"The trouble is that no one in Washington cares. I saw our legislators in one hour pass three bills for the relief of the railways but when labor cries for aid for the children they will not listen.

"I asked a man in prison once how he happened to be there and he said he had stolen a pair of shoes. I told him if he had stolen a railroad he would be a United States Senator.

"We are told that every American boy has the chance of being president. I tell you that these little boys in the iron cages would sell their chance any day for good square meals and a chance to play. These little toilers whom I have taken from the mills—deformed, dwarfed in body and soul, with nothing but toil before them—have never heard that they have a chance, the chance of every American male citizen, to become the president. . . ."

We marched down to Oyster Bay but the president refused to see us and he would not answer my letters. But our march had done its work. We had drawn the attention of the nation to the crime of child labor. And while the strike of the textile workers in Kensington was lost and the children driven back to work, not long afterward the Pennsylvania legislature passed a child labor law that sent thousands of children home from the mills, and kept thousands of others from entering the factory until they were fourteen years of age.

John Muir (1838-1914)

Born in Scotland and reared in Wisconsin, John Muir became one of the leading exponents and founders of the ecological movement. As a young man, he traveled extensively around the United States, and after his first visit to the Hetch Hetchy Valley in 1868, he made up his mind to settle in California. Concerned that loggers, miners, cattlemen, and sheepherders were despoiling the meadows and mountainsides of the Sierra Nevada, he began writing articles extolling the beauties of nature and advocating the preservation of the wilderness. By the end of the 1870s, his reputation had spread, not only throughout the United States but also around the world. In 1890, along with Century magazine editor Robert Underwood Johnson and several other supporters, Muir convinced

Congress to preserve the Hetch Hetchy Valley and the surrounding area by passing an act establishing Yosemite National Park. Later he was influential in the creation of the Sequoia and Grand Canyon national parks, which earned him the nickname of "Father" of the national park system.

Determined to prevent ranchers from encroaching on the new park, Muir founded the Sierra Club in 1892 to protect the Sierras and the redwoods. In 1903, President Theodore Roosevelt camped out with Muir in Yosemite and began to shape his own conservation and preservation policy. Claiming that "everybody needs beauty as well as bread, places to play in and pray in, where nature may heal and give strength to body and soul alike," Muir campaigned ardently, until his death in 1914, against business interests and politicians who would destroy the natural beauty of the forests and wilderness. The year before his death, he fought a losing and disheartening battle against the proposal to dam the Hetch Hetchy Valley to create a reservoir for San Francisco. Still, his efforts to preserve the redwoods and create a national park system bore fruit. One of the most beautiful state parks in California, in Marin County just north of the Golden Gate Bridge, is Muir Woods, and nearby is Muir Beach. Participants in the environmental movement that emerged from 1960s activism still regard Muir's writings to be as relevant and applicable today as they were a century ago. (For a longer version of this essay as well as Muir's "Save the Redwoods," see the full edition of *Dissent* in America: The Voices That Shaped a Nation.)

"THE HETCH HETCHY VALLEY," JANUARY 1908

It is impossible to overestimate the value of wild mountains and mountain temples as places for people to grow in, recreation grounds for soul and body. They are the greatest of our natural resources, God's best gifts, but none, however high and holy, is beyond reach of the spoiler. In these ravaging money-mad days monopolizing San Francisco capitalists are now doing their best to destroy the Yosemite Park, the most wonderful of all our great mountain national parks. Beginning on the Tuolumne side, they are trying with a lot of sinful ingenuity to get the Government's permission to dam and destroy the Hetch-Hetchy Valley for a reservoir, simply that comparatively private gain may be made out of universal public loss, while of course the Sierra Club is doing all it can to save the valley. The Honorable Secretary of the Interior has not yet announced his decision in the case, but in all that has come and gone nothing discouraging is yet in sight on our side of the fight.

As long as the busy public in general knew little or nothing about the Hetch-Hetchy Valley, the few cunning drivers of the damming scheme, working in darkness like moles in a low-lying meadow, seemed confident of success; but when light was turned on and the truth became manifest that next to Yosemite, Hetch-Hetchy is the most wonderful and most important feature of the great park, that damming it would destroy it, render it inaccessible, and block the way through the wonderful Tuolumne Cañon to the grand central campground in the upper Tuolumne Valley, thousands from near and far came to our help,—mountaineers, nature-lovers, naturalists. Most of our thousand club members wrote to the President or Secretary protesting against the destructive reservoir scheme while other sources of city water as pure or purer than the Hetch-Hetchy were available; so also did the Oregon and Washington mountaineering clubs and the Appalachian of Boston and public-spirited citizens everywhere. And the President, recognizing the need of beauty as well as bread and water in the life of the nation, far from favoring the destruction of any of our country's natural wonder parks and temples, is trying amid a host of other cares to save them all. Within a very short time he has saved the petrified forests of Arizona and the Grand Cañon, and in our own State the jagged peaks of San Benito county known as "The Pinnacles," making them national monuments or parks to be preserved for the people forever. None, therefore, need doubt that everything possible will be done to save Hetch-Hetchy.

After my first visit, in the autumn of 1871, I have always called it the Tuolumne Yosemite, for it is a wonderfully exact counterpart of the great Yosemite, not only in its crystal river and sublime rocks and waterfalls, but in the gardens, groves, and meadows of its flower park-like floor. The floor of Yosemite is about 4000 feet above the sea, the Hetch-Hetchy floor about 3700; the walls of both are of gray granite, rise abruptly out of the flowery grass and groves are sculptured in the same style, and in both every rock is a glacial monument.

