Global Transformation (1750 through the 21st Century)

Some historical events or movements take on actual or symbolic significance far beyond the initial impact of the original developments. An example in recent years is the influence of the 9/11/01 attacks on the World Trade Center and Pentagon on United States politics, foreign policy, civil liberties, attitudes toward immigration, and other domestic concerns. This issue of Social Science Docket (6.2) examines Global Transformation between 1750 and the start of the 21st century with a particular focus on events and movements that have had broad and long lasting impacts on the history of the period.

The opening article is about transforming the curriculum as well as the world. It focuses on the integration of women’s lives into the standard historical narrative as a way to make female students more aware of the possibilities for their own lives, challenging the gender norms held by male students, helping all students become more sensitive to social issues, and as a corrective to the imbalance in the way the past is ordinarily reported. It includes teaching ideas for units on “Women’s Rights around the World”; “Women and Islam”; and “Tradition and Change in Mexico.” The article was originally presented as a paper at the Thirteenth Berkshire Conference on the History of Women, “Sin Fronteras: Women’s Histories, Global Conversations,” held at Scripps College in Claremont, California, June 23-25, 2005. It was part of a panel “Teaching Teachers to Teach Women’s History: One State’s Perspective” organized by Dr. Delight Dodyk, formerly of Drew University, Dr. Ferris Olin, Rutgers University, and Dr. Margaret Crocco, Teachers College, Columbia University. Dodyk and Olin are founding members of the Women’s Project of New Jersey, the organization responsible for the groundbreaking publication, Past and Promise: Lives of New Jersey Women (Syracuse University Press, 1996) and its electronic companion, the New Jersey Women’s History website (http://www.scc.rutgers.edu/njwomenshistory).

The second article discusses the campaign to abolish the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade in Great Britain. It also involves students in an examination of historical explanation as they weigh the impact of different factors that led to the campaign’s success. The consequences of the Great Irish Famine are examined in an article on the impact of the potato blight on the Irish countryside. Study of the Great Irish Famine allows students to explore a number of essential social studies questions related to the causes of events and the responsibility of government to respond to them. No one knows exactly how many people died in Ireland’s Great Famine of 1845-52, but in a population of more than eight million people, the death count reached at least one million. Another million and a half people emigrated. This human disaster occurred within the jurisdiction of Great Britain, the richest and most industrially advanced empire in the world at that time. The New York State Great Irish Famine curriculum is available at online at http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/nysssa/gif/curriculum.html.

One article in this thematic section examines the construction of the Suez and Panama Canals, which expanded trade possibilities, supported the expansion of British and American empires, and symbolized the impact of technological innovation on human accomplishment. Another looks at the expansion of European imperialism in Africa in the 19th century and its impact on that continent with accompanying lesson material on the Congo.

In the twentieth century, a number of events and issues came to symbolize major global transformations. An article and document-package on the atomic bombing of Hiroshima presents the horror of war and of technology unleashed, while material on the launching of Sputnik shows a world awakened to the possibilities and dangers of space travel. The section on Hiroshima includes a mock trial of President Harry Truman for crimes against humanity. The Berlin Wall was the enduring symbol of both the Cold War in the second half of the 20th century and the struggle for human freedom, while Dien Bien Phu and Soweto came to represent the ability of oppressed people in the third world to overthrow their oppressors.

In the 21st century, environmental degradation has become a major concern. An article on the Aral Sea introduces important geographical concepts and an inquiry-based method for teaching adapted from science classrooms. One article uses art as a tool to understand world events. It provides images and testimony from victims of genocide in Darfur. An article designed for elementary school classrooms looks at children’s literature that examines the transformation of Native American culture following the Columbian Exchange. The thematic section on Global Transformation ends with a series of reviews of books that teachers can use as supplementary materials and to expand their own understanding of contemporary issues. – Alan Singer
Gender role socialization is one of the predominant influences on identity development in children and adolescents. From the time a baby is born (and in many cases, before s/he is born), gender socialization is apparent in every aspect of a person’s life. The toys we choose, the friends we play with, the school subjects we like, and the playground activities we feel comfortable with are all influenced by gender socialization. In American culture, gender norms, often expressed in binary or oppositional terms, are enforced through social expectations, the media, and the education system. Children are required to develop a gender identity and set of behaviors narrowly shaped by rigid views of what their biological sex is understood to prescribe. Unfortunately, such expectations have resulted in discrimination of many forms, ranging from sexism in the workplace to hate crimes against trans-gendered people. The education system, as one of the factors enforcing gender socialization, is among the most powerful institutions available for either reinforcing or deconstructing harmful gender norms.

To understand how gender norms can be deconstructed through education, we must reflect on how education traditionally has enforced and constructed gendered norms. As noted by researchers, “As agents of society, schools necessarily reinforce gender social definitions, whereas as socializing agents, they are also primary locations for the development of new standards, roles and attitudes toward gender” (Lee, Marks and Byrd, 1994). Preschool and elementary school classrooms by design encourage children to segregate by gender: girls know their place in dress-up (where most of the clothes are dresses and other items girls are expected to wear) while boys dominate the block building area. Picturebooks show male protagonists saving secondary female characters, girls in dresses and boys in pants, females as princesses and males as firefighters. Expectations of young children preclude boys from having nice handwriting and girls from being “natural” engineers. The Sadkers’ research has shown that teachers unconsciously support gender norms and gender inequity through their everyday classroom behaviors and interactions with students (even when they consider themselves aware of these issues!). Girls are more likely to be praised for their appearances while boys receive more attention from teachers, both qualitatively and quantitatively (Sadker and Sadker, 1994). The AAUW (1999) reports that institutionalized sexism in schools lead young women to perpetuate gender stereotypes. For example, schools reinforce the belief that girls are not as good at math as boys are, and therefore girls should not take higher level math courses. Later in college, young women do not qualify for enrollment into the science courses or pre-med degree programs (AAUW).

Reviewing and Revising the Curriculum

In response to this research, some educators have begun to review the curriculum - both the overt curriculum that consists of standards and materials, and the hidden curriculum, or the ways that boys and girls are treated in schools. Reducing sex-role stereotyping (as noted by researchers in the U.S. and in Canada) has focused on increasing the range of opportunities for girls, encouraging them to seek careers in non-traditional fields such as engineering. Such educational reforms, while important, do not inherently challenge the idea that women’s work is inferior to men’s; in fact, the way to help improve girls was to “make [them] ‘less defective men’” (Coulter, 1996). Therefore, integrating notable women in the history curriculum (for example, highlighting a female scientist or a female political leader) is aimed at “empowering each girl to overcome the obstacles rather than to challenge the obstacles themselves” (Coulter, 1996). Another approach to reducing sexism
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and addressing sex-role stereotyping in schools has been to acknowledge differences between boys and girls, and then educate them differently. Coulter notes that in response to the work by Carol Gilligan and her colleagues, many schools have developed single-sex classes (usually in math or science) and sex-segregated schools. While this approach has been shown to have some positive effects on the self-esteem of young women, it further reinforces the notion of differences between men and women.

Non-Sexist Education
Out of this dissatisfaction and disagreement over how to make education better for girls has come the idea of gender equity or non-sexist education. This framework encourages educators to consider the effects that sexism has on both males and females, and empowers young men and women to actively challenge sexism in all its forms. In this approach, Jane Gaskell suggests that “Children should be helped to see the world as it is, while being encouraged to develop a critical consciousness, a sense of active and cooperative participation that equips them to engage in the struggle for social change” (quoted in Coulter, 1996). True gender equity education explores the relationships between men and women, the social construction of gender norms and expectations, and the ways in which our society as a whole is harmed by rigid gender stereotyping and sexism. As a result of this critical exploration, students learn that, as a member of society, they have the power to deconstruct harmful norms and thus improve society for all its members.

Research demonstrates that the conscious integration of women into the social studies curriculum, the use of sex-equitable materials, and offering of women’s studies and women’s history courses can all have positive effects on students’ attitude towards gender roles, equity and personal empowerment (Klein, 1985; Stake, 1994). Integrating women’s studies into the curriculum through the study of women in history or women’s issues in social sciences is an obvious first step in creating a gender equitable curriculum. The natural progression of this integration leads to the critical evaluation of gender norms and a new consciousness of gender equity in society. The following curriculum units have all been developed with the purpose of integrating women into the existing curriculum. As the units have developed over time, they have expanded to include the broader gender equity consciousness as described earlier.

Although I have not collected formal data on all of the outcomes of such units, I believe that every unit that integrates women and raises questions about gender norms has several effects on the students. First, as noted by other research, girls become more aware of the possibilities for their own lives. (Three years ago a colleague of mine literally had to show a female student that the U.S. Constitution allowed women to be President.) Second, boys become more aware of their possibilities. Breaking gender norms for boys is still more difficult than it is for girls, but as boys learn to deconstruct norms for girls, we hope that the reverse will eventually become more prevalent. Third, students become more sensitive to people who do not fit into society’s rigid gender norms. While a discussion of transgender identity has not yet become a part of my formal curriculum, it is an idea that can only be introduced once students are able to break free from the traditional male-female norms. Overall, students learn to develop a personal identity with a consciousness about and resistance to social expectations.

Another lesson inherent in studying women in history and women around the world, is that positive contributions to society do not always take place in a government building or on a battle field. They learn that there are many ways of fighting oppression and that “average” people with little power can affect large-scale changes. Finally, they learn to have empathy for other, because we are not all so different. We all benefit from improving women’s lives; we have a hand in making those improvements. We are all limited by social constructions of gender (race, class and other categories), but we are all also capable of deconstructing those norms.

Women’s Rights around the World: This unit was developed to help teachers (who were not either knowledgeable about women’s issues, or who did not know how) to integrate women into their curriculum. In our high school, the Comparative World Studies curriculum guide requires us to teach about human rights in a global context, and evaluate the effectiveness of international laws and covenants, national governments, and non-governmental organizations in addressing human rights violations. In this unit, I have focused on many different geographical regions, sometimes covering every
continent and sometimes taking a more focused approach. The unit begins with an introduction to women’s rights issues around the world to get students thinking about the variety of ways in which women are denied rights, including education, politics, marriage, and health care, and the ways in which women’s basic human rights are violated by practices such as spousal abuse, honor killings, female genital mutilation and sexual assault. Next, students analyze the difference between sex (biological traits) and gender (social norms). We reflect on how gender is defined in American culture, and which human rights violations can result from our own gender norms. This discussion almost always leads the students to consider the history of women’s rights in the United States, and whether women are truly “equal” in contemporary American society.

Women and Islam: This year the case study we explored was Women and Islam since many students in the post 9/11 world have become aware of these issues (but are often mis-educated). We analyzed the difference between religious values, cultural norms, and government laws, and tried to discern what the underlying cause of the human rights violations were. We also examined how, over time, the status of women in various societies has changed. Iran provides an interesting example of a nation where women were afforded certain rights at one period of time, but those rights were later restricted due to a change in government after the Revolution. Shirin Ebadi, the Nobel Laureate, is an interesting case study of the changing status of women in Iran. Prior to the Revolution, Ebadi was a professor, lawyer and judge. After the Revolution, her rights were dramatically restricted, and yet, she has continued to use her experience in the court system and university to continue fighting for women’s rights. Another example of a nation that was previously more liberal toward women, and then experienced a dramatic change in the status of women is Afghanistan. In the 1950s and 60s, women had the right to vote and participate in most aspects of public life. Invasion, occupation, and eventually civil war resulted in the rule of the Taliban who is notorious for their strict enforcement of rules that violate women’s rights. After watching the movie Osama, we discussed how the rules imposed by the Taliban reflected neither the Muslim religion nor Afghan culture as a whole.

The study of the modern history of women in countries like Iran and Afghanistan encourages students to consider why women’s rights might be violated, and why women’s rights must be recognized as a critical part of developing a healthy society. A spontaneous group discussion between three male students elicited comments about the role men play in violating or upholding women’s rights. One male student commented, “I guess we don’t study men’s rights because they pretty much have them” and another suggested that “men are the ones in charge of deciding who got rights.” We investigated how women’s rights have improved in Afghanistan since the fall of the Taliban and discussed why women’s rights were important to the overall security and stability of the nation. We ended the unit with a look at the magazine, Marie Claire’s “Women of the World Award” recipients (women who have fought for human rights in a variety of areas). In response to this unit, students reflected on the importance of studying women’s rights.

Students have an awareness of women’s rights beyond that of many teachers; they commented that women’s rights should be a part of the curriculum for all students, since, “Women are a part of the world, just like men, so why shouldn’t a student learn about them?” Another student said it is important “because without learning about half of the population, the world would be ignorant and sexist without even realizing it.” One student also considered the importance of women’s rights in his own life: “Our unit has taught me about how women’s rights can greatly affect everything else; it has also helped me appreciate women more”. One female student saw the women’s rights unit as important to her understanding of other people and cultures: “I will always stop to wonder how the women really feel about the issue. This unit has given me a different perspective on the approach to women’s rights.” Another student used her new knowledge to reflect on our own culture: “Learning about the Taliban and inequality in the Islamic world really opened my eyes to the women’s rights problems. It made me rethink our society and values.” Several students recognized that as young adults, their knowledge of women’s rights will have an impact in the world. One student said, “I feel that maybe if our generation is taught about it then we can change it in the future.” Another, acknowledging the potential for change said that “students’ opinions may help make women’s rights better than what they are now.”
Tradition and Change in Mexico: Frida Kahlo and Diego Rivera: In a unit on tradition and change in Mexico (also part of Comparative World Studies), we study the art of Frida Kahlo and Diego Rivera to understand gender norms of twentieth century Mexico. The works of Frida Kahlo, when compared to those of her husband, Diego Rivera, provide the students with another avenue of exploring women’s rights and gender norms. Using print and electronic resources, the students explore the lives and art of Rivera and Kahlo, first to answer comprehension questions such as:

- What were their lives like? Which life events shaped their art?
- What time period (part of Mexican history) were they artists? How did this influence their art?
- What type of art did they create?
- Why did they paint? What were their goals?
- How are these art forms related to the messages they wanted to portray?
- How are these artists important to Mexican national identity?

