

REVEALING DOCUMENTS

Revealing Documents: Answer Guides for the Document Questions

2026 Edition of the Answer Guides

by Tom Stadler

All rights reserved.

Table of Contents

<i>Questions related to The Book of Proverbs on Prudent Speech.....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Questions related to Thucydides on Historical Investigation</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Questions related to The Corinthian Speech at Sparta</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Questions related to Pericles Replies to the Spartan Ultimatum.....</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Questions related to Sparta Makes Ready for War.....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Questions related to The First Year of the War.....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Essay Question related to Pericles' Funeral Oration.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>True/False Questions related to The Plague</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Essay Question related to Pericles Defends His Policy.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Essay Question related to The Final Outcome for Pericles and Athens</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Questions related to The Contest of the Three Bodyguards</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>True/False Questions related to the Conspiracy to Kill Caesar.....</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Questions related to Caesar's Assassination.....</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Questions related to Caesar's Will and Funeral.....</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Questions related to Homosexuality in Antiquity.....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Questions related to John the Baptist, Jesus Christ, and Politics.....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>True/False Questions related to Pope Urban's Speech.....</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>Questions related to History of Calamities</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>Questions related to the Personal Letters.....</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>Question: Do you think Abelard got what he deserved?.....</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Questions related to "Is There a God?"</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>Questions about Jihad and Related Matters.....</i>	<i>28</i>
<i>Questions related to Boccaccio's Account of the Black Death</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>Questions related to Dr. Chanca's Letter</i>	<i>31</i>
<i>Essay Questions related to Dr. Chanca's Letter.....</i>	<i>32</i>
<i>Question related to Eight Statements from the Council of Trent.....</i>	<i>33</i>
<i>Essay Questions related to Galileo's Letter to the Grand Duchess Christina</i>	<i>34</i>
<i>Questions related to Dutch Tulip Mania.....</i>	<i>35</i>
<i>Question related to The Implications of Intolerance</i>	<i>36</i>
<i>Questions related to Massacre at Michilimackinac.....</i>	<i>37</i>

<i>Question related to Taxation No Tyranny.....</i>	<i>39</i>
<i>Questions related to Hamilton on Impeachment and Prosecution</i>	<i>40</i>
<i>Questions related to Article II and the Sinking Fund</i>	<i>41</i>
<i>Questions related to The Old Regime’s Revolutionary Education of the Common People</i>	<i>43</i>
<i>Questions related to Washington on Party Spirit and More.....</i>	<i>44</i>
<i>True/False Questions related to Mungo Park on Slavery in Africa.....</i>	<i>45</i>
<i>Essay Question related to Marbury v. Madison and Judicial Review.....</i>	<i>47</i>
<i>Questions related to McCulloch v. Maryland and Federalism.....</i>	<i>48</i>
<i>Questions related to Johnson v. McIntosh and Native Americans</i>	<i>49</i>
<i>True/False Questions related to David Walker’s Appeal.....</i>	<i>50</i>
<i>Questions related to The Grimké Sisters on Slavery.....</i>	<i>51</i>
<i>True/False Questions related to Story of Indian Removal.....</i>	<i>52</i>
<i>Questions related to Calhoun’s Speech on the Conquest of Mexico</i>	<i>53</i>
<i>Questions related to The Communist Manifesto.....</i>	<i>54</i>
<i>Questions related to the “Great Fiction” of Government.....</i>	<i>56</i>
<i>Questions related to The Dred Scott Decision.....</i>	<i>57</i>
<i>Questions related to The Legal Status of Abortion Prior to Criminalization.....</i>	<i>58</i>
<i>Questions related to Physicians Push to Criminalize Abortion</i>	<i>59</i>
<i>Questions related to White Status and Southern Secession.....</i>	<i>60</i>
<i>Questions related to Lincoln’s First Inaugural Address.....</i>	<i>61</i>
<i>Lincoln’s Second Inaugural Address (Multiple-choice Included).....</i>	<i>63</i>
<i>Questions related to Edward Bates on American Citizenship.....</i>	<i>65</i>
<i>Questions related to Anthony’s Address</i>	<i>67</i>
<i>Questions related to The Massacre Canyon Battle.....</i>	<i>68</i>
<i>Questions related to God and Evolution</i>	<i>70</i>
<i>Questions related to A German Anti-Semitic Statement</i>	<i>72</i>
<i>Questions related to A German-Jewish Response</i>	<i>73</i>
<i>Questions related to Andrew Carnegie’s “Gospel of Wealth”</i>	<i>74</i>
<i>Questions related to David Brewer on the United States as a Christian Nation.....</i>	<i>75</i>
<i>Questions related to A Red Record.....</i>	<i>77</i>
<i>Questions related to Gun Rights and Gun Control through the 19th Century</i>	<i>78</i>

<i>Questions related to “Anarchy Defended by Anarchists”</i>	79
<i>True/False Questions related to Ophelia Amigh on the White Slave Trade</i>	80
<i>Questions related to the Right to Make War</i>	81
<i>Questions related to “Children in Bondage”</i>	82
<i>Questions related to “Life Unworthy of Life”</i>	83
<i>Questions related to The Thorny Politics of Women’s Suffrage</i>	84
<i>Questions related to Theodore Roosevelt</i>	85
<i>Questions related to Calvin Coolidge</i>	86
<i>Questions related to The Weakness of Radical Tactics</i>	87
<i>Questions related to Clarence Darrow on Eugenics</i>	88
<i>Questions related to The Model T and Its Operation</i>	89
<i>Questions related to Millard Tydings on Prohibition</i>	90
<i>Questions related to “Why I Am a Socialist”</i>	91
<i>Questions related to “Social Justice through Social Action”</i>	92
<i>Questions related to The Bureaucratic Challenge to Liberty</i>	93
<i>Questions related to the Capitalist Double Standard</i>	94
<i>True/False Questions related to Education for National Conformity</i>	95
<i>Questions related to Victor Klemperer Bears Witness</i>	96
<i>Questions related to Arriving at Auschwitz</i>	98
<i>Questions related to Leopold Weiss and Jacob de Haan</i>	99
<i>Questions related to An American Jewish Statement against Zionism</i>	100
<i>True/False Questions related to Soviet Prison Camps</i>	101
<i>True/False Questions related to John Melby on the Chinese Revolution</i>	103
<i>Questions related to Robert H. Jackson on Free Speech and Public Order</i>	104
<i>Questions related to Becoming a Communist</i>	106
<i>Questions related to Breaking with Communism</i>	107
<i>Questions related to Time Magazine on Joe McCarthy</i>	108
<i>Questions related to “The Dignity of Family Life”</i>	109
<i>Questions related to Doug Ramsey, Vietnam POW</i>	110
<i>Questions related to “Where Do We Go from Here?”</i>	111
<i>Questions related to Sullivan and Felt on J. Edgar Hoover</i>	112
<i>Questions related to Dr. Li on Chairman Mao</i>	113

<i>Questions related to Byron White's Dissent in Roe v. Wade</i>	<i>115</i>
<i>Questions related to William Rehnquist's Dissent in Bellotti.....</i>	<i>116</i>
<i>Questions related to William Colby on Constitutional Intelligence</i>	<i>117</i>
<i>Questions related to Michael Brown on Love Canal</i>	<i>118</i>
<i>Questions related to Police and the Constitutional Use of Force.....</i>	<i>120</i>
<i>Questions related to George Ball on AIPAC.....</i>	<i>121</i>
<i>Questions related to John DiIulio on Black Crime</i>	<i>122</i>
<i>Questions related to Pavel Voloshin on Ryazan.....</i>	<i>123</i>
<i>Questions related to Iraq on the Record.....</i>	<i>125</i>
<i>Questions related to Michael Crichton on Global Warming</i>	<i>126</i>
<i>Questions related to Liberty Veterans on War Crimes Committed</i>	<i>127</i>
<i>Questions related to The Troubled Economics of American Healthcare.....</i>	<i>129</i>
<i>Essay Question related to Al-Ahmar and Bakr.....</i>	<i>130</i>
<i>Questions related to Paul Volcker on Price Stability.....</i>	<i>131</i>

Questions related to The Book of Proverbs on Prudent Speech

Using the points made in the verses from *Proverbs*, write twenty short sayings of your own about prudent speech.

1. Don't talk excessively.
2. Say what is proper.
3. Don't be a gossip.
4. Tell the truth.
5. Don't speak hastily.
6. Speak to encourage others.
7. Watch what you say.
8. Speak gently, not harshly.
9. Say the right thing at the right time.
10. Pause before you answer.
11. Speak pleasantly.
12. Words can destroy.
13. Keep your language clean.
14. There's a time to be silent.
15. Understand before you speak.
16. Whispering goes deeper than shouting.
17. Listen before you speak.
18. Avoid a quarrel.
19. Guard your mouth to stay out of trouble.
20. Don't speak in the presence of a fool.
21. Give the correct answer.
22. The right word in the right circumstances is beautiful.
23. Speak up to defend the downtrodden.

Questions related to Thucydides on Historical Investigation

Indicate whether each statement is true or false based on the reasoned judgments of Thucydides.

1. People accept stories about the past too easily. (True)
2. The Peloponnesian War was second in importance to the Persian Wars. (False)
3. It is acceptable at times for a historian to put words in the mouths of speakers as long as they fit the circumstances. (True)
4. Even reports from eyewitnesses must be checked for accuracy. (True)
5. In no way does history repeat itself. (False)

Short Essay Questions.

6. Thucydides wrote that poets “exaggerate the importance of their themes” and chroniclers are “less interested in telling the truth than in catching the attention of their public.” Identify two groups in our society today that do each of those things. Defend your choices.

For example, talk radio personalities often “exaggerate the importance of their themes” in order to get viewers to listen, and scriptwriters for movies that are based on real events can be “less interested in telling the truth than in catching the attention of their public.”

7. According to Thucydides, how difficult is historical investigation? Quote or paraphrase the text twice in support of your position.

Historical investigation is very difficult. Thucydides talks about how, with speeches, all of a speaker’s words cannot be recorded exactly as they were spoken (certainly not back then). Also, different eyewitnesses often give different accounts of the same event, and therefore facts must be checked as thoroughly as possible.

Questions related to The Corinthian Speech at Sparta

1. Is Corinth an ally of Sparta? Support your answer with textual evidence.

While the text is not entirely conclusive, it does seem to imply that Corinth is Sparta's ally. To quote the text: "Do not force the rest of us in despair to join a different alliance... But if you will only make up your minds to act, we will stand by you..." Though the friendship or alliance is being tested and Corinth might pursue a different alliance, there is the strong suggestion that Corinth is presently allied with Sparta.

2. What action does Corinth demand of Sparta? Support your answer with textual evidence.

Corinth demands Sparta to "invade Attica (the peninsula Athens is on) at once."

3. What does the Corinthian speaker say about Athenians and Spartans to help make his case? Quote or paraphrase the text twice in your response.

The Corinthian speaker says that the Athenians always take action and the Spartans always hesitate. "An Athenian is always an innovator, quick to form a resolution and quick at carrying it out. You, on the other hand, are good at keeping things as they are; you never originate an idea, and your action tends to stop short of its aim." Also, "while you (Spartans) are hanging back, they (Athenians) never hesitate; while you stay at home, they are always abroad." By drawing this stark contrast, the Corinthian speaker is attempting to shame Sparta into action against Athens. While Athens has been busy growing its empire, Sparta has stood by and done little or nothing. It is high time for Sparta to deal with Athenian aggression by attacking Athens.

4. In relation to how Athenians and Spartans are described, are our citizens today like the Athenians, the Spartans, both, or neither? Take a position, and defend your position.

(Any of the four positions is possible here. Look to see how well students defend their position.)

Questions related to Pericles Replies to the Spartan Ultimatum

1. How was Pericles' role in Athens the same yet different from other citizens?

Being a democracy, the Athenian government made decisions through its assembly where the citizens would debate and vote. In that sense, Pericles was the same as others, because he was only one speaker and only cast a single vote. But because he was such a strong speaker and debater, he was usually able to persuade the majority of the assembly to support his ideas. In that sense, he was different from everyone else and was "the leading man of his time among the Athenians."

2. Why is Pericles opposed to making any concessions to the Spartans?

Pericles believes that if Athens gives in to a smaller demand from Sparta, then Sparta will conclude that Athens is afraid and will make a bigger demand. In the end, Sparta would still insist on everything it wants while losing respect for Athens at the same time.

3. According to Pericles, what are four disadvantages the Peloponnesians would have in a war with Athens?

First, the Peloponnesians have no financial resources.

Second, the Peloponnesians have no experience fighting overseas.

Third, the Peloponnesians have no experience with fighting that lasts a long time.

And fourth, to defeat Athens, the Peloponnesians will need to learn how to fight at sea, which is very difficult to acquire.

4. Identify the two basic parts of the war strategy recommended by Pericles.

The first basic part was to abandon their land holdings in the countryside and protect Athens and its access to the sea. The second basic part was not to try to add to Athens' empire during the war but simply maintain what they already have.

Questions related to Sparta Makes Ready for War

Based on the excerpt, indicate whether each statement is true or false. Re-write the false statements to make them true.

1. Sparta would advance into Attica alone, without troops from any other Greek cities.

False. Sparta would advance into Attica at the head of a combined army of Peloponnesians and allies from outside the peninsula.

2. The army that would invade Attica was especially large.

True.

3. King Archidamus understood that Athens was a very powerful city.

True.

4. At the time, most Greeks hated Sparta and loved Athens.

False. At the time, most Greeks hated Athens and supported Sparta.

5. War is predictable, because the side with the larger army wins.

False. War is unpredictable, and sometimes a smaller force defeats a larger force.

6. It is possible that Athens will come out to meet them in battle.

True.

Short-Answer Question.

7. As the army is preparing to march into Attica, list four concerns of the Spartan king.

First, Athens is a very powerful city.

Second, the army might relax its precautions.

Third, war is unpredictable.

And fourth, Athens might come out to meet them in battle.

Questions related to The First Year of the War

Based on the excerpt, indicate whether each statement is true or false. Re-write the false statements to make them true.

1. During the war, the Spartans criticized Archidamus, but the Athenians did not criticize Pericles.

False. The Spartans criticized Archidamus, and the Athenians criticized Pericles.

2. The young men of Athens were outraged at seeing their land laid waste.

True.

3. Pericles changed his mind and sent out the entire Athenian army to face the Peloponnesian army.

False. Pericles stuck with his policy and did not send out the entire army to face the enemy.

4. The Athenians kept their entire navy near Athens to make sure the city was protected.

False. The Athenians sent out a fleet of 100 ships to attack places around the Peloponnesian coast.

5. Both the Peloponnesians and the Athenians destroyed property belonging to the other side.

True.

Essay Question.

6. In the first year of the war, did Pericles and the Athenian assembly act undemocratically toward Athens' citizens? Quote or paraphrase the text twice in explaining your response.

Yes, both Pericles and the Athenian assembly acted undemocratically toward Athens' citizens. Pericles acted undemocratically in that "he summoned no assembly or special meeting of the people, fearing that any general discussion would result in wrong decisions." He attempted to curtail the will of the people at this particular moment by not holding any public meetings, which could be considered undemocratic. The Athenian assembly also acted undemocratically by laying down (legislating) the death penalty "for anyone who should suggest or should put to the vote" any proposal that called for a different use for the funds that had been set aside to defend the city. It is undemocratic to curtail free speech and even more so to impose the death penalty for exercising free speech.

Essay Question related to Pericles' Funeral Oration

In his Funeral Oration, Pericles makes a case for the greatness of Athens. In your opinion, what is the strongest evidence he cites in support of Athens' greatness, and what is the weakest? Defend your choices.

Answers may vary.

Perhaps the strongest evidence for Athens' greatness is its form of government: democracy. As Pericles claims, in Athens, power is in the hands of the whole people, and everyone enjoys equality before the law. A democratic society is based on the principle of fairness to all, and Athens was a model for Greece in this regard. Nothing could be stronger evidence for the greatness of the city of Athens than its democracy.

On the other hand, perhaps the weakest evidence cited is where Pericles asserts that "our adventurous spirit has forced an entry into every sea and every land; and everywhere we have left behind us everlasting memorials of good done to our friends or suffering inflicted on our enemies." This "adventurous spirit" seems to mean that the principle of fairness that was applied at home did not extend to other Greek cities, which the Athenians felt free to exploit for their own gain.

True/False Questions related to The Plague

Based on the excerpt by Thucydides, indicate whether each statement is true or false. Rewrite the false statements to make them true.

1. The plague was believed to have originated in Africa.

True.

2. Prayers made in the temples seemed to slow the spread of the disease.

False. "Equally useless were prayers made in the temples..."

3. People who caught the disease felt chilled and wanted to be covered with blankets.

False. People who caught the disease felt like they were burning inside and wanted to be completely naked.

4. People who caught the disease became extremely thirsty.

True.

5. In most cases, death came from fever on the seventh or eighth day.

True.

6. There was no recognized method of treatment.

True.

7. If they caught the disease, people who were naturally healthy tended to survive it.

False. "Those with naturally strong constitutions were no better able than the weak to resist the disease, which carried away all alike..."

8. Many people died without anyone caring for them.

True.

9. People who came down with the plague and recovered often caught the disease a second time and died as a result.

False. "...for no one caught the disease twice, or, if he did, the second attack was never fatal."

10. Given that death was occurring all around them, the Athenians prayed harder and worshipped the gods more than ever before.

False. "No fear of god...had a restraining influence" in the pursuit of pleasure.

Essay Question related to Pericles Defends His Policy

Given that Pericles was such a strong promoter of democracy, identify and discuss three surprising admissions he makes in regard to Athens' treatment of other Greek cities.

With Pericles, it seems that democratic principles applied to Athens but not necessarily to Athens' dealings with other Greek cities. For example, Pericles speaks of how their fathers "won an empire" and how this is inherently praiseworthy. The problem with winning an empire, however, is that it involves taking over territory that belongs to others, which is inherently undemocratic to the conquered. Another example, and the most incredible admission of them all, is this: "Your empire is now like a tyranny: it may have been wrong to take it; it is certainly dangerous to let it go." Here Pericles admits to his fellow Athenians that their empire has become a tyranny in regard to the subject cities, it was probably wrong to take it in the first place, but it cannot be given up because Athens' security and prosperity depend on it—a questionable line of reasoning based purely on pragmatism and utterly devoid of democratic principle. As a final example, Pericles reminds his fellow citizens "that the reason why Athens has the greatest name in all the world" is in part because Athens "has spent more life and labor in warfare than any other state." In this instance, Pericles praises the Athenian commitment to warfare, something that could be considered quite contrary to the welfare of people, which democracy is supposed to be about.

Perhaps the key to understanding Pericles' point of view is that his dedication to democracy was limited to Athens and did not extend to other Greek cities. After all, even in Athens itself, slaves made up a third of the population. In sum, Pericles' idea of democracy was probably more exclusive than inclusive.

Essay Question related to The Final Outcome for Pericles and Athens

Thucydides has a very high opinion of the leadership and war policy of Pericles. But what does Thucydides have to say, either directly or indirectly, about Athenian democracy?

Quote or paraphrase the text at least three times in your response.

Thucydides seems to have a low opinion of Athenian democracy. He tips his hand fairly early in the excerpt when he uses the expression, “the way with crowds,” referring to the vacillating sentiments among the masses. The particular context involves how the Athenian assembly had first condemned Pericles to pay a fine for his conduct of the war, but then soon “re-elected him to the generalship and put all their affairs into his hands.” Later on he praises Pericles as the one “who led them, rather than they who led him.” Pericles, as a leader, truly guided the people, rather than the people, who are supposed to rule in a democracy, giving him direction. Thucydides eventually goes on to say that “in what was nominally a democracy, power was really in the hands of the first citizen,” namely Pericles. Since Thucydides asserts that “Athens was at her greatest” under Pericles’ leadership, the implication seems clear: The only way for Athenian democracy to work well is to have a wise and influential leader. Without such a leader, the democracy was a failure, as proven under Pericles’ flawed successors. Looking to the end of the war, Thucydides claims that, “it was only because they (the Athenians) destroyed themselves by their own internal strife that finally they were forced to surrender.” In other words, democracy proved inadequate and the discord under lesser leaders resulted in Athens’ defeat in the Peloponnesian War. The only way the democracy could have continued to succeed was with a truly gifted leader like Pericles at the helm, but such a requirement would seem to challenge the notion of democracy itself, which is rule by the people.

Questions related to The Contest of the Three Bodyguards

1. The first bodyguard argues that wine is the strongest thing in the world. Does he characterize wine's impact on individuals and society as mostly positive or negative?

Mostly negative.

2. The second bodyguard argues that the king is the strongest thing. Does the type of king referred to here have limited or unlimited power with respect to his subjects?

Unlimited power.

3. The third bodyguard speaks about women and truth, claiming that women are stronger than both wine and the king, but truth is stronger than any of them. First, how are women stronger than wine and the king? And second, how is truth "stronger than all"?

Women are "master" over both wine and the king. Women give birth to and rear those who plant the vineyards from which wine comes into being. And women not only give birth to kings but have their way with kings and virtually all men because of the power of love (or at least attraction).

Truth, however, is "stronger than all." With truth, "there is nothing unrighteous. Wine is unrighteous, the king is unrighteous, women are unrighteous... But truth remains and is strong for eternity." The one and only God, who is "the God of truth," oversees it all, and this God will make sure that truth is preserved for all eternity.

4. What do you think is "the one thing that is strongest," and why? You may choose from one of the four items in the story, or you may choose your own strongest thing that didn't come up in the story. Fill up the space below with your response.

Obviously, answers may vary.

True/False Questions related to the Conspiracy to Kill Caesar

Based on the two accounts, indicate whether each statement is true or false. Re-write the false statements to make them true.

1. According to Nicolaus of Damascus, more than eighty people took part in the plot.

True.

2. According to both accounts, Decimus Brutus had a close relationship with Caesar.

True.

3. According to Plutarch but not Nicolaus of Damascus, Marcus Brutus was well thought of by Romans at the time.

False. According to *both accounts*, Marcus Brutus was well thought of by Romans at the time.

4. Plutarch indicates that Marcus Brutus's participation was critical for the conspiracy.

True.

5. Nicolaus of Damascus seems to sympathize with those who assassinated Caesar.

False. *Plutarch* seems to sympathize with those who assassinated Caesar.

6. Nicolaus of Damascus lists many motives for why Caesar was assassinated.

True.

7. According to Plutarch, Marcus Brutus and Cassius included only close friends in the conspiracy.

False. According to Plutarch, Marcus Brutus and Cassius included "*familiar friends*" in the conspiracy as well as others who were "*bold and brave and despisers of death.*"

8. Nicolaus of Damascus indicates that Caesar treated his political opponents well.

True.

9. According to Plutarch, Marcus Brutus hated Caesar personally.

False. According to Plutarch, Marcus Brutus hated *the rule but not the ruler*.

10. Nicolaus of Damascus contends that while the real motives for killing Caesar were often personal in nature, the plotters pretended to be acting on important principles.

True.

Questions related to Caesar's Assassination

1. List five details that all three accounts include in their descriptions of Caesar's assassination.

The conspirators crowded around him almost immediately upon his entering the Senate.

Tillius Cimber took the lead in approaching him, pretending to ask a question.

Cimber grabbed hold of Caesar's toga at the beginning of the attack.

One of the Casca brothers gave Caesar the first cut near the neck.

Caesar died with a large number of stab wounds.

2. According to each of the three accounts, how many times was Caesar stabbed?

Nicolaus said 35 times, but Plutarch and Suetonius both said 23.

3. According to Nicolaus and Plutarch, where did Caesar fall down dead?

At the foot of Pompey's statue (Pompey, a Roman general, had been Caesar's rival for power; he was killed in Egypt during the first civil war. When Caesar was assassinated, the Senate was meeting in Pompey's Assembly Hall, which explains the presence of the statue.)

4. According to Plutarch and Suetonius, in what part of Caesar's body did Marcus Brutus stab him?

Plutarch said in the groin, but Suetonius said in the chest.

5. According to Suetonius, whose stab was the only one that was fatal?

Marcus Brutus's

6. How helpful are these three accounts in discovering details about the act of assassinating Caesar? Discuss in at least four sentences.

Overall, they are quite helpful. For the most part, the accounts agree and are very descriptive regarding the assassination. Where Marcus Brutus stabbed Caesar, however, is a rather glaring discrepancy between Plutarch (groin) and Suetonius (chest). There is also a curious discrepancy between the number of stab wounds cited by Nicolaus (35) as compared with Plutarch (23) and Suetonius (23).

Questions related to Caesar's Will and Funeral

1. Based on the two accounts, how did Caesar's will start to turn the Roman people against the assassins?

Answers may vary, but they should definitely include how Caesar left money and his gardens to the Roman people. They might also point out that his will demonstrated Caesar's trust, confidence, and closeness to several of the assassins, who obviously had betrayed him.

2. Based on the two accounts, list at least three incidents that occur during Caesar's funeral that finish turning the Roman people against the assassins.

Possible answers include the following:

The reading of the decree that "the entire Senate had pledged themselves to watch over his safety."

Antony's funeral oration, which included showing "the bloody garment of Caesar" and "the number of his wounds."

The inflamed emotions of the crowd due to the funeral pyre

3. Do you agree with Plutarch that Brutus committed an error by not having Antony also killed on the Ides of March? Defend your position.

Answers may be either affirmative or negative.

Yes: Antony was the key figure in turning the populace against the assassins—first by the reading of Caesar's will and then by the orchestration of Caesar's funeral. (Later on, Antony's generalship would defeat Cassius and Brutus at the Battle of Philippi.)

No: Mark Antony had done nothing deserving of death. Caesar was the tyrant, not Antony.

4. Explain what happened to Helvius Cinna.

Though he was actually "one of Caesar's friends," at Caesar's funeral he was mistaken for Cornelius Cinna, "who had delivered a bitter speech against Caesar on the previous day." As a result, the crowd murdered him.

5. List three successive events related to the assassins following Caesar's funeral.

First, their houses were almost burned by the mob. Second, they had to leave Rome. And third, most of them died within three years.

Questions related to Homosexuality in Antiquity

1. In his otherwise sweeping narrative, *Homosexuality & Civilization* (Harvard University Press, 2003), Louis Crompton omits any discussion of homosexuality in Ancient Egypt or Mesopotamia and begins his chronicle with the Greeks and their exuberance for pederasty (sexual activity involving a man and a boy). Crompton then lays the blame for centuries of gay persecution at the feet of the post-classical West, which chose to pattern itself on Judeo-Christian condemnation of homosexual behavior. Crompton's thesis is that the world was comfortable with homosexuality until Judaism came along and vilified it, leading to all the abuse and discrimination that followed. While evidence from Ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia regarding homosexuality is slight, there is some which suggests that Jewish and Christian attitudes did not stand in sharp contrast to these earlier civilizations. In other words, Judaism and Christianity were not alone in their opposition to homosexuality but were aligned—at least to some extent—with prior moral and legal constructs. Choosing between Ancient Egypt and Assyria (a major Mesopotamian empire), which of these civilizations expressed its disapproval of homosexual behavior in a legal code and which in a moral code?

Assyria expressed its disapproval in a legal code and Ancient Egypt in a moral code.

2. How strongly do the Jewish and Christian scriptures condemn homosexual behavior? Be specific in regard to both scriptures.