Standing boldly out from the south wall is a strikingly picturesque rock called "Kolana" by the Indians, the outmost of a group 2300 feet high, corresponding with the Cathedral Rocks of Yosemite both in relative position and form. On the opposite side of the Valley, facing Kolana, there is a counterpart of the El Capitan of Yosemite rising sheer and plain to a height of 1800 feet, and over its massive brow flows a stream which makes the most graceful fall I have ever seen. From the edge of the cliff it is perfectly free in the air for a thousand feet, then breaks up into a ragged sheet of cascades among the boulders of an earthquake talus. It is in all its glory in June, when the snow is melting fast, but fades and vanishes toward the end of summer. The only fall I know with which it may fairly be compared is the Yosemite Bridal Veil; but it excels even that favorite fall both in height and fineness of fairy-airy beauty and behavior. Lowlanders are apt to suppose that mountain streams in their wild career over cliffs lose control of themselves and tumble in a noisy chaos of mist and spray. On the contrary, on no part of their travels are they more harmonious and self-controlled. Imagine yourself in Hetch Hetchy on a sunny day in June, standing waist-deep in grass and flowers (as I have oftentimes stood), while the great pines sway dreamily with scarce perceptible motion.

Looking northward across the Valley you see a plain, gray granite cliff rising abruptly out of the gardens and groves to a height of 1800 feet, and in front of it Tueculala's silvery scarf burning with irised sun-fire in every fiber. In the first white outburst of the stream at the head of the fall there is abundance of visible energy, but it is speedily hushed and concealed in divine repose, and its tranquil progress to the base of the cliff is like that of downy feathers in a still room. Now observe the fineness and marvelous distinctness of the various sun-illuminated fabrics into which the water is woven; they sift and float from form to form down the face of that grand gray rock in so leisurely and unconfused a manner that you can examine their texture, and patterns and tones of color as you would a piece of embroidery held in the hand. Near the head of the fall you see groups of booming, comet-like masses, their solid, white heads separate, their tails like combed silk interlacing among delicate shadows, ever forming and dissolving, worn out by friction in their rush through the air. Most of these vanish a few hundred feet below the summit, changing to the varied forms of cloud-like drapery. Near the bottom the width of the fall has increased from about twenty-five to a hundred feet. Here it is composed of yet finer tissues, and is still without a trace of disorder—air, water and sunlight woven into stuff that spirits might wear.

So fine a fall might well seem sufficient to glorify any valley; but here, as in Yosemite, Nature seems in nowise moderate, for a short distance to the eastward of Tueculala booms and thunders the great Hetch Hetchy Fall, Wapama, so near that you have both of them in full view from the same standpoint. It is the counterpart of the Yosemite Fall, but has a much greater volume of water, is about 1700 feet in height, and appears to be nearly vertical, though considerably inclined, and is dashed into huge outbounding bosses of foam on the projecting shelves and knobs of its jagged gorge. No two falls could be more unlike—Tueculala out in the open sunshine descending like thistle-down; Wapama in a jagged, shadowy gorge roaring and plundering, pounding its way with the weight and energy of an avalanche. Besides this glorious pair there is a broad, massive fall on the main river a short distance above the head of the Valley. Its position is something like that of the Vernal in Yosemite, and its roar as it plunges into a surging trout-pool may be heard a long way, though it is only about twenty feet high. There is also a chain of magnificent cascades at the head of the valley on a stream that comes in from the northeast, mostly silvery plumes, like the one between the Vernal and Nevada falls of Yosemite, half-sliding, half-leaping on bare glacier polished granite, covered with crisp clashing spray into which the sunbeams pour with glorious effect. And besides all these a few small streams come over the walls here and there, leaping from ledge to ledge with birdlike song and watering many a hidden cliff-garden and fernery, but they are too unshowy to be noticed in so grand a place.

The correspondence between the Hetch Hetchy walls in their trends, sculpture, physical structure, and general arrangement of the main rock-masses has excited the wondering admiration of every observer. We have seen that the

El Capitan and Cathedral rocks occupy the same relative positions in both valleys; so also do their Yosemite Points and North Domes. Again that part of the Yosemite north wall immediately to the east of the Yosemite Fall has two horizontal benches timbered with golden-cup oak about 500 and 1500 feet above the floor. Two benches similarly situated and timbered occur on the same relative portion of the Hetch Hetchy north wall, to the east of Wapama Fall, and on no other. The Yosemite is bounded at the head by the great Half Dome. Hetch Hetchy is bounded in the same way though its head rock is far less wonderful and sublime in form. . . .

Strange to say, this is the mountain temple that is now in danger of being dammed and made into a reservoir to help supply San Francisco with water and light. This use of the valley, so destructive and foreign to its proper park use, has long been planned and prayed for, and is still being prayed for by the San Francisco board of supervisors, not because water as pure and abundant cannot be got from adjacent sources outside the park—for it can,—but seemingly only because of the comparative cheapness of the dam required.

Garden- and park-making goes on everywhere with civilization, for everybody needs beauty as well as bread, places to play in and pray in, where Nature may heal and cheer and give strength to body and soul. This natural beauty-hunger is displayed in poor folks' window-gardens made up of a few geranium slips in broken cups, as well as in the costly lily gardens of the rich, the thousands of spacious city parks and botanical gardens, and in our magnificent National parks—the Yellowstone, Yosemite, Sequoia, etc.—Nature's own wonderlands, the admiration and joy of the world. Nevertheless, like everything else worth while, however sacred and precious and well-guarded, they have always been subject to attack, mostly by despoiling gainseekers,—mischief-makers of every degree from Satan to supervisors, lumbermen, cattlemen, farmers, etc., eagerly trying to make everything dollarable, often thinly disguised in smiling philanthropy, calling pocket-filling plunder "Utilization of beneficent natural resources, that man and beast may be fed and the dear Nation grow great." Thus long ago a lot of enterprising merchants made part of the Jerusalem temple into a place of business instead of a place of prayer, changing money, buying and selling cattle and sheep and doves. And earlier still, the Lord's garden in Eden, and the first forest reservation, including only one tree, was spoiled. And so to some extent have all our reservations and parks. Ever since the establishment of the Yosemite National Park by act of Congress, October 8, 1890, constant strife has been going on around its borders and I suppose this will go on as part of the universal battle between right and wrong, however its boundaries may be shorn or its wild beauty destroyed. The first application to the Government by the San Francisco Supervisors for the use of Lake Eleanor and the Hetch Hetchy Valley was made in 1903, and denied December 22nd of that year by the Secretary of the Interior. In his report on this case he well says: "Presumably the Yosemite National Park was created such by law because of the natural objects, of varying degrees of scenic importance, located within its boundaries, inclusive alike of its