Based on this information, the students then write a response to the following question: How does identity and gender influence art? In discussing their responses, we look more closely at the artwork: Rivera’s murals that were created for the public, about politics and public issues, and Kahlo’s paintings which reflect her very personal pain, especially the pain associated with the inability to bear children. The contrast between the public and private is a theme of women’s history that can be carried throughout any course on history in almost every culture. Kahlo, however, is also a woman who broke out of traditional gender roles in many aspects. First, she was an artist in a field dominated by men. Second, her relationship with Rivera, and her numerous other relationships challenge the traditional norms of male machismo and female passivity and devotion.

In one course, which is an interdisciplinary class (English and Social Studies combined), this lesson is integrated into a unit on the novel, Like Water for Chocolate by Laura Esquivel. The novel encompasses many themes around the topic of gender norms and expectations, and particularly about the self-expression of women. The protagonist, Tita, expresses her forbidden love through her cooking. Cooking thus becomes an art form, similar to the self-expression of Kahlo through her paintings. This concept helps students challenge the traditional definition of “art” which, in many cultures, is a patriarchal definition. Kahlo’s work also emphasizes the value of indigenous art in contrast to European-style art, adding another dimension to the discussion.

The lesson on Diego and Kahlo can be done in one 84-minute period (or over two 45-minute periods), and yet provides the teacher and students with ample opportunities to study both important aspects of Mexican history as well as critically evaluate gender norms. Taken another step, the lesson could include a reflection on current gender norms and expectations in Mexican society, or a comparison to gender roles in the U.S. at the time of Kahlo and Rivera.
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For nearly three centuries, slavery was the driving force of the world economy. The slave trade and the market it supported were among the most dominant economic institutions the world had ever known. During this period, ships brought three times as many enslaved Blacks as they did free Whites to the new world. Over three-quarters of the world population was in some form of bondage. Slavery represented an institution so large and encompassing that many people failed to comprehend it for what it truly was.

In 1770, Britain, France, Spain and Portugal possessed flourishing slave colonies in the Americas. However, by the mid-nineteenth century, colonial rule was ended in most of the Western Hemisphere and the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade was illegal and largely suppressed. Chattel slavery, itself, was outlawed in the remaining British and French Caribbean basin colonies, although it continued in Spanish Cuba, a semi-independent Brazil, and in the United States until the conclusion of the American Civil War in 1865. During a period of approximately one hundred years, a three-hundred-year old slave system that made possible the European conquest and settlement of the Americas, a global trade network, the financing of the industrial revolution, and the emergence of modern nation-states, came to an end.

For as long as the slave system existed, it had its ideological supporters. For almost as long, there also existed an abolitionist movement that was determined to put an end to the slave trade and to slavery. This raises the question why, after hundreds of years of failures, the abolitionist movement was able to end the slave trade in the early 19th century.

**Different Explanations for the End of Slavery**

Historians offer different explanations for this change. Adam Hochschild in *Bury the Chains, Prophets and Rebels in the Fight to Free an Empire’s Slaves* (Boston, MS: Houghton Mifflin, 2005) highlights the role of anti-slavery advocates in Great Britain. He credits a small group of Quakers who met in a printing shop in London in May 1787 and their Black and White allies with being the force behind the abolition of the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade and the eventual end to slavery. Leading figures in this movement eventually included Thomas Clarkson, Granville Sharp, John Newton, William Wilberforce and Olaudah Equiano. David Brion Davis, in his *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution 1776-1823* (1975), provides a similar focus while including abolitionists in the United States.

The abolitionists highlighted by Hochschild undertook a campaign that sparked outrage from British citizens. This marked the first time that popular opinion in Britain moved steadily into the abolitionist camp. The abolitionists used methods that while common today were unfamiliar to people in the eighteenth century, including printed pamphlets and fliers that were distributed to the masses. Their philosophy was that, generally speaking, people care about the suffering of other people, and that all they needed to do was expose the evils of slavery and the truth would drive people to action. Within a few years, the abolition movement grew substantially. In 1789, nearly 800 workers petitioned Parliament to end the slave trade. In 1792, Parliament passed the first law banning slavery and people all over Britain refused to eat slave grown sugar. In 1838, full emancipation arrived in Britain.

In *Capitalism and Slavery* (Chapel Hill, NC: UNC, 1944/1994), Eric Williams argues that chattel slavery in the Americas and the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade were part of an out-dated colonial mercantilist system that was replaced by more efficient wage labor with the maturity of the industrial revolution. According to Williams, “The commercial capitalism of the eighteenth century developed the wealth of Europe by means of slavery and monopoly. But in so doing it helped to create the industrial capitalism of the nineteenth century, which turned round and destroyed the power of commercial capitalism, slavery, and all its works” (210). Even though slavery had produced capitalism, it eventually became an unnecessary drag on profits and was discarded.

Other historians have emphasized the additional economic factor of the disruption of the triangular trade in the Atlantic. The American Revolution produced a new power in the Western Hemisphere that was bound no longer by the old economic system forced on them by the British. The United States understood that an extremely profitable trade could be developed by exchanging goods directly with the Caribbean islands rather than going through Great Britain. Also of significance to the disruption of the
triangular trade were the ecological issues surrounding the slave economy. It has been argued that slave labor is not an economically efficient as free labor, and therefore requires very high production levels in order to overcome inefficiencies and turn a profit. Furthermore, without fertile soil, the system simply is not economically viable. The soil in much of the Caribbean was extremely fertile and thus allowed slavery to prosper. However, after 150 years of constant use, the soil was becoming exhausted. With production levels decreasing, the continued viability of the institution was in jeopardy.

The Role of Rebellion

Eugene Genovese, in *From Rebellion to Revolution* (Baton Rouge: LSU, 1979) argues that anti-slavery actions by enslaved Africans played a crucial role in redirecting national revolutions at the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th centuries so that they at least questioned the slave system.

C.L.R. James, in *The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L’Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution* (NY: Vintage, 1938/1989) focuses on the role of enslaved Africans in the Caribbean with bringing down slavery and the slave trade. Considered the economic ‘boom’ island of the era, St. Domingue was controlled by the French until a slave rebellion in the 1790s took control out of the hands of the Europeans. Preoccupied with revolution in their own country, the French made only a modest effort to reclaim the Island. The newly freed slaves resisted the French counterattack. They proved even more resilient when only a few years later they soundly defeated an army of 40,000 British soldiers sent to re-establish European control over the colony. French difficulties in St. Domingue played a key role in the sale of the Louisiana Territory to the United States. The completion of the sale in 1807 meant that as of 1808, when the US banned the importation of new slaves, a vast area of land was now off limits to the importation of slaves. With this turn of events, the British economic stake in the region diminished even further.

Some have suggested that abolitionist sentiment increased when British merchants recognized the increasing importance of India as a major sugar producing colony. A steady supply of sugar from India reduced the need to maintain production levels in their Caribbean colonies. The increasing reliance upon palm oil also played a role. Palm oil was already used heavily in Europe at this time, as a key ingredient in soaps and as a lubricant for heavy machinery. It was produced most efficiently in Africa. The British quickly realized that Africans were of more use producing palm oil in Africa than as slaves in the new world working on plantations for ever-diminishing returns.

In *The Overthrow of Colonial Slavery 1776-1848*, Robin Blackburn (NY: Verso, 1988) argues that the slave system was not overthrown primarily for economic reasons, but because it became politically untenable. He believes it was eliminated, even in areas where it remained profitable, because of broader conflicts in transforming societies. Political and military struggles created conditions in which slavery could be successfully challenged. Napoleonic Wars between France and Britain created conditions for American, Haitian and Latin American revolutions. Initial beneficiaries of the overthrow of the slave system were not industrialists but other slave societies, such as when Cuba replaced Haiti. Slavery ended when it was politically vulnerable rather than economically unprofitable (520).

For Blackburn, three factors were crucial in these developments. First, he points to the role of political crisis or war in marginalizing the influence of slaveholders. This included the cost of warfare by mercenary armies, but also national independence. Once the American colonies were independent of Great Britain, slaveholders no longer had as much influence in British society. Rebellions in Haiti and Jamaica were costly in money and troops and suggested the potential for other rebellions. They also established the humanity of enslaved Africans. The last factor that seemed to tip the balance was the development of social movements calling for reform and revolution, such as the British Jacobins, American abolitionists, and British anti-slavery advocates. The reformers identified anti-slavery agitation with broader demands for natural rights.

Blackburn’s explanation avoids single-cause determinism and helps students discover both multiple-causality and the importance of historical explanation. Part of its strength is that it shows the relationship between seemingly unrelated events in different parts of the world. Slave rebellions and white abolitionists play an important role in his explanation, but Blackburn puts the abolition of slavery into the context of industrialization in the 19th century.
Margaret Mead was a path-breaking American anthropologist and social commentator who is credited with the statement, “Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world; indeed, it’s the only thing that ever does.” In Bury the Chains, Prophets and Rebels in the Fight to Free an Empire’s Slaves (2005), Adam Hochschild argues that the founders of the British anti-slavery society were a small group that transformed the world. Read the biographical statements below and answer the questions.

1. What was the major contribution of each abolitionist to the anti-slavery campaign?
2. How were these people similar to each other and how were they different?
3. In your opinion, can a small group of committed citizens such as these people really change the world? Explain.

A. Granville Sharp (Spartucus encyclopedia)
Granville Sharp was born in Durham, England in 1735. He was the son of an archdeacon and the grandson of the Archbishop of York. In 1765, Sharp was living with his brother, a surgeon in East London. An enslaved African named Jonathan Strong appeared at the house. Strong had been so badly beaten by his master, a man named David Lisle, that he was close to death. Sharp took Strong to a hospital where he spent four months recovering from his injuries. After Jonathan Strong regained his health, David Lisle paid two men to recapture him. When Sharp heard the news he took Lisle to court claiming that as Strong was in England he was no longer a slave. The case received national publicity and in 1768 the courts ruled in Strong’s favor.

In 1787, Granville Sharp and Thomas Clarkson formed the Society for the Abolition of the Slave Trade. Although Sharp and Clarkson were both members of the Church of England, nine of the twelve members on the original committee were Quakers. Influential figures such as John Wesley, a Methodist, and Josiah Wedgwood, who owned a ceramics company, gave their support to the campaign. Later they persuaded William Wilberforce to be their spokesman in the British Parliament. After passage of the Abolition of the Slave Trade Act in 1807, Sharp joined with Thomas Clarkson and Thomas Fowell Buxton to form the Society for the Mitigation and Gradual Abolition of Slavery. He died on July 6, 1813.

B. Thomas Clarkson (Spartucus encyclopedia)
Thomas Clarkson was born in 1760 and educated at Cambridge University where he was ordained as a deacon in the Church of England. In 1785, Clarkson entered an essay contest on the question, “Is it right to make men slaves against their wills?” He won the first prize and was asked to read his essay to the Cambridge University Senate. This experience stimulated what Clarkson believed was “a direct revelation from God ordering me to devote my life to abolishing the trade.” He contacted Granville Sharp and in 1787 Clarkson and Sharp formed the Society for the Abolition of the Slave Trade.

Clarkson was responsible for collecting information to support the abolition of the slave trade. This included interviewing 20,000 sailors and obtaining equipment used on the slave ships such as iron handcuffs, leg-shackles, thumb screws, instruments for forcing open slave’s jaws and branding irons. In 1787 he published a pamphlet, “A Summary View of the Slave Trade and of the Probable Consequences of Its Abolition.” After the passing of the Abolition of the Slave Trade Act in 1807, Clarkson helped found the Society for the Mitigation and Gradual Abolition of Slavery. In 1833, Parliament passed the Slavery Abolition Act that gave all enslaved Africans in the British Empire their freedom.

C. Elizabeth Colman Heyrick (Spartucus encyclopedia)
Elizabeth Colman was born in 1769. Her father held progressive political views and as a young woman she was introduced to the ideas of Tom Paine. In 1787, Elizabeth married John Heyrick, who died eight years later. Elizabeth became a member of the Society of Friends (Quakers) and decided to devote herself to social reform. Her main concern was the campaign against slavery. Heyrick organized a sugar boycott and with Lucy Townsend, Mary Lloyd, Sarah Wedgwood and Sophia Sturge helped to form the Birmingham Ladies Society for the Relief of Negro Slaves.
In 1824, Elizabeth Heyrick published a pamphlet titled “Immediate Not Gradual Abolition.” She argued passionately in favor of the immediate emancipation of the slaves in the British colonies. Heyrick’s views differed from the official policy of the Anti-Slavery Society that believed in gradual abolition. In 1825, Elizabeth Heyrick and other women began forming women’s Anti-Slavery Societies in Great Britain. The Female Society for Birmingham established a network of women’s anti-slavery groups to distribute Heyrick’s pamphlet. In 1827, the Sheffield Female Society became the first anti-slavery society in Britain to call for the immediate emancipation of slaves. While other women’s groups quickly followed, the leadership of the national Anti-Slavery Society refused to endorse this position.

In 1830, the Female Society for Birmingham submitted a resolution to the National Conference of the Anti-Slavery Society calling for an immediate end to slavery in the British colonies. The women threatened to withdraw funding of the organization if it did not approve the resolution. In response, the Anti-Slavery Society agreed to drop the words “gradual abolition” from its title. It also agreed to support a new campaign to bring about immediate abolition. The following year the Anti-Slavery Society presented a petition to the House of Commons calling for the “immediate freeing of newborn children of slaves.”