Very strongly. Leviticus 20:13 sentences both participants to death, and 1 Corinthians 6:9-10 states clearly that practicing homosexuals will not inherit the kingdom of God.

3. How did Greek and Roman “desire for boys” differ regarding the boy’s background?

In Greece, adult male sexual attraction for boys was directed toward free citizens, namely the higher born youth who had to consent to such a relationship; whereas in Rome, the same attraction was directed toward slaves and prostitutes.

4. How common was bisexual behavior among Greeks and Romans? Give an example.

Very common. Men continued to have sex with males even after marriage to a woman.

5. What, in your opinion, is the biggest implication that Greek and Roman sexuality has for us today? Explain as fully as possible in the space provided.

Gay rights are said to be akin to civil rights: Just like race and ethnicity, one's sexual orientation is inherent and therefore should be protected. What is overlooked in this rationale is that, unlike with race or ethnicity, societal norms play a huge role in sexual proclivities. Adult male attraction for boys was “fashionable” in ancient Greece and Rome; if acted upon today, we call it criminal sexual assault. The lesson from ancient Greece and Rome is that there is nothing neutral about normalizing various sexual behaviors: when such behaviors become accepted, far more people engage in them.

Questions related to John the Baptist, Jesus Christ, and Politics

1. The Bible indicates that John the Baptist and Jesus were cousins, with John being six months older than Jesus. How did Jesus show his approval of John's ministry?

Jesus came to be baptized by John.

2. Tax collectors were Jews who worked for the Romans by gathering taxes from their fellow Jews, who despised them. Tax collectors could pocket the surplus amounts they collected, which made them rich. Roman soldiers were present in Palestine to enforce the Roman occupation and could be enlisted by the tax collectors to coerce people to pay up. Is John's advice to the tax collectors and soldiers critical of Roman authority?

No, he basically tells them to do their jobs in a fair and ethical way.

3. Identify one way in which what John and Jesus were doing was similar, and another way in which what they were doing was different.

Answers may vary. What they were doing was similar in that both urged individuals to repent and get right with God; but they were different in that John's main role was to prepare people for the coming of Jesus, the Messiah, whose ministry and mission would be of far greater significance than John's.

4. Had John been arrested for challenging Herod's legitimacy as a ruler or for challenging Herod's personal conduct? Explain.

John had been arrested for challenging Herod's personal conduct, which had entailed marrying his brother's wife.

5. How did Jesus react to the news of John's execution? Did his mission change after that?

Evidently, Jesus was sad when he heard the news and withdrew to a place by himself. But "the people" pursued him and found him, and he went back to helping them, as he had been doing before.

6. Jesus had religious enemies who tried to get him in trouble with the Roman authorities. One attempt involved trying to trap him into saying something damning in regard to the poll-tax. The poll-tax was an annual fixed sum—one denarius—assessed by Rome on subjects (non-citizens) in the provinces. A denarius was a Roman coin equivalent to a day's wage. The Jewish inhabitants of Palestine were very unhappy about this tax; it was a considerable sum for most people, who were poor, and the money was then used to pay for the Roman occupation of their land. Does Jesus challenge Roman authority when answering whether the tax should be paid? Explain.

No, he divides the situation into two distinct categories and tells them to give to Caesar the things that belong to Caesar and to God the things that belong to God.

7. In Luke 13, Jesus is told about an atrocity committed by Pontius Pilate, the Roman governor of Judea. Is Jesus critical of Pilate in his reaction to the report? Explain.

No. Rather than say something critical of Roman authority, which Jesus was being prompted to do, he redirects the discussion to a point that he wants to make, namely that we are all sinners and need to repent or face the consequence of perishing, like those killed by Pilate or those killed in the sudden collapse of a tower.

8. As regards religion, what did the Jewish leaders have against Jesus?

Jesus claimed to be the Son of God and thereby divine. This was blasphemy to the Jewish leaders, who tolerated no mingling of divinity with humanity.

9. What two lies were told by the Jewish leaders when they brought Jesus before Pilate?

That Jesus had instructed people not to pay taxes to Caesar, and that he had incited the people to rebel in both Galilee and Judea.

10. Since Jesus was from Galilee, which was governed by Herod rather than Pilate, Pilate attempted to shift Jesus's case to Herod, who happened to be in Jerusalem at the time for Passover. Did Jesus challenge Herod when he appeared before him?

Only the challenge of silence, if that counts as a challenge— "he answered him nothing."

11. Since neither Herod nor Pilate agreed with the charge of rebellion, a crime punishable by death, why did Pilate go ahead and have Jesus crucified?

He wanted to avert a riot; the Jews present were literally screaming for his execution.

12. During his trial Jesus acknowledged to Pilate that he was in fact "a king." What does Jesus say about his kingdom in John 18?

In John 18 Jesus says that his kingdom is "not of this world" nor of "this realm." If it were, his servants would be "fighting" for him. Also, those who are "of the truth," and hence belong to his kingdom, respond to his voice.

13. According to Matthew 25, when will Jesus's kingdom come to fruition in a political sense? On what basis will every individual who has ever lived be judged?

According to Matthew 25, Jesus will return at the end of history and "will sit on his glorious throne," with all "the nations... gathered before him." That is when the coming of Jesus's kingdom will reach its final fulfillment, which includes a political dimension.

Everyone who has ever lived will be judged on the basis of whether he or she cared for the needy, as in the hungry, the thirsty, the stranger, the naked, the sick, or the prisoner, having done so to "the least of these."

True/False Questions related to Pope Urban's Speech

Indicate whether each statement is true or false in relation to the views of Pope Urban II.
Re-write the false statements to make them true.

1. Western Christians need military help from Eastern Christians.

False. *Eastern* Christians need military help from *Western* Christians.

2. Muslims have been attacking and conquering significant portions of the Byzantine Empire.

True.

3. This call to action should be proclaimed only in France.

False. This call to action should be proclaimed (*or published*) "*everywhere*."

4. Only knights should respond to this call to help their fellow Christians.

False. "*All people*" should respond to this call to help their fellow Christians.

5. Those who die on the Crusade will be forgiven for their sins.

True.

6. Only God, and in no way the pope, has the power to forgive sins.

False. *God has given the pope the power to forgive sins.*

7. Christians should treat Muslims kindly and try to be their friends.

False. Christians *are called upon* "*to destroy that vile race*."

8. This holy war should have started much earlier.

True.

9. Unfortunately, Christians have been busy fighting their fellow Christians.

True.

10. The Crusaders should prepare for their journey this winter and start out in the spring.

True.

Questions related to *History of Calamities*

1. What is Abelard's scheme in relation to Heloise? Answer by quoting two consecutive sentences from the excerpt.

"Being on fire for this girl, I wanted to create a situation where the two of us could be alone together. Therefore, I made a deal with the uncle to rent a room in his house and to tutor Heloise in my spare time."

2. What odd thing (strange to us but not them) did Abelard and Heloise do in order to avoid detection?

They agreed for Abelard to hit her at times, enough to leave a mark on her face. (In the Middle Ages, teachers routinely beat their students to make them pay attention and work hard at their studies.)

3. How much time passed before Fulbert became aware of the illicit relationship, and what did he do when he found out?

"Several months passed before he came to know what was going on. ...I (Abelard) was expelled from his home."

4. Why did Abelard take Heloise to his "country" after finding out she was pregnant?

This afforded Abelard protection against an angry Fulbert given that Heloise was pregnant. Abelard needed to be in Paris because of his responsibilities as master of his school, but in that location Fulbert could potentially exact revenge. By taking Heloise to Brittany, making her a hostage though a willing one, Abelard could move about safely in Paris. It would have been obvious to Fulbert that any injury done to Abelard would have resulted in harm to his beloved niece.

5. In order to appease Fulbert as well as his own conscience, Abelard proposed the idea of a "secret" marriage, which Fulbert accepted. As master of the cathedral school of Notre-Dame, Abelard was required at least to appear to be celibate (unmarried)—hence, the idea of the secret marriage, which was not unheard of in those days. Briefly describe the five remaining events leading up to Abelard's castration.

First, Abelard and Heloise were married. Second, Fulbert and his servants broke their promise of secrecy and spread the news of the marriage. Third, Heloise declared them to be lying. Fourth, Fulbert "abused" Heloise severely on several occasions. And fifth, Abelard placed her in a convent for safety, including dressing her as a nun. (This fifth and final event led directly to the castration, because Fulbert naturally assumed that Abelard had grown tired of Heloise and had chosen to make a nun out of her. Heloise could have remained in the convent without dressing as a nun, but Abelard probably believed this afforded her additional protection against Fulbert.)

Questions related to the Personal Letters

1. To what extent had Heloise decided for herself to become a nun? Explain.

Heloise claims the decision to become a nun was all Abelard's. She became a nun, not because she wanted to or felt a sense of calling, but strictly out of obedience to Abelard.

2. Have Abelard and Heloise been communicating on a personal level these past ten years? Explain.

No. According to Heloise, Abelard has "so neglected and forgotten" her that there has been no personal communication during those ten years (which were prior to the writing of the personal letters).

3. In one word, what does Heloise believe had been Abelard's motivation in their early relationship?

"Lust." (In Letter 4, Abelard admits as much when he writes, "My love, which brought us both to sin, should be called lust, not love. I took my fill of my wretched pleasures in you, and this was the sum total of my love." (*Letters of Abelard and Heloise*, page 153))

4. In Letter 1, what does Heloise say she wants from Abelard and why?

Heloise wants Abelard to start writing her, so that she "may find increased strength and readiness to serve God."

5. In Letter 2, how does Abelard respond to Heloise's complaint?

Abelard offers the excuse that he has not written "any word of comfort or advice," not because of "indifference," but rather that he had so much "confidence" in her that he "did not think anything was needed."

6. Based on Letter 3, does Heloise believe that Abelard deserved to be castrated? Explain.

No, Heloise believes that Abelard's punishment was too severe. First, Abelard had tried to make amends for their fornication by marrying Heloise, and, second, it was not as if they had committed adultery, for which castration was considered an appropriate punishment in those days.

7. Based on Letter 4, does Abelard believe that he deserved to be castrated? Explain.

Yes, Abelard believes he got what he deserved. He refers to the "fornication" and "impurities" that preceded their marriage and also to his utter betrayal of Fulbert's trust while living in Fulbert's house.

8. Does Abelard believe that God brought good out of the evil? Yes.

Question: Do you think Abelard got what he deserved?

Considering all the information you have been given, respond to the above question with four affirmative arguments and four negative arguments. (Looking at two sides of a question was actually a key part of the dialectical method of scholastics like Abelard.)

Four affirmative arguments:

1. Abelard premeditated having a sinful relationship with Heloise. Fornication, of course, was considered a serious sin as well as a crime in the 12th century. Before Abelard approached Fulbert about moving into his house, he had already determined what he would try to do with Heloise.
2. Abelard abused Fulbert's trust. Fulbert allowed Abelard to live in his house and have free access to Heloise in order to tutor her. Abelard utterly betrayed Fulbert's trust by pursuing a sinful relationship with Heloise. In Letter 4 of the Personal Letters, Abelard himself admits he got what he deserved due to the fornication and betrayal of trust.
3. To a certain extent Abelard did the right thing by marrying Heloise, but he could have been much more in the right by marrying her openly instead of secretly. Abelard was from a noble family and probably had other career options.
4. Abelard should have known that by putting Heloise in a convent and having her dress as a nun that "Fulbert and his friends and relatives" would all naturally conclude that Abelard was ridding himself of Heloise "by making her a nun." After all, this is how a husband in the Middle Ages could unload a wife he no longer wanted.

Four negative arguments:

1. Since Fulbert gave Abelard complete and private access to Heloise in tutoring her, Fulbert must share some responsibility for the intimate relationship that occurred between them.
2. After agreeing to the "secret" marriage, "Fulbert and his servants" had no business breaking the "promise of secrecy" and spreading the "news of the marriage." This too was a very serious betrayal and abuse of trust.
3. The castration itself was based on a misunderstanding. "Fulbert and his friends and relatives" jumped to the conclusion that Abelard was dumping Heloise by making a nun out of her when in fact he put her in the convent to protect her from Fulbert's physical abuse. Abelard's punishment resulted from a wrong idea and was therefore unjust.
4. As Heloise indicated in Letter 3 of the Personal Letters, castration was too severe of a punishment for what Abelard had done. First, Abelard had tried to make amends for their fornication by marrying Heloise. And second, it was not as if they had committed adultery, for which castration was considered an appropriate punishment in those days.

Questions related to “Is There a God?”

1. Aquinas begins this passage with two arguments that go against believing in the existence of God. Describe these two arguments in your own words.

The first argument involves the problem of evil. “God” is at least partly understood as “limitless good.” Therefore, if God existed, there would be no evil in the world. Since evil clearly exists, God does not exist. The second argument relates to causation: Since everything that occurs in this world can be accounted for by either natural or human causes, there is no reason to suppose the existence of a supernatural cause—God.

2. Give a one-sentence summary for each of the five arguments for the existence of God.

The first way (which is also found in Aristotle) is that since all things are in motion, there must be a first or prime mover (God). The second way is that since everything stems from cause and effect, there must be a first or original cause (God). The third way is that since all things are contingent, there must be something (God) that is not contingent and is responsible for the existence of all contingent things. The fourth way is that since things are often described in comparison to a superlative, the superlative source (God) of such comparisons must exist as well. The fifth way is that since nature displays order and design, there must be someone (God) behind and responsible for this direction.

3. How does Aquinas counter the argument involving the problem of evil, which goes against belief in the existence of God? Answer this question in your own words.

Here Aquinas cites the early Christian theologian, Augustine (354-430), to make the point that God’s goodness is so great that He can permit evil to exist and turn it to good; therefore, the presence of evil in this world does not negate the possibility of God’s existence.

4. Do you find Aquinas’s arguments in favor of the existence of God to be persuasive? Take a position and defend it.

Answers may vary.

I have no data to back this up, but I imagine that those who are inclined to believe in the existence of God will find Aquinas’s arguments to be intriguing and possibly persuasive, while those who are not so inclined will consider them to be weak and invalid. This is not to suggest, however, that the proofs are irrelevant or without any value—from a religious point of view, they can serve to bolster the faith of individuals who already believe in God’s existence.

Questions about Jihad and Related Matters

1. What is the purpose of jihad, and when did it become a communal obligation?

To spread the religion; it became a communal obligation after the hijra.

2. In terms of acquiring merit, does Allah consider it better to fight or to stay home?

It is better to fight.

3. How often should jihad be carried out against non-Muslims in their own countries?

Annually.

4. Describe the required response when non-Muslim enemies enter Muslim lands.

They “must be met with effort and struggle to repel them by every possible means.”

5. Are Muslims allowed to seek help from non-Muslim allies? Explain.

Yes, but only if the Muslims “are considerably outnumbered and the allies are of goodwill towards the Muslims.”

6. What are the two reasons for having a caliph, and is the caliphate an essential office?

To preserve the religion and manage this-worldly affairs; yes, it is essential.

7. What happens when Jews or Christians refuse to convert and refuse to pay the poll tax?

Jihad continues...

8. Delineate the possible outcomes when an adult male is taken captive.

The adult male is either killed, enslaved, released, or ransomed. If he becomes a Muslim before his fate is decided, he may not be killed, and one of the other options is chosen.

9. Why is seeking or accepting a truce such a serious matter?

“...because it entails the nonperformance of jihad,” which generally needs to continue.

10. List four considerations that should give pause to a suicide bomber who believes he is about to become a Muslim martyr on his way to paradise.

First, it is not permissible to kill women or children unless they are truly fighting. Second, a martyr is someone who dies in an actual battle with non-Muslims. Third, suicide results in burning in hell. And fourth, the bomber might be killing a believer.

Questions related to Boccaccio's Account of the Black Death

1. To which year and what city does Boccaccio's account refer?

1348 and Florence

2. According to Boccaccio, what were two possible causes of the plague?

The "influence of heavenly bodies" or "God's just wrath as a punishment" for man's wickedness

3. Where did the plague originate and how far had it spread?

It originated in the East and had spread all over the West.

4. Explain the origin of the term, "bubonic plague."

The plague's main symptom was "gavoccioli," large swellings in the groin or under the armpits. Gavoccioli are called "bubboni" in modern Italian and "buboes" in modern English—hence the modern term, "bubonic plague."

5. How effective were the doctors in treating the disease?

"Neither a doctor's advice nor the strength of medicine could do anything to cure this illness."

6. Describe the survival rate for people who caught the plague.

"few of the sick were ever cured, and almost all died after the third day of the appearance of the previously described symptoms (gavoccioli)"

7. Describe just how contagious the plague was.

"not only did talking to or being around the sick bring infection and a common death, but also touching the clothes of the sick or anything touched or used by them seemed to communicate this very disease to the person involved."

8. List and briefly describe the four different approaches to dealing with the plague.

First, there were those who lived in isolated groups within the city and ate and drank very moderately. Second, there were those who were out and about and satisfying their appetites in every way, especially in regard to excessive drinking. Third, there were those who adopted a middle course between the two ways just described and simply lived a moderate existence, which included carrying about good smelling things as a means of “purifying the brain.” And fourth, there were those who decided to flee Florence, going at least as far away as the countryside.

9. What did people do for sick family members?

Eventually nothing—they abandoned them.

10. What was done with all the bodies as people died? Describe the three steps in the process.

Corpses were placed outside in front of homes; bodies were stacked on planks and carried to cemeteries; the dead were dumped by the hundreds in huge trenches, “one on top of another, like a ship’s cargo, until the trench was filled.”

11. How many people were believed to have died in Florence from the plague, and over how many months did all these deaths occur?

“more than one hundred thousand”

“from March to July”—five months

12. How quickly did many people go from being healthy to dead?

Many who were healthy at breakfast were dead by dinner.

Questions related to Dr. Chanca's Letter

1. Why was Columbus interested in visiting the Carib islands on the second voyage?

His main reason was curiosity. The Indians he had encountered during his first voyage told him about "the Carib islands, whose inhabitants eat human flesh." Since they "lay on the direct route to the island of Hispaniola, where he had left his men on the previous voyage," he sought to "discover them" on his return voyage.

2. Why did the fleet stay anchored so long at the island of Guadeloupe? What did the other Spaniards think happened to these men?

One captain and six others "got lost and could not find their way back" for many days, causing the others to wait around to see what happened to them.

The others "thought that they were dead and eaten by the Caribs."

3. According to Dr. Chanca, did Caribs from different islands cannibalize one another? Explain.

No. "The people were all friendly to one another as if of one family. They do not harm each other but all make war against the neighboring islands."

4. List four things the Caribs did to the Indians of the islands they raided.

They "carry off all the women they can take, especially the young and beautiful, whom they keep as servants and concubines."

"The Caribs eat the male children that they have by them (the captured women), and only bring up the children of their own women."

As "for the men they are able to capture, they bring those who are alive home to be slaughtered and eat those who are dead on the spot."

"They castrate the boys that they capture and use them as servants until they are men. Then, when they want to make a feast, they kill and eat them, for they say that the flesh of boys and women is not good to eat."

5. What did the natives on the island of Burenquen, who were not Caribs, do with Carib raiders they managed to capture?

They "eat them in the same way as the Caribs themselves."

6. Why does Dr. Chanca think that some natives could be easily converted to Christianity?

Because "they imitate everything that we do."

Essay Questions related to Dr. Chanca's Letter

1. Based on Dr. Chanca's letter, discuss what happened to the Spaniards who had been left behind on Hispaniola during the first voyage.

The men who were left behind all died, but how that "occurred remained uncertain." It is possible that Guacamari and his followers were telling the truth about how the men died, but it is also possible that they were lying and had participated directly in the killing of the men. On the one hand, King Guacamari and his followers asserted that the men had died in three ways: some from disease, some from quarrels among themselves, and some at the hands of two other kings, Caonabo and Mayreni. The evidence in support of this consists primarily in the fact that one of Guacamari's own villages had been burned down, which would seem to indicate an attack by a rival. Dr. Chanca states that, "there were many undoubted signs that some hostile people had attacked Guacamari." On the other hand, Dr. Chanca also states that Guacamari's followers complained that, "the Christians had taken three or four women apiece, from which we concluded that they had been murdered out of jealousy." This indicates that Guacamari and his followers might have killed at least some of the men because of the women. Furthermore, Guacamari alleged that he had been wounded in the thigh when Canaobo and Mayreni attacked his village, but when the bandages were taken off "it was quite obvious that he was no more wounded in this thigh than in the other, although he made a cunning pretense of being in great pain." This might suggest that Guacamari was trying to cover up his involvement in the deaths of Columbus's men by demonstrating that he too had been attacked, but it might also suggest he was concerned about how Columbus might react to his men's deaths and therefore feigned injury in order to arouse sympathy. Given the muddled evidence and the language barrier, Dr. Chanca admits that they were "not able to determine the truth about the death of our men."

2. Dr. Chanca's claim that cannibalism existed among some of the natives is widely accepted today, but his claim that an abundance of gold was present on Hispaniola was disproven long ago. Does the letter itself tend to support the first claim more than the second?

Yes, the evidence given in the letter is stronger for the first claim than for the second. Dr. Chanca himself observed evidence of cannibalism: "we found great numbers of human bones and skulls hanging in the houses as vessels to hold things," and in "one house the neck of a man was found cooking in a pot." The assertion of an abundance of gold, however, was based on hearsay. Two captains had been sent out in search of gold and returned with major assertions but minor samples. One captain said that "wherever you look, anywhere in the province, you will find gold. He brought samples from many parts from the sand of rivers and from springs on land." The other captain "brought news of much gold in three or four places, and he too brought a sample." The letter, therefore, offers direct evidence for cannibalism but only indirect evidence for an abundance of gold.

Question related to Eight Statements from the Council of Trent

Using the statements from the Council of Trent, write a Protestant response to each of the eight Catholic statements. The eight Protestant responses may be more brief and concise than the Catholic statements are, but they should encompass all the important points.

1. The Catholic Church is not the final judge of the “true sense and interpretation” of the Holy Scriptures (the Bible).
2. Mary, who was a virgin when she became the mother of Jesus (who is God), was not without the taint of original sin.
3. The sinner is justified by faith alone.
4. Justice received is not preserved and also not increased before God through good works, but those works are merely the fruits and signs of justification obtained.
5. Baptism is not necessary for salvation, but a Christian should be baptized.
6. Our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and true man, is not truly, really and substantially contained in the Eucharist.
7. There is no such thing as purgatory between heaven and hell; special saints should not be “honored and invoked,” nor should “their relics be venerated”; and indulgences have no power and are not beneficial to Christians.
8. The Catholic Church is not the “mother and teacher of all churches,” and no one should swear obedience to the pope.

Essay Questions related to Galileo's Letter to the Grand Duchess Christina

1. Describe Galileo's view of Scripture (the Bible). Quote the text at least twice in your response.

Galileo has a very high regard for the Bible. When it comes to discussing anything having to do with the Bible, Galileo's starting point is that Scripture is always true and can never lie. But even though the Bible is perfect and without error, it is sometimes difficult to interpret and requires "wise interpreters." For example, there are passages in Scripture where the words should not be taken literally; otherwise, "one would have to attribute to God feet, hands, eyes, and bodily sensations, as well as human feelings like anger, contrition, and hatred, and such conditions as the forgetfulness of things past and the ignorance of future ones." Passages like these are still true and without fault, but their actual meaning should not be confused with their literal meaning.

2. How does Galileo view the relationship between science and the Bible? Quote the text at least three times in your response.

When it comes to the natural world, Galileo believes that scientific findings should take precedence over the Bible, even though the Bible is always without fault. Since "the primary purpose of the Holy Writ" pertains "to the worship of God and the salvation of souls," the Bible avoids "confusion" on less important matters by referring to them according to "popular understanding" and says "things that are different from the absolute truth." In other words, the Bible is intentionally imprecise when it comes to things like the natural world, because it wants the reader to focus on more important spiritual truths, which are not revealed through nature. But nature, like the Bible, comes from God, and nature always follows the laws that God has "imposed upon her." God has also given human beings "senses, language, and intellect" and wants us to use them to acquire information about the world around us, and the best way to discover these truths about nature is through "scientific research." Therefore, actual scientific discoveries should take priority whenever Bible passages refer to things having to do with nature. This means that Bible passages involving nature should be interpreted in light of scientific findings—the scientific findings come first, and then the relevant passages should be interpreted accordingly. This is especially true "for those sciences discussed in Scripture to a very minor extent and with disconnected statements," which is "precisely the case of astronomy," the hot-button issue of Galileo's time.

Questions related to Dutch Tulip Mania

1. In your opinion, which is the best example of how high the price of tulips rose?

Answers may vary. Possibilities include that “many persons were known to invest a fortune of 100,000 florins in the purchase of forty roots” and that a single Semper Augustus, the most expensive variety of tulip bulb, “was thought to be very cheap at 5500 florins.”

2. What identical mistake did both the sailor and the English traveler make?

They both mistook a very expensive tulip bulb for an onion.

3. How did some people make a lot of money from tulips?

Tulip-jobbers “made large profits by buying when prices fell, and selling out when they rose.”

4. To what extremes did people go to invest substantial capital in the tulip market?

“People of all grades converted their property into cash, and invested it in flowers.”

5. Why did the prices of other goods also rise? (Think through this for yourself.)

Since the value of tulips had been rising for a period of time, investors had either more money or more credit with which to purchase goods in general, causing inflation.

6. In which year did the tulip bubble burst?

1636.

7. What happened to the price of tulips when the realization set in that tulip prices could not rise indefinitely? What happened to many investors?

Tulip prices crashed, and many investors were ruined.

8. What explanation did the Dutch courts give for deciding not to hear cases involving broken tulip contracts?

The judges “refused to interfere, on the ground that debts contracted in gambling were no debts in law.”

9. How did the crash of the tulip market affect the Dutch economy?

The “commerce of the country suffered a severe shock, from which it was many years before it recovered.”

Question related to The Implications of Intolerance

In this chapter from his *Treatise on Tolerance*, Voltaire specifically criticizes intolerance between Catholics and Protestants in France, but his arguments could be applied more generally to any society where the followers of a religion (or a particular interpretation of a religion) seek to force their beliefs on others. Unfortunately, we still live in a world where there are religious fanatics or extremists who are attempting to do exactly that.

Re-write six of Voltaire's arguments in a way that they could be used to counter religious intolerance in the world today. Quote Voltaire in at least three of the arguments.

First argument: Each person should be allowed to believe what his own reason tells him; this applies whether the beliefs are "enlightened or misguided"; but, regardless of beliefs, each individual is still obligated to respect the laws and customs of the country where he resides.

Second argument: Even if a religion truly is from God, there is no justification for persecuting those who fail to subscribe to it. Besides, if a religion really is from God, it does not belong to humans, and humans should not seek to control it. "God will sustain it without your help."

Third argument: It is wrong for the followers of a religion, even if they are in the majority, to depose a ruler or a government that does not embrace their beliefs. Those who govern and have their position on the basis of proper procedure should not be deposed because their religion varies from that of the majority.

Fourth argument: It is wrong to carry out religious prosecutions on the basis of theological hairsplitting. Differences in belief are often subtle, and exact teachings have sometimes changed over time. These subtleties offer a weak foundation for religious prosecutions, and such prosecutions should cease regardless.

Fifth argument: It is okay to have religious differences with others and even to argue about them, but peace can still be preserved. We should not act as if every religious question requires a definitive answer to which everyone must adhere. As Voltaire states, "we should be tolerant with one another in our disagreements and humble when faced with something we do not understand."

