



PEARSON

PRENTICE HALL

## The Zimmermann Telegram (1917)

*On January 19, 1917, Alfred Zimmermann, Germany's foreign secretary, sent the following telegram to the German ambassador in Mexico. The telegram was intercepted by British intelligence agents, who transmitted it to President Wilson. The president subsequently made the contents available to the U.S. public. On February 3, Germany resumed unrestricted submarine warfare. At that point, the United States severed diplomatic relations with Germany and began to arm its merchant fleet. The contents of the telegram were made public on March 1, inflaming public sentiment. The United States declared war on Germany on April 6, 1917.*

---

Berlin, January 19, 1917

On the first of February we intend to begin submarine warfare unrestricted. In spite of this, it is our intention to endeavor to keep neutral the United States of America.

If this attempt is not successful, we propose an alliance on the following basis with Mexico: That we shall make war together and together make peace. We shall give general financial support, and it is understood that Mexico is to reconquer the lost territory in New Mexico, Texas, and Arizona. The details are left to you for settlement....

You are instructed to inform the President of Mexico of the above in the greatest confidence as soon as it is certain that there will be an outbreak of war with the United States and suggest that the President of Mexico, on his own initiative, should communicate with Japan suggesting adherence at once to this plan; at the same time, offer to mediate between Germany and Japan.

Please call to the attention of the President of Mexico that the employment of ruthless submarine warfare now promises to compel England to make peace in a few months.

Zimmerman  
(Secretary of State)

Copyright © 2009 Pearson Education, Inc. All rights reserved.



PEARSON

PRENTICE HALL

## Eugene V. Debs, Critique of World War I (1918)

*Eugene V. Debs, labor leader, politician, and perhaps the nation's most famous Socialist, delivered the speech excerpted below at the Ohio state convention of the Socialist Party during World War I. Debs, an outspoken critic of the war, was outraged that many radicals, socialists, and members of the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW) had been arrested for opposing the war. When Debs was prosecuted for violating the Espionage Act of 1917, the transcript of this speech became an exhibit for the prosecution. Sentenced to ten years in prison, Debs made his fourth and most successful run for the presidency in 1920 from his cell, garnering almost 1 million votes. He was pardoned in 1921, but his health prevented him from returning to politics.*

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

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

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

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

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

Yes, in good time we are going to sweep into power in this nation and throughout the world. We are going to destroy all enslaving and degrading capitalist institutions and recreate them as free and humanizing institutions. The world is daily changing before our eyes. The sun of capitalism is setting; the sun of Socialism is rising. It is our duty to build the new nation and the free republic. We need industrial and social builders. We Socialists are the builders of the beautiful world that is to be. We are all pledged to do our part. We are inviting—aye challenging you—in the name of your own manhood and womanhood to join us and do your part.

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



## Claude McKay, "White Houses" (1925)

*Claude McKay was born in Jamaica, West Indies, in 1889. After studying English novels, poetry, and scientific texts, McKay published a book of verse when he was 20 years old. Songs of Jamaica, described black life in Jamaica and was written in dialect. In 1912, McKay attended Tuskegee Institute, but after only a few months, he left to study agriculture at Kansas State University. In 1919, McKay responded to the summer violence and the brutal attacks on black people with a forceful poem, "If We Must Die." During the twenties, he became interested in Communism, went to the Soviet Union and then to France where he met Edna St. Vincent Millay and Sinclair Lewis. In 1928 he wrote Home to Harlem, which described the seamy side of life in Harlem. He returned to the United States in 1934 and settled in Harlem. SOURCE: From Alain Locke, editor. The New Negro, An Interpretation. New York: Albert and Charles Boni, Inc., 1925. 134.*

---

### WHITE HOUSES

Your door is shut against my tightened face,  
And I am sharp as steel with discontent;  
But I possess the courage and the grace  
To bear my anger proudly and unbent.  
The pavement slabs burn loose beneath my feet,  
A chafing savage, down the decent street,  
And passion rends my vitals as I pass,  
Where boldly shines your shuttered door of glass.  
Oh I must search for wisdom every hour,  
Deep in my wrathful bosom sore and raw,  
And find in it the superhuman power  
To hold me to the letter of your law!  
Oh I must keep my heart inviolate  
Against the potent poison of your hate.  
From *The Archives of Claude McKay*, Carl Cowl, Administrator.

Copyright © 2009 Pearson Education, Inc. All rights reserved.



PEARSON

PRENTICE HALL

## Margaret Sanger, Family Planning (1926)

---

*Margaret Sanger was a controversial figure in her day. She introduced the term birth control to American couples, she encouraged people to explore the pleasures of passionate and sexual love, and she wrote frankly about the topic. She advocated the use of contraceptives for working-class people, to control family growth at an economically manageable level, and also to the middle class, to postpone the arrival of children so the couple could build their relationship on the pleasure of intimate knowledge of each other. SOURCE: Margaret Sanger, Happiness in Marriage (1926), pp. 191-203.*

---

### PREMATURE PARENTHOOD AND WHY TO AVOID IT

Coming together with widely differing likes and dislikes, varying inheritances and often with widely divergent training and ideals, the two young people who marry will not be long in discovering that they may have much less in common than they had ever dreamed possible.

When Society has tossed them a marriage certificate and the Church has concluded the ceremony which has legally united them, they are then forced back upon their own resources. Society, so to speak, has washed its hands of the young couple, or cast this man and this woman into the deep waters of matrimony, where they are left to sink or swim as best they may.

The certificate of marriage solves nothing. Rather it accentuates the greater and more complex problems of life. To find a solution to this great problem of living together and growing together requires all the combined intelligence and foresight both man and woman can command. Drifting into this relation will offer no solution, for very often those who drift into marriage, drift out of it in the same aimless fashion.

Others, who have not realized that the marriage of a man and woman is not merely a legal sanction for parenthood, but that it is an important relation in itself - the most important one in human life - often find themselves defeated and forced into an accidental and premature parenthood for which they are not financially or spiritually prepared.

Two years at least are necessary to cement the bonds of love and to establish the marriage relation. Parenthood should therefore be postponed by every young married couple until at least the third year of marriage.

Why is this advisable?

When the young wife is forced into maternity too soon, both are cheated out of marital adjustment and harmony that require time to mature and develop. The plunge into parenthood prematurely with all its problems and disturbances, is like the blighting of a bud before it has been given time to blossom.

Even in the fully matured healthy wife pregnancy has a disturbing physiological and nervous reaction. Temporarily the whole character and temperament of the woman undergoes profound changes. Usually nausea, headaches, irritability, loss of appetite, ensue. At the beginning of this period there develop temporary eccentricities that do not belong to the woman in her normal condition.

If the bride is enforced into an unwilling or accidental pregnancy during the honeymoon or the early stages of their marital love, the young husband is deprived of the possible opportunity of knowing his wife during one of the most interesting stages of her development. He has known her in the exciting days of courtship and during the heightened though brief period of the honeymoon, and now, alas, she enters all too soon the ominous days of early pregnancy. Never under such conditions can he know her in the growing beauty and ripening of mature womanhood. He has known her as a romantic girl before marriage - and now as a mother-to-be, frightened, timorous, and physically and nervously upset by the great ordeal she must go through.

Here often begins a spiritual separation between husband and wife. Conscious of his own helplessness, likewise of his own responsibility, the young husband feels it his duty to leave her alone. This enforced separation is spiritual rather than physical. Outwardly the relation may seem the same. It may be a separation only in the sense that no real unity or welding has been attained. Engrossed by this new problem, the young wife may resign herself to the inevitable and enters a state of passive resignation that is deadening to her love-life. She is in no condition to enjoy companionship. Beneath the superficial and conventional expression of happiness at the approaching parenthood, there may rankle a suppressed resentment at the young husband's careless pride in becoming a father. The young bride knows that she is paying too great a price for the brief and happy days of her honeymoon. She has been swept too rapidly from girlhood to motherhood. Love and romance, as many young wives have confessed to me, were but traps leading her to endless travail and enslavement. And this hidden rankling is often directed toward the husband, whom the wife holds responsible for her accidental pregnancy.

This unhappy condition would not have occurred if they had time to become one, if there were a period of two years during which the bonds of love might be firmly cemented, for time alone can produce this unity. It is a process of growth. Married love does not spring fullgrown into life. It is a delicate plant and it grows from the seed. It must be deeply and firmly rooted, nourished by the sunlight of tenderness, courtship and mutual consideration, before it can produce fine flowers and fruits. This period is as essential for human development as the period of body-building and adolescence.