beautiful small lakes, like Eleanor, and its majestic wonders, like Hetch-Hetchy and Yosemite Valley. It is the aggregation of such natural scenic features that makes the Yosemite Park a wonderland which the Congress of the United States sought by law to preserve for all coming time as nearly as practicable in the condition fashioned by the hand of the Creator—a worthy object of national pride and a source of healthful pleasure and rest for the thousands of people who may annually sojourn there during the heated months.”

That any one would try to destroy such a place seemed impossible; but sad experience shows that there are people good enough and bad enough for anything. The proponents of the dam scheme bring forward a lot of bad arguments to prove that the only righteous thing for Hetch-Hetchy is its destruction. These arguments are curiously like those of the devil devised for the destruction of the first garden—so much of the very best Eden fruit going to waste; so much of the best Tuolumne water. Very few of their statements are even partly true, and all are misleading. Thus, Hetch Hetchy, they say, is a “low-lying meadow.”

On the contrary, it is a high-lying natural landscape garden.

“It is a common minor feature, like thousands of others.”

On the contrary, it is a very uncommon feature; after Yosemite, the rarest and in many ways the most important in the park.

“Damming and submerging it 175 feet deep would enhance its beauty by forming a crystal-clear lake.”

Landscape gardens, places of recreation and worship, are never made beautiful by destroying and burying them. The beautiful lake, forsooth, should be only an eyecore, a dismal blot on the landscape, like many others to be seen in the Sierra. For, instead of keeping it at the same level all the year, allowing Nature to make new shores, it would, of course, be full only a month or two in the spring, when the snow is melting fast; then it would be gradually drained, exposing the slimy sides of the basin and shallower parts of the bottom, with the gathered drift and waste, death and decay of the upper basins, caught here instead of being swept on to decent natural burial along the banks of the river or in the sea. Thus the Hetch Hetchy dam-lake would be only a rough imitation of a natural lake for a few of the spring months, an open mountain sepulcher for the others.

“Hetch Hetchy water is the purest, wholly unpolluted, and forever unpollutable.”

On the contrary, excepting that of the Merced below Yosemite, it is less pure than that of most of the other Sierra streams, because of the sewerage of campgrounds draining into it, especially of the Big Tuolumne Meadows campgrounds, where hundreds of tourists and mountaineers, with their animals, are encamped for months every summer, soon to be followed by thousands of travelers from all the world.

These temple destroyers, devotees of ravaging commercialism, seem to have a perfect contempt for Nature, and, instead of lifting their eyes to the mountains, lift them to dams and town skyscrapers.

Dam Hetch-Hetchy! As well dam for water-tanks the people's cathedrals and churches, for no holier temple has ever been consecrated by the heart of man.

Emma Goldman (1869–1940)

Emma Goldman, a Lithuanian Jew, spent much of her youth in St. Petersburg, Russia, at a time when Jews were persecuted and the political philosophy of anarchism was having a huge impact on revolutionary students. In 1881, revolutionary factions had become so sure of the righteousness of their cause that they assassinated Czar Alexander III. In the aftermath of the authoritarian crackdown on anarchists, 16-year-old Emma Goldman emigrated to the United States in 1885. She must have had a sense that she would find a golden land of opportunity in the New World—at least that there would be more opportunities for a young woman than there were in czarist Russia. But it did not take her long to realize that life in her new home was not exactly a bed of roses. She took a low-paying job in a factory in Rochester, New York, and began to engage in political activities. Influenced by newspaper accounts of the trial, conviction, and execution of the anarchists who had been accused of killing several police officers at Haymarket Square in Chicago, Goldman left her job in 1889, moved to New York City, and joined an anarchist association. Within a few short years, she became one of the most outspoken and notorious anarchist-feminists in the nation. Believing that a society could be created in which there would be no private property or repression and in which absolute freedom would exist for all individuals, she became an activist campaigning for women's rights to birth control, full equality, and sexual liberation, as well as the rights of workers to unionize. In 1892, she went so far as to aid and abet her lover (and fellow anarchist) Alexander Berkman in his unsuccessful attempt to assassinate the chairman of the Carnegie Steel Company, Henry Clay Frick, during the Homestead Strike. During the First World War, her protests against conscription and her speeches praising the Bolshevik revolution in Russia led to her arrest and, after two years in jail, her eventual deportation in 1919.

The institution of marriage, Goldman believed, was nothing but legalized prostitution. In a patriarchal society that deprived them of social and economic equality, women were forced to “sell themselves” into marriage to survive. The only way women would ever achieve equality was not through gaining political power or the right to vote but through abolishing the institution of marriage altogether and securing absolute control over their own bodies. “True emancipation,” she declared, “begins neither at the polls nor in court. It begins in a woman's soul.” The goal was complete and total emotional and sexual liberation.

In her many writings, Emma Goldman argues persuasively for the creation of a society in which democracy and freedom are truly realized

and in which distinctions of gender and race have been obliterated. (For a longer version of this essay, as well as her "The Individual, Society, and the State," see the full version of *Dissent in America: The Voices That Shaped a Nation*.)