Sixth argument: If killing heretics and unbelievers is truly an act of religious devotion, some of heaven's greatest rewards would go to mass murderers. "These are strange claims indeed to eternal glory."

Questions related to Massacre at Michilimackinac

1. Why did Wawatam, a Chippewa, want to adopt Alexander Henry into his family?

According to Wawatam, “the Great Spirit had given him a dream in which he had adopted an Englishman as his son, brother, and friend. From the moment he first beheld me, he had recognized me as the person the Great Spirit had pointed out to him for a brother.”

2. Give three reasons as to why Alexander Henry failed to heed Wawatam’s warning and leave Michilimackinac.

First, Henry ascribed much of what he was told “to the peculiarities of the Indian character,” which might have been a reference to unfounded suspicions, such as being alarmed simply by the large number of Indians (400) near the fort, an important place for trade. Second, although Wawatam informed him that the Indians intended to become intoxicated, this might not have seemed too threatening to one afforded the protection of the fort. And third, Henry’s imperfect understanding of the Chippewa language, which is highly figurative, perhaps prevented him from grasping the full significance of what Wawatam was saying. (A fourth reason, which emerges later in the story, is that Wawatam had possibly been intentionally vague with Henry, because he had promised his fellow Indians not to divulge the planned attack.)

3. Describe “the stratagem by which the Indians had obtained possession of the fort.”

Up until the day of the massacre, the Indians had been behaving with “every appearance of friendship.” The Indians had made arrangements with the commandant of the fort, Major Etherington, for the Chippewas and the Sauks to play a game of baggatiway, an early form of lacrosse, on June 4, the British King’s birthday. The game, of course, was played outside the fort, and the commandant and many of the ninety soldiers of the garrison were in attendance. The anticipated moment came, however, when the ball was “tossed over the pickets of the fort,” giving the Indians extensive access to the fort and precipitating the attack.

4. How bloody was the attack? Quote at least two complete sentences from the account.

The attack was savage. Some Englishmen were scalped “while yet living.” “The dead were scalped and mangled, the dying were writhing and shrieking under the knife and tomahawk. From the bodies of some, ripped open, their butchers were drinking the blood, scooped up in the hollow of joined hands, and quaffed amid shouts of rage and victory.”

5. How was Wawatam able to obtain Alexander Henry's release?

Wawatam spoke to his fellow chiefs, reminding them how he had adopted Alexander Henry as his brother long before this recent war began. Therefore, Henry should be regarded as one of the Chippewas rather than their captive. Wawatam also brought "goods to buy off every claim that any among you may have on my brother."

6. What did the Indians do to inspire themselves with courage against an enemy?

The Indians would "make a war feast from among the slain." In other words, they would eat the flesh of the enemy from prior attacks to receive courage for future attacks.

Question related to *Taxation No Tyranny*

In the *Declaration and Resolves of the First Continental Congress*, as quoted below, Americans asserted that only their own colonial legislatures could tax them and pass laws related to their own internal governance:

“That the foundation of English liberty, and of all free government, is a right in the people to participate in their legislative council: and as the English colonists are not represented, and from their local and other circumstances, cannot properly be represented in the British parliament, they are entitled to a free and exclusive power of legislation in their several provincial legislatures, where their right of representation can alone be preserved, in all cases of taxation and internal polity...”

By referring to *Taxation No Tyranny*, describe five points Samuel Johnson makes to counter these American claims. Each description should consist of a combination of your own words and at least one partial quotation from Johnson.

First point: The “supreme authority” in a society cannot be shared between two separate assemblies—in other words, between parliament and colonial legislatures. This necessary, absolute, and undivided sovereignty, therefore, must reside in parliament. (Americans came to believe that sovereignty remains with the people and that governmental power should not be unlimited.)

Second point: Due to the “greater distance,” Americans have been “entrusted with ampler liberty of regulating their conduct by their own wisdom,” and they are “entitled to all the rights of Englishmen.” But, being Englishmen, “they are subject to English parliament, and chargeable by English taxation.” In fact, “the parliament of England has a right to bind them by statutes, and to bind them in all cases whatsoever.”

Third point: In the past, Americans accepted laws made by parliament, and, therefore, “by a chain that cannot be broken,” they must also now submit to taxation.

Fourth point: By living in America, the colonists have “voluntarily” given up their right to be represented in parliament. “By his own choice he has left a country where he had a vote and little property, for another, where he has great property, but no vote.”

Fifth point: Of those living in England, “far the greater part have no vote,” so Americans are actually “represented by the same virtual representation as the greater part of Englishmen.”

(18th century Englishmen had more rights and freedoms than most people in the world, but 18th century Americans possessed significantly more. Samuel Johnson’s views were in line with traditional English expectations, but most Americans were no longer interested in the old logic; Americans now demanded and even insisted upon additional safeguards against government as well as greater responsiveness from government.)

Questions related to Hamilton on Impeachment and Prosecution

1. What does it mean for the House of Representatives to “have the sole Power of Impeachment” and for the Senate to “have the sole Power to try all Impeachments”?

It means that when it comes to a potential impeachment, the House may conduct an investigation as it sees fit and charge the individual by majority vote. As to the trial, the Constitution sets only a few rules for the Senate to follow, the most important one being that a two-thirds majority vote is required for a conviction. By simple majority votes, however, the Senate may determine what is and what is not to be included in the trial, both as to procedure and evidence.

2. Write down Alexander Hamilton’s two-sentence description in *Federalist No. 65* of the type of wrongdoing that is meant by “high Crimes and Misdemeanors.”

“The subjects of its jurisdiction are those offenses which proceed from the misconduct of public men, or, in other words, from the abuse or violation of some public trust. They are of a nature which may with peculiar propriety be denominated POLITICAL, as they relate chiefly to injuries done immediately to the society itself.”

3. According to Hamilton, in which country did this process of impeachment and trial originate, and did any of the state constitutions already follow this example?

It originated in Great Britain, and “several” of the state constitutions already followed it.

4. Hamilton defends having impeachment trials take place in the Senate but is also concerned with the partisan passions that might be aroused. To what degree does Hamilton believe these passions could affect the outcome of an impeachment trial?

“...there will always be the greatest danger that the decision [the verdict] will be regulated more by the comparative strength of parties than by the real demonstrations of innocence or guilt.”

5. Referencing Hamilton’s belief (*Federalist 70*) in the necessity of “a ‘vigorous’ and ‘energetic’ Executive,” the U.S. Supreme Court in *Trump v. United States* (2024) decided that all sitting Presidents must be safeguarded from an unhealthy fear of criminal prosecution after leaving office. Therefore, former Presidents possess broad immunity from criminal prosecution for actions taken while in office. Based on *Federalist 69* and *77*, would Hamilton agree? Quote from both 69 and 77 in your response.

Hamilton would not agree. In *Federalist 69* Hamilton says a former President would be “liable to prosecution and punishment in the ordinary course of law,” and, likewise, in *Federalist 77* he says a former President would be liable to “prosecution in the common course of law.” The only difference between a President and anyone else seems to be that the prosecution would be delayed until after his term expires. There isn’t even a hint of any sort of immunity from criminal prosecution for a former President.

Questions related to Article II and the Sinking Fund

1. The Constitution vests executive power in the President of the United States. In recent years some people have taken this to mean that the President has complete supervisory authority over anyone whose job it is to carry out federal law, including removing that individual from office if the President so desires. Give two examples from Article II which suggest some measure of autonomy for at least some executive branch officers.

To say the President “may require the Opinion, in writing, of the principal Officer in each of the executive Departments, upon any Subject relating to the Duties of their respective Offices,” suggests those principal officers may be operating independently to some extent. Furthermore, since “Congress may by Law vest the Appointment of...inferior Officers...in the Heads of Departments,” those Heads as well as their appointees would seem to have some autonomy from the President.

2. In January 1790, Alexander Hamilton, the first Secretary of the Treasury, proposed a Sinking Fund Commission to the First Congress. The goal of the Commission would be to repay the national debt in the years to come by utilizing part of the revenue of the new federal government. (The debt had originated because of the expenses of the Revolutionary War.) Making decisions regarding “the discharge” of the “public debt” is clearly an executive branch function, as they entail carrying out a law. Based on Hamilton’s proposal, to what extent would the President be able to control the decisions of the Commission?

The President would have very little control. Three of the five members were not subject to his removal, as they included the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and the Chief Justice. The Treasury Secretary and the Attorney General could have theoretically been removed by him, but the two of them would not have constituted a majority on the Commission. The Commission’s main task of applying surplus revenue toward reducing the debt would not require the President’s approval as they would act alone by simple majority votes. If the commissioners wanted to borrow additional money to help deal with the debt, they would need the President’s approval for that.

3. In August 1790, the First Congress passed into law Hamilton’s Sinking Fund proposal, with the support and signature of President Washington. But the actual law did vary in some ways from the proposal. How did the composition of the Commission differ from that in Hamilton’s proposal, and what is the significance of this? What changed regarding Presidential approval?

The law substituted the Secretary of State for the Speaker of the House, giving the President removal power over three of the Commission’s five members, who also then constituted a majority. And in the law, all the Commission’s decisions would require the President’s approval. As for borrowing additional money to help with the debt, the President could decide to do so on his own, without the Commission’s involvement. But the use of these borrowed funds would still be determined by the Commission, with the President’s approval.

4. How did President Andrew Jackson, who was a strong proponent of presidential prerogatives, characterize the role of the sinking fund commissioners?

In his State of the Union address in 1832, when the sinking fund was winding down forty years later, President Jackson mentioned how the commissioners were “invested with full authority to purchase the debt...” In other words, he (like other presidents before him) saw the commissioners as the ones who, essentially on their own, had been making decisions and fulfilling this important task within the executive branch.

5. Discuss how the Sinking Fund law upheld the principle that the President is the one in whom executive power is vested while at the same time countering the notion, which some hold today, that the President’s executive power is absolute.

The law did two things to uphold the principle that executive power is vested in the President. First, since three of Commission’s five members were heads of executive departments over whom the President had removal power, he ultimately had control of a majority on the Commission. And second, each of the Commission’s decisions to deal with the national debt had to be approved by the President.

But there were also checks on the President’s power when it came to the Commission. Two of the Commission’s five members were not removable by the President and held offices of stature, namely the Vice President of the United States and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. When the law was passed—14 years before the 12th Amendment was ratified—the Vice President was not the President’s running mate but the runner-up in the presidential election, which could imply a large measure of independence from the President. Moreover, if the President tried to control the Commission for his own purposes, the Vice President and the Chief Justice had front row seats to what was happening and could go public with their concerns. And as for the President’s removal power regarding three of the members, they not only held positions of stature but were essential to the functioning of the government, which would have to give the President pause with respect to removing and then having to replace any of them. In addition, Section 3 of the law provided for congressional oversight by requiring “a full and exact report of the proceedings [of the Commission] ...within the first fourteen days of each session” of Congress. Taken as a whole, the Sinking Fund law is a great example of carrying out a legislative purpose while also ensuring that checks and balances are in place for all concerned, including the President.

(Other instances of commissions or boards created in the 1790s and existing outside any executive department included those tasked with inspecting coinage at the Mint, ruling on patent applications, and allocating public lands in the territories. The early Congress also passed laws that utilized state officials—in no way under Presidential control—to issue warrants, approve the unloading of vessels, and grant citizenship. As a final example of Congress’s complex vision of how government might be organized, out of the 25 directors of the First Bank of the United States, only 5 were chosen by the President; the other 20 were elected by private investors who owned stock in the Bank, and the President had no power to remove them.)

Questions related to The Old Regime's Revolutionary Education of the Common People

1. What institution did Louis XV abolish, and what code did Louis XVI fundamentally alter?

Louis XV abolished the French Parlement, and Louis XVI altered the code of law.

2. What does Tocqueville mean when he says, "there is no more dangerous example than violence motivated by goodness and exercised by people of goodwill"?

The king and his ministers expressed good intentions in making reforms. The reforms, however, "were enacted suddenly and without adequate preparation" and affected well-established habits and rights. This served as an example to the common people who would acquire positions of authority during the Revolution; it showed them that leaders with good intentions could make fundamental changes in society quickly and without due consideration for the consequences.

3. "The idea is the mother of socialism." To what was Tocqueville referring?

The theory that the state (or nation) is "the only true landowner," which implies that the government can do whatever it wants with the nation's land and resources.

4. Give two examples of how the government showed contempt for private property.

The government seized land for roads and other public works without providing fair compensation.

The wills of donors who had established charitable institutions were overridden.

5. List seven unfair procedures used in criminal law against the lower classes.

Special courts, biased judges, a rapid or sham trial, executive decrees without appeal, arrested without a warrant, a long while in prison before being able to talk to counsel, and the accused were interrogated within twenty-four hours.

6. "The mildness of the sentence concealed the horror of the procedure." To what was Tocqueville referring, and what implications did this have for the Revolution?

The judges almost always gave light sentences to the convicted, but the problem with this was that no one was paying attention to how unfair the procedure was. Later on, during the Revolution (and especially during the Reign of Terror), these shoddy procedures went hand-in-hand with death sentences.

Questions related to Washington on Party Spirit and More

1. According to George Washington, party spirit is the “worst enemy” of popular government. Name four bad outcomes that could result from party spirit.

Despotism, enfeebled government, an agitated community, and foreign interference

2. What attitude should the American people have toward party spirit? Quote a phrase.

The American people should seek “to discourage and restrain it.”

3. Do political parties serve a positive role? Explain.

Within “certain limits” they probably do. They serve as “useful checks upon the administration of government” and “keep alive the spirit of liberty.”

4. If constitutional powers need to be adjusted in some way, how does Washington say this should be accomplished? And how should it not be accomplished?

It should be accomplished through the amendment process as given in the Constitution. One department, or branch of government, should not simply takeover a power that constitutionally belongs to another.

5. What two supports does Washington view as essential to successful government?

Religion and morality

6. What can help develop an “enlightened” public opinion? Quote a phrase.

“institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge.”

7. What does Washington have to say about the national debt and taxes?

The “accumulation of debt” should be avoided “by shunning occasions of expense” and “by vigorous exertion in time of peace to discharge the debts.” We should not throw “upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear.” To pay the debts “there must be revenue” and “to have revenue there must be taxes,” which are “inconvenient and unpleasant” but still necessary.

8. How should we conduct ourselves with respect to other nations?

We should “cultivate peace and harmony with all.” We need to be “a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence.” In the long run, “the fruits of such a plan” will be “richly” repaid. “Can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue?”

True/False Questions related to Mungo Park on Slavery in Africa

Based on the excerpt from Park's book, indicate whether each statement is true or false.

1. Park estimated that slaves made up twenty-five percent of Africa's population.

False.

2. Slaves taken in war usually received better treatment than domestic slaves.

False.

3. There were regular markets within Africa where slaves were bought and sold.

True.

4. The Atlantic slave trade, involving European buyers of African slaves, could be viewed as a subset of all the slavery in Africa.

True.

5. The vast majority of slaves for the Atlantic trade were brought to the coast in large caravans from inland countries.

True.

6. European buyers often traveled to the interior of Africa as part of the slave trade.

False.

7. An African was born a slave if his or her father was a slave at the time of their birth.

False.

8. Black slave-merchants would purchase slaves in the interior countries and then bring them to the coast for sale to Europeans.

True.

9. Park surmised that slavery in Africa originated through wars in the distant past.

True.

10. It was a known fact that prisoners of war in Africa became slaves of the conquerors.

True.

11. African kingdoms tended to avoid war with each other whenever possible.

False.

12. Prisoners of war in Africa were never put to death but always enslaved.

False.

13. During a famine, Africans who were free might volunteer to become slaves in order to obtain food.

True.

14. During a famine, African parents might sell a child or two to purchase provisions for the rest of the family.

True.

15. If an African merchant could not repay a debt, he could easily be enslaved.

True.

16. The most common way for someone who had been enslaved to regain freedom was by escaping.

True.

17. Park believed that slavery was first introduced to Africa by the Arab Muslims when they conquered the northern part of the continent during the early Middle Ages.

False.

18. Park believed that the abolition of the Atlantic slave trade would also bring slavery within Africa to an end.

False.

Essay Question related to *Marbury v. Madison* and Judicial Review

Article III of the United States Constitution states that, “The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish... The judicial power shall extend to all cases in law and equity arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority...”

Based on the quotation from Article III above, the background article on the Marshall court, and the excerpts from *Marbury v. Madison*, what is the best argument in favor of the federal judiciary having the power of judicial review, and what is the best argument against the federal judiciary having this power?

Best Argument For:

Answers may vary.

The best argument in favor of the federal judiciary having the power of judicial review is the one given by the Marshall court in *Marbury v. Madison*. The United States Constitution is “the fundamental and paramount law of the nation” (the highest law). Moreover, it is “the province and duty of the judicial department to say what the law is (i.e., to interpret the law)... If two laws conflict with each other, the courts must decide on the operation of each.” Consequently, if the federal judiciary determines “an act of the legislature” to be “repugnant to the constitution,” the federal judiciary must declare the “act of the legislature” to be “void,” which means it is no longer a law. In the course of doing their job, it is necessary for the federal courts to interpret the Constitution and to uphold it as the supreme law of the land, which includes judging whether laws passed by Congress or state legislatures are constitutional.

Best Argument Against:

Answers may vary.

While the judicial power of the United States is vested in the federal judiciary according to Article III of the United States Constitution, Article III does not specifically grant the federal judiciary the power of judicial review. The power to determine constitutionality, because of its ultimate and final nature in relation to the law, is extremely important. Therefore, if the framers of the Constitution had intended for such an important power to reside in the judicial branch, they would have been explicit about it. Since nothing explicit is asserted about it in relation to the federal judiciary or any other branch of government, there is no part of government that can make an exclusive claim to this highly significant authority. (Of course, Jefferson took the position that the power to determine constitutionality resides with the states, because in his view the Constitution came about as a compact among the states and ultimate sovereignty remains with them.)

Questions related to *McCulloch v. Maryland* and Federalism

1. Maryland contended that the power of the federal government originated with the states, and the Supreme Court held that it originated with the American people. If Maryland's contention was correct, one could infer that state authority is superior to federal authority. How did the Supreme Court discredit Maryland's view and demonstrate that federal power originated, not with the states, but with the people?

Federal power originated with the American people because it was the people, not the states, who ratified the United States Constitution. While it is true that the people assembled in conventions in each state to decide on ratification, this did not confer higher authority on the states but was simply the most logical way for the people to assemble. In fact, the Constitution itself proclaims that its authority derives from the people of the whole country.

2. The Supreme Court states in *McCulloch v. Maryland* that the federal government "is acknowledged by all to be one of enumerated powers." What is meant by "enumerated powers," and what is the "extent" of such powers?

The concept of enumerated powers means that the federal government "can exercise only the powers granted to it" in the Constitution, but its powers are "supreme within its sphere of action." "The government of the United States, then, though limited in its powers, is supreme;" specifically, this means that federal laws, which rightfully extend from Congress's enumerated powers, are supreme in relation to state constitutions and state laws.

3. According to the Supreme Court, in what sense is a state government "sovereign"?

A state government is sovereign "with respect to the objects committed to it" but not "with respect to the objects committed to" the federal government.

4. The Constitution says that Congress has the power to "make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof." How did Maryland interpret this clause, and how did the Supreme Court interpret it? How would each of these interpretations affect the powers of Congress? If Maryland's interpretation were adopted, what impact would this have, according to the Supreme Court, on Congress?

The two interpretations boiled down to the definition of the word "necessary." Maryland defined it as "indispensable," and the Supreme Court defined it as "convenient" or "useful." Maryland's definition would serve to tighten or restrict the powers of Congress, and the Supreme Court's definition would serve to loosen or broaden the powers of Congress. If Maryland's interpretation were upheld, it would "almost annihilate" Congress's right "to select its means" for carrying out its enumerated powers.

Questions related to *Johnson v. McIntosh* and Native Americans

1. What do all European nations who have acquired territory on the North American continent have in common?

They have all claimed, and recognized in each other, “the exclusive right of the discoverer to appropriate the lands occupied by the Indians.”

2. Has the United States made the same claim?

Yes.

3. Can the courts in the United States deny this claim?

No.

4. Does the Supreme Court express some ambivalence about the European (and American) treatment of Indians? Include a quotation.

Yes. “...we do not mean to engage in the defense of those principles which Europeans have applied to Indian title...”

5. The Supreme Court believes there is “some excuse, if not justification,” for how Europeans have seized title to Indian lands. Describe this “excuse” or “justification.”

The Indians were “fierce savages, whose occupation was war.” They were a people with whom it was impossible to mix, who could not be governed as a separate society, and who could not be allowed to remain in the same neighborhood as whites because of “the perpetual hazard of being massacred.” There have been “frequent and bloody wars” with Indians, “in which the whites were not always the aggressors.”

6. According to the Supreme Court, what is the status of Indians in the United States?

They are occupants, to be protected while in the peaceful possession of their lands; but they do not hold an “absolute title” to the lands they occupy.

7. According to the Court, does this treatment of the Indians violate their natural rights as well as common practice among “civilized nations”?

Yes.

8. Give two reasons, according to the Court, as to why this treatment is warranted.

It is indispensable to the system under which the country has been settled, and it fits “the actual condition of the two people” (Indians and whites).

True/False Questions related to David Walker's *Appeal*

Indicate whether each statement is true or false in relation to the ideas of David Walker.
Re-write the false statements to make them true.

1. African Americans are the worst off of any people who ever lived.

True.

2. Those who claim to be Christians are oppressing African Americans.

True.

3. Christianity should be rejected because it is the religion of the whites.

False. David Walker is a Christian.

4. African Americans are united in their pursuit of the abolition of slavery.

False. African Americans are not united with respect to slavery.

5. God will eventually punish those who oppress African Americans.

True.

6. The time will come when black people will kill some white people.

True.

7. Mr. Jefferson wrote that blacks and whites have equal mental and physical abilities.

False. Jefferson wrote that blacks have lesser abilities than whites.

8. Mr. Jefferson was the greatest spokesperson against slavery who ever lived.

False. Jefferson's comments about black inferiority have strengthened slavery.

9. Many black slaves give in and allow their white masters to abuse them.

True.

10. Blacks must prove that they are men before whites will accept that they are men.

True.

Questions related to The Grimké Sisters on Slavery

1. Did the laws of Moses and the slave codes both deprive slaves of all their rights?

No, only the Southern slave codes deprived slaves of all their rights.

2. Identify the two biblical precepts that were at odds with American slavery.

The Golden Rule and “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.”

3. Were female slaves ever purchased for any other reason than to work? Explain.

Yes, there were times when they were bought to satisfy the lust of the master.

4. Why do you think a beautiful female *mulatto* would fetch such a high price?

Because her “white” features made her even more attractive to certain buyers.

5. Did slaveholding fathers ever sell their own daughters, and did slaveholding brothers ever sell their own half-sisters?

Yes, and yes.

6. How did the sleazy behavior of some slaveholding men affect white Southern women?

The white women were tied to white men, including some husbands who were known “to be polluted by licentiousness” with female slaves. The awful degradation of chattel slavery sank even lower because of such behavior; everyone was “contaminated” by it.

7. Discuss how the North’s fear of racial amalgamation helped perpetuate slavery.

The North feared that if the slaves were emancipated and the free blacks remained in the United States, there would be a mixing of the white and black races to the great detriment of the white race and of civilization itself. Therefore, northerners resisted emancipation apart from an established plan for returning blacks to Africa. Ironically, northerners believed slavery was sinful but viewed amalgamation as the greater evil.

8. The North purchased the South’s cotton, sugar, and rice. As a region, the South was agricultural and possessed very little manufacturing. The North had a growing manufacturing sector and even produced the whip used by overseers on southern plantations. Describe how attuned the northern manufacturer of the whip was to the needs of the overseers.

This whip was carefully designed so that the slave’s skin was cut, “almost as keen as a knife,” but the slave’s flesh and bones were neither bruised nor mangled, leaving the slave in “agony” but resulting in no damage to the slaveholder’s valuable property.

True/False Questions related to Story of Indian Removal

Based on Burnett's account, indicate whether each statement is true or false.

1. Earlier in Burnett's life, a Cherokee had tried to stab him to death.

False.

2. Burnett was an eyewitness to the Trail of Tears.

True.

3. Many Cherokees died from cold and exposure during the removal.

True.

4. Mrs. Ross, the wife of Cherokee Chief John Ross, barely survived after coming down with pneumonia.

False.

5. Burnett was dishonorably discharged from the army for having struck another soldier with a hatchet.

False.

6. Cherokee lands had been overrun by gold-hungry thieves and murderers prior to the Trail of Tears.

True.

7. Despite everything that happened later, Chief Junaluska never regretted having saved the life of Andrew Jackson.

False.

8. By the late 19th century, public schools throughout the United States taught about the Trail of Tears.

False.

9. According to Burnett, soldiers were ordered to execute an Indian chief and his children.

True.

10. The sick child to whom Mrs. Ross gave her blanket was able to recover. True.

Questions related to Calhoun's Speech on the Conquest of Mexico

1. Senator John C. Calhoun wants the United States to keep possession of western Texas, New Mexico, and California, which constituted the northern half of Mexico, but he does not want the United States to keep possession of the southern half of Mexico. Why is that?

Calhoun wants the United States to keep possession of the northern half of Mexico, because the "population is sparse" in that part of Mexico. He does not want the United States to keep possession of the southern half of Mexico for the opposite reason, because that part is where the Mexican people live in great numbers.

2. Calhoun claims ours is "the Government of a white race." Does Calhoun view Mexicans as being part of the white race, and why does that matter to him?

Calhoun does not view Mexicans as part of the white race but believes more than half of them are "Indians" with the other portion being composed of "mixed tribes." Calhoun does not believe that "colored races" are "equal to the establishment of free popular government."

3. What does Calhoun believe would happen if Mexicans were incorporated into the United States as equals?

He believes it would be "fatal to our (democratic) institutions."

4. According to Calhoun, if the United States held Mexico as a "subjected province," in what two ways would power shift in the United States?

Power would shift from the states to the federal government, and within the federal government power would shift from the legislative branch to the executive branch.

5. Calhoun refers to Manifest Destiny as a mistake. How is it mistaken?

"None but people advanced to a very high state of moral and intellectual improvement are capable...of maintaining free government," and even among them, "very few...have had the good fortune of forming a constitution capable of endurance."

6. What does Calhoun's speech reveal about the scope and depth of racism in 19th century America?

Answers may vary. Calhoun refers to the superiority of whites and the inferiority of people of color in stark and unabashed terms. For Calhoun, a society's potential is determined by its racial composition, and having a dominant "white race" is a crucial building block if the goal is to have a successful society with free institutions. In expressing himself so blatantly, Calhoun must have known that his racially loaded rationale would resonate with large segments of the American people.

Questions related to The Communist Manifesto

1. According to Marx, even though some parts of Europe were still controlled by landed aristocrats (the traditional upper class), the bourgeoisie (or middle-class), who had originated in towns and taken over through their growing wealth as a capitalist ruling class, now dominated much of it. Why does Marx believe that “middle-class society” is prone to crisis?

Bourgeois, or capitalist, society is all about capital formation via production, but this emphasis leads to “over-production,” because the workers are not paid sufficiently for demand to keep up with supply, leading to severe economic downturns and social turmoil. The overall trend regarding this cyclical problem of over-production is for society to experience ever-greater crises over time.