It is a period of mutual adjustment. It is a period of spiritual discovery and exploration, of finding one's self and one's beloved. It is a period for the full and untroubled expression of passionate love. It is a period for cultural development. It thrusts forward its own complex problems - problems, let it be understood, intricately complex in themselves.

Husband and wife must solve many problems only by living through them, not by any cut and dried rules and regulations. For marriage brings with it problems that are individual and unique for each couple.

If instead of solving these problems of early parenthood, in which the life of a third person is immediately involved, a child thrusts itself into the lives of young husband and wife, these fundamental problems of marriage are never given the attention they deserve. A new situation arises, and in innumerable cases, love, as the old adage has it, flies out of the window.

We must recognize that the whole position of womanhood has changed today. Not so many years ago it was assumed to be a just and natural state of affairs that marriage was considered as nothing but a preliminary to motherhood. A girl passed from the guardianship of her father or nearest male relative to that of her husband. She had no will, no wishes of her own. Hers not to question why, but merely to fulfill duties imposed upon her by the man into whose care she was given.

Today women are on the whole much more individual. They possess as strong likes and dislikes as men. They live more and more on the plane of social equality with men. They are better companions. We should be glad that there is more enjoyable companionship and real friendship between men and women.

This very fact, it is true, complicates the marriage relation, and at the same time enables it. Marriage no longer means the slavish subservience of the woman to the will of the man. It means, instead, the union of two strong and highly individualized natures. Their first problem is to find out just what the terms of this partnership are to be. Understanding full and complete cannot come all at once, in one revealing flash. It takes time to arrive at a full and sympathetic understanding of each other, and mutually to arrange lives to increase this understanding. Out of the mutual adjustments, harmony must grow and discords gradually disappear.

These results cannot be obtained if the problem of parenthood is thrust upon the young husband and wife before they are spiritually and economically prepared to meet it. For naturally the coming of the first baby means that all other problems must be thrust aside. That baby is a great fact, a reality that must be met. Preparations must be made for its coming. The layette must be prepared. The doctor must be consulted. The health of the wife may need consideration. The young mother will probably prefer to go to the hospital. All of these preparations are small compared to the régime after the coming of the infant.

In the wife who has lived through a happy marriage, for whom the bonds of passionate love have been fully cemented, maternal desire is intensified and matured. Motherhood becomes for such a woman not a penalty or a punishment, but the road by which she travels onward toward completely rounded self-development. Motherhood thus helps her toward the unfolding and realization of her higher nature.

Her children are not mere accidents, the outcome of chance. When motherhood is a mere accident, as so often it is in the early years of careless or reckless marriages, a constant fear of pregnancy may poison the days and nights of the young mother. Her marriage is thus converted into a tragedy. Motherhood becomes for her a horror instead of a joyfully fulfilled function.

Millions of marriages have been blighted, not because of any lack of love between the young husband and wife, but because children have come too soon. Often these brides become mothers before they have reached even physical maturity, before they have completed the period of adolescence. This period in our race is as a rule complete around the age of twenty-three. Motherhood is possible after the first menstruation. But what is physically possible is very often from every other point of view inadvisable. A young woman should be fully matured from every point of view - physically, mentally and psychically before maternity is thrust upon her.

Those who advise early maternity neglect the spiritual foundation upon which marriage must inevitably be built. This takes time. They also ignore the financial responsibility a family brings.

The young couple begin to build a home. They may have just enough to get along together. The young wife, as in so many cases of early marriage these days, decides to continue her work. They are partners in every way - a commendable thing. The young man is just beginning his career - his salary is probably small. Nevertheless, they manage to get along, their hardships are amusing, and are looked upon as fun. Then suddenly one day, the young wife announces her pregnancy. The situation changes immediately. There are added expenses. The wife must give up her work. The husband must go into debt to pay the expenses of the new and joyfully received arrival. The novelty lasts for some time.

The young wife assumes the household duties and the ever growing care of the infant. For a time the child seems to bring the couple closer together. But more often there ensues a concealed resentment on the part of the immature mother at the constant drudgery and slavery to the unfortunate child who has arrived too early upon the scene, which has interfered with her love life.

For the unthinking husband, the "proud papa," the blushing bride is converted at once into the "mother of my children." It is not an unusual occurrence to find that three months after the birth of the baby, the parents are thinking and speaking to each other as "mumsy" and "daddy." The lover and sweetheart relation has disappeared forever and the "mamma-papa" relation has taken its place.

Instead of being a self-determined and self-directing love, everything is henceforward determined by the sweet tyranny of the child. I know of several young mothers, despite a great love for the child, to rebel against this intolerable situation. Vaguely feeling that this new maternity has rendered them unattractive to their husbands, slaves to deadly routine of bottles, baths and washing, they have revolted. I know of innumerable marriages which have been wrecked by premature parenthood.

Love has ever been blighted by the coming of children before the real foundations of marriage have been established. Quite aside from the injustice done to the child who has been brought accidentally into the world, this lamentable fact sinks into insignificance when compared to the injustice inflicted by chance upon the young couple, and the irreparable blow to their love occasioned by premature or involuntary parenthood.

For these reasons, in order that harmonious and happy marriage may be established as the foundation for happy homes and the advent of healthy and desired children, premature parenthood must be avoided. Birth Control is the instrument by which this universal problem may be solved.

Copyright © 2009 Pearson Education, Inc. All rights reserved.



PEARSON

PRENTICE HALL

## The Chicago Riot, from the Chicago Defender, August 2, Page 1 (1919)

*During the summer of 1919 major race riots broke out all over the country. The riot in Chicago, which lasted for four days, left thirty-eight people dead and hundreds injured and/or homeless. Racial tensions had been building throughout World War I as southern blacks moved north, especially to cities like Chicago, searching for jobs and an opportunity for better lives. As black soldiers returned from the war to face continuing discrimination and white soldiers returned to displace war workers, housing and job shortages fueled public struggles that resulted in racial violence. The bloody riots of 1919 helped fuel a growing awareness of the depth of racial strife in the United States as well as a new determination on the part of many African Americans to increase their efforts to gain racial equality. Other headlines for August 2 included "Riot Sweeps Chicago"; "Gun Battles and Fighting in Streets Keep the City in an Uproar"; "4,000 Troops in Armory Ready to Patrol City"; and "Scores are Killed."*

---

*Note: The Chicago Defender was one of the most influential African American newspapers at the time this article was written.*

---

The refusal of Policeman Daniel Callahan (white) . . . to arrest George Stuber (white) . . . last Sunday afternoon after the latter had knocked Eugene Williams, age 13 . . . from a raft as he was floating down Lake Michigan at Twenty-ninth street, fanned into action one of the worst race riots in the history of Illinois. Officer Callahan, it is charged, not only refused to make an arrest, but kept expert swimmers from reaching Williams. The news of Callahan's negligence reached the bathers at the Twenty-sixth street beach and a mob of fifty men marched to Twenty-ninth street to avenge the death of the boy. The patrolman's action so enraged the bathers that they pounced upon Callahan and commenced to pommel him. Callahan was chased to a drug store, where he summoned help. . . .

The whites on the beach took the policeman's part and a battle royal was waging in a few minutes. . . .

The news of Williams' death spread like wildfire, and about 8 o'clock Sunday night the whole South Side was in an uproar. Trolleys were pulled from the street cars in the vicinity of Thirty-fifth and State streets, and every white face was taken from the cars and severely beaten. Martin Webb (white) . . . had his head pommelled to a jelly when he fell in the hands of the rioters. Automobiles were stopped and the occupants taken out and beaten with sticks. All the autos were damaged beyond repair and left in the middle of the streets. Webb was carried to a hospital, where he died later in the night.

To quell the riot Sunday night 500 patrolmen invaded the district and remained until the early morning hours. At 12 o'clock midnight the rioters murdered a white peddler. . . .

Sunday night only proved a starter to the real fracas. Two colored men on their way to work at the stock yards were killed by the whites 6 o'clock Monday morning. . . . Pistols were flashed and men made threats to invade the stock yards district where the whites were attacking every black face that would show up. Stores were closed and motion picture houses nailed up their doors. All women and children retired from the streets, leaving the mob to work at free will. . . .

Groups of colored men gathered on the streets and discussed the situation and planned the night's attack. The word was passed around to clean the district of the whites for revenge. As the fever of race antagonism gained ground more fuel was added to the flame when workers from the stock yards came with stories of horrible attacks made by the whites upon colored women. These stories so enraged the crowd that they defied all policemen and beat white men up upon their appearance. . . .