John Newton was a sailor on the Greyhound, a vessel involved in the Atlantic Slave trade. He had been a sailor from the age of eleven. In March, 1748, the Greyhound was caught in a north Atlantic storm off of the coast of Sierra Leone. The storm ripped its sails and splintered and tore away one side of the ship. The sailors had little hope of survival but they continued to pump out water in an effort to trying to keep the boat afloat. March 21, 1748 was the eleventh day of the storm. Newton, who was too exhausted to pump water, was tied to the helm where he tried to hold the ship to its course. He remained there from one o’clock in the afternoon until midnight.

While waiting for death, John Newton underwent a religious awakening and believed he had experienced God’s grace. Although Newton continued as a slave-trader, his life was transformed. He eventually abandoned the sea and became a Protestant minister. As part of his duties, he composed hymns, including one that described his experience as a slave trader and his eventual redemption. It was called “Amazing Grace.” John Newton also became an activist in the campaigns to end the slave trade and abolish slavery.

E. Olaudah Equiano (http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/historic_figures/equiano_olaudah.shtml)

Olaudah Equiano is best known for his autobiography, “The Interesting Narrative of the Life of Olaudah Equiano or Gustavus Vassa, the African.” Around the age of eleven, Equiano and his sister were kidnapped and shipped through the notorious middle passage. A British naval officer bought Equiano and introduced him to the naval way of life. He also renamed Equiano “Gustavus Vassa” after a 16th-century Swedish king.

Equiano was brought to England where he learned to read and write. He saw action in major naval battles during the Seven Years War in the 1750s and traveled to Canada and the Mediterranean. He felt entitled to freedom and some of the prize money handed out to sailors, but was cheated of this income and sold to another sea-captain who took him to the Caribbean where he was sold again. During this time, Equiano was exposed to the horrors of slavery. However, he was more fortunate than most of his peers. After three years of saving his income, Equiano was able to buy his freedom in 1766 for £40.

In 1775, Equiano became involved in a project to set up a new plantation on the Caribbean coast of Central America. During this time Equiano and his associates bought people, but he wrote in his autobiography that he did “every thing I could to comfort the poor creatures.” Equiano later protest against slavery and worked with Granville Sharpe, a prominent British abolitionist. He appealed to Sharpe to save his friend, John Annis, a former slave who had been illegally kidnapped by his prior owner.

Equiano’s book appeared in the spring of 1789 and was favorably reviewed. He went on lecture tours and sold the book across Great Britain while campaigning to abolish the slave trade. In 1792, Equiano married an Englishwoman named Susanna Cullen. They had two daughters, one of whom inherited a sizeable estate from her father when he died in 1797.
Impact of the Great Irish Famine on World History  
by Maureen Murphy

The consequences of the Great Irish Famine altered more than the course of Irish history; the Irish Diaspora changed the shape of world history, especially that of the United States, Canada, Australia and England. In the 1990 federal census, 44 million Americans voluntarily reported their ethnicity as Irish.

Study of the Great Irish Famine allows students to explore a number of essential social studies questions related to the causes of events and the responsibility of government to respond to them. No one knows exactly how many people died in Ireland’s Great Famine of 1845-52, but in a population of more than eight million people, the death count reached at least one million. Another million and a half people emigrated. This human disaster occurred within the jurisdiction of Great Britain, the richest and most industrially advanced empire in the world at that time.

According to historian Christine Kineally in an article in *Natural History* magazine (January 1998), “the potato blight was an ecological disaster that struck Ireland when it was particularly vulnerable. But what transformed the blight into a famine was the failure of the British government, along with landlords and merchants, to meet the challenge and implement effective action.” Conditions in Ireland became so bad during the potato famine that according to one report: “Most of the dead were buried in fields or along the roads. The corpse was frequently wrapped with straw ropes and buried in this way without a coffin. . . . Tombstones were not erected as it was difficult to find men with the strength to make the graves. . . . Bodies actually lay unburied by hedges for rats soon devoured the flesh and only the skeleton remained.” During the famine people died from a variety of causes, though relatively few from actual starvation. Most were felled by relapsing fever, typhus, dysentery, and cholera. Their vulnerability to these diseases made worse by hunger, inadequate shelter, overcrowding in workhouses, and hard labor on work relief projects.

Study of the Great Irish Famine helps students better understand problems with contemporary relief efforts. A major question to consider is “What should the British Government have done to alleviate suffering?” The New York State Great Irish Famine curriculum is on-line at http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/nysssa/gif/curriculum.html.

---

How did the Potato Blight Devastate the Irish Countryside?

1. W. Steuart Trench was an Irish land agent and experimental farmer in Queen’s County at the beginning of the Famine period. This is his account of the second attack of the potato blight. It was published in 1868 in a book *Realities of Irish Life*.

On August 1st of that calamitous year, 1846, I was startled by hearing a sudden and strange rumor that all the potato fields in the district were blighted; and that a stench had arisen emanating from their decaying stalks. I immediately rode up to visit my crop, and test the truth of this report; but I found it as luxuriant as ever, in full blossom, the stalks matted across each other with richness, and promising a splendid produce, without any unpleasant smell whatever. On coming down from the mountain, I rode into the lowland country, and there I found the report to be but too true. The leaves of the potatoes on many fields I passed were quite withered, and a strange stench, such as I had never smelt before, but which became a well-known feature in “the blight” for years after, filled the atmosphere adjoining each field of potatoes.

The next day I made further inquiries, and I found the disease was fast extending, and on rooting up some of the potato bulbs under the withered stalks, I found that decay had set in, and that the potato was rapidly blackening and melting away. In fields having a luxuriant crop, the stench was generally the first indication of disease, and the withered leaf followed in a day or two afterwards. Much alarm now prevailed in the country; people looked blank enough, as they asked each other if they had seen this new and formidable disease. Those, like me, who had staked a large amount of capital on the crop, hitherto almost a certainty, and at least as sure as the crop of wheat or turnips or any other agricultural produce, became extremely uneasy; whilst the poorer farmers looked on helplessly and with feelings of dire dismay at the total disappearance of all they had counted on for food.
On August 6, 1846, I rode up as usual to my mountain property, and my feelings may be imagined when before I saw the crop, I smelt the fearful stench, now so well known and recognized as the death-sign of each field of potatoes the luxuriant stalks soon withered, the leaves decayed, the disease extended to the tubers, and the stench from the rotting of such an immense amount of rich vegetable matter became almost intolerable. But my own losses and disappointments, deeply as I felt them, were soon merged in the general desolation, misery, and starvation which now rapidly affected the poorer classes around me and throughout Ireland.

It is true that in the more cultivated districts of the Queen’s County and the midland counties generally, not many deaths occurred from actual starvation. I mean, that people were not found dead on the roads or in the fields from sudden deprivation of food; but they sank gradually from impure and insufficient diet; and fever, dysentery, the crowding in the workhouse or hardship on the relief works, carried thousands to a premature grave. The crop of all crops, on which they depended for food, had suddenly melted away, and no adequate arrangements had been made to meet this calamity, -- the extent of which was so sudden and so terrible that no one had appreciated it in time -- and thus thousands perished almost without any effort to save themselves.

Questions
1. How did Trench first learn about the potato blight?
2. What was the first sign that the blight had arrived?
3. Why did Irish potato farmers have a sense of helplessness?
4. What happened to Mr. Trench’s crop?
5. According to Mr. Trench, why was mortality so high during the famine?

2. Elihu Burritt was an American pacifist. He visited Skibbereen, Ireland in February, 1847. This passage is from his account of the visit.

He lived several miles from the center of the town, in one of the rural districts, where he found himself on the eve of perishing with his family of seven small children. Life was worth the last struggle of nature, and the miserable skeleton of a father had fastened his youngest child to his back, and with four more by his side, had staggered up to the door. The hair upon his face was nearly as long as that upon his head. His cheeks were fallen in, and his jaws so distended that he could scarcely articulate a word. The children’s appearance, though common to thousands of the same age in this region of the shadow of death, was indescribable. Their paleness was not that of common sickness. There was no sallow tinge in it. They did not look as if newly raised from the grave and to life before the blood had begun to fill their veins anew: but as if they had just been thawed out of the ice, in which they had been imbedded until their blood had turned to water.  

Question: In your opinion, why was Mr. Burritt driven to write about this man and his children?

3. William Bennett was an English Quaker who traveled to County Mayo, Ireland in 1847 to distribute seeds.

My hand trembles while I write. The scenes of human misery and degradation we witnessed will haunt my imagination, with the vividness and power of some horrid and tyrannous delusion, rather than the features of a sober reality. We entered a cabin. Stretched in one dark corner, scarcely visible, from the smoke and rags that covered them, were three children huddled together. Lying there because they were too weak to rise, pale and ghastly, their little limbs perfectly emaciated, eyes sunk, voice gone, and evidently in the last stage of actual starvation. Crouched over the turf embers was another form, wild and all but naked, scarcely human in appearance. It stirred not, nor noticed us. On some straw, soddened upon the ground moaning piteously, was a shriveled old woman. Above her, on something like a ledge, was a young woman, with sunken cheeks, a mother I have no doubt, who scarcely raised her eyes in answer to our enquiries, but pressed her hand upon her forehead, with a look of unutterable anguish and despair.

We entered upward of fifty of these tenements. The scene was one and invariable, differing in little but the number of the sufferers, or of the groups, occupying the several corners within. Perhaps the poor children presented the most piteous and heart-rending spectacle. Many were too weak to stand. Every infantile expression entirely
departed; and in some, reason and intelligence had evidently flown. Many were remnants of families, crowded together in one cabin; orphaned little relatives taken in by the equally destitute, and even strangers, for these poor people are kind to one another to the end.

In one cabin was a sister, just dying, lying by the side of her little brother, just dead. I have worse than this to relate, but it is useless to multiply details, and they are, in fact, unfit. They did but rarely complain. When inquired of, what was the matter, the answer was alike in all, -- “Tha shein ukrosh” -- indeed the hunger. We truly learned the terrible meaning of that sad word, ukrosh.

Questions
1. In your opinion, why does Mr. Bennett begin by saying, “My hand trembles while I write”?
2. Why does Mr. Bennett say that “the poor children presented the most piteous and heart rending spectacle”?
3. Mr. Bennett writes, “We truly learned the terrible meaning of that sad word, ukrosh.” While the word technically means hunger, what else could it mean? Explain your answer.


   The landlords of Mayo are pursuing a course which cannot fail to add to the universal wretchedness and poverty which exist. The corn (grain) crops, bountiful as they may be, are not sufficient to meet the landlords’ claim for rent and arrears. In every direction, the agents of the landlords, armed with the full powers of the law, are at work “canting” the small patches of oats or potatoes. Extortionate charges must be paid by the unfortunate tenant. Even the produce of seed, distributed through the agency of benevolent associations, has been totally swept away.

   To add to the universal distress caused by this system of seizure, eviction is in many cases practiced. I saw a memorable instance of this mode of proceeding, at the wretched fishing village of Kiel. A driver had ejected some twenty families. A crowd of these miserable ejected creatures collected around us, bewailing, with bitter lamentations, their hard fate. One old grey-headed man came tottering up to us, bearing in his arms his bedridden wife. Putting her down at our feet, he pointed, in silent agony to her, and then to his roofless dwelling, the charred timbers of which were scattered in all directions around. This man said he owed little more than one year’s rent, and had lived in the village, which had been the home of his forefathers, all his life.

   Questions
1. Why were Irish families unable to survive on other crops after the failure of the potato crop?
2. What happened to a family that owed money for rent?
3. Under the law, landlords had the right to evict tenants unable to pay their rent. In your opinion, what option did landlords have? What could the government have done? Why?

5. S. Godolphin Osborne was a Church of England clergyman. In this passage he reports on conditions in the Limerick workhouse during the summer of 1850.

   The first Union-house we visited was that at Limerick. Last year, when I went over it, I found it clean and in good order; I now found it every way the reverse. In the parent and auxiliary houses these was no less a number than 8,000 paupers; every department, except the fever hospital, showed evident symptoms of gross neglect. I have no words with which I can give any real idea of the sad condition of the inmates of two large yards at the parent house, in which were a very large number of young female children; many of them were clothed in the merest dirty rags, and of these they wore a very scanty allowance; they were in the dirt collected on their persons for many weeks; there was not about them the slightest evidence of any of the least care being taken them; as they filled before me, two and two, they were a spectacle to fill any humane heart with indignation: sore feet, sore hands, sore heads; ophthalmia evident in the case of the great proportion of them; some of them were suffering from it in its very worst stage; they were evidently eat up with vermin -- very many were mere skeletons.

   Question: What happened to the Limerick workhouse between 1849 and 1850? Why?
Bivarani Recalls Famine and War in Bengal
by Lindsey Das

My grandmother is named Bivarani. In our household we call her “Tacoma,” the Bengali word for grandma. Tacoma was born in 1931 on the island of Sandeep in the Bay of Bengal. At the time it was part of the British colony of India. Today it is in the country of Bangladesh. Tacoma does not know the exact day or month of her birth because births were not registered at that time. Her father was the village doctor and her mother kept house. Tacoma has three brothers and one sister. Her sister was the oldest. On the island, her family was considered relatively wealthy. They owned their own land and had their own house. Her father had a respected position and reputation in village society.

As a child Tacoma attended primary school until the third grade where she learned to read and write. After Tacoma’s primary school education was completed at the age of eight she stayed home. Her parents did not see the point in sending their daughter on to higher education. As a child my grandmother led a privileged life. She did not have to learn how to cook, clean, or do any household chores because there were other people to take care of that. She spent her days playing with her cousins and female friends. They would play ball games and make believe. At night, her father would teach her how to count, add, and subtract.

Famine and War

The famine started in 1943. Tacoma describes it as a “terrible time.” The rice crop was diseased and the entire crop was destroyed. Great Britain was at war at the time and did not provide help. Thousands of people would go to a wedding or a funeral of a person they did not know just so they can get some kind of food to eat. Although her family was well-off, they rationed what they had so they could share the food they bought with the entire village. Every day the family would put together packages to give to their neighbors. Her family and the village were amongst the lucky ones because three million people ended up dying of starvation and malnutrition.