2. What powerful class—powerful in numbers—have the bourgeoisie inadvertently called into being?

The “modern working men, the Proletarians.”

3. How does capitalist society view workers, and what is happening to workers’ wages?

Workers are “a commodity like other articles of commerce,” and wages are declining.

4. Apart from the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, what is happening to the other social classes?

“All the other classes of Society are being destroyed by the modern industrial system...”

5. Why is the middle-class incapable of governing?

The middle-class concerns itself with capital but not with workers, who are increasingly impoverished; therefore, since the middle-class cannot ensure “the bare existence of its Slaves,...Society can no longer exist under this class...”

6. What will be the outcome of this situation?

The bourgeoisie are creating the very men, the proletariat, who will destroy them. “Their destruction and the victory of the Proletarians are alike unavoidable.”

7. What do the “communists” try to encourage in relation to the proletariat, and how might they be considered more advanced than the majority of the proletariat?

The communists try to encourage class-consciousness and solidarity among the proletariat worldwide in a way that rises above nationality, and they are more advanced than “the bulk of the Proletariat” in that they have “insight into the historical conditions, the march, and the general results of the Proletarian Movement.”

8. Why does communism call for the “abolition of private property”?

Under the “present system of society, private property has no existence for nine-tenths of its members,” who are extremely poor. In fact, in the current capitalist society, the existence of private property “is based upon the very fact that it exists not at all for nine-tenths of the population.” In other words, private property is almost entirely “Bourgeois property” and is used to create capital, “a species of property which plunders Wages-labour, in order to use it up anew.” It “rests on the antagonism of classes, on the using up of the many by the few.” The destruction of such private property is completely justified and can only harm the bourgeoisie, who will cease to exist as a class following their inevitable defeat in a proletarian revolution.

9. Describe the societal progression that will occur beginning with the proletarian, or communist, revolution.

The proletariat will take over as “the ruling class.” The new ruling class will deprive the middle-class, or bourgeoisie, of their private property, or capital. All the instruments of production will then be centralized in the hands of the new government. The mass of productive power will actually be increased, and this will happen “with the utmost rapidity.” With the proletariat as the only remaining class, the proletariat will lose its class character, and politics as such will come to an end. The future will then entail “an association, wherein the free development of EACH is the condition of the free development of ALL.” (If the sky falls, we shall catch larks.)

10. Marx demonstrated strong insights into the nature of capitalism and how harsh such a system could be toward workers, but he was also wrong in predicting the course of history. Describe three ways in which Marx’s predictions were wrong.

Answers may vary. First, society was not simply evolving into two classes, one made up of rich capitalists and the other of poor workers—a process that Marx claimed could only cease with a communist revolution. In fact, our modern use of the term “middle class” refers to the many who fall somewhere in-between. Second, workers organized into unions that did effectively, though it took decades, bring about improvements in wages, hours, and working conditions—and, once again, this occurred without a communist revolution. And third, the despised “bourgeois” governments eventually passed a variety of laws designed to improve workers’ lives.

11. Based on the excerpt, what do you think Marx would have thought of the communism that came about in Russia and China in the 20th century?

Answers may vary. Marx might have responded hopefully at first. He might have even been flattered. But, in the end, I believe he would have rejected both revolutions as total—or totalitarian—failures. Neither of those communist regimes in any way achieved “an association, wherein the free development of EACH” was “the condition of the free development of ALL.” By comparison, workers living in “bourgeois” countries did much better, enjoying far more freedom and prosperity.

Questions related to the “Great Fiction” of Government

1. What is the strange illusion with respect to government?

The strange illusion is that government is “an inexhaustible source of wealth and enlightenment”—that government can and should solve all problems.

2. Describe the process by which one group in society can legally plunder another.

By beseeching the government to pass a law that takes from a different group of citizens and gives to yours.

3. According to Bastiat, how widespread is this legal plunder? Quote the text in support.

Bastiat views it as being universal. In fact, he defines government as “the great fiction through which everybody endeavors to live at the expense of everybody else.”

4. Why does government respond affirmatively when advised to “take from the public”?

“Government is not slow to perceive the advantages it may derive...” It “will take much, for then a large share will remain for itself; it will multiply the number of its agents; it will enlarge the circle of its privileges...”

5. According to Bastiat, how does the preamble to the new constitution in France compare with the preamble to the U.S. constitution?

On the one hand, the French preamble led them to “expect everything from an energy not our (their) own”—that is, from the government. On the other hand, the American preamble led them to “expect nothing except from themselves and their own energy.”

6. How are French expectations for government a “source of calamities and revolutions”?

The government is confronted with the contradictory expectations of providing many benefits but doing so without raising any taxes. When the impossibility of this situation becomes acute, other leaders emerge to stir up the masses with promises of what they would accomplish if they were in power, and this causes social upheaval.

7. Describe the political system that Bastiat favors. Do you agree that this would be best? If so, defend his position. If not, what political system would you prefer and why?

Bastiat favors a political system where the government is “little felt,” with its only role being “to secure to everyone his own.” Answers may vary: I prefer a system where government is somewhat felt, where it takes some and does some. Public education and a social safety net are needed as well as some measure of government regulation when it comes to the economy and the environment. Laissez-faire capitalism, which is what Bastiat was calling for, is insufficient and ignores the less fortunate.

Questions related to The Dred Scott Decision

1. Describe the historical, legal, political, and social status of people of African descent in the late 18th century (and later) by focusing on the first three paragraphs of the excerpt.

Black people, “whether they had become free or not,” were not considered part of the American people. In fact, at the time of the signing of the Declaration of Independence and the adoption of the U.S. Constitution, a low opinion of blacks was true of “every European nation.” For “more than a century” they were considered “beings of an inferior order,” “altogether unfit to associate with the white race,” either socially or politically, and “had no rights which the white man was bound to respect.” They were considered so inept that slavery was viewed as an improvement in their situation as compared with being left on their own. As a slave, they were nothing more than “an ordinary article of merchandise,” to be “bought and sold,” “whenever a profit could be made by it.” “This opinion was at that time fixed and universal in the civilized portion of the white race.”

2. Did the thirteen colonies allow free blacks to marry whites? No.
3. “They spoke and acted according to the then established doctrines and principles, and in the ordinary language of the day, and no one misunderstood them.” What is this sentence referring to?

That the words in the Declaration of Independence, “all men are created equal,” clearly excluded the “enslaved African race.”

4. The Dred Scott opinion refers to how the Constitution “reserves to each of the thirteen states the right to import slaves until the year 1808,” which was true. But the relevant clause refers to more than just the importation of slaves from outside the country: “The Migration or Importation of such Persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the Year [1808] ...” How could this clause be used to argue that the framers of the Constitution were open to the future curtailment of slavery?

Not only could Congress end the importation of slaves from outside the country in 1808, but it could also stop the “Migration” of slaves from one state to another. “Migration” refers to the movement of slaves between states, which clearly involves the buying and selling of slaves between owners from different states. If slaves could no longer be bought and sold and transported among the states, the result would be a serious curtailment of slavery itself, especially when one considers the enormity of such slave trading across the South. Therefore, one could argue that the framers of the Constitution were open to the future curtailment, if not actual elimination, of slavery. (While Congress did end the importation of slaves in 1808, it never did attempt—in the period before the Civil War—to curtail the movement of slaves between states, knowing that any such legislation would likely provoke southern secession.)

Questions related to The Legal Status of Abortion Prior to Criminalization

1. In your own words, state the legal question that is under consideration in this 1849 opinion of the New Jersey Court of Errors and Appeals.

The legal question is whether, according to the common law, obtaining an abortion, prior to quickening, is a criminal act.

2. Although the timing can vary by several weeks, “quickening” typically occurs toward the end of the fourth or early in the fifth month of pregnancy. What does quickening refer to, and when does life begin as stipulated in the common law?

Quickening is when a pregnant woman first feels fetal movement, and life begins, as stipulated in the common law, when this occurs.

3. In the common law, was killing a fetus after quickening but before birth ever considered “murder”?

No.

4. In the more modern common law (see Blackstone), what kind of a crime was killing a fetus after quickening but before birth?

It was a “heinous misdemeanor.”

5. In the common law, was killing an embryo/fetus before quickening a crime?

No, unless it happened as part of an assault on a pregnant woman.

6. Did the common law view killing an embryo/fetus before quickening as a crime for which the perpetrator would be punished by God?

No, it wasn’t viewed as a crime against God or religion.

7. If society were to decide that aborting an un-quickened embryo/fetus should be made a crime, what remedy do the justices of the New Jersey court recommend?

The justices recommend proceeding by “legislative enactments”—that is, encouraging legislatures to pass laws making it a crime.

8. What remedy do the justices think should be avoided?

The courts, by “judicial construction,” should not make aborting an un-quickened fetus a crime. The courts should not usurp the power of the legislature by legislating from the bench. If a new criminal offense is to be created, it should be done by the legislative branch passing a law.

Questions related to Physicians Push to Criminalize Abortion

1. According to this 1858 medical editorial, was abortion on the rise? Quote the text.

Yes, “so rapidly is it spreading.”

2. What did the editorial call abortionists, and how were abortionists attracting patients?

It called them “quacks,” who were attracting patients through “flaming advertisements.”

3. Had the daily press or the religious press taken a stand against abortion? Explain.

No, both had been silent on the subject, and much of the daily press and even some of the religious press had been making money off of abortion-related advertisements in their publications.

4. How effective were the medicines of the time at producing an abortion, and how did this effectiveness compare with the advertising claims made about them?

These medicines succeeded at times, but they also had “repeated failures.” They were advertised, however, as a “never-failing remedy.”

5. How had women come to regard abortion, and did this attitude affect all social classes?

“Females have now come to regard the production of abortion as one of the most innocent and natural things in the world.” Yes, the attitude affected all social classes.

6. While admonishing physicians not to give in and perform abortions, discuss how the editorial expressed sympathy for women in certain situations who sought abortions.

A woman’s future would almost certainly be ruined by having a child out-of-wedlock: “a happy, innocent life changed to a wild and almost unavoidable career of crime and remorse.” With an illegitimate child, a woman would probably be unable to marry and would likely only be able to support herself and her child through prostitution.

7. Did the editorial seem to view contraception as equivalent to abortion? Explain.

Yes, in reference to the advertised “Female Protecting Instrument,” which was clearly a contraceptive device, the editorial declared how the women who use it “know not the crime of which they are guilty.”

8. Did the editorial claim that abortion at any stage of pregnancy is “murder,” and did it discuss cases where the pregnancy is endangering the mother’s life? If current laws were incapable of stopping abortions, what was the medical profession urged to do?

Yes, and no. The profession should demand of legislatures that such laws be passed.

Questions related to White Status and Southern Secession

1. Do the two paragraphs from South Carolina's "Declaration of the Immediate Causes" leave any doubt that South Carolina seceded over the issue of slavery? In the lead-up to secession, what was the last straw as far as South Carolina was concerned?

No doubt whatsoever. The last straw was Lincoln's election to the presidency.

2. Southern leaders were concerned about whether secession had enough support. Why?

Only about a quarter of white southerners owned slaves.

3. In your own words, what is the gist of the argument that Townsend and DeBow are making? Quote them both to reinforce your response.

That, with the existence of black slavery, a white non-slaveholding southerner always has reason to feel good about himself, even one who is very poor, and that is because he belongs to the privileged white caste. Townsend writes: "the status and *color of the black race* becomes the badge of inferiority, and the poorest non-slaveholder may rejoice with the richest of his brethren of the white race, in the distinction of his color." And DeBow: "The poor white laborer at the North is at the bottom of the social ladder, whilst his brother here has ascended several steps and can look down upon those who are beneath him, at an infinite remove."

4. Discuss the reasonableness of such an argument.

It is unreasonable to revel in a higher legal and social status because of one's skin color and to look down upon a whole other group because of their skin color. An individual's skin color, or race, does not in and of itself determine their character or competence, as is known from experience with people of all different colors and races.

5. Townsend and DeBow seem to imply a necessary link between slavery and white privilege, but do you think white privilege needed slavery to survive? Explain.

The 13th Amendment would end slavery forever as the South had known it, but white privilege—and rabid racism—survived and even thrived in the decades to come.

6. Townsend and DeBow give the impression that non-slaveholding white southerners were largely poor. Do you think the poverty of non-slaveholding whites added fuel to their racism, and how do you think they felt about black slaveholding? Explain.

I believe racism can be fueled by poverty. If a person isn't doing well in life, given human nature, they sometimes try to feel better by having another group to look down upon, so that no matter how low they are there are others who are lower. It also probably upset them, as indicated by Townsend, to see black people who could afford slaves (even "many slaves") when they and most other white people could not.

Questions related to Lincoln's First Inaugural Address

1. Beginning his term in office, a president normally addresses the whole country on Inauguration Day, but this was not the case with Abraham Lincoln's first inaugural. Lincoln's speech, given on March 4, 1861, was directed at southerners. What does he say to reassure them about his intentions?

Lincoln quotes from one of his own speeches: "I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so."

2. List three reasons why, according to Lincoln, the southern states have no legitimate grounds to leave the Union. What does Lincoln say about whether the Constitution expressly protects slavery in the territories?

The Union was intended to be "perpetual," "no State upon its own mere motion can lawfully get out of the Union," and the southern states have not been deprived of any "vital" or "clearly written constitutional right," which might otherwise justify revolution. The Constitution does not expressly protect slavery in the territories.

3. According to Lincoln, what is the problem with the idea of secession?

The problem with secession is that a minority may leave a country any time the "majority refuses to be controlled" by them. This is a prescription for "anarchy."

4. How is the majority restrained, within our system of government, so that it cannot abuse the rights of a minority?

The majority is restrained by "constitutional checks and limitations."

5. In the Dred Scott decision (1857) the Supreme Court held that Congress had no power to prohibit slavery in the territories. This decision ran counter to the constitutional convictions of Lincoln, the Republican Party, and northerners in general. What does Lincoln imply about the authority of the Supreme Court to determine constitutionality?

Lincoln draws into question the ultimate authority of the Supreme Court to determine constitutionality, because if that were truly the situation, "the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned their government into the hands of that eminent tribunal."

6. What does Lincoln claim is the fundamental disagreement between the North and the South?

“One section of our country [the South] believes slavery is right, and ought to be extended, while the other [the North] believes it is wrong, and ought not to be extended.”

7. How does Lincoln counter the southern concern that the fugitive-slave clause in the Constitution has not been fully enforced in the North, which he admits is true?

Lincoln says that if the South were to secede, runaway slaves “would not be surrendered at all.” In other words, inadequate enforcement of the fugitive-slave clause is not an argument for leaving the Union, because leaving would make matters far worse.

8. According to Lincoln, who will decide whether there will be a civil war? Include a three-sentence quotation in your answer.

The South. “In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow-countrymen, and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The government will not assail you. You can have no conflict without being yourselves the aggressors.” (The South’s subsequent attack on Fort Sumter that commenced on April 12 marked the beginning of the Civil War.)

9. How hard does Lincoln try to avoid war?

Lincoln certainly wants to avoid war but is unwilling to yield any ground on the fundamental disagreement. He appeals to the good sense of southerners and also to them personally as “friends.” He leaves “the momentous issue of civil war” in their hands. But he is opposed to making concessions on whether slavery should be allowed to extend further into the territories. His election resulted precisely from his opposition to the further spread of slavery, this position formed the main plank of the Republican Party, and he personally believed deeply in this moral stance against slavery. He would rather have war than allow slavery to spread any further.

Lincoln's Second Inaugural Address (Multiple-choice Included)

1. Which word best describes how the first paragraph presents information?
 - a. causally
 - b. sequentially
 - c. comparatively**
 - d. nonsensically
2. How were the Union (northern) forces doing at this point in the war?
 - a. They were clearly losing.
 - b. They were clearly winning.**
 - c. They needed more manpower and materials.
 - d. They needed better generals.
3. Which statement is true based on the second paragraph?
 - a. The two sides were at odds over the preservation of the Union.**
 - b. Four years earlier no one had any idea a civil war was coming.
 - c. Both sides had been ready and eager to go to war.
 - d. Lincoln's first inaugural address had explained his war plans.
4. Who had known that slavery had in some way caused the war?
 - a. the politicians
 - b. the educated
 - c. the generals
 - d. everyone**
5. While southerners had wanted to extend slavery, President Lincoln's goal had been to _____.
 - a. abolish it completely within the United States
 - b. prevent it from spreading into new places**
 - c. outlaw the slave trade among southern states
 - d. stop the importation of slaves from Africa
6. Had either side expected the war to be so long and so large?
 - a. The South had but the North hadn't.
 - b. The North had but the South hadn't.
 - c. Both sides had.
 - d. Neither side had.**

7. Had either side expected slavery to end because of the conflict?
 - a. The South had but the North hadn't.
 - b. The North had but the South hadn't.
 - c. Both sides had.
 - d. **Neither side had.**
8. Which word best describes Lincoln's personal opinion about slavery?
 - a. moral
 - b. legitimate
 - c. **wrong**
 - d. biblical
9. What did Lincoln say about God in relation to the war?
 - a. The prayers of the North were being fully answered.
 - b. God was especially punishing the South because of slavery.
 - c. The war had caused Lincoln to criticize God's judgments.
 - d. **Perhaps God was using the war to end slavery, and our nation was being punished for having had slavery.**
10. Based on the final paragraph, what was not a step Lincoln wanted to take?
 - a. To bring the war to a successful conclusion.
 - b. **To punish the South for causing the war.**
 - c. To care for the soldiers and for the families of those who died.
 - d. To do what was needed to achieve a peace that would last.

Questions related to Edward Bates on American Citizenship

1. Did Bates discover a clear legal definition of a “citizen of the United States”?

No, there was “no authoritative establishment of the meaning of the phrase.”

2. People assumed then (and do now) that the right to vote is central to citizenship. Did most U.S. citizens possess the right to vote in 1862? Explain.

No, all females and all minor males were non-voters but were nonetheless citizens, and together they made up a majority of U.S. citizens.

3. Had the U.S. government ever taken away an individual’s citizenship? Explain.

No, only “the volition and act of the individual” can remove one’s citizenship. “Neither infancy nor madness nor crime can take away from the subject the quality of citizen.”

4. Discuss whether citizenship was a requirement for voting or holding office in 1862.

The states determined voting qualifications and did not necessarily require voters to be citizens. (Noncitizen—or immigrant—voting rights were rolled back in the decades around the turn of the 20th century and then eliminated altogether by 1926.) Those holding state or federal office also did not necessarily have to be citizens, “except in regard to a few of the highest national functionaries”—namely, the President, the Vice President, and members of Congress, who according to the U.S. Constitution did have to be citizens.

5. In basic terms, what does it mean to be “a citizen of the United States”?

It means to be “a member of the nation” and in theory “equal” to all other citizens.

6. According to Bates, is it obvious that a U.S. citizen is also a citizen of the state in which he or she resides?

Yes, “it needs no argument to prove.”

7. If free blacks had been deemed citizens back in 1862, would they have had the right to vote and hold office?

No, because voting and holding office are “not essential to citizenship.”

8. What does the U.S. Constitution mean by a “natural born Citizen,” and did free black people meet the requirement?

“Natural born” simply means “home-born” (born on U.S. territory), and free black people met this requirement. (Bates had declined to discuss the citizenship status of slaves, who, by 1862, were almost all natural born but obviously still property.)

9. Could a “foreign-born” black person have become a U.S. citizen in 1862?

No, “for our laws extend the privileges of naturalization to such persons only as are ‘*aliens*, being free *white* persons.’” (Bates is quoting the Naturalization Act of 1790.)

10. As of 1862, had Congress passed a law so that children born in foreign countries to American parents were deemed citizens?

Yes, such a law was passed in 1855.

11. The 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments are known as the Reconstruction Amendments and were ratified between 1865 and 1870, following the Civil War. The 13th abolished slavery, and the 14th and 15th addressed black citizenship and black voting rights, respectively.

The first sentence of the 14th Amendment states that, “All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.” This sentence added nothing to what Bates believed was already embedded in the U.S. Constitution. Why, then, do you think the authors of the 14th Amendment thought it was needed? Is there anything in Bates’s legal opinion that sheds light on the phrase, “and subject to the jurisdiction thereof”?

The authors of the 14th Amendment believed the first sentence was needed because many people disagreed with Bates and continued to proclaim, in the words of the Dred Scott decision, that blacks were “beings of an inferior order” and “altogether unfit to associate with the white race.” These white people held firm to the conviction that “the negro race” should not be “regarded as a portion of the people or citizens of the Government.” Moreover, though Chief Justice Taney had died in 1864, the Dred Scott decision still stood as the opinion of the United States Supreme Court. All in all, the authors of the 14th Amendment wanted the Constitution to be crystal clear that black people, now freed, were in fact citizens, so they included a sentence to that effect.

Now as for the phrase, “and subject to the jurisdiction thereof,” Bates’s legal opinion does shed some light on this. Toward the very end of the excerpt, Bates writes that, “*prima facie*, every person in this country is born a citizen,” and anyone “who denies it in individual cases assumes the burden of stating the exception to the general rule, and proving the fact which works the disfranchisement...” Bates then acknowledges the “small” number of cases “of the *natural born* composed of the children of foreign ministers and the like,” granting that such children would not qualify as natural born citizens of the United States. An instance of “the like” today would be a sailor of a foreign navy aboard her ship at an American port who gives birth, in which case the child would not qualify as a natural born citizen because, as with children of diplomats, the child would not be “subject to the jurisdiction” of the United States.

Questions related to Anthony's Address

1. How does Susan B. Anthony use the 15th Amendment's phrase, "previous condition of servitude," to argue that women should not be denied the right to vote?

The phrase "previous condition of servitude" refers to those who were held in bondage as slaves but are now not to be denied the vote. Anthony likens the condition of women to that of the former African American slaves and concludes that women, based on the 15th Amendment, are also now not to be denied the vote.

2. How was it that, even with the passage of helpful legislation in many states, it was still unlikely for a married woman to have any money unless her husband gave it to her?

Wives still did not have the "right of joint ownership of the joint earnings of the marriage co-partnership," and since the vast majority of married women didn't work outside the home, nor inherit money from their fathers, most of them still never had a dollar unless their husbands gave it to them.

3. Describe how bad the child custody situation had been twenty years earlier in all the states, which was still how it was in many states.

The "father had sole custody and control of the children." He could be a brutal drunk and still do whatever he wanted with his children, including apprenticing "sons to rum-sellers" and "daughters to brothel keepers." "He could even will away an unborn child."

4. Why was the wife with the false teeth not allowed to testify in court? In the case of the wife who was severely injured by the defective sidewalk, on what basis did the husband sue and obtain damages? What was this identical to?

The wife with the false teeth was not allowed to testify because it was a matter of "joint interest between herself and her husband." As to the wife injured by the defective sidewalk, the husband sued and obtained damages "for the loss of the services of his wife," just as it would have been with a slave or would be with an "ox, cow or horse."

5. Anthony points out that "the old common law of marriage" continued to be followed in the United States. Sir William Blackstone, the famous commentator on English law, summed it up like this: "husband and wife are one, and that one is the husband." What did that mean?

The wife, by herself, had no legal standing. The husband legally subsumed the wife, so that she had no independent existence in a legal sense.

6. Did unmarried women have anything to complain about? Explain.

Yes. "Women are taxed without representation, governed without their consent, tried, convicted and punished without a jury of their peers."

Questions related to The Massacre Canyon Battle

1. Based on the *Tribune* statements attributed to Nick Janis, the trail agent for the Oglala Sioux, give three reasons for the Sioux attack on the Pawnee on October 5, 1873.

First, the scouting report sighting the Pawnee camp caused the Sioux to desire to exploit a perceived advantage. Second, in response to a question, Nick Janis told the Sioux chief, Little Wound, that he had no orders to keep the Sioux from attacking the Pawnees. And third, the young warriors were determined to fight because during the previous year Janis had prevented them from fighting another enemy, the Utes, and the Utes had been able to steal their horses and kill one of their warriors. "They believed the same thing would happen again if they did not strike the Pawnees first."

2. Based on the *Tribune* article, give four specific examples of the cruelty the Sioux inflicted on the Pawnees.

First, Sioux warriors raped "wounded and dying women." Second, they "took the children by the heels and beat their brains out on the ground." Third, some of the dead "lay on the ground, their bowels protruding from ghastly wounds made by knives." And fourth, others "presented to us their skinless heads," having been scalped.

3. Who was Platt? What is the significant discrepancy involving Platt between the *Tribune* article and Williamson's 1922 account? Which of these two sources do you find more believable and why?

Platt was a young man who had gone along for the adventure on the Pawnee buffalo hunt in the summer of 1873. The *Tribune* article reports Williamson saying that Platt and he had ridden toward the Sioux and tried to prevent the Sioux attack on the Pawnees. In Williamson's own later account, he says that Platt, seeing that a Sioux attack was coming, had already chosen to leave the area and that it was actually Ralph Weeks, a half-breed interpreter, who had accompanied him to parley with the Sioux. Even though the *Tribune* article was written in 1873, within a few weeks of the attack, it makes more sense to believe Williamson's 1922 account, because he was actually there and would have no reason to say Weeks accompanied him rather than Platt.

4. Based on Williamson's 1922 account, what were the two reasons why a trail agent would accompany a tribe going off the reservation on a buffalo hunt?

To prevent clashes between rival tribes, and to keep Indians from molesting homesteaders.

5. After killing their first buffalo of the hunt, what did the Indians dare Williamson to do, and did he do it?

The Indians dared him to cut out a piece of the buffalo's liver, sop it in the blood, and eat it raw, which he did.

6. What did the young Indian do that resulted in running the gauntlet?

He “disobeyed a rule of the hunt by dashing into the herd.”

7. While a cowboy in Lowell did molest an Indian by trying to steal his horse, the Pawnees also molested some white people along the way. Give two examples of this, and could something more serious have occurred? Explain.

The woman in the sod house was terrorized but came to no physical harm; however, Williamson did wonder “what would have occurred had I not been there...” Another Williamson rescue was the “white hunter corralled at the head of the canyon.” Williamson concluded that he didn’t “think the Indians would have hurt him as long as he didn’t show fight. They might have robbed him and probably would have taken his horses had they not been made to quit.”

8. Why wasn’t Sky Chief more careful when warned about a possible Sioux attack?

Sky Chief was convinced the men who were warning them “wanted to scare the Pawnees away from the hunting grounds so that white men could kill buffaloes for hides.”

9. Why did the Pawnees have no chance in the Massacre Canyon Battle?

The number of Sioux warriors was “several times more than the fighting men of the Pawnees.”

10. Based on Williamson’s account, why wasn’t the massacre even worse?

A company of U.S. cavalry emerged upon the scene. “When the Sioux saw the soldiers approaching, they beat a hasty retreat.”

11. According to Williamson, how many of their men, women, and children did the Pawnees lose?

156

12. Why do you think the Sioux were only fined \$10,000, with no other consequence for their unprovoked attack upon the Pawnees?

Indian affairs were messy, and these two tribes had been fighting each other for decades.

13. Half a century later, Williamson concluded that the Republican Valley (where the battle took place) was better off without the Indian. Do you agree or disagree and why?

Answers may vary.

Questions related to God and Evolution

1. According to Burr, what is the difference between the Doctrine of Evolution in its “ripest form” and in its less ripe form?

In its “ripest form,” evolution is believed to have occurred “solely by means of such forces and laws as belong to matter,” leaving no room for God; whereas in its less ripe form the matter that evolved could have “come directly from the hand of a Creator.”