The situation reached such a point that circulars pleading for order were distributed in the streets. The policemen had matters under control until 6 o'clock. . . . News flooded the South Side district that the whites on Wentworth avenue were collecting to invade State street. Over 500 policemen, mounted and on foot, were stationed at 31st street and 35th street. At the corner of 35th and State streets several colored men exhibited hand grenades preparing for the attack. An order was given to the police to shoot to kill any person who endeavored to start a disturbance, white or black. . . .

When night set in every store, poolroom, ice cream stand, and all business catering to the public was ordered closed. No crowds gathered on corners. Everything was seemingly quiet until 9:15 o'clock. A crowd of automobiles loaded with white men wheeled around the corner at 26th and State streets carrying army rifles and an unlimited supply of ammunition. Speeding down the street at the rate of fifty miles an hour the occupants of these machines fired right and left. The autos slowed down at 37th street on State to fire into a crowd. The motorcycle cops picked up the trail at 35th street and closed in on the white rioters. . . . The car stopped at 39th street; three of the occupants of the car were dead and two others were seriously wounded.

Five minutes after this another car swung right in behind the first fatal car and started firing right and left. The policemen at 35th street, being warned of this attack, swung the patrol wagons across the street and blocked the path of the death car. A fusillade of shots greeted the autoists. Four were killed. Another death car followed this one. The streets were clear and the police were ready to stop the rioters. . . . The officers turned their automatics on this car and killed three.

Several of the wounded were spirited to Provident hospital for treatment. When the colored men heard of this they made for the hospital and threatened to batter the doors to get the whites. It was here that Detective Sergeant Middleton was shot. His wound was not serious. The trouble between the races has been brewing for months. Assaults in parks on colored men and the trouble at the beaches kindled the fire.

• • •

Copyright © 2009 Pearson Education, Inc. All rights reserved.



PEARSON

PRENTICE HALL

## The Victims of the Ku Klux Klan (1935)

*These statements are from a collection of oral histories gathered from former slaves under the New Deal's WPA Writers Project. They describe in detail some of the tactics of the Klan, whose goal, according to U. S. President Ulysses S. Grant, was "to reduce the colored people to a condition closely allied to that of slavery."*

---

### Pierce Harper

After de colored people was considered free an' turned loose de Klu Klux broke out. Some of de colored people commenced to farming like I tol' you an' all de ol' stock dey could pick up after de Yankees left dey took an' took care of. If you got so you made good money an' had a good farm de Klu Klux'd come an' murder you. De gov'ment built de colored people school houses an' de Klu Klux went to work an' burn 'em down. Dey'd go to de jails an' take de colored men out an' knock der brains out an' break der necks an' throw 'em in de river.

Der was a man dat dey taken, his name was Jim Freeman. Dey taken him an' destroyed his stuff an' him 'cause he was making some money. Hung him on a tree in his front yard, right in front of his cabin. Der was some young men who went to de schools de gov'ment opened for de colored folks. Some white widda woman said someone had stole something she own', so dey put these young fellers in jail 'cause dey suspicioned 'em. De Klu Kluxes went to de jail an' took 'em out an' kill 'em. Dat happened de second year after de War.

After de Klu Kluxes got so strong de colored men got together an' made a complaint before de law. De Gov'nor told de law to give 'em de ol' guns in de commissary what de Southern soldiers had use, so dey issued de col'ored men old muskets an' told 'em to protect themselves.

De colored men got together an' organized the 'Malicy [Militia]. Dey had leaders like regular soldiers, men dat led 'em right on. Dey didn't meet 'cept when dey heard de Klu Kluxes was coming to get some of de colored folks. Den de one who knowed dat tol' de leader an' he went 'round an' told de others when an' where dey's meet. Den dey was ready for 'em. Dey's hide in de cabins an' when de Klu Kluxes come dere dey was. Den's when dey found out who a lot of de Klu Kluxes was, 'cause a lot of 'em was killed. Dey wore dem long sheets an' you couldn't tell who dey was. Dey even covered der horses up so you couldn't tell who dey belong to. Men you thought was your friend was Klu Kluxes. You deal wit' 'em in de stores in de day time an' at night dey come out to your house an' kill you.

### Sue Craft

My teacher's name Dunlap — a white teacher teachin' de cullud. De Ku Klux whupped him fo' teachin' us. I saw de Ku Klux ridin' a heap dem days. Dey had hoods pulled ovah der faces. One time dey come to our house twict. Fus' time dey come quiet. It was right 'fore de 'lection o' Grant jus' after slavery. It was fus' time cullud people 'lowed t' vote. Dey ast my father was he goint to vote for Grant. He tell 'em he don' know he goin' vote. After 'lection day come back, whoopin' an' hollerin. Dey shoot out de winder lights. It was 'cause my father voted for Grant. Dey broke de do' open. My father was a settin' on de bed. I 'member he had a shot gun in his han'. Well, de broke de do' down, an' then father he shoot, an' dey scattered all ovah de fence.

### Morgan Ray

. . . I heard a lot about the Klu Klux, but it warn't till long afterwards dat I evah see 'em. It was one night after de work of de day was done and I was takin' a walk near where I worked. Suddenly I heard the hoof

beats of horses and I natcherly wuz curious and waited beside the road to see what was coming'. I saw a company of men hooded and wearin' what looked like sheets. Dey had a young cullud man as der prisoner. I wuz too skairt to say anything or ask any questions. I just went on my sweet way. Later I found out dey acclaimed de prisoner had assaulted a white woman. Dey strung him up when he wouldn't confess, and shot him full of holes and threw his body in de pond.

Copyright © 2009 Pearson Education, Inc. All rights reserved.



PEARSON

PRENTICE HALL

## Socialist Party Platform (1932)

*The Socialist Party of America had suffered setbacks during and after World War I, when many of its leaders and members were arrested or deported during the Red Scare and others left to form the American Communist Party. The party suffered another major blow in 1926 when the charismatic leader Eugene V. Debs died. In the 1932 presidential election Norman M. Thomas was the party's nominee. By the middle of that year 13 million Americans were out of work, and dissatisfaction with President Herbert Hoover was growing. In the election, which Hoover lost to the Democratic nominee, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Thomas garnered almost 900,000 votes. The official platform of the Socialist Party is excerpted below. After 1932, Roosevelt's New Deal convinced many Socialist Party supporters to shift their allegiance to the Democratic Party. By the 1936 election, the Socialists had lost much of their national momentum, although the party remained powerful in some northeastern cities.*

We are facing a breakdown of the capitalist system. . . . Unemployment and poverty are inevitable products of the present system. Under capitalism the few own our industries. The many do the work. The wage earners and farmers are compelled to give a large part of the product of their labor to the few. The many in the factories, mines, shops, offices, and on the farms obtain but a scanty income and are able to buy back only a part of the goods that can be produced in such abundance by our mass industries. . . .

The Socialist Party is to-day the one democratic party of the workers whose program would remove the causes of class struggles, class antagonisms, and social evils inherent in the capitalist system.

It proposes to transfer the principal industries of the country from private ownership and autocratic, cruelly inefficient management to social ownership and democratic control. . . . It proposes the following measures:

. . . A Federal appropriation of \$5,000,000,000 for immediate relief for those in need, to supplement State and local appropriations.

. . . A Federal appropriation of \$5,000,000,000 for public works and roads, reforestation, slum clearance, and decent homes for the workers, by Federal Government, States, and cities. . . .

. . . The 6-hour day and the 5-day week without a reduction of wages. . . .

. . . A compulsory system of unemployment compensation with adequate benefits, based on contributions by the Government and by employers.

. . . Old-age pensions for men and women 60 years of age and over.

. . . Health and maternity insurance.

. . . Improved systems of workmen's compensation and accident insurance.

. . . The abolition of child labor.

. . . Government aid to farmers and small-home owners to protect them against mortgage foreclosures and a moratorium on sales for nonpayment of taxes by destitute farmers and unemployed workers.

. . . Adequate minimum wage laws. . . .

. . . Increased Federal and State subsidies to road building and educational and social services for rural communities. . . .

. . . Proportional representation.

. . . Direct election of the President and Vice President.

. . . The initiative and referendum. . . .

. . . Abolition of the power of the Supreme Court to pass upon the constitutionality of legislation enacted by Congress. . . .

. . . Federal legislation to enforce the first amendment to the Constitution so as to guarantee freedom of speech, press, and assembly, and to penalize officials who interfere with the civil rights of citizens.

. . . The abolition of injunctions in labor disputes, the outlawing of "yellow-dog" contracts and the passing of laws enforcing the rights of workers to organize into unions. . . .