"MARRIAGE AND LOVE," 1911

The popular notion about marriage and love is that they are synonymous, that they spring from the same motives, and cover the same human needs. Like most popular notions this also rests not on actual facts, but on superstition.

Marriage and love have nothing in common; they are as far apart as the poles; are, in fact, antagonistic to each other. No doubt some marriages have been the result of love. Not, however, because love could assert itself only in marriage; much rather is it because few people can completely outgrow a convention. There are to-day large numbers of men and women to whom marriage is naught but a farce, but who submit to it for the sake of public opinion. At any rate, while it is true that some marriages are based on love, and while it is equally true that in some cases love continues in married life, I maintain that it does so regardless of marriage, and not because of it.

On the other hand, it is utterly false that love results from marriage. On rare occasions one does hear of a miraculous case of a married couple falling in love after marriage, but on close examination it will be found that it is a mere adjustment to the inevitable. Certainly the growing used to each other is far away from the spontaneity, the intensity, and beauty of love, without which the intimacy of marriage must prove degrading to both the woman and the man.

Marriage is primarily an economic arrangement, an insurance pact. It differs from the ordinary life insurance agreement only in that it is more binding, more exacting. Its returns are insignificantly small compared with the investments. In taking out an insurance policy one pays for it in dollars and cents, always at liberty to discontinue payments. If, however, woman's premium is a husband, she pays for it with her name, her privacy, her self-respect, her very life, "until death doth part." Moreover, the marriage insurance condemns her to life-long dependency, to parasitism, to complete uselessness, individual as well as social. Man, too, pays his toll, but as his sphere is wider, marriage does not limit him as much as woman. He feels his chains more in an economic sense.

Thus Dante's motto over *Inferno* applies with equal force to marriage: "Ye who enter here leave all hope behind."

That marriage is a failure none but the very stupid will deny. One has but to glance over the statistics of divorce to realize how bitter a failure marriage really

is. . . . [S]cores of . . . writers are discussing the barrenness, the monotony, the sordidness, the inadequacy of marriage as a factor for harmony and understanding. . . .

From infancy, almost, the average girl is told that marriage is her ultimate goal; therefore her training and education must be directed towards that end. Like the mute beast fattened for slaughter, she is prepared for that. Yet, strange to say, she is allowed to know much less about her function as wife and mother than the ordinary artisan of his trade. It is indecent and filthy for a respectable girl to know anything of the marital relation. Oh, for the inconsistency of respectability, that needs the marriage vow to turn something which is filthy into the purest and most sacred arrangement that none dare question or criticize. Yet that is exactly the attitude of the average upholder of marriage. The prospective wife and mother is kept in complete ignorance of her only asset in the competitive field—sex. Thus she enters into life-long relations with a man only to find herself shocked, repelled, outraged beyond measure by the most natural and healthy instinct, sex. It is safe to say that a large percentage of the unhappiness, misery, distress, and physical suffering of matrimony is due to the criminal ignorance in sex matters that is being extolled as a great virtue. Nor is it at all an exaggeration when I say that more than one home has been broken up because of this deplorable fact.

If, however, woman is free and big enough to learn the mystery of sex without the sanction of State or Church, she will stand condemned as utterly unfit to become the wife of a "good" man, his goodness consisting of an empty head and plenty of money. Can there be anything more outrageous than the idea that a healthy, grown woman, full of life and passion, must deny nature's demand, must subdue her most intense craving, undermine her health and break her spirit, must stunt her vision, abstain from the depth and glory of sex experience until a "good" man comes along to take her unto himself as a wife? That is precisely what marriage means. How can such an arrangement end except in failure? This is one, though not the least important, factor of marriage, which differentiates it from love.

Ours is a practical age. . . . If, on rare occasions young people allow themselves the luxury of romance they are taken in care by the elders, drilled and pounded until they become "sensible."

The moral lesson instilled in the girl is not whether the man has aroused her love, but rather is it, "How much?" The important and only God of practical American life: Can the man make a living? Can he support a wife? That is the only thing that justifies marriage. Gradually this saturates every thought of the girl; her dreams are not of moonlight and kisses, of laughter and tears; she dreams of shopping tours and bargain counters. This soul-poverty and sordidness are the elements inherent in the marriage institution. The State and the Church approve of no other ideal, simply because it is the one that necessitates the State and Church control of men and women.

Doubtless there are people who continue to consider love above dollars and cents. Particularly is this true of that class whom economic necessity has

forced to become self-supporting. The tremendous change in woman's position, wrought by that mighty factor, is indeed phenomenal when we reflect that it is but a short time since she has entered the industrial arena. Six million women wage-earners; six million women, who have the equal right with men to be exploited, to be robbed, to go on strike; aye, to starve even. Anything more, my lord? Yes, six million wage-workers in every walk of life, from the highest brain work to the most difficult menial labor in the mines and on the railroad tracks; yes, even detectives and policemen. Surely the emancipation is complete.

Yet with all that, but a very small number of the vast army of women wage-workers look upon work as a permanent issue, in the same light as does man. No matter how decrepit the latter, he has been taught to be independent, self-supporting. Oh, I know that no one is really independent in our economic treadmill; still, the poorest specimen of a man hates to be a parasite; to be known as such, at any rate.

... What I wish to prove is that marriage guarantees woman a home only by the grace of her husband. There she moves about in *his* home, year after year until her aspect of life and human affairs becomes as flat, narrow, and drab as her surroundings. Small wonder if she becomes a nag, petty, quarrelsome, gossipy, unbearable, thus driving the man from the house. She could not go, if she wanted to; there is no place to go. Besides, a short period of married life, of complete surrender of all faculties, absolutely incapacitates the average woman for the outside world. She becomes reckless in appearance, clumsy in her movements, dependent in her decisions, cowardly in her judgment, a weight and a bore, which most men grow to hate and despise. Wonderfully inspiring atmosphere for the bearing of life, is it not? ...