2. Describe three ways in which the Doctrine of Evolution is hostile to Christianity.

First, it explains the world without reference to God—hence its appeal with atheists. Second, it contradicts the idea of divine intervention in the world, which is central to Christianity. And third, it is a direct slap to the biblical account of man and creation.

3. To what extent had the Doctrine of Evolution penetrated Christian circles? How is the doctrine “the champion of unbelief”?

It was present in Christian colleges, among Christian professors, and in Christian seminaries. There were devout and eminent Christians who entertained the idea.

It is “the champion of unbelief” in that it is a credible hypothesis that explains how the world works and came about without necessitating God as part of the explanation.

4. Give two instances of how natural selection played a part in Darwin’s thoughts about the existence of God.

First, according to Darwin, natural selection negates the argument from design for the existence of God, because when taking a close look at nature one sees that there “seems to be no more design in the variability of organic beings...than in the course which the wind blows.” And second, the existence of suffering seemed to Darwin to be a “strong” argument against God’s existence, but something that was also “quite compatible” with natural selection.

5. Identify and discuss Darwin’s strongest argument for the existence of God.

Darwin argues best for God’s existence when he ventures back to the argument from design, which he had more or less dismissed earlier. This time, instead of focusing on the details of dissected organisms, he marvels over the size and complexity of the universe and the amazing capacity of the mind of man.

The argument goes like this: There is “the extreme difficulty or rather impossibility of conceiving this immense and wonderful universe, including man with his capacity for looking far backwards and far into futurity, as the result of blind chance or necessity. When thus reflecting I feel compelled to look to a First Cause having an intelligent mind in some degree analogous to that of man; and I deserve to be called a Theist.”

6. Why, in the end, was Darwin an agnostic rather than a theist?

When Darwin wrote *On the Origin of Species* he essentially was a theist, but since that time his belief in theism has weakened. Here, again, evolutionary concepts come into play. He now doubts whether the mind of man, which has evolved from that of the lowest animal, should be “trusted” when it draws the “grand” conclusion that God does in fact exist. It is quite possible that this conclusion is merely the result of an inherited trait or people’s upbringing. In the end, Darwin gives up on trying to know whether God exists and declares himself an agnostic. “The mystery of the beginning of all things is insoluble by us; and I for one must be content to remain an Agnostic.”

7. According to Graham, how was the “first rudimentary eye,” in combination with actual vision, a tremendous example of “purpose” in the universe? How do you think an evolutionist—one who is also a pure materialist—would respond to this?

The primitive eye is still a highly complex organ, which, to be useful, must be connected with the brain and manage to produce “the fact of vision.” It is virtually impossible that such an incredible phenomenon as the ability to see could be “the result of lucky chance, a fortunate meeting of the atoms.” Therefore, a “purpose or Final Cause in the universe” must have been orchestrating this amazing phenomenon of actual vision.

An evolutionist would respond that what has occurred in the development of vision is not the “lucky chance” that Graham contends on behalf of the materialist perspective. Rather, the natural world—even without a “Final Cause”—is inherently purposeful in that the abilities that have evolved, such as vision, are ones that are useful for survival and therefore not merely random. In other words, a faculty does not develop simply by chance even in a purely material universe—it occurs by the process of natural selection.

8. In Graham’s view, why is there little point in distinguishing between creation and evolution?

God creates and gives purpose to nature through the evolutionary process, so creation and evolution go together and work hand-in-hand.

9. Does Graham believe in the supernatural? Explain.

The answer is a qualified “yes.” Graham believes that the “power behind Nature” may be considered “supernatural as well natural,” because it is a power that exists apart from nature. Graham does not, however, believe in a supernatural power that engages in “miraculous interventions.” Graham rejects the notion of the “old anthropomorphic” God of the Bible who breaks into the natural processes from the outside in order to intervene and perform miracles. Instead, the supernatural power behind nature guides and governs the world through nature, without any sharp interruptions.

Questions related to A German Anti-Semitic Statement

1. According to Treitschke, why are German Jews such a societal problem when English and French Jews are not? What does Treitschke demand of German Jews?

The English and French Jews go back to the Spanish branch of Jewry, which has “adapted rather easily to Western ways,” but the “Germans have to deal with that Polish branch of Jewry, which has been deeply scarred by centuries of Christian tyranny.” Treitschke demands that German Jews “become thoroughly German.”

2. Compare the frequency of Treitschke’s criticisms of German Jews with the frequency of his positive comments about them and the frequency with which he acknowledges the bad treatment they have received. Give examples for each of the three categories. What effect do you think all this has on the reader?

Treitschke’s criticisms of German Jews far outweigh the other two considerations. Compared with the criticisms, the positive comments and recognitions of bad treatment take the form of interjections and are relatively few in number. He admits many Jews are good Germans and many Jewish businesses are run honestly. He mentions how a “flood of anti-Jewish libels is inundating the book market”; the Polish branch of Jewry “has been deeply scarred by centuries of Christian tyranny”; and “this noisy agitation of the moment” against Jews may indeed be characterized as “brutal and hateful.” His complaints against Jews, however, are far more numerous and are discussed at much greater length. The complaints include: ill will, arrogance, contempt, falsehood, deceit, greed, fraud, materialism, usury, third-rate literature, a shameless tone in journalism, anti-Christian defamations and witticisms, intolerance, and disrespect. The effect of all this on the reader depends on the reader. A person who is inclined or at least open to anti-Semitism would probably find the article rather reasonable if not actually compelling, because it attempts to be fair by showing a measure of sympathy toward Jews and having some positive things to say about them. The reader who stands opposed to anti-Semitism, however, would pick up on the unbalanced treatment and the preponderance of unfair stereotypes and would conclude that the author is a bigot.

3. Is Treitschke’s anti-Semitism based on what he believes to be cultural differences, racial differences, or both? Support your position.

Treitschke’s anti-Semitism is largely cultural. He asserts that English and French Jews have adapted to Western ways; he demands of German Jews that they “become Germans”; and he does not want to roll back Germany’s emancipation of Jews. All of these claims indicate that Treitschke views the “Jewish question” as one of culture and not race—if the issue involved racial characteristics, nothing about Jews could or would change, because Jewish traits would be inherited and therefore unalterable. It does seem, however, that racial overtones are still present. References to “the undeniable weaknesses of the Jewish character,” the “Germanic racial feeling against an alien element,” and “*the Jews are our misfortune*” seem to point to something deeper than mere acculturation and quite possibly suggest a racial component.

Questions related to A German-Jewish Response

1. Lehmann deems the more inflammatory varieties of anti-Semitism to be less dangerous than Treitschke's more moderate position. Why is that?

The more extreme varieties "reveal themselves in their tone as pure products of hatred, envy, and the basest passions, or even as pure speculation" and "founder on their own exaggerations." Treitschke's position, by implication, is more subtle and enduring.

2. To what does Lehmann attribute Treitschke's positive view of English and French Jews?

English and French Jews had been emancipated decades earlier than German Jews and are therefore better assimilated into their respective societies.

3. According to Lehmann, how do anti-Semites like Treitschke deal with the fact that in their own circles there are Jews with whom they happily associate?

"They exempt the Jews they know or befriend but condemn the great bunch unknown to them..."—a highly questionable procedure.

4. What reason is given for why Jews are being targeted in Germany at this time?

People "are venting dissatisfaction" over the current state of society and lack the means "to probe for deeper sources." They are "striking out in a superficial way against those who have always been the target of anger when general problems arise," namely Jews.

5. What is Lehmann's assessment of the overall conduct of German Jews?

Most of his co-religionists have shown themselves to be moral, honest, and hard-working people as well as loyal German citizens—"true sons of our German homeland, of our German fatherland." Moreover, "these obligations are fulfilled in Jewish circles to the same extent that they are among our Christian fellow citizens."

6. Using Lehmann's assertions, give three examples of the historian, Treitschke, being "unhistorical." The three examples should not all come from the same paragraph.

First, the presumed Polish heritage of German Jews; second, that the German nation is a "Christian" nation; and third, that Jews represent a dual nationality.

7. Are there indications that German anti-Semitism contains a racial component? Explain.

Yes. Lehmann refers to "chauvinists who...fantasize about ancient German purity of blood and thus express what they accuse us of: racial arrogance." Therefore, at least some anti-Semites apply racial constructs to both Germans and Jews. He also mentions how "even the baptized Jew is subject to aversion," which suggests that nothing can be done to erase one's Jewish essence—making it fundamentally a matter of race.

Questions related to Andrew Carnegie's "Gospel of Wealth"

1. According to Carnegie, why do we owe "our wonderful material development" to the "law of competition"? Carnegie also acknowledges there are negative consequences to the "law of competition." What are they?

The law of competition "insures the survival of the fittest in every department," which produces the greatest advances in society. The negative consequences are "great inequality" and the concentration of business and wealth in "the hands of a few."

2. Why is "intense Individualism" better than radical alternatives like socialism, anarchism, or communism?

"Progress" and "good" have come to humanity "from the accumulation of wealth by those who have the ability and energy that produce it" and not from the radical alternatives.

3. Does Carnegie agree with the idea of estate taxes? Explain.

Yes, absolutely. If a "selfish millionaire" has not given away the bulk of his estate while alive, it should be taxed "heavily" upon his death.

4. What are the three duties of the wealthy individual?

To live modestly, to provide moderately for his dependents, and "to consider all surplus revenues which come to him simply as trust funds, which he is called upon to administer."

5. Describe the "best uses to which surplus wealth can be put," first in general terms and then with four examples.

They should be "spent for public purposes" in order "to help those who will help themselves." The examples are parks, means of recreation, works of art, and public institutions of various kinds.

6. Give five examples of the kinds of charity to which Carnegie is opposed.

Here are six: Giving small sums to many people; giving indiscriminately—not actually knowing the situation of the recipient; giving so much to as to solve all of a person's present financial problems; almsgiving (assisting the needy) in general; supplying permanent instead of temporary assistance; and giving to unworthy individuals.

7. What is the strongest criticism you can think of regarding the "Gospel of Wealth"?

Answers may vary. Many of the poor were too tired and overworked to go to a park, a museum, or a library. (Grueling 12-hour shifts in Carnegie's steel mill at the time.)

Questions related to David Brewer on the United States as a Christian Nation

1. Speaking for a unanimous Supreme Court, Brewer asserts that “this is a religious people.” What time frame does this “historically true” statement cover?

“From the discovery of this continent [1492] to the present hour [1892].”

2. By the end of this Supreme Court opinion, Brewer will make a much bolder assertion by declaring that “this is a Christian nation” (see the underlined words later on). Why do you think he starts out with the more modest assertion that “this is a religious people”? Refer to his first set of examples, which range from Columbus’s commission to the Declaration of Independence, in your response.

Perhaps Brewer starts out with the more modest claim because he is referencing a wide variety of religious thought that fails to harmonize as a single Christian faith. His first examples include the Catholic Columbus, Virginia Anglicans, Mayflower Pilgrims, Connecticut Congregationalists, Pennsylvania Quakers, and the Declaration of Independence whose author was Thomas Jefferson, a deist. Looking back over history, Catholics and Protestants had warred against one another, conventional Christians had ridiculed and persecuted Quakers, and Thomas Jefferson hadn’t even been a Christian.

3. Moving on to state constitutions, Brewer observes: “Every constitution of every one of the forty-four States contains language which either directly or by clear implication recognizes a profound reverence for religion and an assumption that its influence in all human affairs is essential to the well being of the community.” Brewer is undoubtedly correct in these claims but once again refers to “religion” rather than to “Christianity.” Which two of the state constitutions are specifically Christian, and which four are not?

The state constitutions of Massachusetts and Delaware are specifically Christian, and those of Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, and Mississippi are not.

4. Do Brewer’s quotations from the U.S. Constitution do much to bolster the argument that the United States is a religious or Christian nation? Explain.

No. The First Amendment supports religious freedom but not religion or Christianity, and Article 1, Section 7’s reference to “(Sundays excepted)” at the most amounts to extremely weak and indirect backing for Christianity and may actually be viewed as nothing more than simple recognition of a non-business day.

5. In the next paragraph Brewer quotes opinions from state courts in Pennsylvania and New York to continue the theme that “this is a religious nation.” Do these quotations bring us any closer to the larger claim that “this is a Christian nation”? Continue your response at the top of the next page.

Not really. The Pennsylvania court connects the state’s common law with “general Christianity,” and the New York court connects the “people of this state, in common

with the people of this country” with “the general doctrines of Christianity”—also claiming that “we are a Christian people, and the morality of the country is deeply ingrafted upon Christianity.” The issue, though, is whether general Christianity and Christian morality can be equated with the Christian faith, which consists of a host of very specific beliefs and practices that Christians themselves can’t necessarily agree on.

6. By the end of his Supreme Court opinion, did Brewer convince you that “this is a Christian nation” (as of 1892)? Elaborate on your position.

I agree that the United States had strong Christian influences. Perhaps the best evidence for this would be “the laws respecting the observance of the Sabbath,” which would have been a profound intrusion upon the lives of those unsympathetic to the practice. And Brewer does well to bring up the incredible abundance of churches, Christian ministries, charitable organizations, and mission agencies.

I believe it’s possible for a nation to have strong Christian influences and contain many Christians, but I don’t believe there ever has been or ever will be a country that merits the title of “Christian nation.” None is worthy, and that includes the United States. Our country’s history has entailed too much violence, hate, oppression, and just plain bad behavior to earn the accolade.

The United States Constitution gives no direct affirmation to any notion of a “Christian nation.” Besides “(Sundays excepted),” the Constitution’s only other indirect reference to Christianity is how it’s dated with the use of the common phrase: “in the Year of our Lord.” No one should try to transform this conventional form of expression into some sort of constitutional declaration. Whether the United States was ever a Christian nation in a factual or historical sense is debatable, but in a constitutional or legal sense it clearly never was. For that to be true, the United States Constitution would have to say so—and on that point David Brewer would have agreed.

In a series of lectures given at Haverford College in 1905 (lectures which were also then published as a book), Brewer said:

But in what sense can it be called a Christian nation? Not in the sense that Christianity is the established religion or that the people are in any manner compelled to support it. On the contrary, the Constitution specifically provides that “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.” Neither is it Christian in the sense that all its citizens are either in fact or name Christians. On the contrary, all religions have free scope within our borders. Numbers of our people profess other religions, and many reject all. Nor is it Christian in the sense that a profession of Christianity is a condition of holding office or otherwise engaging in the public service, or essential to recognition either politically or socially. In fact the government as a legal organization is independent of all religions. (*The United States as a Christian Nation*, by David J. Brewer, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, The John C. Winston Company, 1905, page 12.)

Questions related to *A Red Record*

1. Although a master might whip a slave mercilessly, why was it uncommon for a master to take a slave's life?

The slave was "too valuable" as property.

2. Following the freeing of the slaves, lynching "came into vogue." What was the southern purpose behind lynching?

The purpose was "intimidation"—to keep black people in their place.

3. In the thirty years since emancipation, how many blacks had been lynched, and how many whites had been tried, convicted, and executed for lynching blacks?

Over ten thousand blacks had been lynched, and only three whites had been punished.

4. What were the "three distinct excuses" for lynching blacks that had been given (in succession) over the previous thirty years?

The first excuse was that blacks had been starting "race riots"; the second was to stop "Negro domination" by keeping blacks from voting; and the third was that "Negroes had to be killed to avenge their assaults upon women."

5. Did southern blacks exercise the right to vote after emancipation? Explain what occurred.

Yes, the black vote became an "important factor" in "state and national politics," but "this did not last long." "The white man's victory (in depriving the black man the vote) soon became complete by fraud, violence, intimidation and murder."

6. The black man "clung to his right of franchise" with incredible heroism. What two important things did voting signify for him?

Manhood and citizenship

7. "Humanity abhors the assailant of womanhood, and this charge upon the Negro at once placed him beyond the pale of human sympathy. With such unanimity, earnestness and apparent candor was this charge made and reiterated that the world has accepted the story that the Negro is a monster which the Southern white man has painted him." Besides the apparent sincerity of southerners in insisting upon this view of black men, why, in your opinion, were white people outside the South so willing to accept it?

They were willing to accept it because white people, even outside the South, were generally racist and therefore were open to such a view of black men. Racism runs deep in American history and has been widespread.

Questions related to Gun Rights and Gun Control through the 19th Century

1. Identify the three limitations placed on having arms in the English Bill of Rights.

The right applies to “Protestants,” the arms must be “suitable to their conditions” (as in their social status), and only “as allowed by law” (Parliament can limit this right).

2. Name the state constitution, which existed prior to the 2nd Amendment of the United States Constitution, that referred to a right to bear arms for self-defense.

The Constitution of Pennsylvania.

3. Would the Massachusetts law from 1783 have made it difficult to use a firearm for self-defense in one’s home in the town of Boston? Explain.

Yes. Because of the risk of fire to the entire town, keeping a loaded firearm in one’s home was illegal. This meant that, if an intruder broke in, the homeowner would have had to load his musket before using it, which likely would have taken too long.

4. What is ambiguous about the 2nd Amendment of the U.S. Constitution?

The first part of the amendment seems to limit the right to the context of state militias, but then the right itself is expressed as “the right of the people to keep and bear Arms,” which sounds like a much broader right than just something involving militias.

5. Between 1850 and 1890, which seven states had constitutions that explicitly declared that carrying concealed weapons was beyond the scope of the right to bear arms?

Kentucky, North Carolina, Missouri, Colorado, Louisiana, Montana, and Mississippi.

6. Between 1870 and 1900, which six states had constitutions that gave their legislatures the power to regulate how arms were carried in public?

Tennessee, Texas, Georgia, Florida, Idaho, and Utah.

7. Did the 1871 Texas law, the 1890 Oklahoma Territory law, and the 1893 Florida law restrict concealed carry, open carry, or both?

All three placed restrictions on both.

8. How does the 2010 decision in *McDonald v. City of Chicago* compare with the three U.S. Supreme Court decisions between 1875 and 1895 (all came post-14th Amendment)?

McDonald differs from the earlier Supreme Court decisions, all of which held that the 2nd Amendment restricts federal power but leaves state power alone. McDonald ruled, via the 14th Amendment, that the 2nd Amendment applies to the states as well.

Questions related to “Anarchy Defended by Anarchists”

1. Based on the article, give the main reason why anarchists believe government is such a bad thing. Quote at least two phrases from the article.

Government “has always been a tyranny.” Government’s “very existence is based on the submission of one class to the dictatorship of another.”

2. According to the article, what laws would we follow if there were no governmental laws, and why would we obey them?

Natural laws, which we would automatically obey, “as they are part of our existence.” (Natural laws exist in both “the physical and social world.”)

3. According to anarchists, what institution is used to keep the poor in their place?

The institution of the Christian religion: “Patience and resignation are preached to the poor, promising them a reward in the hereafter.”

4. Most and Goldman claim that in an anarchist society, “everyone will contribute to his and the common welfare as much labor as he or she is capable of, and consume according to their needs.” In their opinion, what will prevent individuals from taking and not contributing in such a society?

“Mother Nature has so arranged things that only those survive who have the aid of their neighbors,” and “man...will extend his aid to those who will aid him.” In other words, for an individual to get what he wants or needs in this world, he will have to do his part to satisfy others.

5. Most and Goldman contend that, “Anarchy...cannot be brought about without violence.” With what do they compare anarchist violence in order to make it seem acceptable?

They compare it with past struggles for freedom, with the Greeks opposing the Persians at Thermopylae and Marathon, and the Americans resisting the British at Bunker Hill.

6. How does anarchist communism vary from Karl Marx’s communism? (You may have to read up a bit on Marxism in order to answer this.)

According to their respective theories, anarchist communism and Karl Marx’s communism would both come about through revolution, but for the anarchists the outcome would be the absence of government, whereas for Marx a new government would be formed, the “dictatorship of the proletariat.”

7. In your opinion, is government necessary? Support your opinion with one good reason.

Answers may vary.

True/False Questions related to Ophelia Amigh on the White Slave Trade

Based on the chapter by Ophelia Amigh, indicate whether each statement is true or false.

1. Countless parents were unaware of the danger their daughters faced at the hands of white slave traders.

True.

2. For the most part, only girls who took repeated risks ended up as white slaves.

False.

3. The less attractive girls were in greater danger than the more attractive ones.

False.

4. Adequate laws were already in place, but the problem was one of proper enforcement.

False.

5. The traffic in girls was active and systematic and done with skill and precision.

True.

6. "Nellie" is an example of a girl who believed that being a prostitute would be a better option than working as a housemaid.

False.

7. Even well-off girls and girls in the care of a State Home could end up in houses of shame.

True.

8. Amigh gives no details regarding the treatment the girls received in these houses of prostitution.

True.

9. Gretna Greens were safe places supervised by responsible adults where young men and women could meet and socialize with others their own age.

False.

10. Some girls were enticed into a sudden elopement and then sold by their husband into white slavery. True.

Questions related to the Right to Make War

1. According to Bernhardi, how strong was public sentiment against war at this time?

Public sentiment against war was very strong at this time (around 1911).

2. What are the problems that accompany wars? What kind of wars should be eliminated, and should the suffering that coincides with wars be mitigated?

The problems are: disruption of economic life and development, “widespread misery,” and an emphasis on “the primitive brutality of man.” Wars for “trivial reasons” should be eliminated, and, yes, the suffering that coincides with wars should be mitigated.

3. Bernhardi acknowledges that peaceful rivalries may exist between nations. Why then, in his opinion, is war essential for the progress of civilization? Quote the text.

“The natural law, to which all laws of nature can be reduced, is the law of struggle.” And the “struggle which guides the external development of societies, nations, and races, is war.” “Without war, inferior or decaying races would easily choke the healthy budding elements, and a universal decadence would follow.”

4. According to Bernhardi, what do flourishing nations require because of their growing populations? By what right is this to be acquired?

They “require new territory for the accommodation of their surplus population.” This territory is to be acquired by right of conquest.

5. Which later German leader would have agreed with Bernhardi’s harsher ideas?

Adolf Hitler.

6. What is your reaction to Bernhardi’s ideas, and what is your view as to when war is necessary?

Answers may vary.

I find Bernhardi’s ideas intolerable. Clean, rules-based economic competition among nations is a very good thing, but war, while it might be necessary at times, should never be viewed as desirable. Bernhardi acknowledges the misery that war brings but at the same time believes that war is a creative, purifying act and a life-giving principle. What I see resulting from war is terrible human suffering and massive material destruction. War represents a failure of civilization, not a furthering of it.

But there are times when war is necessary. I reject Bernhardi’s “right of conquest” and hold that war may be needed to stop a country from doing just what he proposes. I also believe that a nation, when invaded or attacked, has the right to defend itself.

Questions related to “Children in Bondage”

1. While immigrants from a variety of countries worked at the cannery in Albion, which nationality seemed to be the most prevalent?

Italian.

2. How did the “American women” view these “furriners”?

There was definitely “race antagonism” toward them, especially when it came to how they treated their own children, but at the same time they felt sympathy for them, because snipping beans was their only source of income.

3. Was there any evidence that the government regulated child labor? Explain.

Yes, “inspectors” had visited “a few days before” and made it clear that “Baby Benny” could not accompany his mother to the “shed” and had to be tended by a “teacher” elsewhere. But ten-year-olds, like Baby Benny’s sister, Milly, could work all day.

4. What was the rate of pay for snipping beans?

“A penny a pound for each pound snipped,” which amounted to about twenty cents for two-and-a-half hours of work.

5. Why did some local “American women” choose to snip beans at the cannery?

They would “work a few hours to earn a few pennies for ribbons, for laces, for luxuries.”

6. The author says how the “spark of discontent is smoldering against a wage so low that stolen goods must be obtained to make a living wage.” Describe these “stolen goods.”

The “stolen goods” were uncut beans acquired through stealth so that an immigrant family would have additional beans to snip and get paid for.

7. How many hours a week did these immigrant women toil at the cannery?

“more than a hundred hours a week”

8. Write at least five sentences reviewing ten-year-old Milly’s schedule for the day.

Housed on factory land, the boss woke them up at 3:30 a.m. Her mother hustled “her out to the shed in the shivering gray of dawn.” Sometime after 7 she ate breakfast, “a hunk of bread to be munched down between intervals of snipping.” At 9, she left the shed for one hour to tend to Baby Benny and place him with his “teacher.” For the remainder of the day she works, endlessly snipping beans. They stay until 10 at night, but sometime after dark Milly fell asleep in the shed, “completely worn out.”

Questions related to “Life Unworthy of Life”

1. Describe the “uneasy feeling” to which Binding refers. What is your reaction to Binding’s “uneasy feeling”? Explain.

The “uneasy feeling” has to do with how “valuable lives,” like those of soldiers and workers, are handled “wastefully,” while precious resources are squandered in the effort “to preserve lives not worth living,” like those of mental patients. My reaction is one of great discomfort with the whole exercise of placing a value on a human life and judging whether another person should live or die.

2. Binding favors the granting of a legal power to end certain “worthless” and “asocial” lives, but what are the three caveats he places on such an initiative? Do you think Hitler and the Nazis adhered to these limitations?

First, it must be “experienced as a release” by the person involved; second, the desire of an individual to go on living should never be violated by the state; and third, the killing of a mentally ill patient who feels “happy in their lives” cannot be considered. For a fact, Hitler and the Nazis paid absolutely no attention to these limitations.

3. Name the three groups of people whom Binding proposes for euthanasia, and, for each group, identify who would decide whether a particular person is euthanized. What other entity would need to approve the decision? Explain why in some cases oversight could be exercised after an individual had been euthanized rather than before.

The first group involves the severely ill or injured who are aware of their situation and wish to be euthanized; therefore, they decide on their death for themselves. The second group consists of “incurable idiots” who, because of their condition, cannot decide for themselves; with this group, the family would decide; but if the mother wants to keep the child alive, then she must assume responsibility for the child’s care—the implication is that society should not be burdened with such an expense. The third group is made up of those in a longstanding comatose state. Binding is not specific as to who would decide these cases, referring to the decision-maker as an “agent,” but given the context the “agent” would probably be either a family member or a physician. Approval of the decision to euthanize someone would come from a government “Permission Board,” which would give its approval in advance when possible; but in time-sensitive cases, with urgent circumstances due to the patient’s pain and suffering, oversight could occur after the fact.

4. In their own euthanasia program, the Nazis would go much further than what Binding is proposing, but Binding’s ideas are still very troubling. Discuss what is troubling about Binding’s comments regarding the “possibility of error” by the board.

Errors are possible, but the benefits to society of euthanasia outweigh the risks to some individuals. Binding measures human life by its social utility rather than by its intrinsic value. He sums up by saying, “one more or one less [person] really scarcely matters...”

Questions related to The Thorny Politics of Women's Suffrage

1. How many other countries gave their women the vote while America delayed? Would you say that NAWSA demonstrated a high level of organization?

26. Yes.

2. The "liquor interests" (the breweries, the distilleries, the saloons) were convinced, with good reason, that women would vote for prohibition and therefore opposed women's suffrage. Give three ways the liquor interests went about this.

They financed and directed the political campaigns against women's suffrage; they allied themselves with other industries in mutual political support of each other's concerns; and they urged the foreign-born voters, who were deeply attached to their alcoholic beverages, to oppose women's suffrage.

3. What were the three arguments of the well-to-do women of the Association Opposed to Suffrage for Women? What were the two worst things that these "women antis" did?