. . . Legislation protecting aliens from being excluded from this country or from citizenship or from being deported on account of their political, social, or economic beliefs, or on account of activities engaged in by them which are not illegal for citizens. . . .

The enforcement of constitutional guarantees of economic, political, and legal equality for the Negro.

The enactment and enforcement of drastic antilynching laws.

Copyright © 2009 Pearson Education, Inc. All rights reserved.



PEARSON

PRENTICE HALL

## Executive Order 9066, Relocation of Japanese Americans (1942)

*The Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor concerned the government that a Japanese invasion of the west coast was imminent. The War Department urged Roosevelt to order the evacuation of all Japanese and Japanese-Americans on the west coast to relocation centers. This action was debated openly in government and in California before it was implemented with the full knowledge of the American people. SOURCE: Henry Steele Commanger, Documents of American History (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1949), pp. 464-465; Japanese Relocation Order; Federal Register, vol. VII, No. 38.*

### EXECUTIVE ORDER

#### Authorizing the Secretary of War to Prescribe Military Areas

Whereas the successful prosecution of the war requires every possible protection against espionage and against sabotage to national-defense materials, national-defense premises, and national-defense utilities. . . .

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States, and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, I hereby authorize and direct the Secretary of War, and the Military Commanders whom he may from time to time designate, whenever he or any designated Commander deems such action necessary or desirable, to prescribe military areas in such places and of such extent as he or the appropriate Military Commander may determine, from which any or all persons may be excluded, and with respect to which, the right of any person to enter, remain in, or leave shall be subject to whatever restrictions the Secretary of War or the appropriate Military Commander may impose in his discretion. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to provide for residents of any such area who are excluded therefrom, such transportation, food, shelter, and other accommodations as may be necessary, in the judgment of the Secretary of War or the said Military Commander, and until other arrangements are made, to accomplish the purpose of this order. The designation of military areas in any region or locality shall supersede designations of prohibited and restricted areas by the Attorney General under the Proclamations of December 7 and 8, 1941, and shall supersede the responsibility and authority of the Attorney General under the said Proclamations in respect of such prohibited and restricted areas.

I hereby further authorize and direct the Secretary of War and the said Military Commanders to take such other steps as he or the appropriate Military Commander may deem advisable to enforce compliance with the restrictions applicable to each Military area hereinabove authorized to be designated, including the use of Federal troops and other Federal Agencies, with authority to accept assistance of state and local agencies.

I hereby further authorize and direct all Executive Departments, independent establishments and other Federal Agencies, to assist the Secretary of War or the said Military Commanders in carrying out this Executive Order, including the furnishing of medical aid, hospitalization, food, clothing,

transportation, use of land, shelter, and other supplies, equipment, utilities, facilities, and services. . .

Franklin D. Roosevelt

Copyright © 2009 Pearson Education, Inc. All rights reserved.

## Bernice Brode, Tales of Los Alamos (1943)

---

*Bernice Brode lived at Los Alamos for two years with her husband, an experimental physicist, and their two children. Like many Los Alamos wives, she also worked as a computer technician after receiving training here. She wrote this account some 35 years after the war ended. SOURCE: Lawrence Badash, et al., eds., *Reminiscences of Los Alamos, 1943-1945* (Boston: Reidel 1980), 138-146.*

---

Los Alamos was a very unusual community. Beginning with its remote location high on the mesa, it was closed tight.... Only visitors or VIPs from high places in Washington, who were directly connected with the Manhattan Project, were allowed in. It was unusual because it was a young community, with an average age of around twenty-five years. There were practically no old people. Those of us in our early forties were the senior citizens. We had no invalids, no in-laws, no unemployed, no idle rich, no poor, and no jails...

The Army Engineers proceeded in the early spring of 1943 to erect barracks in the technical area. Barracks were built for the Army personnel and dormitories for the single civilians. We also had a trailer area for maintenance people at the edge of the mesa. The sanitary conditions were a disgrace and many of our socially minded ladies tried to get improvements, but in our last hectic days of '45, when the trailer area grew alarmingly, the authorities were too pressed to take any steps. Well, this then was the town where the first atomic bomb was made. Plain, utilitarian, and quite ugly, but surrounded by some of the most spectacular scenery in America. We could gaze beyond the town, fenced in by steel wire, and watch the seasons come and go. The aspens turning gold in the fall, the dark evergreens, blizzards piling up snow in winter, the pale green of spring buds, and the dry desert wind whistling through the pines in summer. It was surely a touch of genius to establish our strange town on the mesa top, although many sensible people have very sensibly said that Los Alamos was a city that never should have been.

The strangest feature of all to us was the security. We were quite literally fenced in by a tall barbed wire barricade surrounding the entire site and patrolled along the outside by armed MPs. In our first weeks we heard shots but never knew why. Actually we felt cozy and safe, free from robbers and mountain bears. We never locked our doors. In our second year, extra MPs were sent to guard the homes of the Oppenheims and Parsons, making round-the-clock patrols. No one, not even the families themselves could go in without a pass. If they had forgotten their pass, they had a hard time getting in. Some of the practical housewives cooked up a scheme to use these MPs as babysitters in the immediate neighborhood. What could be safer than a man with a gun guarding the precious small-fry? The children were sure to be impressed and behave accordingly. Martha Parsons never hired a babysitter as long as the MPs remained around her house, and Kitty Oppenheimer once got real service when the guard came to the front door of the house she was visiting to tell her that little Peter was crying. Soon after, the sergeant in charge put his foot down, no more babysitting for his crack MPs a group that was specially picked for duty at the number-one government project. The patrol outside the fence soon ceased except for an occasional mounted patrol. There was little temptation to conquer the fence and no one tried, except dogs and children, to dig holes underneath it. Rather the fence became a symbol. We felt protected and very important, and tended to act



accordingly, griping at everything, including our fenced-in condition. Although we could leave the mesa at will with a pass, we did have to keep within the boundaries roughly defined by Albuquerque, Cuba, Las Vegas and Lamy, all in New Mexico. We would go to Mesa Verde, Denver, Carlsbad Caverns or El Paso, with special permission. We could not talk to strangers or friends on trips and it was common knowledge that we were being watched by the Army G-2 and the FBI. In general, we were not allowed to send children to camp or away to school. If they were already in school they could not come up for vacations. Our driver's licenses had numbers instead of names and were not signed. All our occupations were listed 'Engineers' and our addresses as Post Office Box 1663, Santa Fe. With gas rationing in effect, most of the traffic between Lamy and Santa Fe and Taos was ours....

In the fall of 1943 the daily bulletin delivered by a soldier and thrust in the kitchen door suddenly announced that all mail, incoming and outgoing, would be censored. The announcement caused quite a stir and a number of questions about its fairness, necessity and legality. We were always accusing Army management of being dramatic about such things. As censorship began we had to apply for cards to send to relatives stating that mail was being opened for security purposes and asking that they destroy the cards and not mention the censorship ever. We sent our mail unsealed with the understanding that it would be read, sealed up and sent on. If something inside did not meet with the censor's approval, it would be returned to the writer with a slip indicating what rule had been broken. We each had a book of rules describing what not to say. We could not mention last names, give distances or places nearby, and the worst word, "physicist," was strictly forbidden. I might say we could write "theoretical" or "experimental," and the censors wouldn't know, but our friends would.... Since Los Alamos, or more strictly speaking, P.O. Box 1663, was the only place in the United States where mail was censored, envelopes with the censor's seal are now collector's items. I destroyed I don't know how many before we left for home, alas. We continued to live in a security-minded atmosphere for nearly three years. Actually, anyone who had wanted to could have given away secrets. But enough of us, while poking fun at the security regulations, took our trusted positions very seriously. Some of the neighborhood philosophers at Los Alamos foresaw implications in the secrecy formula. Hans Staub, who was a Swiss physicist, went around asking in emphatic tones of prophecy, "are these big tough MPs with their guns here to keep us in or to keep the rest of the world out? There is an important distinction here, and before I leave this place I would like to know the answer."

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Manhattan District ran the project in those early years. Most of us were civilians at Los Alamos. We found living in an Army post unique and I'm sure the Army regarded us, all of us, as equally strange. Ordinarily Army officers run any post to suit themselves, setting the standards and following strict protocol. At Los Alamos things did not work that way at all. Of all civilians, probably free-wheeling scientists with their tradition of non-conformity, are the least likely to measure up to proper military standards. Furthermore, there was a feeling that we were slumming it up there in our secluded mesa, far from city and university life and free from the need to keep up appearances. We truly believed in plain living and high thinking. To counteract the Army regime, the civilians had a town council, appointed at first and later elected as the town grew. The council was most unorthodox on an Army post but Oppenheimer believed that a civilian governing body, though lacking in real authority, would serve a useful purpose. And it did....