Tacoma also recalls the day the war came to Bengal. She was playing in the yard and climbing a tree with her cousins when they heard a sound they had never heard before. It kept getting louder and louder. Her cousin on the ground told them to get out of the tree and run to the house, but they stayed in the tree. When they looked up they saw an airplane. It was the first time they had ever seen anything like this. Now they all ran into the house and hid in case it came back. The plane was part of the British airforce.

Independence and Partition

In 1947, India gained independence from Great Britain. The only catch was that instead of staying a united people, the two largest religious groups, Hindus and Muslims, decided they wanted their own countries. Bangladesh fell under the control of the Muslim country of East Pakistan. My family, which was Hindu, had always lived in harmony with their Muslim neighbors. After 1947, that harmony was shattered. Neighbors who had been like family to each other became enemies. There was rioting in the streets and an effort to drive all Hindus out of Bangladesh. Islamic extremists wanted Islamic law in Bangladesh and in order to accomplish this they wanted an all-Islamic population. Tacoma lost many family members in the riots of 1947 and she wondered if getting national independence was a good thing.

Eventually things began to calm down. In 1948, Tacoma got married at the age of seventeen. Her groom was twenty years her senior. He had been married to her cousin, but she died and left a young son behind. Two and half years later, Tacoma and her husband welcomed a son into the family. They went on to have a total of eight boys, although two died shortly after they were born for unknown reasons.

In 1989, Tacoma and her husband left the island of Sandeep for India. The river was rising and they were losing their home and their land. In India they had no home of their own and had to live with their daughter-in-law. They decided to move the United States temporarily, but it turned out they never returned to India or Bangladesh.
**The Suez and Panama Canals and the Age of Empire (Document-based Essay)**

Developed by Bill Hendrick, Brian Rodahan and Krystle Rogala

**Historical Context:** “Whosoever commands the sea commands trade; whosoever commands the trade of the world commands the riches of the world, and consequently the world itself.” Sir Walter Raleigh (c.1610).

The Suez Canal, which opened in November, 1869, and the Panama Canal, built between 1904 and 1914 by the United States, were prodigious technological, financial and logistical achievements during the “Age of Empire” that preceded World War I. They supported the expansion of global trade by making sea routes much shorter. As air travel did in the second half of the twentieth century and computerization is doing today, they made the world a much smaller place. Construction of the canals also supported European and United States economic, political and military domination of other regions of the world.

The opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 transformed world shipping. Before the canal was built, ships traveling between Europe and Asia had to sail around the southern tip of Africa, a voyage of approximately 10,000 miles. The Suez Canal meant that the trip from London, England to Bombay, India was shortened by more than 4,000 miles. The canal saved nearly two months time on a one-way trip. In the book, *Parting the Desert: The Creation of the Suez Canal*, author Zachary Karabell calls the construction of the Suez Canal the greatest engineering feat of the nineteenth century. It also spurred nationalist ambitions. Egyptians hoped the canal would lead to a national renaissance and renewed power in the eastern Mediterranean. The French believed the canal would advance their status as the standard-bearers of Western civilization. British merchants and businessmen invested in the canal with an eye on global economic domination. The canal fell under British control by 1875.

The idea of a canal was originally considered in ancient Egypt around the 13th century BC. In the modern era, Napoleon Bonaparte introduced the idea of building a waterway connecting the Mediterranean and Red Seas during the French occupation of Egypt in the late eighteenth century. In 1854, Muhammad Said became the ruler of Egypt and granted Ferdinand de Lesseps, a French diplomat, the right to build a hundred-mile-long canal across the isthmus of Suez. Design, financial arrangements and construction took fifteen years. Nearly 100 million cubic yards of sand and sediment had to be removed. The canal channel was originally 20 feet deep, 72 feet wide at the bottom and 190 feet wide at the surface. Initially, the trip through the canal by steamship took about 40 hours. When the Suez Canal was completed, it was a symbol of progress in the industrial world and a sign that East and West could coexist and cooperate. The Suez Canal finally reverted to Egyptian control in 1956.

Construction of a canal across the Isthmus of Panama was considered by Spanish conquistadors as early as the 1520s. A survey was ordered and a working plan for a canal was drawn up in 1529. However, it was not until 1819 that the Spanish government authorized the construction of a canal and created a company to build it. These plans were interrupted by revolutionary movements in Latin America. Surveys made between 1850 and 1875 showed two possible routes, one across Panama and another across Nicaragua. In 1876 an international company was organized that obtained permission from the Colombian government to construct a canal on the Panama route. When this company failed, Ferdinand de Lesseps, the builder of the Suez Canal, and a French company took over the project.

When the U.S. gained a global empire with territory in the Caribbean and the Pacific following the 1898 Spanish-American War, it envisioned a canal to tie this empire together. The canal would dramatically reduce the time and mileage needed for travel between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, saving 18,000 miles on a trip from New York to San Francisco.
In 1903, the United States instigated a rebellion in the Panama territory of Colombia to secure permission to build the canal. The Hay-Bunau-Varilla treaty granted the United States a perpetual lease on a 10-mile strip of Panama and permission to complete construction along the de Lesseps route. The Panama Canal is approximately 51 miles long and cost $400 million to build, which is the equivalent of approximately $8 billion today. Administration of the Panama Canal was turned over to local authorities in 1999 after 96 years of U.S. control.

Construction of the Panama Canal under the direction of U.S. army engineer Colonel George Goethals involved battles against disease, such as malaria and yellow fever, as well as the development of new engineering techniques, designing a lock system, and mobilization of a work force of about 25,000 people from across the Caribbean. Along the route of the canal there are a series of three sets of locks which lift ships over the central mountains and equalize the water levels of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

Theme Question: Should construction of the Suez and Panama canals best be viewed as technological and economic achievements or as imperialist adventures by France, Great Britain and the United States?

Task: Carefully read the document-based question and the historical context. Consider what you already know about this topic. How would you answer the theme question if you had no documents to examine? Read each document carefully, and answer the questions that follow. Formulate a thesis that directly answers the theme question. Write a well-organized essay supporting your thesis. The essay should be logically presented and should include information both from the documents and your general knowledge about the topic.


   “In order to understand the historical importance of the Suez Canal, one must look at a map of the world. . . One can see at once that the opening of a passage between the Mediterranean and the Red Sea was a matter of immense strategic and economic importance, for it created an alternate route from Europe to the East, both for potential traders and for warriors. The discovery of the Cape of Good Hope route had led to a shift of commercial supremacy in the Eastern trade from Mediterranean to Atlantic ports. Thus it is not surprising that the idea of digging a canal through the 100-mile strip of desert which separated the Mediterranean from the Red Sea held a special appeal. . .”

   Questions:
   Why is the Suez Canal strategically and economically important to Europe?
   How would the Suez Canal promote the growth of European imperialism?

2. World Map

   Question: Locate the Suez and Panama Canals on this world map. Why are these canals of strategic and economic importance?
3. British Cotton Cloth Exports to India, 1814-1835

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Export of plain British cotton</th>
<th>Export of dyed British cotton</th>
<th>Total British cloth export to India</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1814</td>
<td>213,408</td>
<td>604,800</td>
<td>818,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>9,423,352</td>
<td>9,715,374</td>
<td>19,138,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>30,411,857</td>
<td>12,410,220</td>
<td>42,822,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>39,459,172</td>
<td>12,318,105</td>
<td>51,777,277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions:
1. What is happening to British cotton cloth exports to India from 1814-1835?
2. Why would these statistics be an argument in favor of construction of the Suez Canal?


**Earl of Cromer, First British Viceroy of Egypt (1908).** “Egypt may now almost be said to form part of Europe. It is on the high road to the Far East. It can never cease to be an object of interest to all the powers of Europe, and especially to England.”

**Ham Mukasa, official secretary to the Katikiro of Buganda (1902).** “[It] is a marvelous thing and shows how the Europeans can always do whatever they set about doing. It is as long as from Mengo to Wakoli’s, eighty-seven miles, and is all cut through the sand, and is so deep that it will take vessels seven stories high. It is not wide - one could throw a stone or an orange across from side to side; and when two ships meet they tie up to posts on the bank to let the other pass.”

Questions:
1. Why does the British viceroy believe Great Britain’s actions in Egypt are justified?
2. What is the attitude of Ham Mukasa toward the Suez Canal and European actions in Africa?

5. Shipping on the Suez Canal, 1870-1895


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ships</th>
<th>Tons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>436,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1,494</td>
<td>2,009,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>2,026</td>
<td>3,037,422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ships</th>
<th>Tons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>3,624</td>
<td>6,335,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>3,389</td>
<td>6,890,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>3,434</td>
<td>8,448,383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions:
1. What is the general trend in shipping on the Suez Canal between 1870 and 1895?
2. The number of ships leveled off while tonnage increased. How would explain this phenomenon?


“[Egypt] stands solidly and staunchly to preserve her dignity against imperialistic schemes of a number of nations who have uncovered their desires for domination and supremacy. . . Egypt nationalized the Egyptian Suez Canal company. When Egypt granted the concession to de Lesseps it was stated in the concession between the Egyptian Government and the Egyptian company that the company of the Suez Canal is an Egyptian company subject to Egyptian authority. Egypt nationalized this Egyptian company and declared freedom of navigation will be preserved. But the imperialists became angry. Britain and France said Egypt grabbed the Suez Canal as if it were part of France or Britain. The British Foreign Secretary forgot that only two years ago he signed an agreement stating the Suez Canal is an integral part of Egypt. Egypt declared she was ready to negotiate. But as soon as negotiations began, threats and intimidations started. . . . [The Arab world] believe[s] in international law. But we will never submit. We shall show the world how a small country can stand in the face of great powers threatening with armed might. Egypt might be a small power but she is great inasmuch as she has faith in her power and convictions. I feel quite certain every Egyptian shares the same convictions as I do and believes in everything I am stressing now. We shall defend our freedom and independence to the last drop of our blood. This is the staunch feeling of every Egyptian. The whole Arab nation will stand by us in our common fight against aggression and domination. Free peoples, too, people who are really free will stand by us and support us against the forces of tyranny. . . .”
Questions:
1. Why does Egyptian President Gamel Nasser claim Egyptian sovereignty over the Suez Canal?
2. In your opinion, why is Egyptian President Nasser giving this speech?
3. Do you agree with Egyptian President Nasser? Explain.

7. The United States role in the 1903 Panamanian Revolution.
A. Telegram from United States Secretary of State Hay, June 9, 1903. The Colombian Government apparently does not appreciate the gravity of the situation. The canal negotiations were initiated by Colombia, and were energetically pressed upon this Government for several years. The propositions presented by Colombia, with slight modifications, were finally accepted by us. In virtue of this agreement our Congress reversed its previous judgment (favoring Nicaragua) and decided upon the Panama route. If Colombia should now reject the treaty or unduly delay its ratification, the friendly understanding between the two countries would be so seriously compromised that action might be taken by the Congress next winter which every friend of Colombia would regret.

B. Convention between the US And Panama (November 18, 1903). “The United States of America and the Republic of Panama being desirous to insure the construction of a ship canal across the Isthmus of Panama to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and the Congress of the United States of America having passed an act approved June 28, 1902, in furtherance of that object, by which the President of the United States is authorized to acquire within a reasonable time the control of the necessary territory of the Republic of Colombia, and the sovereignty of such territory being actually vested in the Republic of Panama”

C. The Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine, 1904. “It is not true that the United States feels any land hunger or entertains any projects as regards the other nations of the Western Hemisphere save such as are for their welfare. All that this country desires is to see the neighboring countries stable, orderly, and prosperous. . . We would interfere with [Latin America] only in the last resort, and then only if it became evident that their inability or unwillingness to do justice at home and abroad had invited foreign aggression to the detriment of the entire body of American nations.”

Questions:
1. Where does the United States want to build a canal?
2. In your opinion, why did Secretary of State Hay send this telegram?
3. What was the purpose of the 1903 agreement between the United States and Panama?
4. How did the United States benefit by supporting an independent Panama?
5. How did the Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine define the U.S. relationship with Latin America?
6. In your opinions, were U.S. actions in Panama justified or an unfair imperialist action? Explain.

8. Nicaraguan Poet Rubén Darío warns Theodore Roosevelt (1904)
You are the United States, you are the future invader of the native America that has Indian blood, that still prays to Jesus Christ and still speaks Spanish. You think that life is fire, that progress is eruption, that wherever you shoot you hit the future. No.
The United States is potent and great. When you shake there is a deep tremble that passes through the enormous vertebrae of the Andes. Be careful. Viva Spanish America!
There are a thousand cubs loosed from the Spanish lion. Roosevelt, one would have to be, through God himself, the fearful Rifleman and strong Hunter, to manage to grab us in your iron claws.
And, although you count on everything, you lack one thing: God!

Questions:
1. How does Nicaraguan poet Rubén Darío view the United States role in Latin America?
2. In your opinion, why does Dario take this position?
9. Problems in the Construction of the Panama Canal


“One of the most important things which has been delaying an agreement on the Panama Canal is the necessity of securing to the United States extraordinary police powers to enforce sanitary regulations. The early experiences of the French on the isthmus were terrible on the extreme, and any administration here in Washington which should permit an epidemic of cholera, yellow fever, dysentery, or other serious fatal attack would invite political defeat. The problem of sanitation for the Panama Canal becomes more serious every time it is examined. The Washington government has been forced to take the position that, during the time of active building operations, when thousands of men will be congregated in close quarters, and when the newly turned, damp soil will invite malarial fevers in every form, it will be absolutely necessary for the United States to have actual police control of a strip of territory at least three miles wide on each side of the canal.”