The majority of women did not want the vote; a "woman's place was in the home"; and women were incompetent to vote. These "women antis" gave politicians an excuse to oppose suffrage, and they confused the public by being very visible and out front while the liquor interests worked in the shadows and behind the scenes.

4. Which other political movement inadvertently caused decades of delay in bringing about nationwide women's suffrage? Explain.

Prohibition. Men opposed to prohibition were afraid to support women's suffrage.

5. "The Congress looked to the States for its cue, the States to Congress..." What does this mean?

The Congress and the states each used the inaction of the other as justification for not taking action themselves on behalf of women's suffrage.

6. What will native-born American women "always resent"?

That "Negroes fresh from slavery" and "hordes of European immigrants totally unfamiliar with the traditions and ideals of American government" were given the vote long before they were and had been manipulated to vote against women's suffrage.

7. Do Catt and Shuler believe there has been a lot of corruption in American politics? Do they have anything good to say about any of the men involved in politics?

Corruption, absolutely! Since only men were "inside politics" at the time, some of them were the ones who actually dragged female enfranchisement across the finish line.

Questions related to Theodore Roosevelt

1. What is the new Progressive Party proposing? How is this approach to government different from what the old parties, the Democrats and the Republicans, had been doing?

The new Progressive Party is proposing to put government, both state and federal, “at the service of all our people.” The old parties had been “boss-ridden and privilege-controlled”; with them, both state and federal government worked only on behalf of the few—the well connected and well off.

2. “We must protect the crushable elements at the base of our present industrial structure.” Explain what Roosevelt is talking about.

Roosevelt is referring to “wageworkers in industry.” To keep these industrial workers from being crushed, as in harmed or killed, government needs to step in and regulate these businesses.

3. What are the three basic things Roosevelt wants done to help industrial workers?

First, he wants government to collect data on “the facts of work.” Second, based on these facts, he wants government to “formulate minimum occupational standards.” And third, where it is discovered that “industrial conditions...fall below such standards,” the government should step in and regulate.

4. Add six more items to the list of what Roosevelt wants done for industrial workers. Also develop a list of six industrial practices Roosevelt wants stopped.

Wants done (here are eight): minimum wage commissions; mine and factory inspection standards; workmen’s compensation standards; a living wage—“enough to secure the elements of a normal standard of living”; at least one day of rest in seven; 8-hour shifts; insurance for illness, accident, unemployment, and old age; and women’s suffrage.

Wants stopped (here are seven): excessive hours, night labor for women and children, employing women more than 48 hours per week, hazardous working conditions, “premature employment of children,” employment where women stand constantly, and re-employment of women sooner than eight weeks after childbirth.

5. Describe four ways in which Roosevelt is realistic in his economic thinking.

Some men refuse or are incapable of prospering, and nothing government can do will cause them to succeed; there are useful and legitimate ways for a person to become exceedingly wealthy; for workers and consumers to do well, business must do well—crushing business, even big business, is not the answer; and it is mistaken to trust the “big men on top...to let something leak through to the mass of their countrymen below.”

Questions related to Calvin Coolidge

1. Theodore Roosevelt, who had passed away in 1919, had come to believe firmly that government needed to regulate business. According to Calvin Coolidge in 1925, how involved should government be with business, and should government grant business interests special favors?

There should be “the largest possible independence between government and business.” Business interests should not be allowed “to run the Government in such a way as to set up a system of privilege.”

2. According to Coolidge, what contribution does government make to business?

Good government is essential to good business—“where the government is bad, business is bad.” The basic tasks of government such as administering justice, providing order and security, and guaranteeing property rights are “priceless” contributions to business.

3. How does Coolidge feel about government regulation? What might happen if regulation were relaxed? How has the present generation of businessmen been behaving?

Coolidge feels that, “Regulation has often become restriction, and inspection has too frequently been little less than obstruction.” However, the existence of government regulation is understandable given past practices “in business which warranted severe disapprobation.” If regulation were “relaxed,” there could be “a relapse” to past practices. The present generation of businessmen “has shown every disposition to correct its own abuses with as little intervention of the Government as possible.”

4. Does Coolidge believe that government regulation of business made sense twenty years earlier (during Roosevelt’s presidency) but not so much in 1925? Explain.

Yes, Coolidge believes government needed to step in and regulate twenty years ago but not so much in the present. He feels that Roosevelt’s push was “important,” just like the combined effort by business and government to eliminate waste over the previous five years has been important. (Warren G. Harding was elected president in 1920—as Vice President, Coolidge became president when Harding died in the summer of 1923).

5. What has been going on with government debt, taxes, prices, and wages?

“Government debt is being rapidly liquidated while at the same time taxes are greatly reduced,” and “prices went down while wages went up.”

6. The Great Depression would follow the prosperity of the Coolidge years. Would the Depression result in more or less government involvement with the economy? Why?

More government involvement—to deal with the effects and to prevent another one

Questions related to The Weakness of Radical Tactics

1. Gompers' friend, Laurrell, had a great deal of experience in the labor movement that extended back to Europe. What were his positions on trade unionism and radicalism?

He was for trade unionism and against radicalism.

2. What major economic event precipitated the Tompkins Square demonstration?

A horrible depression (the Panic of 1873)

3. Worker organizations urged the government to take specific actions to help the unemployed. In your opinion, were these demands reasonable? Explain.

Answers may vary. The proposed actions sound reasonable (public works employment, maintenance or money for at least one week for the needy, and eviction prevention), but the implementation of such ideas would present significant challenges in the way of government debt and fairness to landlords.

4. The conduct of the New York City police both during and after the Tompkins Square demonstration was extreme. While police brutality is always inexcusable, list four factors that likely helped set the stage for a strong police response.

Here are five: Countless demonstrations prior to the Tompkins Square demonstration; communist propaganda; newspaper hype regarding communist activities; the cancellation of the permit to hold the demonstration; and prejudice against the poor (the "attacks of the police kept up all day long—wherever the police saw a group of poorly dressed persons").

5. Identify five labor lessons Gompers learned from the Tompkins Square demonstration.

Here are six: Professions of radicalism concentrate "all the forces of organized society" against labor; leadership in the labor movement should come from labor's own ranks; improvements for workingmen need to come about through their own efforts; labor alliances with "intellectuals" should be avoided; the labor movement itself contains many radical members; and the labor movement depends on solidarity—don't publicly condemn others within the movement, including radicals.

6. Did trade unionist goals include having the working class rule society? Explain.

To the contrary, there should be "equal rights and duties for all members of society."

7. Which did trade unionists view as labor's first priority, economic improvement for workers or political action by workers?

Economic improvement for workers (by unions dealing directly with employers)

Questions related to Clarence Darrow on Eugenics

1. Why was doom hanging over the human race, and what did eugenicists claim was the solution to the crisis?

The “weak and unfit” were “breeding much faster than the strong and the fit.”
“*Organized society...must in some way control mating and birth.*”

2. List five methods (four involve legislation) by which the solution could be achieved.

“...control of immigration, more discriminating marriage laws, a quickened eugenic sentiment, sexual segregation of defectives, and, finally, drastic measures of sterilization when necessary.”

3. Identify the two fundamental obstacles with respect to breeding for intelligence.

We do not know what intelligence is, and we do not know how to breed for it.

4. What would be the economic problem with a world full of geniuses?

Many necessary jobs involve manual labor that is ill-suited to geniuses.

5. Describe Darrow’s alarm regarding “the advocates of this new dream.”

His alarm is over their “conceit and sureness,” “their ruthlessness in meddling with life,” “their egoistic and stern righteousness,” “their judgment of their fellows,” and their lack of “tolerance, kindness and sympathy.”

6. The Scopes Monkey Trial (1925) occurred the year before Darrow’s anti-eugenics article was published. Darrow’s objective while defending Scopes was to debunk the Bible as a scientific source on human origins and to support the teaching of evolution in the public schools. Scopes, the defendant due to Tennessee’s recent passage of the Butler Act, had taught his high school class using Hunter’s *Civic Biology* (1914), the best-selling text in the field. The textbook not only taught evolution but also eugenics, an aspect which did not come up during the Scopes trial and of which Darrow seems to have been unaware. The following is from *Civic Biology* on the topic of eugenics:

If such people [those producing disease, immorality, and crime] were lower animals, we would probably kill them off to prevent them from spreading. Humanity will not allow this, but we do have the remedy of separating the sexes in asylums or other places and in various ways preventing intermarriage and the possibilities of perpetuating such a low and degenerate race. Remedies of this sort have been tried successfully in Europe and are now meeting with success in this country (p. 263).

Do Hunter’s comments jibe with Darrow’s description of those who advocate eugenics?
–Yes, Darrow says they are “willing to do anything to others” and to “compel all others.”

Questions related to The Model T and Its Operation

1. List the seven controls a person needed to be familiar with in order to start the engine. Since an electric starter increased the purchase price, a Model T usually did not have one. Therefore, list the controls involved when a car was not equipped with a starter.

Throttle lever, spark lever, hand lever, switch key, starting crank/handle, carburetor priming wire/rod, and carburetor dash adjustment.

2. Two controls acted to stop the vehicle, one being the emergency brake and the other the regular brake. Identify each of them and describe their location.

The “hand lever” is the emergency brake and “extends through the floor of the car at the left of the driver,” and the “transmission brake” is the foot pedal (out of three) that is farthest to the right.

3. Is one of the foot pedals used to accelerate? What controls are involved in getting the vehicle to drive forward, and where is each located? How many forward gears does the vehicle have? What is the purpose of the center pedal?

No, none of the foot pedals is used to accelerate.

The controls involved in driving the vehicle forward are the throttle lever, which is to the right side of steering column; the clutch pedal, which is farthest to the left of the three pedals; and the hand lever, which extends from the floor to the left of the driver.

The car has two forward gears, low and high.

The center pedal is used to go in reverse.

4. Is stopping the car correctly as simple as pushing a foot pedal? Explain.

No, stopping the car correctly involves the throttle, the clutch pedal, the hand lever, and the foot brake/pedal.

5. What can happen to the engine valves if the spark lever isn't set properly? What can happen to a person turning the starting crank if the spark lever isn't set properly?

The engine valves may become “warped, burned, or cracked.”

A “sudden back kick (of the starting crank) may injure the arm of the operator.”

6. Look at the Lubrication Chart. How many individual applications of oil or grease (excluding motor oil) were supposed to occur with 1,000 miles of use?

90. ($A = 12 \times 5 = 60$; $B = 7 \times 2 = 14$; $C = 1 \times 1 = 1$; $D = 7 \times 2 = 14$; and $E = 1 \times 1 = 1$)

Questions related to Millard Tydings on Prohibition

1. What did the 18th Amendment do “for the first time”?

It gave Congress the power “for the first time” to deal with a local matter.

2. Did Tydings believe the regrettable results of national prohibition were foreseeable?

Yes, it was “a matter of plain common sense.”

3. What determines the effectiveness of any law?

The effectiveness of any law depends on the “sentiment” or attitude of the local people toward it. If the locals are supportive, it will be largely obeyed; otherwise, it will not.

4. Can local authorities be counted on to enforce an unpopular law? Explain.

No, the local authorities are “the servants and reflectors of local sentiment.” Elected officials “naturally conform to local rather than remote sentiment” and follow “the wishes of the taxpayers and voters who put them in office and pay their salaries.”

5. Which geographic areas were most resistant to prohibition?

Big city areas, or “metropolitan districts.”

6. How did proponents of prohibition justify forcing it on states and localities that preferred to allow alcohol?

Prohibition advocates claimed that liquor from wet states and localities kept “seeping into” dry states and localities, making them wet as well.

7. Does Tydings seem to agree that alcohol abuse had been a serious issue? Does Tydings seem to agree with what historians say today about how prohibition did actually cut the flow of alcoholic beverages by at least 50 percent? (Historians arrived at this claim by comparing federal liquor tax revenues before and after prohibition.)

Yes, he refers to “the right of each community to work out *the problem* (italics mine) in its own way...” No, Tydings asserts that during prohibition even the dry states became wetter than before.

8. What does Tydings mean when he says that we have “violated the philosophy of the Constitution under which we have lived for 150 years”?

The “philosophy” to which he refers is that of federalism. In other words, letting state and local matters be decided by their respective states and localities and restricting the federal government to its delegated powers.

Questions related to “Why I Am a Socialist”

1. What were Americans told was the cause of the Great Depression?

Overproduction—“we are told that men starve because they have produced too much.”

2. How often have economic crises been occurring?

Every “seven or eight years” on average

3. Thomas proclaims, “I am a Socialist and not a Communist.” What does this mean?

It means he wants “to improve democracy rather than to embrace dictatorship.” A communist, like Lenin, would establish a party dictatorship.

4. Was poverty abolished during the prosperous years of the 1920s? Explain.

No, there was still a very unequal distribution of wealth.

5. Thomas believes that in a capitalist society a person’s income is determined by ownership, which is often inherited, and not by work. Do you agree? Explain.

Answers may vary, but there are wealthy individuals who work very hard, and their success seems to be due in large part to their effort and ability.

6. What are three ways by which socialists expect to advance their movement?

By organizing labor unions across whole industries and by empowering consumers through consumer cooperatives and citizens through a labor party (the Socialist Party)

7. Give three examples of socialist ideas for government programs.

Here are four: Relief for the unemployed, assistance for the elderly, direct federal aid for the needy, and a housing program

8. Socialists seek the redistribution of wealth and the public ownership of industry. Name three kinds of taxes that socialists believe would assist with these goals.

Land (real estate) taxes, income taxes, and inheritance taxes.

9. Thomas wants to replace “profit seeking private owners” with a “public authority” that represents “producers” and “consumers.” Discuss whether such a system would work.

Answers may vary. Economic decision-making via government committee seems like a weak and inefficient way to run an economy. Private ownership and the profit motive have succeeded in creating wealth, but some government involvement is also needed.

Questions related to “Social Justice through Social Action”

1. Match up each of the “two schools of philosophy” with its corresponding theory of prosperity.

The philosophy of “letting things alone” would match up with the theory of “trickle down” prosperity from the rich to everyone else. The philosophy of “social justice through social action” would match up with the theory of making “the average of mankind comfortable and secure,” whose prosperity would then rise up through the ranks of society.

2. Describe in one specific sentence how Roosevelt wants to go about reducing poverty.

Roosevelt wants to reduce poverty by reducing the causes of poverty through new or improved government programs.

3. List five government programs that, in Roosevelt’s opinion, effectively reduce poverty.

Workmen’s compensation, old age pensions, mental health treatment, prison reform, and unemployment insurance.

4. Does Roosevelt believe that, in normal economic times, social justice requires enormous philanthropic efforts on the part of the rich? Explain.

No, he believes that “if we set up a system of justice we shall have small need for the exercise of mere philanthropy.” The “long-range objective is not a dole, but a job.”

5. Given the “widespread suffering” of the Great Depression, list all those whom Roosevelt believes have a responsibility to care for “the victims.”

The “locality—its individuals, organizations and Government” as well as the state and national governments

6. What did both Protestant and Catholic churches view as a central problem in society?

Wealth inequality.

7. Did Rabbi Israel view the economic order as an invention of God or of man?

An invention of man

8. Does Roosevelt believe the rich should be involved in social action? Explain.

Yes, if they are “straight thinking and unselfish,” he welcomed wealthy leaders to join “Americans everywhere” in choosing “the path of social justice.” In “the last analysis we must have the help of the men and women all the way from the top to the bottom.”

Questions related to The Bureaucratic Challenge to Liberty

1. Does Hoover believe it is ever proper for the federal government to be involved in economic planning? Explain.

Yes, the federal government has made economic plans “since the first days of George Washington’s administration” that are “within the proper functions of government.”

2. What does Hoover mean by “Regimentations or National Planning”?

He is referring to a more extreme and pervasive kind of government planning whereby bureaucrats force their own methods of economic and social life upon others.

3. Quote the one sentence whereby Hoover defines what he means by “our American System.”

“Our American civilization is based upon the maximum of free will in an ordered Liberty.”

4. Give four of Hoover’s reasons as to why “National Planning or National Regimentation” is bound to fail.

Bureaucrats would have to be omniscient geniuses for it to work; it “destroys confidence in the future,” which “delays initiative and new enterprise”; it “develops surprising conflicts between the regiments created”; and our system “cannot be made to work part free and part regimented.”

5. In a single word, given “this program of National Planning or National Regimentation,” who will exercise dictatorial rule over us in the end?

Bureaucracy, or bureaucrats

6. According to Hoover, how are bureaucrats chosen for their jobs? By contrast, how is truly capable leadership in economic life determined?

Bureaucrats are “selected for politics”—chosen for political reasons. Truly capable leadership in economic life “must be ground out in the hard mills of competition. Genius cannot be created by bureaucracy; it must push upward among free men.”

7. Answer Hoover’s question: “Does anyone believe that the automobile would have been invented, constantly perfected, and the enormous industry built by a bureaucracy?” Take a position and defend it.

Answers may vary.

Questions related to the Capitalist Double Standard

1. What is the capitalist rationale for why the federal government shouldn't be allowed to do more for the country, even when government action is clearly needed?

"Posterity," or "our grandchildren," would be harmed, because "such expenditures" are not *accounted* as "a source of future wealth" and are therefore wasteful.

2. Describe how some business advertising could be considered a "social liability."

It could be considered a tax on "the income of persons of moderate means by inducing them to pay tribute for useless things."

3. Do you agree with Arnold's analysis of how capitalist folklore permits government to build roads but not buildings? Defend your position.

Answers may vary. I believe Arnold's analysis identifies the key factor regarding what the federal government may accomplish on the economic front, namely the current folklore. Arnold could have made his point even stronger, however, if, instead of saying the federal government "has always built roads," he revealed how the folklore of early 19th century America served to obstruct federal government involvement with "internal improvements" such as roads. It was later in the 19th century and then on into the 20th, when federal government road building had become an accepted part of the folklore, that the government was in a position to subsidize the automobile industry through road building. From the same overall example, then, Arnold could have provided greater nuance and depth on the importance and relevance of folklore. Arnold is again accurate, however, in pointing out that any attempt by the federal government to replace slums with new buildings or erect something like a Rockefeller Center would violate the folklore and therefore be met with fierce resistance.

4. Since the New Deal programs ran contrary to the folklore, why were they passed into law? Were the programs well received by the culture and courts?

The times were desperate due to the Great Depression; government had to act in areas where the private sector had failed. The discomfort with the New Deal, however, was still extreme, and it faced strong opposition from both the culture and the courts.

5. Give three examples of the double standard involving business and government.

Here are four: Business is "judged by its successes" with its failures being excused, and government is only "judged by its failures." Business has "assets" and "invests," while government has "no assets" and "spends." Government organizations, agencies, and programs need to be efficient and effective from the beginning, whereas businesses are given time to mature. Mistakes by private organizations are not deemed "wasteful," because they do not involve taxpayer money, whereas mistakes by government are unacceptable and are believed to have a negative impact on "posterity."

True/False Questions related to Education for National Conformity

Based on the excerpt by Saburō Ienaga, indicate whether each statement is true or false.

1. Japanese rulers had a long history of “keeping the people ignorant.”
True
2. Initially, the Meiji government wanted educational content to include Western ideas.
True
3. When the People’s Rights movement attracted a large following, the Meiji government decided to work toward true democracy in Japan.
False
4. The Meiji government made school attendance mandatory in order to ensure that the Japanese people received a liberal education.
False
5. Government control of educational content was weak at the high school and college levels, but only a minority of students even went as far as middle school.
True
6. In the early 20th century, exposure to the ideas of a variety of intellectuals made the Japanese people much less submissive to their government.
False
7. Instead of a democratic constitution, an absolutist constitution centered on an emperor with sacred authority was placed over the Japanese people.
True
8. The Imperial Rescript on Education called upon students to revere the emperor but also to resist the growing power of the military.
False
9. Schoolchildren were required to venerate a photograph of the emperor.
True
10. Military training became standard for Japan’s male population.
True
11. While encouraging patriotism and support for the military, students were also taught to have a deep respect for other peoples and countries.
False
12. Because of the internal security laws and the conformist education, the Japanese people were in no position to prevent the Pacific War. **True**

Questions related to Victor Klemperer Bears Witness

1. Before Hitler came to power, how strong had Klemperer thought anti-Semitism was in Germany?

He had sensed its presence but had believed it was not strong at all.

2. Was Nazi anti-Semitism based on religion or race?

It was based on race. (Years earlier Klemperer had converted to Protestantism, which had no bearing on his status during the Nazi era; by descent, he was a full Jew.)

3. To Klemperer, how were National Socialism and Communism the same?

"...both are materialistic and tyrannical, both disregard and negate the freedom of the spirit and of the individual."

4. Which vote most clearly reflected popular support for Hitler's Germany? Why?

"The 90 percent vote in the Saar... After all there was no lack of information, counter-propaganda, free ballot." The people voted overwhelmingly to join Hitler's Germany.

5. At the time, what did many Germans view as the only alternative to National Socialism? Did Klemperer agree? Explain.

Many Germans viewed Russian Communism, or Bolshevism, as the only alternative to National Socialism. Klemperer saw this as a false choice, since the broad center of the political spectrum falls between the two, allowing for other possibilities.

6. Why do you think Klemperer was especially damning of the intellectuals and professors who cooperated with the Nazis?

Given their background and education, they should have known better.

7. Does Klemperer think the German people approved of Hitler's assertion that the Jews are to blame for all crimes as well as Bolshevism? Quote the text.

Yes. "...Hitler speaks for more or less all Germans."

8. What event was Klemperer referring to in his entry for November 25, 1938?

Kristallnacht.

9. What did Klemperer think of the Nazi concept of blood and race? Quote the text.

The Nazi concept of pure blood "long ago ceased to correspond to any reality..."

10. In reference to the entry for August 22, 1941, why do you think the Nazis were killing the mentally ill?

The Nazis saw them as defective and useless and as consuming valuable resources.

11. On what date did Klemperer have to start to wear the Jewish star?

September 19, 1941

12. The reading of which book finally made Klemperer aware of how shaky his status had always been as a Jew in Germany?

Elbogen's *History of the Jews in Germany*

13. How powerful was Hitler in Germany? Quote the text.

Hitler did not have to follow the laws, and he could "intervene directly in everything."

14. Who was Muschel, what happened to him, and why might the Nazis do this?

Muschel was the Klemperer's cat. He had to be put to sleep because Jews were no longer allowed to have pets. Perhaps it was meant to drive a wedge between the two spouses in mixed marriages, so the German spouse would divorce the Jewish partner.

15. What would have happened if the Gestapo had discovered Klemperer's diary?

Klemperer would almost certainly have been killed.

16. Since Aryans/Germans were members of the master race, did that mean they were safe from the Gestapo? Quote the text.

No, as the war wore on, the Nazis "would murder whoever didn't suit us, Jews above all, but also plenty of Aryans"—the electric guillotine in Dresden was for Aryans too.

17. Did Klemperer believe that all Germans were anti-Semites? Give an example.

No. In the factory where Klemperer worked, he frequently observed very warm, kind, and friendly behavior on the part of German workers toward Jewish workers. And since all the Jewish workers in this factory were members of mixed marriages (married to Germans), it made no sense to conclude that all Germans were anti-Semites.

18. According to Klemperer, how effective had Nazi propaganda been?

Extremely effective—from the universal guilt of world Jewry to Hitler's infallibility, the preaching went deep and proved to be enduring. (On the flip side, the German people seem to have been quite open and receptive to such propaganda.)

Questions related to Arriving at Auschwitz

1. What was the overwhelming physical need that Primo and the other 95 members of his group had when they arrived?

Thirst. They had “had nothing to drink for four days.”

2. Why do you think the Germans made so much fuss about the shoes when in the end they were simply swept outside in a heap?

The intention may have been to teach the inmates to follow orders and to be orderly.

3. Why do you think the Nazis kept the men naked for so long?

The point was probably to humiliate them and to remove any thought of resistance.

4. What do you think happened to the women?

Most had probably already been sent to the gas chambers, along with their children.

5. What is ironic about Flesch?

He is a German Jew who fought for Germany in World War I and has a large scar on his face as a result. He is now suffering at the hands of Germans just like all other Jews.

6. Explain the double meaning of the term “extermination camp.”

It means that at the camp, not only will your life be taken, but also, if you live long enough, you will lose yourself. When you are deprived of your family, your home, your habits, your clothes, your hair, and your name, you can very easily lose yourself.

7. Primo’s prisoner number was 174517. Given that half a million people had already entered the camp by the time he got there, why wasn’t his number a lot higher? (The excerpt doesn’t actually answer this question, so just try to figure it out.)

The numbers were only given to those who were kept alive in order to work. The vast majority of those who arrived at Auschwitz were sent immediately to the gas chambers and therefore never received a number.

8. Auschwitz was the only Nazi camp complex that tattooed each inmate with a number. According to Primo, how was the number used on a daily basis? Why else might Auschwitz have resorted to tattooing numbers on prisoners?

One’s number was, in a sense, one’s meal ticket. The number had to be shown daily to receive the food ration. Given the high mortality rate among the inmates in Auschwitz’s work camps, it might have also been used as a swift and sure way to identify a corpse.

Questions related to Leopold Weiss and Jacob de Haan

1. Which Jews set the tone for Jewish life and politics in Palestine?

The European Jews—from Poland and Russia.

2. In 1922, what was the ratio between Arabs and Jews in Palestine?

Five to one—five Arabs for every one Jew.

3. Whose pattern of society and culture were the Zionists following in Palestine?

Europe's

4. From which foreign power were the Zionists anticipating assistance?

Britain

5. Did the Zionists seem at all interested in what the Arabs thought?

No, not at all.

6. What were the two main concerns of the Zionists' leader, Chaim Weizmann?

The financial difficulties and the insufficient response from abroad.

7. What was the moral basis for Weizmann's desire that the Jews would become the majority in Palestine?

That the Jews had been wrongfully expelled from the land (by the ancient Romans).

8. Give two ways in which Weiss challenges the morality of this argument.

First, the Jewish expulsion occurred two-thousand years ago—a distant time. And second, most Palestinian Arabs are descendants of the original inhabitants of Palestine; their ancestors antedate the Jews' ancestors, giving them the prior claim to the land.

9. According to Weiss, what is so ironic about what the Zionists are doing?

That "a nation which had suffered so many wrongs" was "ready to inflict a grievous wrong on another nation"—another nation that had never done anything to them.

10. Describe what Jacob de Haan believed the Jews needed to do.

They needed to repent and become worthy once again to be the bearers of God's message; then God would send the Messiah to lead them back to the Promised Land.

Questions related to An American Jewish Statement against Zionism

1. Which of the following did the Hebrew prophets place above the other three—the land, the moral law, the nation, or the race?

The moral law.

2. What can true democracy offer to the individual which a Jewish state—by inference—cannot offer?

“...with rights for which he is answerable only to God.”

3. Was the American Council for Judaism aware that the Holocaust was taking place?

Yes.

4. Name four values which coincide with both democracy and religion.

Equality, freedom, justice, and humanity.

5. List four specific achievements of Jewish settlers in Palestine.

Schools and universities have been built, scientific agriculture extended, commerce intensified, and culture developed.

6. Had Zionism and the Zionist insistence upon raising a Jewish army helped or harmed the ability of Jewish refugees to immigrate to Palestine?

Harmed.

7. What kind of government would the American Council for Judaism ultimately like to see established in Palestine, and how would a Jewish state vary from this?