...The sign 'Oppenheimer' was placed over baby Tony's crib and people filed by in the corridor for days to view the boss's baby girl. General Groves complained about the rapid increase in the population which immediately increased the housing problem and eventually would increase the school troubles. Rumor had it that the General ordered the commanding officer to do something

about it. It is not clear what, if anything, was ever done. Our population was young and vigorous and the babies were free, so what could the General expect?...

The technical area, called T-area, Tech Area or just simply T, where the main work of the project was done, resembled a small factory - a two-storey clapboard building painted green, of course. The windows were large and pleasant, like those in our houses, although innocent of any washing since the original putty was smeared on. This one building designed as a laboratory only was built along the west road, but it soon grew in several directions and added wings whenever possible.

The physicists were divided, roughly speaking, into two varieties, the theoretical and the experimental. The distinction often made among themselves was that the former knew what was the matter with the doorbell while the latter also knew how to fix it. (Whether they did fix it is something else altogether.) Everyone wore casual clothes, jeans or old unpressed trousers, open shirts and no ties. I don't recall seeing a shined pair of shoes during working hours. They all seemed to be enjoying themselves as scientists always do when they ponder their problems together. No one has to drive them; they drive themselves when they have an intriguing problem. And so it was at Los Alamos. Even an outsider like myself, with no idea what the problem was, could feel the inner urge for scientific solution.

I suppose I heard a lot of talk which is even now stamped top secret, and I used to ask facetious questions when the talk seemed to get bigger than usual. I once asked Emilio Segrè what on earth we were hatching up there? To put me in my place he answered, "now, just you listen to me, what we do here, if we do it will make a revolution, like electricity did." I knew we were engaged in an important aspect of the war effort, but as to Emilio's revolution, I continued to discount it. But later I suppose he was proved right. Each night after everyone had gone home, the MPs came into the T area to check out security violations. If they found anything, they would simply write an appeal in the Bulletin next day, for more diligence. But once in a while they cracked down. One night, after midnight, Hans Bethe was selected as their victim. He had left something out of the safe, so two MPs came to his house, woke him up and insisted he return to T and put the stuff away, himself, to teach him a lesson. Everyone was more careful from then on....

Copyright © 2009 Pearson Education, Inc. All rights reserved.



PEARSON

PRENTICE HALL

## Churchill's "Iron Curtain" Speech (March 5, 1946)

*Winston Churchill gave this speech at Westminster College, in Fulton, Missouri, after receiving an honorary degree. With his typical oratorical skills, Churchill introduced the phrase "Iron Curtain" to describe the division between Western powers and the area controlled by the Soviet Union. Many people feel that the speech marked the onset of the Cold War, which would last for the next fifty years.*

---

A shadow has fallen upon the scenes so lately lighted by the Allied victory. Nobody knows what Soviet Russia and its Communist international organisation intends to do in the immediate future, or what are the limits, if any, to their expansive and proselytising tendencies. I have a strong admiration and regard for the valiant Russian people and for my wartime comrade, Marshal Stalin. There is deep sympathy and goodwill in Britain-and I doubt not here also-towards the peoples of all the Russias and a resolve to persevere through many differences and rebuffs in establishing lasting friendships. We understand the Russian need to be secure on her western frontiers by the removal of all possibility of German aggression. We welcome Russia to her rightful place among the leading nations of the world. We welcome her flag upon the seas. Above all, we welcome constant, frequent and growing contacts between the Russian people and our own people on both sides of the Atlantic. It is my duty however, for I am sure you would wish me to state the facts as I see them to you, to place before you certain facts about the present position in Europe.

From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the Continent. Behind that line lie all the capitals of the ancient states of Central and Eastern Europe. Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade, Bucharest and Sofia, all these famous cities and the populations around them lie in what I must call the Soviet sphere, and all are subject in one form or another, not only to Soviet influence but to a very high and, in many cases, increasing measure of control from Moscow. Athens alone-Greece with its immortal glories-is free to decide its future at an election under British, American and French observation. The Russian-dominated Polish Government has been encouraged to make enormous and wrongful inroads upon Germany, and mass expulsions of millions of Germans on a scale grievous and undreamed-of are now taking place. The Communist parties, which were very small in all these Eastern States of Europe, have been raised to pre-eminence and power far beyond their numbers and are seeking everywhere to obtain totalitarian control. Police governments are prevailing in nearly every case, and so far, except in Czechoslovakia, there is no true democracy.

Turkey and Persia are both profoundly alarmed and disturbed at the claims which are being made upon them and at the pressure being exerted by the Moscow Government. An attempt is being made by the Russians in Berlin to build up a quasi-Communist party in their zone of Occupied Germany by showing special favours to groups of left-wing German leaders. At the end of the fighting last June, the American and British Armies withdrew westwards, in accordance with an earlier agreement, to a depth at some points of 150 miles upon a front of nearly four hundred miles, in order to allow our Russian allies to occupy this vast expanse of territory which the Western Democracies had conquered.

If now the Soviet Government tries, by separate action, to build up a pro-Communist Germany in their areas, this will cause new serious difficulties in the British and American zones, and will give the defeated Germans the power of putting themselves up to auction between the Soviets and the Western Democracies. Whatever conclusions may be drawn from these facts-and facts they are-this is certainly not the Liberated Europe we fought to build up. Nor is it one which contains the essentials of permanent peace.

The safety of the world requires a new unity in Europe, from which no nation should be permanently outcast. It is from the quarrels of the strong parent races in Europe that the world wars we have witnessed, or which occurred in former times, have sprung. Twice in our own lifetime we have seen the United States, against their wishes and their traditions, against arguments, the force of which it is impossible not to comprehend, drawn by irresistible forces, into these wars in time to secure the victory of the good cause, but only after frightful slaughter and devastation had occurred. Twice the United States has had to send

several millions of its young men across the Atlantic to find the war; but now war can find any nation, wherever it may dwell between dusk and dawn. Surely we should work with conscious purpose for a grand pacification of Europe, within the structure of the United Nations and in accordance with its Charter. That I feel is an open cause of policy of very great importance.

In front of the iron curtain which lies across Europe are other causes for anxiety. In Italy the Communist Party is seriously hampered by having to support the Communist-trained Marshal Tito's claims to former Italian territory at the head of the Adriatic. Nevertheless the future of Italy hangs in the balance. Again one cannot imagine a regenerated Europe without a strong France. All my public life I have worked for a strong France and I never lost faith in her destiny, even in the darkest hours. I will not lose faith now. However, in a great number of countries, far from the Russian frontiers and throughout the world, Communist fifth columns are established and work in complete unity and absolute obedience to the directions they receive from the Communist centre. Except in the British Commonwealth and in the United States where Communism is in its infancy, the Communist parties or fifth columns constitute a growing challenge and peril to Christian civilisation. These are sombre facts for anyone to have to recite on the morrow of a victory gained by so much splendid comradeship in arms and in the cause of freedom and democracy; but we should be most unwise not to face them squarely while time remains.

Copyright © 2009 Pearson Education, Inc. All rights reserved.



PEARSON

PRENTICE HALL

## Ronald Reagan, Testimony Before the House Un-American Activities Committee (1947)

---

*The worsening relations between the Soviet Union and the United States was evidenced by an anti-Communist movement led by the House Un-American Activities Committee. Hollywood and the film industry were prime targets of the Committee. In hearing actors such as Ronald Reagan were called to testify on Communist influence in Hollywood.*

---

The Committee met at 10:30 A.M. [October 23, 1947], the Honorable J. Parnell Thomas (Chairman) presiding.

THE CHAIRMAN: The record will show that Mr. McDowell, Mr. Vail, Mr. Nixon, and Mr. Thomas are present. A Subcommittee is sitting.

Staff members present:

Mr. Robert E. Stripling, Chief Investigator; Messrs. Louis J. Russell, H. A. Smith, and Robert B. Gatson, Investigators; and Mr. Benjamin Mandel, Director of Research.

MR. STRIPLING: When and where were you born, Mr. Reagan?

MR. REAGAN: Tampico, Illinois, February 6, 1911.

MR. STRIPLING: What is your present occupation?

MR. REAGAN: Motion-picture actor.

MR. STRIPLING: How long have you been engaged in that profession?

MR. REAGAN: Since June 1937, with a brief interlude of three and a half years - that at the time didn't seem very brief.