B. Bringing Ships over a Mountain: How a Canal Lock Works

The water level in the first lock drops to sea level. The ship enters and the gate is closed. A valve in the next lock is opened raising the water level in the first lock and lowering the water level in the second lock. When the water levels are equal, the ship enters the second lock.

Questions:
1. What diseases interfered with construction of the Panama Canal?
2. What solution was proposed to combat these diseases?
3. What solution was proposed for bringing ships over mountains that separated the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans?

10. Turning over the canal to Panama

“Washington and Panama reported in Agreement on Elements of a Treaty,” The New York Times, June 2, 1977, 6. “United States and Panamanian negotiators have drafted substantial portions of a general Panama Canal treaty and have prepared a second treaty designed to guarantee the canal’s neutrality. . . . Sources said the draft treaty sets Dec. 31, 1999, as the date when Panama would take complete control of the zone and when the United States military bases would be closed.”

“To Cheers, Panama Takes Over Canal,” The New York Times, January 1, 2000, 16. “As the United States turned over the Panama Canal to Panama today, many Panamanians said the occasion felt like Independence Day. ‘The canal is ours,’ President Mireya Morocoso shouted to cheering thousands in front of the old Canal Commission building. . . . ‘I tell the men, women and children of my country that there will be no more fences, no more signs blocking our entrance,’ Mrs. Morocoso said as she spoke under a heavy rain. ‘This territory is ours again. . . ’ In an attempt to avoid anti-American demonstrations, American military officials on Thursday quietly lowered the Stars and Stripes at the canal headquarters, where it had waved since 1914, when the canal was inaugurated. . . . The zone’s 147,000 square miles, with a major complement of American military and civilian installations, cut across Panama and was often seen as a colonial vestige. ‘It divided Panama into two separate territories and gave the United States a level of sovereignty reminiscent of a colonial era more appropriate to the 19th century than to the 20th,’ Mr. Caldera [head of the American delegation] said.”

Questions
1. When was the new canal treaty negotiated and when did it go into affect?
2. How did Panamanians respond to the transfer of authority over the canal from the United States?
3. The head of the American delegation said that in Panama, the United States had a “a level of sovereignty reminiscent of a colonial era more appropriate to the 19th century than to the 20th.” Do you agree with this statement? Explain.
I advocate an “essential questions” approach to teaching high school global history. My goal is to engage students in defining questions about the past that they want to answer. Usually, but not always, they select particular questions about history because the exploration of these questions offer insights into contemporary controversies.

In a period when the global military and economic policies of the United States have contributed to wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, increasingly concerns about the impact of globalization on the American economy and workforce, and fear of new “terrorist” attacks, an essential question that needs to be continually addressed in classes is “What is imperialism?”

Subsumed within this question is the debate over whether foreign expansion by militarily and economically powerful countries are a force for positive global change (i.e., the transformation of the role of women in traditional societies), must be condemned as a cause of exploitation, chaos and war (i.e., the upsurge in religious fundamentalism in the Islamic world), or somehow can be justified on occasion because of specific local circumstances (i.e., intervention to prevent genocide)?

The Literature of Imperialism

In *Culture and Imperialism* (NY: Vintage, 1994), Edward Said surveyed 19th century European and American literature and explored the way support for imperialism was deeply imbedded in the culture of European societies and the United States. He quotes John Stuart Mill, a noted British philosopher and economist, who justified British imperial control over third-world people because of its importance for England’s economic development.

According to Mill, “These outlying possessions of ours are hardly to be looked upon as countries, carrying on an exchange of commodities with other countries, but more properly as outlying agricultural or manufacturing estates belonging to a larger community. Our West Indian colonies, for example, cannot be regarded as countries with a productive capital of their own… [but are rather] the place where England finds it convenient to carry on the production of sugar, coffee and a few other tropical commodities. All the capital employed is English capital; almost all the industry is carried on for English uses, there is little production of anything except for staple commodities, and these are sent to England, not to be exchanged for things exported to the colony and consumed by its inhabitants, but to be sold in England for the benefit of the proprietors there. The trade with the West Indies is hardly to be considered an external trade, but more resembles the traffic between town and country” (Said, 90).

John Ruskin, another well-known writer and thinker of that era, also justified imperialist expansion around the world. In an 1870 lecture at Oxford University, Ruskin argued that imperialism spread civilization. Britain’s “destiny,” according to Ruskin, was to be a “source of light, a centre of peace” and the “mistress of Learning and of the Arts” for the entire world.

To promote this destiny, “she [Britain] must found colonies as fast and as far as she is able, formed of her most energetic and worthiest men, seizing every piece of fruitful waste ground she can set her foot on, and there teaching these her colonists that their chief virtue is to be fidelity to their country, and that their first aim is to be to advance the power of England by land and sea, and that, though they live off a distant plot of ground, they are no more to consider themselves therefore disfranchised from their native land, than the sailors of her fleets do, because they float of distant waves” (Said, 103).

The British upper class’ sense that they were somehow chosen by God for world domination was satirized by Charles Dickens in the novel *Dombey and Son* (1848). Dickens wrote, “The earth was made for Dombey and Son to trade in, and the sun and moon were made to give them light. Rivers and seas were formed to float their ships: rainbows gave them promise of fair weather; winds blew for or against their enterprises; stars and planets circled in their orbits, to preserve inviolate a system of which they were the centre. Common abbreviations took new meanings in his eyes, and had sole reference to them. A.D. had no concern with anno Domini, but stood for anno Dombey - and Son” (50).
European imperialist policies were often justified by racist ideology. Jules Harmand (1845-1921), a French naval doctor who later became Commissaries-General in Tonkin (Vietnam) and the Minister to Japan, was a leading theorist who saw imperialism as an extension of Darwinian evolution (Imperialism, Philip D. Curtin, ed., NY: Harper & Row, 291-293). Harmand argued that depriving a people of independence “is a demonstration of that universal law of the struggle for survival in which we are all engaged, not only on account of our nature, which condemns us to win or die, but also on account of civilization. It cannot permit such vast and fertile regions of the globe to be lost to us and to humanity by the incapacity of those who hold them and by the ill treatment given these lands so long as they are left to themselves. . . . It is necessary, then, to accept as a principle and point of departure the fact that there is a hierarchy of races and civilizations, and that we belong to the superior race and civilization.”

In his poem, “The White Man’s Burden” (1899), Rudyard Kipling echoed similar ideas when he called on the United States to join the European powers in the thankless imperial task of serving the needs of captive nations, overcoming “terror,” and filling the “mouth of Famine,” all while “sloth and heathen folly” bring your “hope to nought.”

The Division of Africa

Imperial ambition and economic greed, coupled with racist ideology, were used to justify the division of Africa by Europe’s major and minor powers. From November, 1884, through February, 1885, representatives from Great Britain, France, and Germany were joined by delegates from Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Denmark, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey and the United States, in Berlin where they attempted to coordinate their expansion into sub-Saharan Africa. While the “General Act” drafted at the Berlin Conference claimed to promote free trade and preserve the rights of native tribes, its principle accomplishment was to require that future territorial claims on the continent be reported to all the signatories of the agreement so that rival claims could be resolved amicably. Among the other conference achievements was recognition of Germany’s claim to Cameroon and King Leopold II of Belgium’s sovereignty in the Congo (Ferguson, 196-198). Between 1885 and 1908, the Congo Free State was run as the personal property of Leopold II and as many as 10 million Africans died there from misgovernment, exploitation and state-sponsored terror. Forced labor did not end until around 1930 (Riding, 2005).

In the United States, the idea of Manifest Destiny - that western expansion at the expense of Mexico and native peoples was God’s will -- was transformed into support for overseas conquest and colonies. In his poem, “Thou Mother With Thy Equal Brood,” Walt Whitman declared that the United States, the “ship of Democracy,” holds not the future of “thyself alone, not of the Western continent alone,” but the “Earth’s resume entire floats on thy keel.” He warned that the nation faced difficulties because “the livid cancer spread its hideous claws, clinging upon thy breasts, seeking to strike thee deep within” and that “consumption of the worst, moral consumption, shall rouge thy face with hectic,” but he was convinced that “thou shalt face thy fortunes, thy diseases, and surmount them all.”

Edward Said saw similar imperialist themes in Herman Melville’s Moby Dick. Said describes Captain Ahab as an “allegorical representation of the American world quest; he is obsessed, compelling, unstoppable, completely wrapped up in his own rhetorical justification and his sense of cosmic symbolism” (288).

United States as Imperial Power

At the dawn of the twentieth century, United States President Theodore Roosevelt was the leading advocate for a United States policy of global imperialism. According to Roosevelt, “We ourselves are becoming, owing to our strength and geographical situation, more and more the balance of power of the whole globe.” Roosevelt believed that “Conflicts between civilized nations and the ‘semi-barbarous peoples’ [are] a most regrettable but necessary international police duty which must be performed for the sake of the welfare of mankind.” He felt that “Chronic wrong-doing may force the United States, however reluctantly, in flagrant cases of such wrongdoing or impotence, to the exercise of an international police power.”

Roosevelt was also clear about the relationship between business expansion and empire. “Business concerns which have the largest means at their disposal and are managed by the ablest men take the lead in the strife for commercial supremacy among the nations of the world. America has only just begun to assume the commanding position in the international business
world which we believe will more and more be hers. It is of the utmost importance that this position be not jeopardized, especially at a time when foreign markets are essential.”

Among the leading opponents of U.S. imperial expansion were Democratic Party presidential candidate (and future Secretary of State) William Jennings Bryan and the author Mark Twain. In 1899, Bryan charged that “When the advocates of imperialism find it impossible to reconcile a colonial policy with the principles of our government... they fall back in helpless despair upon the assertion that it is destiny... Avarice paints destiny with a dollar mark before it, militarism equips it with a sword” (Feder, 235).

The platform of the American Anti-Imperialist League declared that “the policy known as imperialism is hostile to liberty, and tends toward militarism... We insist that the subjugation of any people is ‘criminal aggression’ and open disloyalty to the distinctive principles of our Government” (Feder, 234). Mark Twain, a member of the Anti-Imperialist League, was quoted in the New York World on October 6, 1900 saying, “We have no more business in China than in any other country that is not ours. There is the case of the Philippines... we have got into a mess, a quagmire from which each fresh step renders the difficulty of extrication immensely greater.” On October 15, 1900, he declared in the New York Herald, “I have seen that we do not intend to free, but to subjugate the people of the Philippines. We have gone there to conquer, not to redeem... It should, it seems to me, be our pleasure and duty to make those people free, and let them deal with their own domestic questions in their own way. And so I am an anti-imperialist. I am opposed to having the eagle put its talons on any other land.”

During the first half of the 20th century, critics of imperialism focused on the relationship between imperialism, nationalism and capitalism. J. A. Hobson, an English economist, defined imperialism as “the endeavor of the great controllers of industry to broaden the channel for the flow of their surplus wealth by seeking foreign markets and foreign investments to take off the goods and capital they cannot use at home” (Seldes, 324). Hobson considered imperialism the natural expansion of nationality.

In a 1919 speech after the conclusion of World War I, French novelist Anatole France declared “Let us create rational human beings, capable of... resisting those blooded ambitions of nationalism and imperialism which have crushed their brothers” (Seldes, 254). During the Russian Revolution, V. I. Lenin described it as “capitalism dying, not dead” (Seldes, 408) and he wrote: “World capitalism has at the present time, i.e., about the beginning of the 20th century, reached the stage of imperialism... Imperialist wars, i.e., wars for the mastery of the world, for markets, for bank capital and for the strangulation of small nations, are inevitable under such a state of affairs” (Seldes, 410).

**Western Civilization?**

India, one of the main victim’s of British imperial ambition, produced some of imperialism’s most bitter critics. Mohandas Gandhi, when asked by an interviewer what he thought of Western Civilization, declared that it would be a good idea. In 1958, Indian Prime Minister Jawaharl Nehru argued that “Imperialism, or colonialism, suppressed, and suppresses, the progressive social forces. Inevitably, it aligns itself with certain privileged groups or classes because it is interested in preserving the social and economic status quo” (Seldes, 521).

Historian Richard Barnet, in his book The Roots of War (1972:21), argues that in the second half of the 20th century the United States’ interventionist policies around the world had “all the elements of a powerful imperial creed... : a sense of mission, historical necessity, and evangelical fervor.”

According to Barnet, “The [American] imperial creed rests on a theory of law-making. According to the strident globalists, like [President Lyndon Baines] Johnson, and the muted globalists, like [President Richard] Nixon, the goal of U.S. foreign policy is to bring about a world increasingly subject to the rule of law. But it is the United States which must “organize the peace,” to use Secretary of State Rusk’s words. The United State imposes the “international interest” by setting the ground rules for economic development and military deployment across the planet. Thus the United States sets rules for Soviet behavior in Cuba, Brazilian behavior in Brazil, Vietnamese behavior in Vietnam. Cold War policy is expressed by a series of directives on such extraterritorial matters as whether British Guiana may have a Marxist dentist to run it. Cicero’s definition of the early Roman empire was remarkably similar. It was the domain over which Rome enjoyed the legal right to enforce the law. Today America’s self-appointed writ runs throughout the world,
including the Soviet Union and China, over whose territory the U.S. government has asserted the right to fly military aircraft. The United States, uniquely blessed with surpassing riches and an exceptional history, stands above the international system, not within it. Supreme among nations, she stands ready to be the bearer of the Law.”

I believe Barnet’s discussion of the United States “imperial creed” in the post-World War II period also describes the Bush credo announced at the beginning of the twenty-first century. On October 6, 2001, President George W. Bush declared that the United States had the right to impose its will on the rest of the world in the name of fighting terrorism and promoting freedom. According to Bush, “In this conflict there is no neutral ground... there can be no peace in a world of sudden terror. In the face of today’s new threat the only way to pursue peace is to pursue those who threaten it... We defend not only our precious freedoms but also the freedom of people everywhere to live and raise their children free from fear.”