The institution of marriage makes a parasite of woman, an absolute dependent. It incapacitates her for life's struggle, annihilates her social consciousness, paralyzes her imagination, and then imposes its gracious protection, which is in reality a snare, a travesty on human character.

If motherhood is the highest fulfillment of woman's nature, what other protection does it need save love and freedom? Marriage but defiles, outrages, and corrupts her fulfillment. Does it not say to woman, Only when you follow me shall you bring forth life? Does it not condemn her to the block, does it not degrade and shame her if she refuses to buy her right to motherhood by selling herself? Does not marriage only sanction motherhood, even though conceived in hatred, in compulsion? Yet, if motherhood be of free choice, of love, of ecstasy, of defiant passion, does it not place a crown of thorns upon an innocent head and carve in letters of blood the hideous epithet, Bastard? Were marriage to contain all the virtues claimed for it, its crimes against motherhood would exclude it forever from the realm of love.

Love, the strongest and deepest element in all life, the harbinger of hope, of joy, of ecstasy; love, the defier of all laws, of all conventions; love, the freest, the most powerful moulder of human destiny; how can such an all-compelling

force be synonymous with that poor little State- and Church-begotten weed, marriage?

Free love? As if love is anything but free! Man has bought brains, but all the millions in the world have failed to buy love. Man has subdued bodies, but all the power on earth has been unable to subdue love. Man has conquered whole nations, but all his armies could not conquer love. Man has chained and fettered the spirit, but he has been utterly helpless before love. ...

Love needs no protection; it is its own protection. So long as love begets life no child is deserted, or hungry, or famished for the want of affection. I know this to be true. I know women who became mothers in freedom by the men they loved. Few children in wedlock enjoy the care, the protection, the devotion free motherhood is capable of bestowing.

The defenders of authority dread the advent of a free motherhood, lest it will rob them of their prey. Who would fight wars? Who would create wealth? Who would make the policeman, the jailer, if woman were to refuse the indiscriminate breeding of children? The race, the race! shouts the king, the president, the capitalist, the priest. The race must be preserved, though woman be degraded to a mere machine,—and the marriage institution is our only safety valve against the pernicious sex-awakening of woman. But in vain these frantic efforts to maintain a state of bondage. In vain, too, the edicts of the Church, the mad attacks of rulers, in vain even the arm of the law. Woman no longer wants to be a party to the production of a race of sickly, feeble, decrepit, wretched human beings, who have neither the strength nor moral courage to throw off the yoke of poverty and slavery. Instead she desires fewer and better children, begotten and reared in love and through free choice; not by compulsion, as marriage imposes. Our pseudo-moralists have yet to learn the deep sense of responsibility toward the child, that love in freedom has awakened in the breast of woman. Rather would she forego forever the glory of motherhood than bring forth life in an atmosphere that breathes only destruction and death. And if she does become a mother, it is to give to the child the deepest and best her being can yield. To grow with the child is her motto; she knows that in that manner alone can she help build true manhood and womanhood. ...

In our present pygmy state love is indeed a stranger to most people. Misunderstood and shunned, it rarely takes root; or if it does, it soon withers and dies. Its delicate fiber can not endure the stress and strain of the daily grind. Its soul is too complex to adjust itself to the slimy woof of our social fabric. It weeps and moans and suffers with those who have need of it, yet lack the capacity to rise to love's summit.

Some day, some day men and women will rise, they will reach the mountain peak, they will meet big and strong and free, ready to receive, to partake, and to bask in the golden rays of love. What fancy, what imagination, what poetic genius can foresee even approximately the potentialities of such a force in the life of men and women. If the world is ever to give birth to true companionship and oneness, not marriage, but love will be the parent.

Walter Rauschenbusch (1861–1918)

Throughout history, when the destitute sought solace and relief from hardship from their clergy, they were usually advised to pray and look forward to their reward in the next life. Walter Rauschenbusch, however, believed that it was as important to address people's needs in this life as it was to minister to their spiritual needs. After studying in Germany and England, where he was influenced by the Fabian socialist movement, he returned to the United States and became pastor of the Second German Baptist Church in New York City. While ministering to the German immigrants in the Hell's Kitchen section of the city, he began to develop the Social Gospel. By applying Christian principles to his critique of capitalism and Spencer and Sumner's social Darwinism, he, in effect, brought a moral dimension to the progressive movement. It was not enough to approach the problems of society from a political or social standpoint, for the problems were also, in Rauschenbusch's eyes, moral ones. By bringing morality into the discussion, he had a profound impact on many other reformers at the beginning of the twentieth century. His Social Gospel's appeal to Christian ethics brought many people who had previously been apathetic to the plight of the poor into the progressive movement. One of Rauschenbusch's contemporaries, Charles Sheldon, wrote a popular and influential book, *In His Steps*, in which he urged businessmen and politicians, whenever they were confronted with a decision that would affect the lives of workers, always to ask themselves one simple question before making that decision: "What would Jesus do?" Later in the century, another clergyman, Martin Luther King Jr., would apply a moral dimension to the civil rights movement.

CHRISTIANIZING THE SOCIAL ORDER, 1912

The chief purpose of the Christian Church in the past has been the salvation of individuals. But the most pressing task of the present is not individualistic. Our business is to make over an antiquated and immoral economic system: to get rid of laws, customs, maxims, and philosophies inherited from an evil and despotic past; to create just and brotherly relations between great groups and classes of society; and thus to lay a social foundation on which modern men individually can live and work in a fashion that will not outrage all the better elements in them....

The Christian Church in the past has taught us to work with our eyes fixed on another world and a life to come. But the business before us is concerned

SOURCE: Walter Rauschenbusch, *Christianizing the Social Order* (New York: Macmillan, 1912), 41–44.

with refashioning the present world, making this earth clean and sweet and habitable....