MR. STRIPLING: What period was that?

MR. REAGAN: That was during the late war.

MR. STRIPLING: What branch of the service were you in?

MR. REAGAN: Well, sir, I had been for several years in the Reserve as an officer in the United States Calvary, but I was assigned to the Air Corp.

MR. STRIPLING: Are you the president of the guild at the present time?

MR. REAGAN: Yes, sir. . . .

MR. STRIPLING: As a member of the board of directors, as president of the Screen Actors Guild, and as an active member, have you at any time observed or noted within the organization a clique of either Communists or Fascists who were attempting to exert influence or pressure on the guild?

MR. REAGAN: Well, sir, my testimony must be very similar to that of Mr. [George] Murphy and Mr. [Robert] Montgomery. There has been a small group within the Screen Actors Guild which has consistently opposed the policy of the guild board and officers of the guild, as evidenced by the vote on various issues. That small clique referred to has been suspected of more or less following the tactics that we associated with the Communist Party.

MR. STRIPLING: Would you refer to them as a disruptive influence within the guild?

MR. REAGAN: I would say that at times they have attempted to be a disruptive influence.

MR. STRIPLING: You have no knowledge yourself as to whether or not any of them are members of the Communist Party?

MR. REAGAN: No, sir, I have no investigative force, or anything, and I do not know.

MR. STRIPLING: Has it ever been reported to you that certain members of the guild were Communists?

MR. REAGAN: Yes, sir, I have heard different discussions and some of them tagged as Communists.

MR. STRIPLING: Would you say that this clique has attempted to dominate the guild?

MR. REAGAN: Well, sir, by attempting to put over their own particular views on various issues. . . .

MR. STRIPLING: Mr. Reagan, there has been testimony to the effect here that numerous Communist-front organizations have been set up in Hollywood. Have you ever been solicited to join any of those organizations or any organization which you consider to be a Communist-front organization?

MR. REAGAN: Well, sir, I have received literature from an organization called the Committee for a Far-Eastern Democratic Policy. I don't know whether it is Communist or not. I only know that I didn't like their views and as a result I didn't want to have anything to do with them. . . .

MR. STRIPLING: Would you say from your observation that this is typical of the tactics or strategy of the Communists, to solicit and use the names of prominent people to either raise money or gain support?

MR. REAGAN: I think it is in keeping with their tactics, yes, sir.

MR. STRIPLING: Do you think there is anything democratic about those tactics?

MR. REAGAN: I do not, sir.

MR. STRIPLING: Mr. Reagan, what is your feeling about what steps should be taken to rid the motion-picture industry of any Communist influences?

MR. REAGAN: Well, sir, ninety-nine percent of us are pretty well aware of what is going on, and I think, within the bounds of our democratic rights and never once stepping over the rights given us by democracy, we have done a pretty good job in our business of keeping those people's activities curtailed. After all, we must recognize them at present as a political party. On that basis we have exposed their lies when we came across them, we have opposed their propaganda, and I can certainly testify that in the case of the Screen Actors Guild we have been eminently successful in preventing them from, with their usual tactics, trying to run a majority of an organization with a well-organized minority. In opposing those people, the best thing to do is make democracy work. . . .

Sir, I detest, I abhor their philosophy, but I detest more than that their tactics, which are those of the fifth column, and are dishonest, but at the same time I never as a citizen want to see our country become urged, by either fear or resentment of this group that we ever compromise with any of our democratic principles through that fear or resentment. I still think that democracy can do it.

Copyright © 2009 Pearson Education, Inc. All rights reserved.



PEARSON

PRENTICE HALL

## Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, Statement of Purpose (1960)

---

*The Statement of Purpose of the SNCC (pronounced "snick") was adopted at a conference held at Shaw University in April 1960. The statement was adopted at the insistence of James Lawson, a former theology student at Vanderbilt University and one of the leaders of the Nashville student movement.*

---

We affirm the philosophical or religious ideal of nonviolence as the foundation of our purpose, the presupposition of our faith, and the manner of our action. Nonviolence as it grows from Judaic-Christian tradition seeks a social order of justice permeated by love. Integration of human endeavor represents the crucial first step toward such a society.

Through nonviolence, courage displaces fear; love transforms hate. Acceptance dissipates prejudice; hope ends despair. Peace dominates war; faith reconciles doubt. Mutual regard cancels enmity. Justice for all overthrows injustice. The redemptive community supersedes systems of gross social immorality.

Love is the central motif of nonviolence. Love is the force by which God binds man to Himself and man to man. Such love goes to the extreme; it remains loving and forgiving even in the midst of hostility. It matches the capacity of evil to inflict suffering with an even more enduring capacity to absorb evil, all the while persisting in love.

By appealing to conscience and standing on the moral nature of human existence, nonviolence nurtures the atmosphere in which reconciliation and justice become actual possibilities.

Copyright © 2009 Pearson Education, Inc. All rights reserved.





PEARSON

PRENTICE HALL

## Executive Order 10730: Desegregation of Central High School, 1957

Within a week of the Supreme Court's landmark decision in *Brown v Board*, Arkansas announced it would begin immediately to comply, only one of two southern states. A moderate state, it medical and law schools had been integrated in the previous decade. Blacks had been appointed to state boards, elected to local offices. Public buses, the zoo, library, and parks system had all been desegregated. In 1957, Little Rock's school board had voted unanimously to begin desegregation of the high school, followed by junior high schools the next year and elementary schools following. The plan was gradual, limited to only nine African American students. But protests over their enrollment at Central High School brought civil rights into the homes of millions of Americans who worried about the unraveling of the very fabric of southern society.

The night before school was to start, Faubus ordered 270 Arkansas National Guardsmen to surround Central High School and to stop any black students from entering. The Governor claimed he wanted to protect citizens and property from possible violence by protesters. After Eisenhower and Faubus met in Rhode Island, the president thought the governor had backed down and had agreed to enroll the African American students; Eisenhower consented to keeping the National Guard at Central High to enforce the High Court's order. But, instead of keeping the troops, Faubus withdrew the troops. The president believed Faubus had "double crossed" him, and like high ranking generals everywhere, he deeply resented a direct challenge.

A few days later, rioting erupted when nine African American students slipped into the school to enroll. Little Rock was out of control, and Governor Faubus failed to stop the violence. Finally, Congressman Brooks Hays and Little Rock Mayor Woodrow Mann asked the Federal Government for help. Eisenhower was presented with a difficult problem. He was required to uphold the Constitution and the laws, but he also wanted to avoid a bloody confrontation in Arkansas. With Executive Order 10730, the President placed the Arkansas National Guard under Federal control and sent 1,000 U.S. Army paratroopers from the 101st Airborne Division to assist them in restoring order in Little Rock.

CITATION: Executive Order 10730, September 23, 1957 (Little Rock Crisis); General Records of the United States Government; Record Group 11; National Archives.

---

### EXECUTIVE ORDER 10730

#### PROVIDING ASSISTANCE FOR THE REMOVAL OF AN OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE WITHIN THE STATE OF ARKANSAS

WHEREAS on September 23, 1957, I issued Proclamation No.3204 reading in part as follows: "WHEREAS certain persons in the state of Arkansas, individually and in unlawful assemblages, combinations, and conspiracies, have wilfully obstructed the enforcement of orders of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas with respect to matters relating to enrollment and attendance at public schools, particularly at Central High

School, located in Little Rock School District, Little Rock, Arkansas; and "WHEREAS such wilful obstruction of d justice hinders the execution of the laws of that State and of the United

States, and makes it impracticable to enforce such laws by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings; and "WHEREAS such obstruction of justice constitutes a denial of the equal protection of the laws secured by the

Constitution of the United States and impedes the course of justice under those laws: "NOW, THEREFORE, I, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, President of the United States, under and by virtue of the

authority vested in me by the Constitution and Statutes of the United States, including Chapter 15 of Title 10 of the United States Code, particularly sections 332, 333 and 334 thereof, do command all persons engaged in such obstruction of justice to cease and desist therefrom, and to disperse forthwith;" and

WHEREAS the command contained in that Proclamation has not been obeyed and wilful obstruction of enforcement of said court orders still exists and threatens to continue:

NOW, THEREFORE, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and Statutes of the United States, including Chapter 15 of Title 10, particularly sections 332, 333 and 334 thereof, and section 301 of Title 3 of the United States Code, It is hereby ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. I hereby authorize and direct the Secretary of Defense to order into the active military service of the United States as he may deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Order, any or all of the units of the National Guard of the United States and of the Air National Guard of the United States within the State of Arkansas to serve in the active military service of the United States for an indefinite period and until relieved by appropriate orders.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to take all appropriate steps to enforce any orders of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas for the removal of obstruction of justice in the State of Arkansas with respect to matters relating to enrollment and attendance at public schools in the Little Rock School District, Little Rock, Arkansas. In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to use the units, and members thereof, ordered into the active military service of the United States pursuant to Section 1 of this Order.