In September, 2002, President Bush, in a report to Congress, extended this policy to justify unilateral military action by the United States and preemptive strikes against countries and groups perceived of as threats to the United States. Bush argued that “Given the goals of rogue states and terrorists, the United States can no longer solely rely on a reactive posture as we have in the past... As a matter of common sense and self-defense, America will act against such emerging threats before they are fully formed... While the United States will constantly strive to enlist the support of the international community, we will not hesitate to act alone, if necessary, to exercise our right of self-defense by acting pre-emptively against such terrorists to prevent them from doing harm against our people and our country” (“Bush outlines strategy of pre-emptive strikes, cooperation,” USA Today, 9/20/02).

Personally, I oppose the Bush foreign policy and believe it is decidedly imperialist. Based on my reading of history, imperialist powers have never promoted the freedom of dominated peoples or the best interests of other societies. In addition, I believe the United States, under President Bush, has further destabilized the world. Its actions have driven desperate people into joining the ranks of fundamentalists who offer some hope of resistance against imperial power. By doing this, the Bush policy promotes the very terrorism it hopes to suppress and endangers us all.

As a social studies teacher, my hope is to engage students in an examination of imperialism past and present. My goal is not to get them to agree with me, but to prepare them to participate as informed and active citizens in ongoing debates within a democratic society. “If this be treason,” as Patrick Henry declared in 1765, I believe we should “make the most of it.”
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European Imperialism in the Congo


A. In the 1870s, King Leopold of Belgium wanted a colony in Africa. To promote this ambition, he hosted a Geological Conference in Brussels in 1876. In his welcoming speech, Leopold presented his vision of the goal for European expansion into Africa.

“To open to civilization the only part of our globe which it has not yet penetrated, to pierce the darkness which hangs over entire peoples, is, I dare say, a crusade worthy of this century of progress. . . It seemed to me that Belgium, a centrally located and neutral country, would be a suitable place for such a meeting. . . Need I say that in bringing you to Brussels I was guided by no egotism? No, gentlemen, Belgium may be a small country, but she is happy and satisfied with her fate; I have no other ambition than to serve her well” (44-45).

B. History has preserved few examples of how conquered people viewed their conquerors. In this passage, a Waguhha from West Africa expresses his view of the White man. It is from the 1876 diary of the British explorer, Henry Morton Stanley.

“How can he be a good man who comes for no trade, whose feet you never see, who always goes covered with clothes, unlike all other people? No, there is something very mysterious about him, perhaps wicked, perhaps he is a magician, at any rate it is better to leave him alone and not disturb him” (53).

C. The British explorer Henry Morton Stanley believed that “missionaries of commerce” could spread the “gospel of enterprise” in Africa. However, for this to succeed, he felt it was necessary for Africans to abandon their ways of life and accept European customs.

“I foresaw a brilliant future of Africa, if by any miracle of good fortune I could persuade the dark millions of the interior to cast off their fabrics of grass clothing and don. . . second-hand costumes. . . See what a ready market lies here for old clothes! The garments shed by the military heroes of Europe, of the club lackeys, of the liveried servants of modern Pharaohs, the frockcoats of a lawyer, merchant, or a Rothschild; or perhaps the grave garb of these my publishers, might find people of the rank of Congo chieftainship to wear them” (69).

D. General Henry Shelton Sandford was the United States minister to Belgium and later the personal envoy of King Leopold to the United States. Sandford claimed that Leopold and Belgium were civilizing influences on Africa. In 1883, President Arthur included a passage drafted by Sandford in his annual address to Congress.

“The rich and populous valley of the Kongo is being opened by a society called the International African Association, of which the King of the Belgians is the president. . . Large tracts of territory have been ceded to the Association by native chiefs, roads have been opened, steamboats have been placed on the river and the nuclei of states established. . . under one flag which offers freedom to commerce and prohibits the slave trade. The objects of the society are philanthropic. It does not aim at permanent political control, but seeks the neutrality of the valley” (78).
E. As a result of lobbying by King Leopold’s envoy to the United States, Secretary of State Frelinghuysen officially recognized the Belgium king’s control over the Congo.

“The Government of the United States announces its sympathy with and approval of the humane and benevolent purposes of the International Association of the Congo, administering, as it does, the interest of the Free States there established, and will order the officers of the United States, both on land and sea, to recognize the flag of the International African Association as the flag of friendly Government” (81).

F. In 1889, King Leopold of Belgium awarded the British explorer Henry Morton Stanley the Grand Cross of the Congo. In response, Stanley issued the following praise of Leopold.

“What does the greatness of a monarch consist in? If it is the extent of his territory, then the Emperor of Russia is the greatest of all. If it is the splendour and power of military organization, then William II (of Germany) takes first place. But if royal greatness consists in the wisdom and goodness of a sovereign leading his people with the solicitude of a shepherd watching over his flock, then the greatest sovereign is your own” (94).

G. This passage is from the diary of one of the officers who accompanied the British explorer Henry Morton Stanley on a trip up the Congo River in 1887. The expedition, which would include 389 Europeans, was approved by King Leopold. One of the financial backers of the trip was the British Royal Geographic Society.

“It was most interesting, lying in the bush watching the natives quietly at their day’s work. Some women...were making banana flour by pounding up dried bananas. Men we could see building huts and engaged in other work, boys and girls running about, singing...I opened the game by shooting one chap through the chest. He fell like a stone...Immediately a volley was poured into the village” (99).

H. African porters were used to carry goods and supplies around the rapids of the Congo River before a railroad was built. In 1896, Edmond Picard, a Belgian government official, described a caravan of porters.

“Unceasingly we meet these porters...black, miserable, with only a horribly filthy loin-cloth for clothing, frizzy and bare head supporting the load—box, bale, ivory tusk...barrel; most of them sickly, drooping under a burden increased by tiredness and insufficient food – a handful of rice and some stinking dried fish; pitiful walking caryatids, beasts of burden with then monkey legs, with drawn features, eyes fixed and round from preoccupation with keeping their balance and from the daze of exhaustion. They come and go like this by the thousands...requisitioned by the State armed with its powerful militia, handed over by chiefs whose slaves they are and who make off with their salaries, trotting with bent knees, belly forward, an arm raised to steady the load, the other leaning on a long walking-stick, dusty and sweaty, insects spreading out across the mountains and valleys their many fields and their task of Sisyphus, dying along the road or, the journey over, heading off to die from overwork in their villages” (120-121).

I. Stanislas Lefranc was a Belgian prosecutor who went to the Congo to work as a magistrate (judge). He witnessed the beating of African children and adults who were considered disobedient or disrespectful of Europeans. The chicotte was a whip made of sun-dried hippopotamus hide. Lefranc sent newspaper articles to Belgium complaining about this practice.

“The station chief selects the victims...Trembling, haggard, they lie face down on the ground...two of their companions, sometimes four, seize them by the feet and hands, and remove their cotton drawers...Each time that the torturer lifts up the chicotte, a reddish stripe appears on the skin of the pitiful victims, who, however firmly held, gasp in frightful contortions...At the first blows the unhappy victims let out horrible cries which soon become faint groans...In a refinement of evil, some officers, and I’ve witnessed this, demand that when the sufferer gets up, panting, he must graciously give the military salute” (121).
Prior to the dropping of the atomic bomb, President Harry Truman was faced with a major decision. With the surrender of Germany on May 8, 1945, the United States and its allies still had to bring an end to the war in the Pacific. At the same time, a four-year top-secret scientific project to develop a “super” bomb neared completion. The Manhattan Project had cost nearly $2 billion dollars.

Truman hoped deployment of the weapon, an atomic bomb, would make it possible to avoid a planned November invasion of Japan that would involve over 750,000 troops with projected causalities of over 30,000 men. The use of the atomic bomb on Japan would save American lives, bring about a quick end to World War II, and serve as a warning to the Soviet Union about American military might. Very few moral questions were raised at the time and the decision to drop atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki seems almost inevitable.

In the minds of many Americans, the atom bombing of Japanese cities served its purpose and was justified. Anti-Japanese feeling was rampant and stereotypes of the Japanese as a fanatical or sadistic people were very much a part of the American psyche.

A 1946 account of the impact of the bombing on the people of Hiroshima finally forced the American people to reconsider. Originally published in *The New Yorker* magazine, John Hersey’s *Hiroshima*, helped to penetrate the cloud of self-righteousness that had developed in the United States about the use of the atomic bomb. Before its publication, the American public was generally ignorant about just how destructive the bomb was. Photographs from Hiroshima focused on property damage and statistics about the loss of life hardly told the entire story. Many prominent military leaders had attributed the heavy loss of life in Hiroshima to faulty construction of homes or ruptured gas mains. Hersey’s work, which focused on six survivors, put a human face on the casualties and showed Americans why the atomic bomb was so devastating.

*Hiroshima* is an excellent book to use in the classroom as a starting point to examine and analyze the impact of the dropping of the atomic bomb. Modern warfare has significantly changed and this book, or the excerpts used in the attached activity sheets, can be used to discuss the important moral and ethical questions raised by the use of nuclear weapons.

The curriculum material with the document-based essay is designed to include a number of National Council for the Social Studies thematic strands. To fully understand the bombing of Japan and the aftermath, students should study the unique aspects of Japanese society (Culture, People, Places & Environments). The debate over the use of nuclear weapons examines the thematic strand Power, Authority & Governance. The actual development and capability of such weaponry addresses the Science, Technology and Society thematic strand.

---

**Document Packet:** Should the United States have dropped the Atomic Bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki?

**Introduction:** This document-based essay is based on the accompanying documents (1-9). It is designed to test your ability to work with historical documents. Some of the documents have been edited. As you analyze the documents, take into account both the source of each document and any point of view that may be presented in the document.

**Historical Context:** On August 6, 1945, a United States airplane, the Enola Gay, dropped an atomic bomb on the Japanese city of Hiroshima. Three days later, another bomb was dropped on the city of Nagasaki. Tens of thousands of civilians died in each attack. Following the second bomb, the Japanese government agreed to unconditionally surrender, ending World War II.

**Task:** Using information from the documents and your knowledge of global history, answer the questions that follow each document in Part A. Your answers to the questions will help you write the Part B essay, in which you will be asked to:
- Explain why the United States decided to use atom bombs against Japanese cities.
- Describe the impact of the atomic bombings.
- Explain your opinion on whether the use of atomic bombs against these cities was justified.

**Note:** Be sure to use specific evidence sited in the documents as well as outside knowledge about Global history.
Should the United States have dropped Atomic Bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki?

1. Excerpt from statement by President Harry Truman, August 6, 1945.
   Source: http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/bomb/small/mb10.htm

   Sixteen hours ago an American airplane dropped one bomb on Hiroshima and destroyed its usefulness to the enemy. It is an atomic bomb. It is a harnessing of the basic power of the universe. The force from which the sun draws its power has been loosed against those who brought war to the Far East. We are now prepared to obliterate more rapidly and completely every productive enterprise the Japanese have above ground in any city. We shall destroy their docks, their factories, and their communications. Let there be no mistake; we shall completely destroy Japan’s power to make war. It was to spare the Japanese people from utter destruction that the ultimatum of July 26 was issued at Potsdam. Their leaders promptly rejected that ultimatum. If they do not now accept our terms they may expect a rain of ruin from the air, the like of which has never been seen on this earth. Behind this air attack will follow sea and land forces in such number that and power as they have not yet seen and with the fighting skill of which they are already well aware.

   1. What is the purpose of President Truman’s statement?
   2. Why does the President refer to the rejection of the Potsdam ultimatum in this statement?
   3. What does he mean when he says the Japanese can expect a “rain of ruin from the air?”

2. Leaflet dropped on cities in Japan warning civilians about the atomic bomb, August 6, 1945.
   Source: http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/truman/psources/ps_leaflets.html

   TO THE JAPANESE PEOPLE: America asks that you take immediate heed of what we say on this leaflet. We are in possession of the most destructive explosive ever devised by man. A single one of our newly developed atomic bombs is actually the equivalent in explosive power to what 2000 of our giant B-29s can carry on a single mission. This awful fact is for you to ponder and we solemnly assure you it is grimly accurate. We have just begun to use this weapon against your homeland. If you still have any doubt, make inquiry as to what happened to Hiroshima when just one atomic bomb fell on that city. Before using this bomb to destroy every resource of the military by which they are prolonging this useless war, we ask that you now petition the Emperor to end the war. Our president has outlined for you the thirteen consequences of an honorable surrender. We urge that you accept these consequences and begin the work of building a new, better and peace-loving Japan. You should take steps now to cease military resistance. Otherwise, we shall resolutely employ this bomb and all our other superior weapons to promptly and forcefully end the war. EVACUATE YOUR CITIES.

   1. What does the leaflet warn about?
   2. What is the United States demanding?
   3. In your opinion, why did the United States make this direct appeal to the Japanese public?

3. Excerpt from President Truman’s speech to the nation on August 9, 1945, shortly after the second bomb was dropped on Nagasaki. Source: http://www.dannen.com/decision/hst-ag09.html

   The world will note that the first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, a military base. That was because we wished in this first attack to avoid, insofar as possible, the killing of civilians. But that attack is only a warning of things to come. If Japan does not surrender, bombs will have to be dropped on her war industries and, unfortunately, thousands of civilian lives will be lost. I urge Japanese civilians to leave industrial cities immediately, and save themselves from destruction. We shall continue to use it until we completely destroy Japan’s power to make war. Only a Japanese surrender will stop us.