Twenty-five years ago the social wealth of the Bible was almost undiscovered to most of us.... Even Jesus talked like an individualist in those days and seemed to repudiate the social interest when we interrogated him. He said his kingdom was not of this world; the things of God had nothing to do with the things of Caesar; the poor we would always have with us; and his ministers must not be judges and dividers when Labor argued with Capital about the division of the inheritance. Today he has resumed the spiritual leadership of social Christianity, of which he was the founder. It is a new tribute to his mastership that the social message of Jesus was the first great possession which social Christianity rediscovered....

With true Christian instinct men have turned to the Christian law of love as the key to the situation. If we all loved our neighbor, we should "treat him right," pay him a living wage, give sixteen ounces to the pound, and not charge so much for beef. But this appeal assumes that we are still living in the simple personal relations of the good old times, and that every man can do the right thing when he wants to do it. But suppose a business man would be glad indeed to pay his young women the \$12 a week which they need for a decent living, but all his competitors are paying from \$7 down to \$5. Shall he love himself into bankruptcy? ... The old advice of love breaks down before the hugeness of modern relations.... It is indeed love that we want, but it is socialized love. Blessed be the love that holds a cup of water to thirsty lips.... What we most need today is not the love that will break its back drawing water for a growing factory town from a well that was meant to supply a village, but a love so large and intelligent that it will persuade an ignorant people to build a system of waterworks up in the hills, and that will get after the thoughtless farmers who contaminate the brooks with typhoid bacilli, and after the lumber concern that is denuding the watershed of its forests. We want a new avatar of love....

The Socialist Party

In 1912, the Socialist Party's presidential candidate, Eugene V. Debs, received a remarkable 6 percent of the popular vote. Democrats, Republicans, industrial leaders, and bankers were shocked that nearly a million men voted for a party that wanted to abolish capitalism and turn the United States into a socialist society. In the ensuing years, especially after the Bolshevik revolution in Russia in 1917, opposition to socialism increased dramatically, as politicians and businessmen did everything in their power to discredit the Socialist Party, as well as all other left-wing political organizations.

SOCIALIST PARTY PLATFORM, MAY 12, 1912

The Socialist party declares that the capitalist system has outgrown its historical function, and has become utterly incapable of meeting the problems now confronting society. We denounce this outgrown system as incompetent and corrupt and the source of unspeakable misery and suffering to the whole working class.

Under this system the industrial equipment of the nation has passed into the absolute control of a plutocracy which exacts an annual tribute of hundreds of millions of dollars from the producers. Unafraid of any organized resistance, it stretches out its greedy hands over the still undeveloped resources of the nation—the land, the mines, the forests and the water powers of every State of the Union.

In spite of the multiplication of laborsaving machines and improved methods in industry which cheapen the cost of production, the share of the producers grows ever less, and the prices of all the necessities of life steadily increase. The boasted prosperity of this nation is for the owning class alone. To the rest it means only greater hardship and misery. The high cost of living is felt in every home. Millions of wage-workers have seen the purchasing power of their wages decrease until life has become a desperate battle for mere existence.

Multitudes of unemployed walk the streets of our cities or trudge from State to State awaiting the will of the masters to move the wheels of industry.

The farmers in every state are plundered by the increasing prices exacted for tools and machinery and by extortionate rents, freight rates and storage charges.

Capitalist concentration is mercilessly crushing the class of small business men and driving its members into the ranks of propertyless wage-workers. The overwhelming majority of the people of America are being forced under a yoke of bondage by this soulless industrial despotism.

It is this capitalist system that is responsible for the increasing burden of armaments, the poverty, slums, child labor, most of the insanity, crime and prostitution, and much of the disease that afflicts mankind.

Under this system the working class is exposed to poisonous conditions, to frightful and needless perils to life and limb, is walled around with court decisions, injunctions and unjust laws, and is preyed upon incessantly for the benefit of the controlling oligarchy of wealth. Under it also, the children of the working class are doomed to ignorance, drudging toil and darkened lives.

In the face of these evils, so manifest that all thoughtful observers are appalled at them, the legislative representatives of the Republican and Democratic parties remain the faithful servants of the oppressors. Measures designed to secure to the wage-earners of this Nation as humane and just treatment as is already enjoyed by the wage-earners of all other civilized nations have been smothered in committee without debate, the laws ostensibly designed to bring relief to the

farmers and general consumers are juggled and transformed into instruments for the exaction of further tribute. The growing unrest under oppression has driven these two old parties to the enactment of a variety of regulative measures, none of which has limited in any appreciable degree the power of the plutocracy, and some of which have been perverted into means of increasing that power. Anti-trust laws, railroad restrictions and regulations, with the prosecutions, indictments and investigations based upon such legislation, have proved to be utterly futile and ridiculous.

Nor has this plutocracy been seriously restrained or even threatened by any Republican or Democratic executive. It has continued to grow in power and insolence alike under the administration of Cleveland, McKinley, Roosevelt and Taft.

We declare, therefore, that the longer sufferance of these conditions is impossible, and we purpose to end them all. We declare them to be the product of the present system in which industry is carried on for private greed, instead of for the welfare of society. We declare, furthermore, that for these evils there will be and can be no remedy and no substantial relief except through Socialism under which industry will be carried on for the common good and every worker receive the full social value of the wealth he creates.

Society is divided into warring groups and classes, based upon material interests. Fundamentally, this struggle is a conflict between the two main classes, one of which, the capitalist class, owns the means of production, and the other, the working class, must use these means of production, on terms dictated by the owners.

The capitalist class, though few in numbers, absolutely controls the government, legislative, executive and judicial. This class owns the machinery of gathering and disseminating news through its organized press. It subsidizes seats of learning—the colleges and schools—and even religious and moral agencies. It has also the added prestige which established customs give to any order of society, right or wrong.