SEC. 3. In furtherance of the enforcement of the aforementioned orders of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to use such of the armed forces of the United States as he may deem necessary.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to delegate to the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force, or both, any of the authority conferred upon him by this Order.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER THE WHITE HOUSE, September 24, 1957.

---

### Document Analysis

1. Given Eisenhower's personal views regarding Brown v. Board, and the Civil Rights Act of 1957, why did he nationalize the state's guard?
  2. Which Reconstruction Era Amendment was violated by Faubus?
  3. What larger issues do you find in Faubus' actions? Could he have had another agenda? Why, do you suppose, he chose this issue in Little Rock?
-

## **Declaration of Independence for the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, September 2, 1945, in Ho Chi Minh, Selected Works (Hanoi, 1960–1962), Vol. 3, pp. 17–21.**

*For the people of Vietnam, who were just beginning to recover from five years of economic exploitation by the Japanese, the end of World War II promised to bring eighty years of French control to a close. A resistance faction of Vietnamese nationalists called the Viet Minh had fought against the Japanese invaders as well as the defeated French colonial authorities. With the support of rich farmers and poor peasants, workers, businessmen, landlords, students, and intellectuals, the Viet Minh, led by Ho Chi Minh, had expanded throughout northern Vietnam, where they established new local governments, redistributed some lands, and opened granaries to alleviate the famine. On September 2, 1945, Ho Chi Minh proclaimed the independent Democratic Republic of Vietnam in Hanoi's Ba Dinh Square. The first lines of his speech repeated verbatim the famous second paragraph of the U.S. Declaration of Independence.*

---

Declaration of Independence,  
Democratic Republic of Vietnam

[September 2, 1945]

"All men are created equal. They are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness"

This immortal statement was made in the Declaration of Independence of the United States of America in 1776. In a broader sense, this means: All the peoples on the earth are equal from birth, all the peoples have a right to live, to be happy and free.

The Declaration of the French Revolution made in 1791 on the Rights of Man and the Citizen also states: "All men are born free and with equal rights, and must always remain free and have equal rights." Those are undeniable truths.

Nevertheless, for more than eighty years, the French imperialists, abusing the standard of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity, have violated our Fatherland and oppressed our fellow-citizens. They have acted contrary to the ideals of humanity and justice. In the field of politics, they have deprived our people of every democratic liberty.

They have enforced inhuman laws; they have set up three distinct political regimes in the North, the Center and the South of Vietnam in order to wreck our national unity and prevent our people from being united.

They have built more prisons than schools. They have mercilessly slain our patriots—they have drowned our uprisings in rivers of blood. They have fettered public opinion; they have practised obscurantism against our people. To weaken our race, they have forced us to use opium and alcohol.

In the fields of economics, they have fleeced us to the backbone, impoverished our people, and devastated our land.

They have robbed us of our rice fields, our mines, our forests, and our raw materials. They have monopolised the issuing of bank-notes and the export trade.

They have invented numerous unjustifiable taxes and reduced our people, especially our peasantry, to a state of extreme poverty.

They have hampered the prospering of our national bourgeoisie; they have mercilessly exploited our workers.

In the autumn of 1940, when the Japanese Fascists violated Indochina's territory to establish new bases in their fight against the Allies, the French imperialists went down on their bended knees and handed over our country to them.

Thus, from that date, our people were subjected to the double yoke of the French and the Japanese. Their sufferings and miseries increased. The result was that from the end of last year to the beginning of this year, from Quang Tri province to the North of Vietnam, more than two million of our fellow-citizens died from starvation. On March 9, the French troops were disarmed by the Japanese. The French colonialists either fled or surrendered, showing that not only were they incapable of "protecting" us, but that, in the span of five years, they had twice sold our country to the Japanese.

On several occasions before March 9, the Vietminh League urged the French to ally themselves with it against the Japanese. Instead of agreeing to this proposal, the French colonialists so intensified their terrorist activities against the Vietminh members that before fleeing they massacred a great number of our political prisoners detained at Yen Bay and Cao Bang.

Notwithstanding all this, our fellow-citizens have always manifested toward the French a tolerant and humane attitude. Even after the Japanese putsch of March 1945, the Vietminh League helped many Frenchmen to cross the frontier, rescued some of them from Japanese jails, and protected French lives and property.

From the autumn of 1940, our country had in fact ceased to be a French colony and had become a Japanese possession.

After the Japanese had surrendered to the Allies, our whole people rose to regain our national sovereignty and to found the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

The truth is that we have wrested our independence from the Japanese and not from the French

The French have fled, the Japanese have capitulated, Emperor Bao Dai has abdicated. Our people have broken the chains which for nearly a century have fettered them and have won independence for the Fatherland. Our people at the same time have overthrown the monarchic regime that has reigned supreme for dozens of centuries. In its place has been established the present Democratic Republic.

For these reasons, we, members of the Provisional Government, representing the whole Vietnamese people, declare that from now on we break off all relations of a colonial character with France; we repeal all the international obligations that France has so far subscribed to on behalf of Vietnam and we abolish all the special rights the French have unlawfully acquired in our Fatherland.

The whole Vietnamese people, animated by a common purpose, are determined to fight to the bitter end against any attempt by the French colonialists to reconquer their country.

We are convinced that the Allied nations which at Tehran and San Francisco have acknowledged the principles of self-determination and equality of nations, will not refuse to acknowledge the independence of Vietnam.

A people who have courageously opposed French domination for more than eighty years, a people who have fought side by side with the Allies against the Fascists during these last years, such a people must be free and independent.

For these reasons, we, members of the Provisional Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, solemnly declare to the world that Vietnam has the right to be a free and independent country and in fact it is so already. The entire Vietnamese people are determined to mobilize all their physical and mental strength, to sacrifice their lives and property in order to safeguard their independence and liberty.



PEARSON

PRENTICE HALL

## Martin Luther King, Jr., "Conscience and the Vietnam War" (1967)

*The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation aired the following sermon in December 1967.*

*SOURCE: A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings and Speeches of Martin Luther King, Jr. ed. James Melvin Washington. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 1991, p. 634-640*

### CONSCIENCE AND THE VIETNAM WAR (CHAPTER 2)

It is many months now since I found myself obliged by conscience to end my silence and to take a public stand against my country's war in Vietnam. The considerations which led me to that painful decision have not disappeared; indeed, they have been magnified by the course of events since then. The war itself is intensified; the impact on my country is even more destructive.

I cannot speak about the great themes of violence and nonviolence, of social change and of hope for the future, without reflecting on the tremendous violence of Vietnam.

Since the spring of 1967, when I first made public my opposition to my government's policy, many persons have questioned me about the wisdom of my decision. "Why *you*?" they have said. "Peace and civil rights don't mix. Aren't you hurting the cause of your people?" And when I hear such questions, I have been greatly saddened, for they mean that the inquirers have never really known me, my commitment, or my calling. Indeed, that question suggests that they do not know the world in which they live.

In explaining my position, I have tried to make it clear that I remain perplexed as I think everyone must be perplexed by the complexities and ambiguities of Vietnam. I would not wish to underrate the need for a collective solution to this tragic war. I would wish neither to present North Vietnam or the National Liberation Front as paragons of virtue nor to overlook the role they can play in the successful resolution of the problem. While they both may have justifiable reasons to be suspicious of the good faith of the United States, life and history give eloquent testimony to the fact that conflicts are never resolved without trustful give-and-take on both sides.

Since I am a preacher by calling, I suppose it is not surprising that I had several reasons for bringing Vietnam into the field of my moral vision. There is at the outset a very obvious and almost facile connection between the war in Vietnam and the struggle I and others have been waging in America. A few years ago there was a shining moment in that struggle. It seemed as if there was a real promise of hope for the poor, both black and white, through the poverty program. There were experiments, hopes, new beginnings. Then came the buildup in Vietnam, and I watched the program broken and eviscerated as if it were some idle political plaything of a society gone mad on war, and I knew that America would never invest the necessary funds or energies in rehabilitation of its poor so long as adventures like Vietnam continued to draw men and skills and money like some demoniacal destructive suction tube. And so I was increasingly compelled to see the war not only as a moral outrage but also as an enemy of the poor, and to attack it as such.