   1. Why do you think the president refers to Hiroshima as “a military base”?
   2. Why would the U.S. president urge Japanese civilians to “save themselves from destruction”?
Source: http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/bomb/large/opinions_responses/bmd2-1.htm

I know that Japan is a terribly cruel and uncivilized nation in warfare but I can’t bring myself to believe that, because they are beasts, we should ourselves act in the same manner. For myself, I certainly regret the necessity of wiping out whole populations because of the “pigheadedness” of the leaders of a nation and, for your information, I am not going to do it unless it is absolutely necessary. It is my opinion that after the Russians enter into war the Japanese will very shortly fold up. My object is to save as many American lives as possible but I also have a humane feeling for the women and children in Japan.

1. How did President Truman describe Japan?
2. In your opinion, why did he describe Japan in this way?
3. If his assessment of Japan was accurate, did that justify the bombings? Explain.


1. Describe the city of Hiroshima following the atomic bombing of Hiroshima.
2. What emotions are evoked by these images?


How can a human being with any claim to a sense of moral responsibility deliberately let loose an instrument of destruction which can at one stroke annihilate an appalling segment of mankind? This is not war; this is not even murder; this is pure nihilism. This is a crime against God and humanity which strikes at the very basis of moral existence. The crime of the Americans stands out in ghastly repulsiveness all the more for the ironic contradiction it affords to their lying pretensions. For in their noisy statements, they have always claimed to be the champions of fairness and humanitarianism. But now beside the latest technique of total destruction which the Americans have adopted, their earlier crimes pale into relative insignificance. What more barbarous atrocity can there be than to wipe out at one stroke the population of a whole city without distinction – men, women, and children; the aged, the weak, the infirm; those in positions of authority, and those with no power at all; all snuffed out without being given a chance of lifting even a finger in either defense or defiance!

The United States may claim, in a lame attempt to raise a pretext in justification of its latest action, that a policy of utter annihilation is necessitated by Japan’s failure to heed the recent demand for unconditional surrender. But the question of surrendering or not surrendering certainly can have not the slightest relevance to the question of whether it is justifiable to use a method which under any circumstances is strictly condemned alike by the principles of international law and of morality. For this American outrage against the fundamental moral sense of
mankind, Japan must proclaim to the world its protest against the United States, which has made itself the arch-enemy of humanity.

1. What is the purpose of this editorial?
2. What are the most important charges the editors are making?
3. In your opinion, is a Japanese newspaper justified in making these charges? Explain.

7. Statement by Emperor Hirohito, accepting the Potsdam Declaration, August 14, 1945.
Source: http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/hirohito.htm

After pondering deeply the general trends of the world and the actual conditions obtaining in our empire today, we have decided to effect a settlement of the present situation by resorting to an extraordinary measure. We have ordered our Government to communicate to the Governments of the United States, Great Britain, China and the Soviet Union that our empire accepts the provisions of their joint declaration. We declared war on America and Britain out of our sincere desire to insure Japan’s self-preservation and the stabilization of East Asia, it being far from our thought either to infringe upon the sovereignty of other nations or to embark upon territorial aggrandizement. But now the war has lasted for nearly four years. Despite the best that has been done by everyone, the war situation has developed not necessarily to Japan’s advantage, while the general trends of the world have all turned against her interest. Moreover, the enemy has begun to employ a new and most cruel bomb, the power of which to do damage is, indeed, incalculable, taking the toll of many innocent lives. Should we continue to fight, it would not only result in an ultimate collapse and obliteration of the Japanese nation, but also it would lead to the total extinction of human civilization.

1. What is the purpose of this statement by the Emperor?
2. What reason does he give for the declaration of war on America and Britain?
3. In your opinion, what is the main reason for the Japanese issuing this statement?

8. Excerpt from petition to the President of the United States signed by 67 atomic scientists, signed in July 1945 and released to the public on August 17, 1945. Source: http://www.dannen.com/decision/45-07-17.html

This war has to be brought speedily to a successful conclusion and attacks by atomic bombs may very well be an effective method of warfare. We feel, however, that such attacks on Japan could not be justified. The development of atomic power will provide the nations with new means of destruction. Thus a nation which sets the precedent of using these newly liberated forces of nature for purpose of destruction may have to bear the responsibility of opening the door to an era of devastation on an unimaginable scale.

1. What is the position of the atomic scientists on the use of a nuclear weapon?
2. Why do you think scientists who developed this capability would take this position?


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hiroshima</th>
<th>Nagasaki</th>
<th>Tokyo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Dead/Missing</td>
<td>70,000-80,000</td>
<td>35,000-40,000</td>
<td>83,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wounded</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>102,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Casualties</td>
<td>140,000-150,000</td>
<td>75,000-80,000</td>
<td>185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Destroyed</td>
<td>4.7 sq. miles</td>
<td>1.8 sq. miles</td>
<td>15.8 sq. miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons</td>
<td>“Little Boy,” 1 atomic bomb</td>
<td>“Fat Man,” 1 atomic bomb</td>
<td>1,667 tons of TNT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. What were the combined total casualties from the attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki?
2. Why is the atomic bomb such a powerful weapon?
The Impact of the Atomic Bomb on the People of Japan – A First Hand Account

John Hersey’s book, *Hiroshima* (NY: Knopf, 1956), was first published in November, 1946 in the magazine *The New Yorker*. It told the stories of six survivors of the atomic bomb that was dropped on Hiroshima on August 6, 1945. It is a testament to the social and personal devastation caused by the bombing. These excerpts are from the story of Mrs. Nakamura and her children. As you read these excerpts, picture what is happening in your mind and then answer the questions. As follow-up activities: (a) illustrate these selections; (b) write a poem expressing your feelings about what you have read; (c) write a manifesto explaining your views on attacks on civilian populations during times of war and the use of nuclear weapons.

1. August 6, 1945. 8:15 AM, Hiroshima, Japan (*Hiroshima*, p. 13-14). Mrs. Nakumura went back to the kitchen, looked at the rice, and began watching the man next door. . . . As Mrs. Nakumura stood watching her neighbor, everything flashed whiter than any white she had ever seen. She did not notice what happened to the man next door; the reflex of a mother set her in motion toward her children. She had taken a single step (the house was 1,350 yards, or three-quarters of a mile, from the center of the explosion) when something picked her up and she seemed to fly into the next room over the raised sleeping platform, pursued by parts of her house. Timbers fell around her as she landed, and a shower of tiles pummeled her; everything became dark, for she was buried. The debris did not cover her deeply. She rose up and freed herself. She heard a child cry, “Mother, help me!,” and saw her youngest — Myeko, the five year old — buried up to her breast and unable to move.

As Mrs. Nakamura started frantically to claw her way toward the baby, she could see or hear nothing of her other children.

1. How far away was Mrs. Nakamura and her children from the center of the explosion?
2. Describe what happened to Mrs. Nakamura as a result of the explosion.
3. What do you think Mrs. Nakamura was feeling at this moment? Why?


2. August 6, 1945, Directly after the dropping of the bomb, Hiroshima, Japan (*Hiroshima*, p. 27-29). Mrs. Hatsuyo Nakamura . . . crawled across the debris, hauled at timbers, and flung tiles aside, in a hurried effort to free the child. Then, from what seemed to be caverns far below, she heard two small voices crying, "Tasukete! Tasukete! Help! Help!" She called the names of her ten-year-old son and eight-year-old daughter: "Tesbiol Yaeko!" The voices from below answered. Mrs. Nakamura abandoned Myeko, who at least could breathe, and in a frenzy made the wreckage fly above the crying voices. The children had been sleeping nearly ten feet apart, but now their voices seemed to come from the same place. Toshio, the boy, apparently had some freedom to move, because she could feel him undermining the pile of wood and tiles as she worked from above. At last she saw his head and she hastily pulled him out by it. A mosquito net was wound intricately, as if it had been carefully wrapped, around his feet. He said he had been blown right across the room and had been on top of his sister Yaeko under the wreckage. She now said, from underneath, that she could not move, because there was something on her legs. With a bit more digging, Mrs. Nakamura cleared a hole above the child and began to pull her arm. "Itai! It hurts!" Yaeko cried. Mrs. Nakamura
shouted, "There's no time now to say whether it hurts or not," and yanked her whimpering daughter up. Then she freed Myeko. The children were filthy and bruised, but none of them had a single cut or scratch. Mrs. Nakamura took the children out into the street... The children were silent, except for the five-year-old. Myeko, who kept asking questions: "Why is it night already? Why did our house fall down? What happened?"

1. How was Mrs. Nakamura able to free her children?
2. What do you think the children were feeling when they left their house and observed the wreckage?

3. August 6, 1945. Mid-day. Hiroshima, Japan. (Hiroshima, p. 47-48). Mrs. Hataya, called to Mrs. Nakamura to run away with her to the woods in Asano Park—an estate, by the Kyo River not far off... All day people poured into Asano Park. This private estate was far enough away from the explosion so that its bamboos, pines, laurel, and maples were still alive... Mrs. Nakamura and her children were among the first to arrive, and they settled in the bamboo grove near the river. They all felt terribly thirsty, and they drank from the river. At once they were nauseated and began vomiting, and they retched the whole day.

1. Why did Mrs. Nakamura and her children head for Asano Park?
2. What happened when Mrs. Nakamura and her children drank the water from the river?

4. August 6, 1945. Early Evening. Hiroshima, Japan. (Hiroshima, p. 50-53). It began to rain... The wind grew stronger and stronger, and suddenly... a whirlwind ripped through the park. Huge trees crashed down; small ones were uprooted and flew into the air. Higher, a wild array of flat things revolved in the twisting funnel... The vortex moved out onto the river, where it sucked up a waterspout and eventually spent itself.

1. What happened that evening?
2. What would you have thought if you were in Asano park?

5. August 20–26, 1945. Kabe, Japan (Hiroshima, p. 88-90). As she dressed on the morning of August 20th, in the home of her sister-in-law in Kabe, Mrs. Nakamura, who had suffered no cuts or burns at all, though she had been rather nauseated all through the week, began fixing her hair and noticed, after one stroke, that her comb carried with it a whole handful of hair; the second time, the same thing happened, so she stopped combing at once. But in the next three or four days, her hair kept falling out of its own accord, until she was quite bald.

1. Where did Mrs. Nakamura stay after leaving Asano Park?
2. Describe what was happening to Mrs. Nakamura physically. What do you think was causing this to happen?
3. What would you be thinking if you were Mrs. Nakamura or one of her children?

6. August, 1946. One year after the dropping of the atomic bomb. Hiroshima, Japan (Hiroshima, p. 118). Toshio Nakamura, who was ten at the time of the bombing, wrote the following matter-of-fact essay for his teacher at Noboricho Primary School: “The day before the bomb, I went for a swim. In the morning, I was eating peanuts. I saw a light. I was knocked to little sister’s sleeping place. When we were saved, I could only see as far as the tram. My mother and I started to pack our things. The neighbors were walking around burned and bleeding. Hataya-san told me to run away with her. I said I wanted to wait for my mother. We went to the park. A whirlwind came. At night a gas tank burned and I saw the reflection in the river. We stayed in the park one night. Next day I went to Taiko Bridge and met my girl friends Kikuki and Murakami. They were looking for their mothers. But Kikuki’s mother was wounded and Murakami’s mother, alas, was dead.”

1. Describe the tone of Toshio Nakamura’s essay.
2. Do you think your essay have been similar if you lived through the atomic blast on Hiroshima? Explain.
3. What would you include in your essay that Toshio did not include? Why?
Global Transformation

Mock Trial of Harry Truman for Crimes Against Humanity
by Tom Scheira (trscheira@adelphia.net) and Glen McClary

With the winds of war swirling in Iraq, Afghanistan and in North Korea, it is quite obvious the role the United States plays as police officer of the world. If peace is to be achieved on a global level, the United States is sure to play an important and critical role. No war has changed the complexion of the global landscape like World War II. Its history is still central to the way global politics are played today. This unit addresses an important issue: The dropping of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The atomic bomb introduced a new age and developed a unique perspective on military issues. No longer do conventional weapons decide wars; now nuclear weapons must be considered. The unit focuses on Harry Truman and his decision to use the atomic bomb to end the war with Japan. Students must think critically about why it was used and consider alternatives. Was this the only way to end the war in Japan? Would Japanese soldiers fight to their death and cause tremendous Allied casualties? Was dropping the bomb payback for Japan’s bombing of Pearl Harbor? And finally, did Truman drop the bomb to demonstrate U.S. military power to the rest of the world? The unit also looks at how World War II played out on the local home front. My mother was a “Rosie the Riveter” at the Curtiss Wright Airplane factory in Buffalo, New York and my father was a cook aboard the destroyer USS Pavlic. The unit encourages students to seek out their family members to discover what role they played in the war effort.

These activities were taught at Hutchinson-Technical High School in Buffalo, New York. They require a lot of structure on the part of the teacher and hard work by students. Many of the students at this school have reading problems and are not quite sure what it means to think critically. They did enjoy the part where they interviewed a family member and work on the internet.

Unit Topic: United States President Harry Truman stands on trial for crimes against humanity for his decision to drop the atomic bomb on the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki during World War II.

Connections: How did the need to wage “total war” alter the nature of American society? How did United States domestic policies during World War II compare with those of World War I? Students should compare the role of the United States in World War I and World War II in terms of (1) the arsenal of democracy, (2) United States military leadership and strategy, and (3) role of the President in planning the peace. Students should understand that there were several moral issues that grew out of the war experience. These include: (1) rights of Japanese-Americans, (2) Integration of African-Americans, (3) United States reactions to the Nazi Holocaust, (4) The morality of nuclear warfare, and (5) The treatment of war criminals. Students should study the origins of these concerns and the ways in which they have been addressed in the post-war period.

Unit Assessment: Students will be evaluated on their ability to role-play each part assigned to them. They will be graded on the research of the role and the authenticity of each part in which they are to empathize with their assigned role. Each student will write a two-page document, which identifies their perspective and understanding of the implications of dropping the atomic bomb. The military leaders will give specific facts which explain why the bomb needed to be dropped. The family members and citizens will make arguments as to why the bomb should or should not have been dropped.