The Council would ultimately like to see a “democratic, autonomous government in Palestine,” where each individual has the same rights regardless of religion. A “Jewish state” suggests Jewish domination instead of equal rights and equal treatment for all.

8. Do you believe that a Jewish democracy—or a Christian or a Muslim one, for that matter—can really work? Explain.

I do not believe it can work. The terms Jewish, Christian, and Muslim refer to religion and, in the Jewish case, ethnicity is implied as well. Besides the fact that defining who belongs to a particular religious or ethnic group is extremely difficult, democracy is premised upon freedom and equality, neither of which can be achieved where a particular religious or ethnic group is favored and in control. To function fully and effectively, democracy requires a neutral position toward religion and ethnicity.

True/False Questions related to Soviet Prison Camps

Based on the excerpts from Lipper's book, indicate whether each statement is true or false.

1. Speaking out against the Soviet government was worth the lethal consequences, because it made the world pay attention to what was happening there.

False.

2. Only the leaders of the Communist Party and the Soviet military were safe from arrest in Stalin's Russia.

False.

3. The millions of arrests were motivated by the Soviet government's desire for what amounted to slave labor.

True.

4. Elinor Lipper grew up in Holland where her life had been peaceful.

True.

5. Lipper moved to Germany to study medicine and witnessed the misery of the Great Depression as well as the final stages of the Nazi rise to power.

True.

6. Lipper believed that socialists should use force on an unlimited basis, because prolonged violence was necessary to creating a new social order.

False.

7. Lipper traveled to the Soviet Union to promote the socialist cause, but after two months she was arrested.

True.

8. Before her arrest, Lipper had been involved with publishing material that was critical of the Soviet government.

False.

9. After her time in the Soviet Union, Lipper no longer considered herself a socialist.

False.

10. The abused, exhausted, and starving prisoners of Kolyma would work fourteen and sixteen hours a day in the gold mines.

True.

11. Wallace had no idea that Nikishov and his wife were bad people.

True.

12. Most of the 300,000 people living in Kolyma were prisoners, but Wallace saw only a few of these prisoners and did not even know that they were prisoners.

True.

13. The wooden watchtowers were taken down for Wallace's visit and put up again right afterwards.

True.

14. Female prisoners were not expected to do any sort of heavy lifting, which was reserved exclusively for the men.

False.

15. Wallace saw a wide variety of goods in the shop windows of Magadan, but these goods were actually of American origin.

False.

True/False Questions related to John Melby on the Chinese Revolution

Based on Melby's notes and letters, indicate whether each statement is true or false.

1. In late 1945, many people in China expressed tremendous optimism over the prospects of a negotiated settlement between the Nationalists and the Communists.
False
2. The Nationalist Government made substantial progress in bringing about land reform.
False
3. Members of the Democratic League were in favor of genuine democracy but had no military support and risked their lives by criticizing the Nationalist Government.
True
4. The Communists had held on to their revolutionary faith while the Nationalists had lost theirs and become self-serving.
True
5. Melby's notes include political, military, and economic aspects of the situation in China.
True
6. The "CC clique" referred to those in the Kuomintang who favored Western democracy.
False
7. By the fall of 1946, neither the Nationalists nor the Communists seemed sincere about pursuing a negotiated settlement.
True
8. The Generalissimo agreed with Marshall on how it would be impossible for his forces to destroy the Communists militarily.
False
9. When Marshall left China to return to the United States, he was disgusted with both the Nationalists and the Communists.
True
10. Many peasants, who were eighty percent of the population, sided with the Communists because of Communist support for land reform.
True
11. It was unclear as to how subservient the Chinese Communists would be to the Soviets.
True
12. The Chinese people would have happily embraced Western-style democracy and free enterprise if they had been given the opportunity. **False**

Questions related to Robert H. Jackson on Free Speech and Public Order

1. Does Jackson agree with the Court (the majority opinion) that the jury instruction violated freedom of speech? Explain.

No, because the instruction was not given as a detached theoretical statement about freedom of speech but in the context of a real speech that encouraged a clash between two actual mobs.

2. How does Jackson characterize the Court's position when it comes to the tension between free speech and public order? Quote from his dissent in your response.

The Court seems to hold "the view that we must forego order to achieve liberty. So it fixes its eyes on a conception of freedom of speech so rigid as to tolerate no concession to society's need for public order."

3. If the Court had not reversed the conviction based on the jury instruction, do you think it would have concluded that Terminiello's speech was "composed of derisive, fighting words, which carried it outside the scope" of First Amendment protections? Explain.

Yes, based on the riotous crowd behavior both before and during Terminiello's speech as well as the inflammatory content of the speech itself, that conclusion seems likely.

4. Does Terminiello connect Roosevelt's New Deal with international communism?

Yes.

5. What is ironic about someone from Terminiello's audience shouting that "Jews, niggers and Catholics would have to be gotten rid of"?

Terminiello was a Catholic priest (though suspended by his bishop at the time).

6. Does Jackson associate Terminiello with fascism and the street mob with communism? Have clashes between reactionaries and revolutionaries been a growing problem for American cities? Whose job is it to prevent mobs from taking over the streets?

Yes, yes, and local government/police.

7. According to Jackson, "speech-making to some mass of people" often plays a big role in "mob violence," and the U.S. Constitution gives state and local authorities the "power to solve that problem." What example from the preamble to the Constitution does Jackson give to support such a power?

"The preamble declares domestic tranquility as well as liberty to be an object in founding a Federal government and I do not think the Forefathers were naïve in believing both can be fostered by the law."

8. What does Jackson believe is the danger “if the Court does not temper its doctrinaire logic with a little practical wisdom”?

The Bill of Rights will be converted into “a suicide pact.”

9. In the lead-up to the American Revolution, the most influential argument for free speech was contained in a series of letters published in the *London Journal* between 1720 and 1723. Written by the Radical Whigs John Trenchard and Thomas Gordon, *Cato’s Letters* ranked with the treatises of John Locke as the most authoritative statement on political liberty in the American colonies.

The first paragraph of Letter No. 15 encapsulates Trenchard and Gordon’s view of free speech: “Without freedom of thought, there can be no such thing as wisdom; and no such thing as public liberty, without freedom of speech: Which is the right of every man, as far as by it he does not hurt and control the right of another; and this is the only check which it ought to suffer, the only bounds which it ought to know.”

Does Jackson’s view of free speech align with Trenchard and Gordon’s? Discuss at length in the space below.

I would say Jackson’s view of free speech generally aligns with Trenchard and Gordon’s. Jackson is in favor of allowing the “utmost freedom of utterance,” even in expressing deeply racist, prejudiced, or anti-American sentiments. He believes free speech is not only a right of individuals but a necessity for democratic decision-making. Jackson also holds that free speech, like all rights, comes with limitations, namely that an individual’s right to free speech reaches its end where the rights of others begin. For example, my right to public safety is just as valid as another’s right to free speech, and that speech should not impair my basic security. Trenchard and Gordon write in a similar fashion when they say that free speech “is the right of every man, as far as by it he does not hurt and control the right of another.” This is precisely Jackson’s point when he discusses “speech-making” and “mob movements.”

Some of Jackson’s statements are open to challenge, however, considering America’s own revolutionary tradition. He says that any American citizen can “advocate *peaceful* adoption” of any sort of political or economic system and “argue for some anti-American system of government to supersede by *constitutional methods* the one we have (*italics mine*).” The problem with this, of course, is that in our own history, after years of feeling abused, we set aside “peaceful” and “constitutional methods” of change and fought a war, the American Revolution, with writers like Locke and Trenchard and Gordon providing the philosophical basis for doing so. Jackson, of course, was putting his thoughts to paper in an early Cold War environment where the demands of national security seemed paramount—where memories of European fascism were still fresh and the specter of communism had already begun to threaten. The reader, however, must ask whether he went a little too far with some of his statements limiting free speech. (Such statements by Jackson also appear in other free speech cases that came after this one involving Arthur Terminiello.)

Questions related to Becoming a Communist

1. In addition to personal factors, what were the two huge problems in the world that caused some people, especially intellectuals, to become Communists?

The problem of war and the problem of economic crisis

2. When was Communism intellectually fashionable?

During the 1930s and 1940s

3. Did personal gain or Marxist theory have much to do with why a person became a Communist? Briefly explain.

No, a person was drawn to Communism by one or both of the two huge problems.

4. Describe the abilities and background of many of the most committed Communists.

They are “talented men and women, often of good family.”

5. Identify both the economic crisis and the military crisis that swelled the membership rolls of the Communist Party.

The Great Depression (1930s) and World War II (1939-1945)

6. What did Chambers conclude from his trip to Europe after World War I?

He concluded “that World War II was predictably certain and that it was extremely improbable that civilization could survive it.”

7. According to Chambers (and Lenin), how did Fabian Socialism fall short?

Fabian Socialism (gradualist democratic socialism) made no provision for either getting or keeping power, which would actually require the use of force.

8. According to Lenin, what was necessary for socialism/communism to get and keep power?

“(T)error and dictatorship” would be necessary in order “to defend the socialist revolution.” “Terror” was essential as “an instrument of socialist policy.”

9. Explain how Communism was both “the outrage” and “the hope of the world.”

Communism was “the outrage” in that it would utilize “terror and dictatorship” as needed, but it was also “the hope of the world” in that it would solve the dual crises of war and depression (through communist internationalism and command economies).

Questions related to Breaking with Communism

1. In the Great Purge, why did former high-ranking Soviet Communists confess to treason?

They confessed because “if a man’s family is completely at the mercy of his captors, and if he is systematically tortured by experts, he will, unless he is exceptionally strong or already more than half-dead, confess to almost anything.”

2. What was the purpose of the Purge, and what was the justification for it?

The purpose was to eliminate all Communists who opposed the Stalinists, the group of Communists headed by Stalin. The justification was that “the historical situation” had made it necessary to kill off those who stood in the way of the Stalinists’ “indispensable strategy and tactics.”

3. Explain Lenin’s quotation: “Better less, but better.”

The quotation means that while it is good to eliminate (kill off) opponents, it is a superior action to eliminate even more of them.

4. How did the Purge have a “shattering impact” on other Communists? Quote the text.

Among the hundreds of thousands purged were the men who had “made” the Russian Revolution. The charge that they had betrayed the Revolution was “incredible. They *were* the Communist Party. If the charge was true, then every other Communist had given his life for a fraud. This was a torturing thought. No Communist could escape it.”

5. Chambers asserted that, “as Communists, Stalin and the Stalinists were absolutely justified in making the Purge.” Explain what Chambers meant.

Chambers meant that, from the godless Communist viewpoint, the belief that one was serving the Revolution was sufficient justification for any action, including the Purge.

6. Why did Chambers read *I Speak for the Dead*, a book critical of Soviet Communism?

Chambers had begun to have serious doubts about Communism. “For the fact that I voluntarily opened such a book could mean only one thing: I had begun to doubt.”

7. What did Chambers come to conclude about Communism, and what was the consequence of this new conviction?

Chambers concluded that Communism was “absolute evil,” and regrettably he had been a part of it. As a result, his faith in Communism was now “destroyed,” and he ceased to be a Communist. For him, the human mind no longer had the right “to justify evil in the name of history, reason, or progress.” In effect, he had posited “something greater than the mind, history, or progress”—that “Something” was God.

Questions related to *Time* Magazine on Joe McCarthy

1. What was McCarthy's "underlying accusation" against the State Department?

The "State Department was harboring Communists, knew they were Communists, and was doing so deliberately."

2. What were the problems with McCarthy's charge that Owen Lattimore was "the top Soviet espionage agent" in the U.S.?

Lattimore was a professor of Far Eastern affairs and certainly had leftist tendencies, but he had never been employed by the State Department, and there was no evidence that he "was a spy or in any way disloyal" to the United States.

3. How did McCarthy get around the fact that he frequently had no evidence to back up his accusations?

He would make excuses or come up with additional charges as to why the evidence was not being produced. He would also dodge the criticisms and shift the discussion by moving on to new areas of accusation.

4. Why did McCarthy have such a powerful effect on the American public at this time?

The American people had begun to perceive the actual threat that communism posed. Alger Hiss, for example, had been shown through his trial to be a communist who had held a high position in the State Department. China, the largest country in the world, had just become communist. Americans were feeling vulnerable, and McCarthy stepped in to provide scapegoats. He "found an area of emotion and exploited it."

5. What specific harm did McCarthy cause to individuals?

He destroyed reputations.

6. McCarthy's supporters claimed that, given the gravity of the communist threat, his methods were necessary. Does the article agree or disagree with this? Explain.

The article disagrees. Truth, not lies, are required to fight the lies of the communists.

7. How did Democrats and Republicans each take advantage of McCarthyism?

Democrats used cries of "McCarthyism" to deflect legitimate criticisms and concerns regarding Truman administration policies and appointments. Republicans gave their support to McCarthy because he was popular with their constituents and provided them with votes at election time.

8. What was McCarthy's most reckless charge, which he threw around often? Treason.

Questions related to “The Dignity of Family Life”

1. What does Dr. King mean by the “family,” and how important does Dr. King believe the family is to society?

The family consists of “mother, father and child,” and the “whole of society” rests on the foundation of the family “for stability, understanding and social peace.”

2. According to the Moynihan Report, what percentage of black births were illegitimate, and what percentage of black children would be recipients of public aid at some point in their lives? How big of an effort on the part of society does Dr. King call for in order to solve the overall problem, and what does he view here as a danger?

24% and 56%, respectively. Dr. King wants the overall problem dealt with “fully,” as the “social catastrophe” that it is. The danger is that “the problems will be attributed to innate Negro weaknesses and used to justify neglect and rationalize oppression.”

3. Describe how a matriarchy came about and how it was strengthened later on.

Legal marriage did not exist under slavery. Masters might direct mating between certain pairs, the slaves themselves would enter polygamous or fragile monogamous relationships, and masters and their sons could use female slaves to satisfy their lusts. Indiscriminate sexual relations meant that, while maternity was easily established, paternity was often unknown. What developed from all this was a matriarchy among the slaves. This subordination of black males did not end with slavery, because as blacks moved to cities there was more employment for women than men, due to the availability of positions as domestics. While black men struggled to find work, black women became the main support of the household, and the matriarchy was reinforced.

4. By 1990, roughly 70% of all black births were to single mothers, and the figure has hovered near 70% ever since. Although the illegitimacy rate among blacks has stayed about the same since 1990, it has continued to increase among whites, now being near 30%. Illegitimacy matters, to say the least, because “*living apart from either biological parent at any point during childhood*” tends to have a negative impact on children, given that as a group they “achieve less and suffer more” than those from intact families. (Kathryn Edin and Maria Kefalas, *Promises I Can Keep: Why Poor Women Put Motherhood Before Marriage*, University of California Press, 2011, p. 215.)

Although Dr. King acknowledged the bleak prospects for the black family, he concluded his Abbott House address in a hopeful and encouraging manner. Discuss Dr. King’s faith in black Americans and also in America itself as regards the black family.

Dr. King believed that black Americans would continue “to fight against so many physical and psychological horrors to have a family life.” He also had faith that America would take responsibility for its past and do what was needed with respect to “jobs, education, housing and access to culture” so that the black family might “triumph.”

Questions related to Doug Ramsey, Vietnam POW

1. What likely saved Ramsey's life during his capture by the Viet Cong?

His fluency in Vietnamese—otherwise, likely shot dead inside the truck.

2. Why did a number of farmers from the hamlet demand the right to kill Ramsey?

Because their hamlet had been needlessly and viciously destroyed by South Vietnamese troops that the Americans had been training and supporting.

3. How did the Viet Cong respond to the reason Ramsey gave for why the United States was making war in Vietnam?

They insisted that the Vietnamese people would not tolerate foreign domination, especially by China, even if both Vietnam and China were communist countries.

4. Why was Ramsey treated more harshly than the other prisoners?

He was believed to be a CIA agent— “a loathsome species of American.”

5. Describe the psychological torture used against Ramsey.

The guards performed skits about him that included his execution.

6. What specifically did the Viet Cong want Ramsey to tell them?

The names of secret Vietnamese agents of the CIA.

7. Did the guards ever want to execute him or cause him to commit suicide?

Yes to both.

8. Describe how close Ramsey came to dying from illness.

Very close—at one point he experienced cerebral convulsions followed by a coma for sixty hours.

9. Despite misgivings, John Paul Vann would continue to believe in the American war effort in Vietnam until his death in June 1972. When Ramsey concluded the letter to his parents in January 1967, could the same be said about him? Explain.

No. He hoped that American leaders would pursue “a minimum face-saving rollback which will permit our withdrawal without undue loss of military prestige. Anything more is wishful thinking, and any attempt to achieve it would be to compound past folly with future folly.”

Questions related to “Where Do We Go from Here?”

1. For most of its history, which region of the country had the civil rights movement focused on—the North, the South, the East, or the West?

The South.

2. King mentions the “deep rumbling of discontent in our cities.” What had been going on over the last couple years in some major cities?

Riots.

3. In terms of “where we are now,” what kind of issues is King discussing—political, economic, social, psychological, religious, moral? Pick the main one.

Economic.

4. As to where black Americans “go from here,” what are the two basic challenges?

The first basic challenge involves self-esteem. Black Americans must assert their own “dignity and worth” and “no longer be ashamed of being black.” The second basic challenge is “to organize our strength into economic and political power.”

5. Write the sentence from King’s address about power, love, and justice.

“Power at its best is love implementing the demands of justice, and justice at its best is love correcting everything that stands against love.”

6. What is the goal of the program that King wants developed?

He wants the nation to have “a guaranteed annual income” of a significant amount for each citizen.

7. Do you believe this goal makes sense? Yes, no, or maybe—and give a reason.

Answers may vary. Personally, I would say “maybe,” possibly through a negative income tax, but I would need to study it more before making up my mind.

8. At this late stage of his career, is Martin Luther King still committed to nonviolence?

Yes.

9. King says the truths of two economic systems need to be combined in order to form a better economic system. Name the two economic systems that need to be merged.

Capitalism and communism.

Questions related to Sullivan and Felt on J. Edgar Hoover

Where sources tend to agree, historians can start to form conclusions about what occurred; where sources disagree, historians need to investigate further. For each category below, identify a fact or opinion where Sullivan and Felt agree and also one where they disagree. Answers may vary, but they need to be specific.

1. *Your Books, Free Services at Your Home, and the FBI's Budget:*

Sullivan and Felt agree that the FBI performed free services at Hoover's home.

They disagree as to whether Hoover was completely honest in his accounting.

2. *The FBI and the Negro:*

Sullivan and Felt agree that the number of black agents in the FBI was small.

They disagree as to the cause, with Sullivan ascribing it to Hoover's bigotry and Felt attributing it to the preference for other careers on the part of qualified blacks.

3. *FBI and Organized Crime:*

They agree that organized crime has been a significant issue for law enforcement.

They disagree as to what the FBI's response has been, with Sullivan contending that Hoover had severely downplayed organized crime and Felt claiming that the FBI had been moving against it much earlier than generally acknowledged.

4. *FBI and Politics:*

Sullivan and Felt agree that Hoover played "the political game," as Felt put it.

They disagree on the degree to which Hoover played the game, with Sullivan asserting that Hoover's FBI was "immersed in politics" and Felt arguing that Hoover's goal "never went beyond greater independence for the FBI"—and for himself as its director.

5. *Final Observation:*

Sullivan and Felt agree, to use Felt's words once again, that "Hoover was neither the paragon that his admirers proclaimed nor the ogre that his detractors held up to scorn."

They disagree over where things stood toward the end of Hoover's career. Sullivan declared that major changes were in order at the Bureau, and he hoped that Hoover would initiate those changes himself, but if not, he should resign. Felt, writing after Hoover died, believed that Hoover's directorship had ended well and encouraged recognition for Hoover's "real monument"—the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Questions related to Dr. Li on Chairman Mao

1. Think of two words that describe Mao's lifestyle, and two more words that describe his personal relationships. The words may or may not come from the text.

Example: Casual and imperial, and cold and distant

2. What, specifically, did Mao try to glean from reading Chinese history? Quote the text.

"...for instruction on how to rule, for guidance on how to manipulate the conspiracies that plagued those in the highest reaches of power."

3. In your own words, describe Mao's attitude toward foreign ideas.

He believed China needed to learn from abroad—from the Soviet Union and the West, but those foreign ideas should be adapted to the Chinese situation.

4. Did Mao want China to follow the Soviet model in every possible way? Explain.

No. The Chinese government should follow the Soviet model, but that model should be applied critically and with modifications to suit China—in other words, "socialism with Chinese characteristics."

5. How did Mao view his own place in history? Quote the text.

"He was the greatest leader—the man who had unified the country and would then transform it, the man who was restoring China to its original greatness. ...His own greatness and China's were intertwined. All of China was Mao's to experiment with as he wished. Mao was China..."

6. Give a striking example of how cheaply Mao viewed the lives of the Chinese people.

Answers may vary.

In a 1957 speech in Moscow, Mao said he was willing to lose 300 million people, half of China's population, in a nuclear war. He elaborated by saying that, "the country would suffer no great loss. We could produce more people."

7. What did Mao demand from his subordinates?

Mao demanded "total and indivisible loyalty."

8. How did Dr. Li feel about Mao during his first five years with him? Quote the text.

Even as he became aware of Mao's ruthlessness, Dr. Li "still worshiped Mao." Dr. Li believed that Mao "was China's guiding star, our country's savior, our tallest mountain, the leader of us all. ...I would serve him and, through him, serve the Chinese people."

9. Why, specifically, did the Great Leap Forward result in such a horrific famine?

Huge quantities of grain were being appropriated by the government and were then being exported to the Soviet Union as repayment for debt. China needed the grain to feed its own people, but Mao chose instead to save face with Soviet leader Khrushchev. Mao did not want to acknowledge to Khrushchev that the peasant communes had failed, especially since Khrushchev had warned him ahead of time that they would.

10. Why was the Minister of National Defense, Peng Dehuai, purged, and what effect did this have on Dr. Li?

Peng Dehuai was purged because he stood up to Mao and took the accurate—and actually understated—position that the losses from the Great Leap Forward had been greater than the gains. Dr. Li knew that Peng Dehuai was "a good and honest man." His faith in Mao was "shattered" as a result of the purge of Peng Dehuai. "I felt only revulsion for the man I had once revered."

11. In your own words, describe how Chinese society was behaving toward Mao at the height of his power in 1969.

In Chinese history, an emperor was not considered divine, but in 1969 Mao was looked to as China's god. Tens of millions of Chinese revered his thoughts and recited his utterances; they bowed daily before a picture of his person, looked to it for direction, confessed their sins to it, and promised to do better in the future.

12. What were Mao's two great initiatives or interventions in Chinese society, both of which turned out to be highly destructive?

The Great Leap Forward (1958-1962) and the Cultural Revolution (1966-1976).

13. When Dr. Li wrote this book, was he in a position to speak the truth? Explain.

Yes, he was living in the United States and could write what he wanted. If he had still been in China, he would not have been able to tell the truth.

14. In one word of your own, describe Dr. Li's overall feeling toward Mao when he wrote this book.

Example: Bitter.

Questions related to Byron White's Dissent in *Roe v. Wade*

1. Did the Texas statute at issue in the case, which was typical of abortion laws that had been in effect in a majority of the states for about a century, prohibit abortion even to save the life of the mother?

No.

2. As a result of the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Roe v. Wade*, would a woman have to give a reason for wanting an abortion?

No.

3. What are the two competing rights when it comes to the abortion issue?

The right of the mother to choose whether to have an abortion versus the right of the fetus to be allowed to live.

4. According to White, on what does the Supreme Court base this "new constitutional right for pregnant mothers"?

The Court simply fashioned it and announced it "with scarcely any reason or authority."

5. How does White characterize the Court's decision in *Roe v. Wade*?

He characterizes it as "an exercise of raw judicial power."

6. Does White believe that reasonable people may differ over the abortion issue? (According to his biographer, Dennis J. Hutchinson, White told several law clerks late in his career that if he had been a legislator he would have been "pro-choice.")

Yes.

7. Whom does White believe should be left to decide the abortion issue?

"...the people and legislatures of the States"—"the political processes..." (not the courts)

8. Many readers of White's dissent in *Roe v. Wade* have felt that it comes across as quite callous toward pregnant women who find themselves in truly difficult circumstances. Do you agree? Why or why not?

Perhaps, but I think that White's harsh tone derives from two factors. First, the Court, in White's view, is butting into an area that clearly should be left to legislatures and to the political process in general. And second, in choosing to butt in the Court has arrived at a completely one-sided decision, defending the prerogatives of the pregnant women and allotting to the unborn almost no consideration at all.

Questions related to William Rehnquist's Dissent in *Bellotti*

1. Based on prior Supreme Court decisions, what type of "person" rights had business corporations been entitled to and what type had they not been entitled to?

Business corporations had been entitled to "property" rights but not "liberty" rights.

2. What was the new constitutional question presented in *Bellotti*?

The new question was "whether business corporations have a constitutionally protected liberty to engage in political activities."

3. Describe the "broad consensus of governmental bodies expressed over a period of many decades" that Rehnquist believes is deserving of "considerable deference."

The consensus was that "restrictions upon the political activity of business corporations are both politically desirable and constitutionally permissible."

4. Did Chief Justice Marshall believe that corporations possess the same rights as people? Explain.

No, as "artificial" beings, created by law as opposed to nature, corporations possess "only those properties" which are inherent to their legal existence.

5. How do corporate attributes such as perpetual life and limited liability "pose special dangers in the political sphere"?

These attributes, granted by government, enable a corporation to acquire "economic power" (amassed wealth) that, if permitted, could then be used to subvert democracy.

6. According to Rehnquist, when the government grants special privileges to a form of organization, does it make sense for the government to be able to regulate that form?

Yes.

7. What did the Massachusetts' law specifically prevent a corporation from doing?

It prevented a corporation from engaging in "political activity with regard to matters having no material effect on its business."

8. Would it be acceptable to Rehnquist for a CEO (a corporation's Chief Executive Officer) to use his or her own money, rather than his corporation's money, to run a political ad?

Yes. (In 2010, in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*, the Supreme Court extended corporate speech rights to candidate elections, taking a big step beyond referendums which had been the specific issue in *Bellotti*.)

Questions related to William Colby on Constitutional Intelligence

1. Identify four questionable activities that the CIA had previously engaged in. Why had such questionable activities occurred?

“Drug experiments on unsuspecting Americans, prying into the lives and mail of American citizens, concern only about ‘flap potential’ instead of legality and discussing with Mafia hoods how poison could be administered to Fidel Castro.”

In the context of the Cold War, the thinking was that such activities were needed to protect the nation (play tough because the other side plays tough).

2. What two events had shaken the public’s overall confidence in government, which naturally extended to the CIA, an organization that operated in secrecy?

Vietnam and Watergate.

3. Name three governmental actions taken to put a stop to the abuses.

CIA Director Colby’s directives in 1973, President Ford’s Executive Order 11905 in 1976, and procedural changes in both the Senate (1976) and the House (1977) whereby a special committee in each house of Congress would be continuously informed about intelligence secrets.

4. Colby also called for congressional legislation that would “state the broad principles and prohibitions under which American intelligence must operate.” Describe the “line” he believed should be drawn.

A line should be “drawn between what is too great a limit on future flexibility and what is too little reflective of American ideals.”