The working class, which includes all those who are forced to work for a living whether by hand or brain, in shop, mine or on the soil, vastly outnumbers the capitalist class. Lacking effective organization and class solidarity, this class is unable to enforce its will. Given such a class solidarity and effective organization, the workers will have the power to make all laws and control all industry in their own interest. All political parties are the expression of economic class interests. All other parties than the Socialist party represent one or another group of the ruling capitalist class. Their political conflicts reflect merely superficial rivalries between competing capitalist groups. However they result, these conflicts have no issue of real value to the workers. Whether the Democrats or Republicans win politically, it is the capitalist class that is victorious economically.

The Socialist party is the political expression of the economic interests of the workers. Its defeats have been their defeats and its victories their victories. It is a party founded on the science and laws of social development. It proposes that, since all social necessities to-day are socially produced, the means of their production and distribution shall be socially owned and democratically controlled.

SOCIALIST PARTY PLATFORM, MAY 12, 1912

The Socialist party declares that the capitalist system has outgrown its historical function, and has become utterly incapable of meeting the problems now confronting society. We denounce this outgrown system as incompetent and corrupt and the source of unspeakable misery and suffering to the whole working class.

Under this system the industrial equipment of the nation has passed into the absolute control of a plutocracy which exacts an annual tribute of hundreds of millions of dollars from the producers. Unafraid of any organized resistance, it stretches out its greedy hands over the still undeveloped resources of the nation—the land, the mines, the forests and the water powers of every State of the Union.

In spite of the multiplication of laborsaving machines and improved methods in industry which cheapen the cost of production, the share of the producers grows ever less, and the prices of all the necessities of life steadily increase. The boasted prosperity of this nation is for the owning class alone. To the rest it means only greater hardship and misery. The high cost of living is felt in every home. Millions of wage-workers have seen the purchasing power of their wages decrease until life has become a desperate battle for mere existence.

Multitudes of unemployed walk the streets of our cities or trudge from State to State awaiting the will of the masters to move the wheels of industry.

The farmers in every state are plundered by the increasing prices exacted for tools and machinery and by extortionate rents, freight rates and storage charges.

Capitalist concentration is mercilessly crushing the class of small business men and driving its members into the ranks of propertyless wage-workers. The overwhelming majority of the people of America are being forced under a yoke of bondage by this soulless industrial despotism.

It is this capitalist system that is responsible for the increasing burden of armaments, the poverty, slums, child labor, most of the insanity, crime and prostitution, and much of the disease that afflicts mankind.

Under this system the working class is exposed to poisonous conditions, to frightful and needless perils to life and limb, is walled around with court decisions, injunctions and unjust laws, and is preyed upon incessantly for the benefit of the controlling oligarchy of wealth. Under it also, the children of the working class are doomed to ignorance, drudging toil and darkened lives.

In the face of these evils, so manifest that all thoughtful observers are appalled at them, the legislative representatives of the Republican and Democratic parties remain the faithful servants of the oppressors. Measures designed to secure to the wage-earners of this Nation as humane and just treatment as is already enjoyed by the wage-earners of all other civilized nations have been smothered in committee without debate, the laws ostensibly designed to bring relief to the

farmers and general consumers are juggled and transformed into instruments for the exaction of further tribute. The growing unrest under oppression has driven these two old parties to the enactment of a variety of regulative measures, none of which has limited in any appreciable degree the power of the plutocracy, and some of which have been perverted into means of increasing that power. Anti-trust laws, railroad restrictions and regulations, with the prosecutions, indictments and investigations based upon such legislation, have proved to be utterly futile and ridiculous.

Nor has this plutocracy been seriously restrained or even threatened by any Republican or Democratic executive. It has continued to grow in power and insolence alike under the administration of Cleveland, McKinley, Roosevelt and Taft.

We declare, therefore, that the longer sufferance of these conditions is impossible, and we purpose to end them all. We declare them to be the product of the present system in which industry is carried on for private greed, instead of for the welfare of society. We declare, furthermore, that for these evils there will be and can be no remedy and no substantial relief except through Socialism under which industry will be carried on for the common good and every worker receive the full social value of the wealth he creates.

Society is divided into warring groups and classes, based upon material interests. Fundamentally, this struggle is a conflict between the two main classes, one of which, the capitalist class, owns the means of production, and the other, the working class, must use these means of production, on terms dictated by the owners.

The capitalist class, though few in numbers, absolutely controls the government, legislative, executive and judicial. This class owns the machinery of gathering and disseminating news through its organized press. It subsidizes seats of learning—the colleges and schools—and even religious and moral agencies. It has also the added prestige which established customs give to any order of society, right or wrong.

The working class, which includes all those who are forced to work for a living whether by hand or brain, in shop, mine or on the soil, vastly outnumber the capitalist class. Lacking effective organization and class solidarity, this class is unable to enforce its will. Given such a class solidarity and effective organization, the workers will have the power to make all laws and control all industry in their own interest. All political parties are the expression of economic class interests. All other parties than the Socialist party represent one or another group of the ruling capitalist class. Their political conflicts reflect merely superficial rivalries between competing capitalist groups. However they result, these conflicts have no issue of real value to the workers. Whether the Democrats or Republicans win politically, it is the capitalist class that is victorious economically.

The Socialist party is the political expression of the economic interests of the workers. Its defeats have been their defeats and its victories their victories. It is a party founded on the science and laws of social development. It proposes that, since all social necessities to-day are socially produced, the means of their production and distribution shall be socially owned and democratically controlled.