Perhaps a more tragic recognition of reality took place when it became clear to me that the war was doing far more than devastating the hopes of the poor at home. It was sending their sons and their brothers and their husbands to fight and die in extraordinarily higher proportions relative to the rest of the population. We were taking the black young men who had been crippled by our society and sending them eight thousand miles away to guarantee liberties in Southeast Asia which they had not found in southwest Georgia and east Harlem. And so we have been repeatedly faced with the cruel irony of watching Negro and white boys on TV screens as they kill and die together for a nation that has been unable to seat them together in the same schools. We watch them in brutal solidarity burning the huts of a poor village, but we realize that they would never live on the same block in Detroit. I could not be silent in the face of such cruel

manipulation of the poor. My third reason moves to an even deeper level of awareness, but it grows out of my experience in the ghettos of the North over the last three years—especially the last three summers. As I have walked among the desperate, rejected, angry young men, I have told them that Molotov cocktails and rifles would not solve their problems. I have tried to offer them my deepest compassion, while maintaining my conviction that social change comes most meaningfully through nonviolent action. But, they asked, and rightly so, what about Vietnam? They asked if our own nation wasn't using massive doses of violence to solve its problems, to bring about the changes it wanted. Their questions hit home, and I knew that I could never again raise my voice against the violence of the oppressed in the ghettos without first having spoken clearly to the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today: my own government. For the sake of those boys, for the sake of this government, for the sake of the hundreds of thousands trembling under our violence, I cannot be silent.

For those who ask the question, "Aren't you a civil rights leader?" and thereby mean to exclude me from the movement for peace—I answer by saying that I have worked too long and hard now against segregated public accommodations to end up segregating my moral concern. Justice is indivisible. It must also be said that it would be rather absurd to work passionately and unrelentingly for integrated schools and not be concerned about the survival of a world in which to be integrated. I must say further that something in the very nature of our organizational structure in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference led me to this decision. In 1957, when a group of us formed that organization, we chose as our motto: "To save the soul of America." Now it should be, incandescently clear that no one who has any concern for the integrity and life of America today can ignore the present war.

As if the weight of such a commitment were not enough, another burden of responsibility was placed upon me in 1964: I cannot forget that the Nobel Prize for Peace was also a commission—a commission to work harder than I had ever worked before for "the brotherhood of man." This is a calling which takes me beyond national allegiances, but even if it were not present, I would yet have to live with the meaning of my commitment to the ministry of Jesus Christ. To me the relationship of this ministry to the making of peace is so obvious that I sometimes marvel at those who ask me why I am speaking against the war. We are called to speak for the weak, for the voiceless, for the victims of our nation, and for those it calls enemy, for no document from human hands can make these humans any less our brothers.

And as I ponder the madness of Vietnam and search within myself for ways to understand and respond in compassion, my mind goes constantly to the people of that peninsula. I speak now not of the soldiers of each side, not of the junta in Saigon, but simply of the people who have been living under the curse of war for almost three continuous decades now. I think of them, too, because it is clear to me that there will be no meaningful solution until some attempt is made to know them and to hear their broken cries.

They must see the Americans as strange liberators. The Vietnamese people proclaimed their own independence in 1945 after a combined French and Japanese occupation and before the Communist revolution in China. They were led by Ho Chi Minh. Even though they quoted the American Declaration of Independence in their own document of freedom, we refused to recognize them. Our government felt then that the Vietnamese people weren't ready for independence, and we again fell victim to the deadly Western arrogance that has poisoned the international atmosphere for so long.

For nine years following 1945 we vigorously supported the French in their abortive attempt to recolonize Vietnam. After the French were defeated, it looked as if independence and land reform would come through the Geneva Agreements. But instead there came the United States, determined that Ho should not unify the temporarily divided nation, and the peasants watched again as we supported one of the most vicious modern dictators, Premier Diem. The peasants watched and cringed as Diem ruthlessly rooted out all opposition, supported their extortionist landlords, and refused even to discuss reunification with the North. The peasants watched as all this was presided over by U.S. influence and then by increasing numbers of U.S. troops, who came to help quell the insurgency that Diem's methods had aroused. When Diem was overthrown, they may have been happy, but the long line of military dictatorships seemed to offer no real change, especially in terms of their need for land and peace.

The only change came from America, as we increased our troop commitments in support of governments which were singularly corrupt, inept, and without popular support. All the while, the people read our leaflets and received regular promises of peace and democracy and land reform. Now they languish under our bombs and consider us—not their fellow Vietnamese—the real enemy. They move sadly and apathetically as we herd them off the land of their fathers into concentration camps where minimal social needs are rarely met. They know that they must move or be destroyed by our bombs, and they go, primarily women and

children and the aged. They watch as we poison their water, as we kill a million acres of their crops, and they wander into the hospitals with at least twenty casualties from American fire power to one Vietcong-inflicted injury. They wander into the towns and see thousands of children homeless, without clothes, running in packs on the streets like animals. They see the children selling their sisters to our soldiers, soliciting for their mothers. What do the peasants think, as we ally ourselves with the landlords, and as we refuse to put any action into our many words concerning land reform? Where are the roots of the independent Vietnam we claim to be building? Is it among these voiceless ones?

We have destroyed their two most cherished institutions: the family and the village. We have destroyed their land and their crops. We have cooperated in crushing one of the nation's only non-Communist revolutionary political forces, the United Buddhist church. We have supported the enemies of the peasants of Saigon. We have corrupted their women and children and killed their men. What liberators!

Now there is little left to build on save bitterness. And soon the only solid physical foundations remaining will be found at our military bases and in the concrete of the concentration camps we call fortified hamlets. The peasants may well wonder if we plan to build our new Vietnam on such grounds as these; could we blame them for such thoughts? We must speak for them, and raise the questions they cannot raise. These too, are our brothers.

Perhaps the more difficult but no less necessary task is to speak for those who have been designated as our enemies. What of the National Liberation Front? How can they believe in our integrity when now we speak of "aggression from the North" as if there were nothing more essential to the war? How can they trust us when now we charge them with violence after the murderous reign of Diem? And charge them with violence when we pour every new weapon of death into their land? Surely we must understand their feelings, even if we do not condone their actions. How do they judge us when our officials know that their membership is less than 25 percent Communist and yet insist on giving them the blanket name? They ask how we can speak of free elections when the Saigon press is censored and controlled by the military junta. Their questions are frighteningly relevant. Is our nation planning to build on political myth again and then shore it up with the power of new violence?

Here is the true meaning and value of compassion and nonviolence, when they help us to see the enemy's point of view, to hear his questions, to know his assessment of ourselves. For from his view we may indeed see the basic weaknesses of our own condition, and if we are mature may learn and grow and profit from the wisdom of the brothers who are called the opposition.

So, too, with Hanoi. In the North, where our bombs now pummel the land and our mines endanger the waterways, we are met by a deep but understandable mistrust. In Hanoi are the men who led the nation to independence against the Japanese and the French. It was they who led a second struggle against French domination, and then were persuaded to give up the land they controlled between the thirteenth and seventeenth parallels as a temporary measure at Geneva. After 1954 they watched us conspire with Diem to prevent elections which would surely have brought Ho Chi Minh to power over a united Vietnam, and they realized they had been betrayed again.

When we ask why they do not leap to negotiate, these things must be remembered. Also, it must be clear that the leaders of Hanoi consider the presence of American troops in support of the Diem regime to have been the initial military breach of the Geneva Agreements concerning foreign troops. They remind us that they did not begin to send in any large number of supplies or men until American forces had moved in to the tens of thousands. Hanoi remembers how our leaders refused to tell the truth about the earlier North Vietnamese overtures for peace, how we claimed that none existed when they had clearly been made. Ho Chi Minh has watched as America has spoken of peace and built up its forces, and now he has surely heard the increasing international rumors of American plans for an invasion of the North. At this point, I should make it clear that while I have tried in these last few minutes to give a voice to the voiceless in Vietnam and to understand the arguments of those who are called enemy, I am as deeply concerned about our own troops there as anything else. For it occurs to me that what we are submitting them to in Vietnam is not simply the brutalizing process that goes on in any war, where armies face each other and seek to destroy. We are adding cynicism to the process of death, for they must know after a short period there that none of the things we claim to be fighting for are really involved, and the more sophisticated surely realize that we are on the side of the wealthy and the secure while we create a hell for the poor.

If we continue, there will be no doubt in my mind and in the mind of the world that we have no honorable intentions in Vietnam. It will become clear that our minimal expectation is to occupy it as an American