5. Why can’t the executive branch simply police itself in order to prevent abuses?

Even if intelligence decisions are thoroughly reviewed by senior administration officials or an outside panel of wise citizens, the President still has the authority to bypass them altogether (as in the case of President Nixon and Chile).

6. What lesson was learned regarding the Continental Congress way back in 1776, and how was this lesson applied in the United States Congress 200 years later?

The lesson learned in 1776 was that there were “ ‘too many members of Congress to keep a secret’ ”— and in the Continental Congress there were only 50-some members, whereas the U.S. Congress today consists of 535. The application 200 years later was that congressional review of intelligence secrets should be accomplished through a small committee in each house and not by briefing the whole Congress or even a substantial number of its members.

Questions related to Michael Brown on Love Canal

1. What had attracted chemical companies to the Niagara Falls area?

The powerful Niagara River (actually a strait) provided cheap electricity for industry.

2. Why did Tim and Karen Schroeder's built-in fiberglass pool suddenly rise two feet in October 1974?

An unsecured chemical dumpsite (Love Canal) behind their property had collected large amounts of rainwater and broken containment, resulting in a "chemical water" saturation of the couple's yard.

3. Karen's parents lived three doors down from Tim and Karen. What had been going on in the parents' basement since 1959?

The parents had lived with a seepage of "black sludge" in their basement for years.

4. How did Tim and Karen view their family's health problems, and what was their main concern regarding their home?

They attributed the health problems to bad genes, and they were concerned about how the chemicals were devaluing their property.

5. William T. Love's seven-mile-long canal was only partially dug when the project was halted for financial reasons. What were the dimensions of the trench that remained?

One-mile long, ten to forty feet deep, and generally fifteen yards wide.

6. What was the only warning that the Hooker Chemical Company ever gave after having donated the property within and near the canal/dumpsite to the Niagara Falls school board? Were homes ever built directly on top of the dump?

In 1957, Hooker heard that the school board was planning to sell part of the canal itself for private development and warned that excavation for basements could be dangerous. No homes were ever built directly on top of the dump.

7. Give two distinct reasons why the city of Niagara Falls was reluctant to deal openly and directly with the emerging toxic waste problem in the Love Canal neighborhood.

First, the city didn't want to spend and couldn't afford to spend all the money it would take to clean up the dumpsite and make the residents whole. And second, the Hooker Chemical Company was considered an essential business in an economically depressed area. Hooker provided as many as 3,000 jobs, major tax dollars, and was in the process of moving forward with plans to build a \$17 million headquarters in downtown Niagara Falls.

8. Describe how bad the situation had become by early 1978 for the hundred families whose properties abutted the covered trench. Why didn't the families simply move away?

The "land was a quagmire of sludge." "Masses of sludge beneath the surface were finding their way out at a quickening rate, forming persistent springs of contaminated liquid." Families—like the Schroeders—could not afford to move without selling their homes first, which was impossible at this point. They were "stranded in a wasteland."

9. In the summer of 1978, New York State declared a health emergency at Love Canal. President Carter soon followed with a federal disaster declaration, the first ever for a non-natural disaster. Overnight, Love Canal turned hazardous waste into a national issue, and, by the end of 1980, Congress had passed legislation that became known as "Superfund." Superfund increased the authority of the Environmental Protection Agency so that it could oversee the cleanup of toxic waste sites around the country. The idea was to put the EPA in a position where it could force companies that had dumped hazardous wastes to take responsibility for either the cleanup or the cleanup costs. Finalized in 1983, the first list of Superfund sites included Love Canal as one of 406—later additions would quadruple the total number of identified sites.

Do you think it was necessary for the federal government to get involved in this way? Why or why not?

Yes, I believe it was necessary.

To compete effectively, businesses strive to minimize costs, which means they will sometimes do whatever they feel they can get away with. For certain enterprises, that may include the substantial dumping of hazardous wastes—as opposed to disposing of such wastes properly, recycling some of them, or avoiding them in the first place.

When these cases occur, either the state or the federal government must be prepared to act. The problem with state action, however, is that the companies typically have ties with the state's politicians and the companies are in fact providing jobs in the state. As a result, unless the state is willing to see certain companies (and jobs) depart, they will be reluctant to take strong action. A state may also lack the financial or legal resources to take on a major company.

This is where the need for a strong federal agency, such as the EPA, enters the picture. While the EPA should not be overzealous with respect to the environment or pernicious toward business, it has a critical role to play in protecting the environment and those who live in it. The EPA consists of an appointed director and employees hired to work for the agency; their collective task is to enforce environmental regulations. The EPA is expected to perform its duties regardless of political pressures. If it turns out that the EPA routinely behaves in an overzealous or pernicious manner, then the agency itself can be modified by Congress. The fundamental need for such an agency, however, is beyond question, based solely on what we observed at Love Canal.

Questions related to Police and the Constitutional Use of Force

1. Looking at the Fourth Amendment, what is the constitutional standard for a police officer to “seize” someone? Use the three underlined words in a one-sentence response.

The constitutional standard is that “seizures” of “persons” not be “unreasonable.”

2. Name the two landmark decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court that, along with lower federal court decisions applying them, provide clear guidance on the constitutional use of force by police officers.

Tennessee v. Garner and *Graham v. Connor*.

3. When is it reasonable for a police officer to shoot a fleeing suspect in the back? Explain whether a warning is required before firing.

If there is probable cause—a reasonable basis—to conclude that the fleeing suspect poses “a threat of serious physical harm” to others, it is constitutional “to prevent escape by using deadly force.” A warning is required “where feasible.”

4. Does a police officer have the authority to detain you as part of an investigatory stop?

Yes. (But the officer must be able to articulate a reasonable suspicion of a crime.)

5. Discuss the challenging circumstances of police work that must be factored in when evaluating the “reasonableness” of incidents involving the use of force.

Police officers often have “to make split-second judgments—in circumstances that are tense, uncertain, and rapidly evolving—about the amount of force that is necessary in a particular situation.”

6. What is the fundamental question in a use of force inquiry?

“...the question is whether the officers’ actions are ‘objectively reasonable’ in light of the facts and circumstances confronting them.”

7. Should use of force inquiries take into account the “underlying intent or motivation” of the officers involved? Is deadly force justified only if non-deadly alternatives would have been ineffective?

No, and no.

8. In what sense are police officers sworn to cause trouble?

Their job causes trouble, because it consists of the decision “to do something, to help, to arrest, to inquire.” (The use of force then occurs in reaction to someone else’s decision.)

Questions related to George Ball on AIPAC

1. When did Israel begin to request American financial assistance? Why did Israel's Jewish supporters in America conclude that they needed to appeal directly to Congress?

Israel began requesting financial assistance in 1950. Israel's American friends appealed directly Congress because the State Department was adamantly opposed to economic aid to Israel, believing such aid would deepen Arab bitterness toward the United States.

2. How does AIPAC get around the fact that as a lobbying organization it is prohibited from making campaign contributions?

AIPAC maintains "close communications" with the more than eighty pro-Israel PACs in the United States. AIPAC even has overlapping directors with these PACs.

3. Give an example of how AIPAC seeks to control American media with respect to Israel.

Any newspaper article or column that is critical of Israel is met with "a prompt answer by some prominent individual of some pro-Israeli organization."

4. What might be the rapid response if a politician says something AIPAC dislikes?

The politician can be "denounced or censured."

5. In an election year, what can happen to a politician who does not toe the AIPAC line?

AIPAC might throw its support behind a rival candidate.

6. Does AIPAC hold policy positions independent of those of the Israeli government?

No, "it simply seeks to accommodate whatever Israeli government is in power."

7. Do senators or congressmen publicly question whether the large amount of American aid going to Israel is a good idea?

No, that would be too risky for them politically.

8. What happened to some senators who voted for Reagan's AWACs sale to Saudi Arabia?

They found themselves labeled "anti-Semites," a common tactic of the Israel lobby.

9. Give a specific example of how AIPAC secures huge financial returns for Israel from the relatively small financial contributions of its American donors.

In 1981, on a budget of \$1.8 million, AIPAC succeeded in getting Congress to give Israel \$2.2 billion in foreign aid.

Questions related to John DiIulio on Black Crime

1. Give three examples of racism by cops that DiIulio observed growing up in working-class Philadelphia.

The cop in the cruiser looking out for him (a white kid) while he waited for the bus in high school; the black boys getting much worse treatment at the hands of the police than the white boys when interracial fights broke out; and cops suspecting Willie Brown, a man in his forties, of stealing for no other reason than that he was black.

2. Was DiIulio's father a racist? Cite evidence.

No, he ran for sheriff on "a real rainbow-coalition ticket."

3. Who got attacked three times by black assailants?

DiIulio's grandmother.

4. What are DiIulio's two competing angers?

His anger over "casual racism" from whites, and his anger over violent assailants who "all too often" turn out to be black.

5. How do middle-class blacks feel about inner-city black communities?

They are afraid to go into them, and they do not identify with those who live there.

6. Why doesn't DiIulio think it's surprising that some young blacks "kill, rape, maim, and steal without remorse"?

When you understand their environment, which entails both neglect and abuse, it makes sense that some of them turn out like this.

7. What is the "negative feedback loop"?

Legitimate fears about young blacks lead to excessive white hostility toward blacks, which in turn results in extreme black paranoia about the justice system.

8. How does DiIulio respond to the charge that too many blacks have been incarcerated?

The high rate of black incarceration is due to their high rate of violent criminal activity.

9. According to DiIulio, how does the justice system hurt blacks?

By releasing "convicted violent and repeat black criminals, both adult and juvenile," who then return to black communities which "suffer most of their depredations."

Questions related to Pavel Voloshin on Ryazan

1. How long did it take before Russia FSB put out its official version of what had happened in Ryazan? What had Ryazan FSB already reported?

Two days. Ryazan FSB had already “reported on the successful prevention of a tragedy.”

2. Name four governmental entities in Ryazan that, by order of Moscow, were no longer allowed to have contact with the press.

FSB officers, the press services of the FSB of the Ryazan region, Ryazan police officers, and employees of the Ministry of Emergency Services.

3. Did Russia FSB and Ryazan FSB agree that the case was closed? Briefly explain.

No. Russia FSB said that it was, and Ryazan FSB said that it wasn't.

4. Give six reasons why it's extremely likely that the bags contained hexogen.

First, the local bomb squad consisted of experts. Second, the gas analyzer was a world-class instrument. Third, routine maintenance had been performed on the gas analyzer. Fourth, prior to September 22, no one could remember the last time the bomb squad had examined hexogen vapor, which would be a rare case regardless. Fifth, if it truly was an exercise, wouldn't it make more sense to let the Ryazan specialists continue with the analysis rather than rushing the bags off to Moscow? And sixth, why keep secret the results of the work of the Moscow forensic specialists?

5. What did the experts who neutralized the bomb have to say about the fuse?

It was attached to the bags, it was not a dummy, and it was professionally made.

6. The police officer, who was the first person to enter the basement, referred to “sacks of sugar.” Does this mean he didn't believe it was a real bomb? Explain.

No. The reference to “sacks of sugar” was simply being descriptive of what the bags looked like, as hexogen is a white solid. Based on everything else he said and did, he clearly believed the bomb was real.

7. How does Ryazan fit in with the pattern of the previous bombings?

In the previous bombings and Ryazan, those being attacked were regular people, not the Russian elite. The goal was plainly to terrorize ordinary Russians (and probably to mobilize public opinion against Chechnya), starting in Moscow. Also, the farther from Moscow, the greater the destruction. The bombing in Ryazan, 125 miles from Moscow, could have overshadowed “everything that had happened before.”

8. Aleksey Kartofelnikov, the resident who had noticed the suspicious Zhiguli and called the police, summed up the situation by saying, “If something is blown up, it means a terrorist attack. If the mines have been cleared, exercises...” What did he mean?

He meant it’s difficult to believe the government’s explanations because they are too convenient—plus the fact that they are unproven.

9. By the evening of September 23, the Ryazan police had arrested two suspects. The suspects produced identification showing that they worked for the FSB and, on orders from Moscow, were soon released. Acknowledging the involvement of their own agents, Russia FSB announced on September 24 that what had occurred in Ryazan had been a training exercise.

Besides releasing all documentation and allowing all interviews related to the Ryazan operation, what does Voloshin specifically propose regarding the “perpetrators”?

They should be named, and they should be given the opportunity to talk about the Ryazan operation on television, even if with their backs to the camera.

10. Voloshin doesn’t discuss it, perhaps because it was something his readers would have been well aware of, but the apartment bombings happened at a pivotal moment in Russian politics. President Boris Yeltsin had appointed Vladimir Putin head of the FSB on July 25, 1998, and then, on August 9, 1999, made Putin acting prime minister of the Russian government. Yeltsin also announced on August 9 that he wanted Putin to be his presidential successor. Putin was practically unknown to the Russian people at the time, but this would change dramatically over the next few weeks. The government would use the apartment bombings of September 1999 as justification to launch a new war in Chechnya, with the support of the Russian people. While Yeltsin had been appearing weak for some time, Putin spoke out forcefully in response to the apartment bombings: He said they would pursue and “rub out” the terrorists wherever they go, even “in the outhouse.” Putin soon became the most popular politician in the country. On December 31, 1999, Yeltsin resigned and Putin became Acting President; that same day Putin signed a decree granting immunity from prosecution to Yeltsin and his family, as they had been under investigation for corruption. Putin went on to win the next presidential election on March 26, 2000, after which existing corruption charges against Putin himself would be dropped as well. Going forward, Russia would complete the transition to Putin’s one-man rule, and widespread corruption would continue.

In your opinion, how high is the probability that the Russian regime was behind the apartment bombings, and how high is the probability that Putin was in the loop?

Very high probability for both. It is obvious the Ryazan bomb was real, and the training exercise explanation was fabricated. If Russia FSB was behind the attempted bombing in Ryazan, it was behind the actual bombings that had already occurred. Putin was in the loop: he was head of the FSB until August 9, and the bombings started on August 31. Besides, Putin was nobody’s puppet; he was emerging as the ruler of Russia.

Questions related to Iraq on the Record

1. According to CIA Director Tenet, had the intelligence community ever said that Iraq was an imminent threat to the United States? How had President Bush characterized the threat posed by Iraq?

Tenet stated categorically that the intelligence community had never said that Iraq was an imminent threat. Bush, however, characterized the threat as “unique and urgent.”

2. President Bush had asserted that the Iraqi dictator, Saddam Hussein, was “moving ever closer to developing a nuclear weapon.” What had the International Atomic Energy Agency concluded about Iraq’s nuclear activities?

There was “no indication of resumed nuclear activities . . . nor any indication of nuclear-related prohibited activities.”

3. On what had the U.S. Department of Energy and the International Atomic Energy Agency agreed?

That the aluminum tubes imported by Iraq were not part of a nuclear program.

4. Of all the Bush administration’s claims prior to the U.S. invasion, those with the most support from the intelligence community were related to Iraq’s possession of chemical and biological weapons. But even those intelligence assessments came with a caveat. What was the caveat?

While it seemed likely that Iraq continued to possess weapons of mass destruction, the intelligence community had “no direct evidence of such stockpiles.”

5. Rather than as a means to deliver biological weapons, what did the Air Force believe was the more likely purpose for Iraq’s unmanned aerial vehicles?

Reconnaissance.

6. What had intelligence officials told members of the Bush administration regarding assertions that Iraq was supporting al Qaeda?

Such “claims were disputed by intelligence officials within the Administration.”

7. Why do you think the Bush administration “repeatedly made misleading statements about the threat posed by Iraq”?

After 9/11, President Bush decided to follow a path that took us to war in Iraq. The American people and their representatives in Congress, however, had to be brought on board. The Bush administration must have believed that the facts by themselves were insufficient to make the case for war, so its members resorted to duplicity instead.

Questions related to Michael Crichton on Global Warming

1. What was climate science concerned about in 1975? How quickly were those fears replaced by fears of global warming?

Climate science was concerned about the rapid onset of “a new ice age.” “Fears of an ice age had vanished within five years, replaced by fears of global warming...”

2. Describe Crichton’s problem with the notion of scientific consensus.

Science does not advance on the basis of consensus but on the basis of “results that are verifiable by reference to the real world. In science, consensus is irrelevant.”

3. Had global temperatures been going up from 1940 to 2005? Explain.

Temperatures actually fell from 1940 to 1970, which was the reason for the global cooling scare. From 1970 to 2005 temperatures went up, which became the basis for the concern over global warming.

4. How much had average temperature gone up in the 20th century?

Six-tenths of a degree Celsius (not a huge amount).

5. Is it clear to Crichton that carbon dioxide is the main factor in the recent rise in temperatures? Explain.

No. Other possibilities include solar variability and urban heating, in which case “the amount attributable to carbon dioxide becomes less.” Bottom line: “nobody knows how much is attributable to carbon dioxide right now.”

6. Why might some scientists be reluctant to express doubts about global warming?

Their careers could be stifled or endangered...

7. What is the problem with the way computer models are being used in regard to global warming?

Computer models are not merely being used to add weight to a conclusion but “are seen as generating data in themselves... As if they were themselves a reality.” Furthermore, they are being used to project forward all the way to the year 2100!

8. Summarize Crichton’s point about horses and horseshit.

Suppose people in 1900 had worried about people in the year 2000: With a bigger population, folks might not be able to get enough horses. And what would they do with all the horseshit? The automobile appears, and no problem. Can’t predict the future...

Questions related to *Liberty* Veterans on War Crimes Committed

1. On June 8, 1967, the air and naval forces of Israel attacked the USS *Liberty*. What kind of ship was the *Liberty*? Of the 294 officers and men, how many were killed and how many wounded? How badly damaged was the ship? By jumping ahead to the second page, list the number of cannon holes in the ship as well as the number of machine gun holes.

A United States Navy “signals intelligence platform” (spy ship), which sustained 34 killed and 173 wounded. The ship was sold in 1970 for scrap. The attack resulted in 861 cannon holes and “thousands” of machine gun holes.

2. In what kind of “waters” was the USS *Liberty* patrolling on June 8, and what’s the significance of the eight or more Israeli reconnaissance flights prior to the attack?

Liberty was patrolling in “international waters” (not some country’s territorial waters), where it had a right to be. The large number of reconnaissance flights demonstrates that the Israelis must have been aware of the identity of the ship prior to the attack.

3. Describe the air attack. Why couldn’t *Liberty* contact the Sixth Fleet for help?

Israeli fighter aircraft attacked in multiple flights and employed rockets, cannon fire, and napalm. The fighter aircraft also employed “intense communications jamming.”

4. Describe the surface attack that commenced about a half hour later.

Three Israeli torpedo boats arrived and launched five torpedoes, one of which struck *Liberty*, killing 26. Following the torpedo attack, the torpedo boats raked the ship with cannon and machine gun fire, targeting communications equipment, crewmembers, and inflated lifeboats.

5. Why did the torpedo boat attack suddenly end along with the arrival and immediate departure of attack helicopters (loaded with men in combat attire)?

All facets of the attack ended because the Sixth Fleet indicated in an open transmission that American rescue aircraft were on the way. This led the Israelis to stop their attack and to acknowledge immediately to the American Embassy in Tel Aviv that they had “mistakenly” attacked a U.S. Navy ship.

6. According to Secretary of State Rusk, in a letter to the Israeli ambassador on June 10, what did the U.S. government expect the Israeli government to do following such an “incomprehensible” and “reckless” military incident? Was the expectation on the part of the U.S. government ever fulfilled? Explain. (Additional writing space is available at the top of the next page.)

The U.S. expectation was that heads needed to roll: "...to take the disciplinary measures which international law requires in the event of wrongful conduct by the military personnel of a State."

No Israeli personnel were ever punished. The Israeli Defense Forces turned the matter over to an examining judge who determined that no one should be prosecuted for the incident because "the standard of reasonable conduct" had been met.

7. From the outset, what was clearly inadequate about the U.S. Navy's Court of Inquiry?

The Court was given only "*one week*" to conduct and complete its investigation.

8. Was the senior JAG officer allowed to finish his review of the Court's proceedings and findings? Did anyone else at the time carry out a thorough review? Was the American public given access to this document of over 600 pages? Were there any other "official" (publicly announced) U.S. government investigations into the attack?

No, no, no, and no.

9. Thanks to the Freedom of Information Act, the record of the Court of Inquiry was released nearly a decade later by the U.S. government. What two points has the JAG officer who served as Counsel to the Court of Inquiry made about the document?

First, that the document is a fraud in the sense that it is not the one that he had certified and submitted. And second, the President of the Court of Inquiry informed him that the Court's record had been "altered, in his presence, by civilian Government attorneys following its submission."

10. Write one word that characterizes how the *Liberty* veterans view the attack.

Deliberate (or intentional or savage).

11. According to the *Liberty* veterans, what is the only explanation for why the United States government has refused for decades to conduct a thorough investigation?

The U.S. government made "the political decision to put the interests of Israel ahead of those of American servicemen, employees, and veterans."

12. According to the veterans, why has the Israeli government along with its surrogates in the United States "worked so long and hard to prevent an inquiry" into the attack?

The veterans believe that a detailed inquiry would conclude, even after all this time, that the Israeli attack on the *Liberty* had been deliberate. Such an inquiry would also uncover other unflattering aspects related to Israel and its peculiar relationship with the United States.

Questions related to The Troubled Economics of American Healthcare

1. Identify two ways in which the dilemma posed by Michael D. Reagan can be resolved.

Either give up on the idea of providing necessary care for all, or stop treating medical care as a private good and allow the government to make sure everyone receives care.

2. Based on the excerpt from Mayes and Berenson, give two reasons why the buying and selling of healthcare cannot and should not be treated like an ordinary marketplace.

First, patients and health professionals are not in a position to behave as typical buyers and sellers. Because of the physician's highly specialized training and knowledge, the patient is largely dependent on the physician. And second, health issues can arise quickly, with little or no time for the patient to shop around among various doctors.

3. According to Mayes and Berenson, why will the effort to turn patients into cost-conscious consumers fail to do much to drive down healthcare costs?

Shopping around or deferring treatment, because it is paid for (at least initially) out of one's own medical savings account, will have little impact on healthcare costs overall. The reason is due to the fact that "the most costly 20 percent of patients account for 80 percent of health care spending." These are the unfortunate individuals whose healthcare costs are so high that they would have tapped out their medical savings accounts long ago, if they ever had them.

4. Paul Starr asserts that, "The obstacles to effective cost containment have been political." Explain what he means by this with respect to both Republicans and Democrats.

Rate regulation has worked in other countries and also with Medicare, but "Republicans oppose price and budget regulation on ideological grounds." And because Democrats needed the support of healthcare providers (physicians, hospitals, pharmaceutical companies, etc.) to pass Obamacare, little was done to control costs.

5. Uwe E. Reinhardt compares what U.S. healthcare takes from personal income with what total U.S. taxes at all levels of government take from personal income. How do the two "tax" systems compare in round numbers?

The healthcare system takes about 20 percent of personal income while all levels of government combined take about 30 percent. (There is a big overlap between the two.)

6. Marty Makary refers to the fact that healthcare is "the leading industry of the U.S. economy." Do you think it makes sense economically that this is the case? Explain.

No, it does not make sense. For most of us, if we take care of ourselves, our bodies require very little medical attention. Healthcare costs are out of control because those involved in the industry have found ways to get rich off of it. This needs to stop.

Essay Question related to Al-Ahmar and Bakr

Born in Jerusalem in 1935, Edward Said was from a well-off Palestinian Christian family. Although he grew up mainly in Egypt, there were many extended stays in Palestine and Lebanon. His father, who became a wealthy businessman based in Cairo, had lived in the United States for several years and then served in the army during World War I, thereby earning American citizenship for himself and his future children. Edward Said moved to the United States in the early 1950s and would go on to become a professor of literature at Columbia University as well as a noted public intellectual on the subject of Palestine.

In interviews in the early 1990s, Edward Said made the following remarks about Israel's goal regarding the Palestinians (found in *The Pen and the Sword: Conversations with David Barsamian*, 1994, pages 102-103, 54):

...one of the major achievements of the Palestinian struggle in the last twenty years has been that more and more Palestinians are dedicated to remaining on the land. As long as we're there, we provide a problem for them. That's the main thing. There's no doubt in my mind that ultimately they [the Israelis] want to get rid of us...

The best Palestinian for them is either dead or gone.

Essay Question: How do Edward Said's remarks concerning Israel's goal compare with the experiences of Abdelrahman Al-Ahmar and Jamal Bakr? Include specific examples.

Edward Said's remarks and the experiences of Al-Ahmar and Bakr seem to be congruent. Both Palestinians refer to incidents of a grossly gratuitous nature involving Israelis, who consciously or unconsciously deliver a consistent message that Palestinians should not want to remain in Palestine. The Israelis are communicating that the Palestinians will never have a decent life if they stay where Israel is in control, which is throughout Palestine, including the Occupied Territories.

Multiple examples of egregious Israeli behavior can be found in the stories of the two Palestinians, but I only have space for one of each. For Al-Ahmar, there was the time when he was fourteen and his father bought him his first backpack. An Israeli settler kicked him and slapped him and threw his backpack filled with schoolbooks in the gutter. He tried to get it out of the gutter, but Israeli soldiers hit him and threw it back in. "...the soldiers knew the backpack was important to me because they could see how impoverished we all were and that we were deprived of everything."

For Bakr, one example would be the arbitrary seizures of Palestinian fishing boats, which were never returned. Bakr believes the Israeli rationale (or impulse) behind these seizures has "more to do with fighting people and their source of income. ...the main target is to control what financial benefits people can get out of the sea."

Questions related to Paul Volcker on Price Stability

1. Why is “the stability of our currency” important?

In general, we need to know that the purchasing power of our money will be similar in the future to what it is now. If persistent inflation takes hold, interest rates will rise, savings will lose value, and people on fixed incomes will fall behind. Once lost, price stability is difficult to restore.

2. Volcker makes the point that, once inflation takes hold, the inflationary process feeds on itself. Explain how this might work.

In an inflationary spiral, the belief that prices will go up in the future encourages the consumer to make purchases today. Businesses then take advantage of this expectation and raise prices further—business costs are also being pushed higher by inflation.

3. How does Volcker characterize what had to be done in the 1980s to bring down the growing inflation of the 1970s? (1970s inflation would peak at 14% in 1980.) Was inflation under control during the thirty years that followed?

Inflation was “extinguished” through “forceful monetary policies” that included a “crippling recession.” (There were those at the time—and since—who argued for a more gradual approach.) Yes, inflation was under control for the next the thirty years.

4. The Federal Reserve formally adopted a 2% inflation target in 2012. What do you think is Volcker’s biggest concern about the idea of a 2% target?

I think his biggest concern is that when inflation is running below 2%, the Fed will use it as an excuse to ease, which could result in inflation running significantly above 2%.

5. Does Volcker believe it is possible to “fine-tune” inflation? Explain.

No, targeting inflation with 2% as an upper limit might be worthwhile but not aiming for an exact target, which can neither be measured nor achieved.

6. According to Volcker, when is the only time that deflation is truly a problem? What often accompanies rising inflation, which could in fact become a serious problem?

Deflation is a problem only if there is “a critical breakdown of the financial system,” such as occurred during the Great Depression of the 1930s. Rising inflation often goes hand in hand with “extreme speculation and risk taking,” also described as “bubbles and excesses,” which do seriously threaten the financial system and the overall economy.

7. What are the two policy objectives that the Fed needs to emphasize?

Price stability and prudent oversight of the financial system.