In the face of the economic and political aggressions of the capitalist class the only reliance left the workers is that of their economic organizations and their political power. By the intelligent and class-conscious use of these, they may resist successfully the capitalist class, break the fetters of wage slavery, and fit themselves for the future society, which is to displace the capitalist system. The Socialist party appreciates the full significance of class organization and urges the wage-earners, the working farmers and all other useful workers to organize for economic and political action, and we pledge ourselves to support the toilers of the fields as well as those in the shops, factories and mines of the nation in their struggles for economic justice.

In the defeat or victory of the working class party in this new struggle for freedom lies the defeat or triumph of the common people of all economic groups, as well as the failure or triumph of popular government. Thus the Socialist party is the party of the present day revolution which makes the transition from economic individualism to socialism, from wage slavery to free co-operation, from capitalist oligarchy to industrial democracy....

COLLECTIVE OWNERSHIP

1. The collective ownership and democratic management of railroads, wire and wireless telegraphs and telephones, express service, steamboat lines, and all other social means of transportation and communication and of all large scale industries.
2. The immediate acquirement by the municipalities, the states or the federal government of all grain elevators, stock yards, storage warehouses, and other distributing agencies, in order to reduce the present extortionate cost of living.
3. The extension of the public domain to include mines, quarries, oil wells, forests and water power.
4. The further conservation and development of natural resources for the use and benefit of all the people....
5. The collective ownership of land wherever practicable, and in cases where such ownership is impracticable, the appropriation by taxation of the annual rental value of all the land held for speculation and exploitation.
6. The collective ownership and democratic management of the banking and currency system....

INDUSTRIAL DEMANDS

The conservation of human resources, particularly of the lives and well-being of the workers and their families:

1. By shortening the work day in keeping with the increased productivity of machinery.
2. By securing for every worker a rest period of not less than a day and a half in each week.

3. By securing a more effective inspection of workshops, factories and mines.
4. By forbidding the employment of children under sixteen years of age.
5. By the co-operative organization of the industries in the federal penitentiaries for the benefit of the convicts and their dependents.
6. By forbidding the interstate transportation of the products of child labor, of convict labor and of all uninspected factories and mines.
7. By abolishing the profit system in government work and substituting either the direct hire of labor or the awarding of contracts to co-operative groups of workers.
8. By establishing minimum wage scales.
9. By abolishing official charity and substituting a non-contributory system of old age pensions, a general system of insurance by the State of all its members against unemployment and invalidism and a system of compulsory insurance by employers of their workers, without cost to the latter, against industrial diseases, accidents and death.

POLITICAL DEMANDS

1. The absolute freedom of press, speech and assemblage.
2. The adoption of a graduated income tax and the extension of inheritance taxes, graduated in proportion to the value of the estate and to nearness of kin—the proceeds of these taxes to be employed in the socialization of industry.
3. The abolition of the monopoly ownership of patents and the substitution of collective ownership, with direct rewards to inventors by premiums or royalties.
4. Unrestricted and equal suffrage for men and women.
5. The adoption of the initiative, referendum and recall and of proportional representation, nationally as well as locally.
6. The abolition of the Senate and of the veto power of the President.
7. The election of the President and Vice-President by direct vote of the people.
8. The abolition of the power usurped by the Supreme Court of the United States to pass upon the constitutionality of the legislation enacted by Congress. National laws to be repealed only by act of Congress or by a referendum vote of the whole people.
9. Abolition of the present restrictions upon the amendment of the constitution, so that instrument may be made amendable by a majority of the voters in a majority of the States.
10. The granting of the right of suffrage in the District of Columbia with representation in Congress and a democratic form of municipal government for purely local affairs.
11. The extension of democratic government to all United States territory.
12. The enactment of further measures for the conservation of health. The creation of an independent bureau of health, with such restrictions as will secure full liberty to all schools of practice.

13. The enactment of further measures for general education and particularly for vocational education in useful pursuits. The Bureau of Education to be made a department.
 14. The separation of the present Bureau of Labor from the Department of Commerce and Labor and its elevation to the rank of a department.
 15. Abolition of all federal district courts and the United States circuit court of appeals. State courts to have jurisdiction in all cases arising between citizens of several states and foreign corporations. The election of all judges for short terms.
 16. The immediate curbing of the power of the courts to issue injunctions.
 17. The free administration of the law.
 18. The calling of a convention for the revision of the constitution of the U.S.
- Such measures of relief as we may be able to force from capitalism are but a preparation of the workers to seize the whole powers of government, in order that they may thereby lay hold of the whole system of socialized industry and thus come to their rightful inheritance.

PART SIX

Conflict and Depression, 1912-1945

INTRODUCTION: BECOMING A WORLD POWER

During the first two decades of the twentieth century, women were ever more insistently demanding suffrage. Woodrow Wilson's inauguration as president raised hopes that a Democrat would now, finally, support the suffragist cause. It was soon apparent, however, that Wilson had no intention to fight for women's suffrage, and so militants, led by Alice Paul, increased their pressure by picketing the White House six days a week. Their signs displayed passages from Wilson's speeches justifying America's entry into the Great War as part of the nation's mission to spread democracy to people who had no say in their government; suffragists demanded to know why the president was blind to the fact that 50 percent of America's citizens were denied a say in their own government. By 1918, Wilson gave in and began to urge congressional Democrats to vote for the suffrage amendment. With the ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment in 1920, women had finally won the right to vote, 144 years after Abigail Adams had exhorted her husband "not to forget the ladies" and 72 years after Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth Cady Stanton had written the "Declaration of Sentiments" at Seneca Falls. Still, the vote did not bring equality for women, and in 1923 Alice Paul launched a new campaign for an equal rights amendment that would give women full economic and social rights.

Simultaneous with the battle for political rights, Margaret Sanger led the feminist movement into new territory by championing a woman's right to have complete control over her body. Sanger's successful assault on the Comstock Law, which equated the promotion of birth control with pornography, resulted in the repeal of the law and the opening of the first clinics that would later become known as Planned Parenthood.