The participants: Harry Truman, Douglas Macarthur, Secretary Marshall, Robert Oppenheimer, President of the American Legion, American Army private in Okinawa, American Sailor on a destroyer in Okinawa, parent of American soldier, wife of American sailor, Emperor Hirohito, Tojo, three different citizens of Japan (past and current), citizen of Switzerland and India, three members of an International Tribunal, a lawyer representing Harry Truman and a prosecutor.

Project: All students will also be given an assignment to interview a family member who served in the war effort during World War II. That individual may have served in the Asian theater or served in a local plant aiding the war effort. The student will ask various questions in an open-ended interview format. Some of the questions may include the role the individual played and may be asked to share artifacts with the class.
Day 1: Outlining the Mock Trial
Instructional Objective: Introduce students to the idea of a Mock Trial of Harry Truman because of his decision to drop two atomic bombs on Japan at the end of World War II.

Materials: Web sites. If computers are not available, students will be given a topic to research in the library or the teacher will download the pages of these web sites and make them available to students. World War II Preservation Society (www.cybercreek.com/cybercity/WWIIps); World War 2 Veterans (ww2.vet.org); Children of the Camp (www.pbs.org/childofcamp); Manzanar Relocation camp (www.manzanar.com); Songs of Survival (www.whitecloudpress.com/books/song.html); Douglas MacArthur (www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/macarthur); Tojo Hideki (www.isd.net/aswanson/ww2his/tojo.htm); Marshall (www.isd.net/aswanson/ww2his/marshall.htm); Japan’s War Crimes (vikingphoenix.com/public/JapanIncorporated/1895-1945/jpwcrmz.htm); Hiroshima, Nagasaki and Truman (users.erols.com/goodman); Men and ships of World War 2 (www.usmm.org/men_ships.html); Robert Oppenheimer (www.ceiptualinstitute.com/genre/oppenheimer.htm).

Activity: Teacher will give an overview of the topic and discuss the goals of the unit.
Teacher will then place students into cooperative groups of four or five, depending on class size and distribute the students’ assignment. Teacher will sit with each cooperative group and give instructions for the assignment and assign the specific task of giving everyone a role. Students will write a brief paragraph in their notebooks paraphrasing the role they will play in the overall assignment.

Evaluation: In a brief paragraph, students will describe their participation in the overall unit assignment.

Day 2: Identify Reasons And Supporting Facts.
Instructional Objective: Given material for their specific role in a skit judging Harry Truman’s decision to drop the atomic bomb, the student will list three historical facts and three supporting reasons.

Materials: Web pages from previous day or information from textbooks contained in class on World War 2.

Activity: Teacher will state the purpose of the day’s class for the students to assimilate into their roles and decide whether they believe Truman should have dropped the bomb. The students will huddle into small groups and discuss each other’s information sheet. After the discussion, they will read their material and identify three facts and three supporting reasons for their decision.

Evaluation: A list that was generated in their notes of the three facts and supporting reasons.

Day 3: Develop A Rough Draft Of Their Paper.
Instructional Objective: Students will compose a rough draft of approximately 150 words stating their position on Harry Truman’s decision to drop the atomic bomb.

Materials: Notes from previous day and information sheet on World War 2.

Activity: Teacher will explain the concept of “rough draft,” which is the process of converting ideas and facts into the essay form. The teacher will also describe the basic parts of the writing process. The students will work in cooperative groups spending the majority of the class composing the paper. The teacher will assist individuals and rely on group members to help one another.

Evaluation: The students will draft a 150-word paper on their decision regarding Harry Truman’s decision to drop the atomic bomb.

Day 4: Writing Paper.
Instructional Objective: Given the previous day’s rough draft, the students will edit their paper into a final form of approximately 150 words which is to include at least three historical facts and three supporting reasons on their decision regarding Harry Truman’s decision to drop the atomic bomb.

Materials: Students will use the previous day’s rough draft, a dictionary, thesaurus, and their information sheet.

Activity: Teacher will place the students into cooperative groups where they will edit a rough draft and convert it into a final paper. The students will pair off and read each other’s paper and give suggestions for improvement. The students will spend the rest of the class finalizing their paper.

Evaluation: The students will compose a 150 word final draft of their decision regarding Harry Truman’s decision to drop the atomic bomb.
Day 5: Group Meetings

Instructional Objective: In a class brainstorming session, students will list at least 10 reasons whether Harry Truman was justified in dropping the atomic bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. In meetings with members of the prosecution or defense. Each student will compose one reason to support his or her side.

Materials: Students will refer to their notes and final paper.

Activity: Teacher will place students in groups of either supporting or renouncing Harry Truman’s decision to drop the atomic bomb. From their final drafts, students will rank the order of their decision. Teacher will place the students who will act as defender or prosecutor of Harry Truman in the appropriate group. The individual will call on each member of the group, have them identify who they are and identify their position. A list will be composed by the lawyers stating 10 specific reasons for their client’s innocence or guilt.

Evaluation: After a brainstorming session, a list will be compiled of at least 10 reasons for and against Harry Truman’s decision to drop the atomic bomb.

Day 6: First Day Of The Trial

Instructional Objective: In a mock court trial determining whether President Harry S. Truman is guilty of war crimes for dropping the atomic bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, two class representatives will state their arguments for guilt or innocence.

Materials: Student notes, information sheets and textbooks from World War 2.

Activity: The teacher will state that the purpose of today’s class is to have a mock trial of Harry S. Truman. The lawyers for the prosecution and the defense will call these individuals to the stand and ask them to state their testimony. The class will be divided into their appropriate roles: Harry Truman, Douglas MacArthur, Secretary Marshall, Robert Oppenheimer, President of the American Legion, American Army private in Okinawa, American Sailor on a destroyer in Okinawa, parent of American soldier, wife of American sailor, Emperor Hirohito, Tojo, three different citizens of Japan (past and current), citizen of Switzerland and India, three members of an International Tribunal, a lawyer representing Harry Truman and a prosecutor.

Evaluation: Given various facts and supporting reasons, a class representative will state the most important reason for Truman’s innocence or guilt.

Day 7: Verdict and Assessment

Instructional Objective: Given various sources for information and individual accounts, three members of the class acting as a jury, will compose a one page decision determining whether President Harry Truman’s decision to drop the atomic bomb was a war crime.

Materials: Student notes, information sheets and textbooks from World War 2.

Activity: The teacher will call on various students and ask them to state the class activities of the past week. The teacher will ask each member of the jury to read his or her “verdict” to the class.

Evaluation: Individual students will write a one-paragraph reflection identifying three ideas they learned participating in this trial.
The Berlin Wall: Cold War Symbol of a World
by Matthew Chicco and Oliver Schnabel

Berlin, a divided city in a divided country, and the Berlin Wall, which separated the eastern and western sectors of the city, were the most important symbols of the Cold War (1945-1991). They represented the great divide between the United States and the capitalist-democratic west and the Soviet Union and its allies amongst the Communist bloc of nations. Events in Berlin underscored the potential of Cold War divisions to erupt at any moment, or with the slightest provocation, into a world war that could unleash nuclear arsenals and annihilate the world.

As World War II drew to a close in Europe, ideological and economic conflicts amongst the allies that had been set aside because of the need to defeat a common enemy, began to surface. A major issue was the future map of Europe. The United States, with the support of Great Britain and free French forces, along with the Soviet Union, maneuvered to grab as much of the occupied German territories as possible. The Soviet Union, whether legitimately or not, feared that the capitalist powers of the West would seek to destabilize their country, and perhaps even invade, as they had done after World War I. The United States was concerned that once American troops had gone home across the Atlantic, the Soviet Union would be in a position to dominate the entire continent.

In 1945, leaders of the four powers met at Yalta and in Potsdam, where they divided the post-war world into spheres of influence and decided on a joint occupation of Germany. Germany was divided into four sectors, each controlled by a different member of the victorious alliance. Its capital city of Berlin, located deep inside the Soviet sector, was also divided into areas administered by France, Great Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union. The division was formalized when the French, British and American sectors were combined into the Federal Republic of Germany and the Soviet sector became a separate country under the military control of the Soviet Union.

As the Cold War took shape, a divided Berlin symbolized the tensions of a divided world. In June, 1948, the Soviet Union blockaded West Berlin, cutting off supplies and western access to the city and supplies. The United States responded with an airlift and the stalemate lasted for about a year. In August, 1961, East Germany and the Soviet Union erected a wall of concrete and barbed wire to divide the city and prevent East Berliners from escaping to the west. In 1963, when United States President John Kennedy spoke at the Berlin Wall, he declared “All free men, wherever they may live, are citizens of Berlin, and, therefore, as a free man, I take pride in the words ‘Ich bin ein Berliner’ (I am a Berliner).” In 1987, United States President Ronald Reagan visited Berlin and demanded that Soviet Prime Minister Mikhail Gorbachev “tear down this wall.”

In November, 1989, with the Soviet Union beginning to collapse and with its control over its allies waning, the Berlin Wall was finally opened. Just as the Berlin blockade signaled the start of the Cold War and the Berlin Wall symbolized the division of the world into two hostile camps, the tearing down of the wall and the reunification of Berlin and Germany in 1990 marked the Cold War’s end.

The primary source documents and activities in this package are designed to examine the importance of Berlin and the Berlin Wall during the Cold War.

President Reagan at Berlin Wall, 1987 (CNN)
1. **Start of the Cold War.** Winston Churchill was the British Prime Minister during most of World War II. In 1946, he gave a speech at Westminster College in Fulton, Missouri where he coined the term “Iron Curtain.” Joseph Stalin, Soviet Communist Party leader from 1929-1953, responded to Churchill in a speech later the same year. Churchill: “An Iron Curtain has descended across the continent. Behind that line lie all of the capitals of the ancient states of central and eastern Europe . . . all these famous cities and the populations around lie in the Soviet sphere and all are subject . . . to a very high and increasing measure of control from Moscow.” Stalin: “The Soviet Union’s loss of life [during World War II] has been several times greater than that of Britain and the United States of America put together. . . And so what can be so surprising about the fact that the Soviet Union, anxious for its future safety, is trying to see to it that governments loyal in their attitude to the Soviet Union should exist in these countries?”

**Questions**
3. According to Winston Churchill, what has happened to Eastern Europe?
4. How does Joseph Stalin justify what has happened?

2. **Cold War Timeline.** The history of the Berlin Wall and the history of the Cold War are directly related. Examine this joint timeline. What would you identify as the key events in the histories of the Berlin Wall and the Cold War? In your opinion, why might the Berlin Wall be considered the major symbol of the Cold War?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Berlin and Germany</th>
<th>Cold War</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>World War II in Europe is over. Germany and Berlin are divided into U.S., British, French and Soviet sectors.</td>
<td>At Yalta and Potsdam conferences, victorious allies divide the world into spheres of influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-1948</td>
<td>Berlin is divided into two different currency zones. Beginning of the Berlin Blockage by Soviet forces (June 24, 1948) and the U.S. airlift.</td>
<td>Communists take power in Poland. The U.S. announces the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan to contain the expansion of Soviet influence (1947).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1952</td>
<td>The border between East and West Germany is closed. Only the border between East and West Berlin remains open (1952).</td>
<td>UN forces led by the U.S. battle against communist forces from northern Korea and China. The Korean War ends in 1953 with the division of the Korean peninsula into two countries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1960-1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Berlin and Germany</th>
<th>Cold War</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Berlin Wall is opened (November) and East Germany allows unrestricted migration to West Germany.</td>
<td>University students at Tiananmen Square demand reforms by the Chinese Communist government. Solidarity forms the first post-war non-Communist government in Poland.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. A Divided Germany and a Divided Berlin

By 1947, the wartime alliance had completely broken down and the United States and Soviet Union were facing off as enemies. In March, President Truman pledged American support for “free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.” Three months later, Secretary of State Marshall offered financial aid to promote economic recovery among pro-western European nations. As part of the U.S.-Soviet hostilities, the United States, France and Great Britain decided to merge the areas they occupied in western Germany into a new German Federal republic. In response to what they considered anti-Soviet provocations by the west, the Soviet military government in Berlin began a land blockade of the allied occupied areas of the city in April, 1948.

**Questions:** Which wartime ally controlled the sector of Germany where the city of Berlin was located? Why did this lead to conflict with the other wartime allies?

“United States airpower throughout Europe is being mobilized for a great shuttle service into besieged Berlin. United States aircraft, which four years ago brought death to the city, will bring life in the form of food and medicines to the people of the Western sectors, whose food supplies have been cut off by the Russians. A greatly increased airlift will go into operation Monday. It will include, in addition to supplies for United States personnel in Berlin, a daily shipment of 200 tons of flour, medicines, serums, and vaccines and foodstuffs of small bulk but high caloric value.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Berlin Airlift Statistics</th>
<th>Cargo (tons)</th>
<th>Passengers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flights</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>189,963</td>
<td>1,783,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>87,841</td>
<td>541,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Questions**

1. How did the United States respond to the Soviet blockade of land routes to Berlin?
2. According to the chart, what were the key supplies sent to West Berlin?
3. In your opinion, why would the United States consider it crucial to maintain its connection with Berlin?

5. **The Berlin Wall.** In the fifteen years following the Second World War, over 3 million people emigrated from the East Germany to West Germany. In 1961, in an attempt to keep people from leaving East Germany, the Soviet Union ordered the separation of East Berlin from West Berlin by means of a barbed wire fence. A concrete and barbed wire wall was completed in 1965.

**East Germans attempt to Escape**

*The New York Times, November 6, 1961, 1*

Thirty East Germans attempted to break through the barbed wire to reach West Berlin today. The fire of an East German Border guard disrupted the mass flight and only nine managed to reach the West. The successful group was composed of five men and four children. The relatives of the nine, including the mothers of the children, were not able to get across the border barrier. The flight took place at about 4 P.M. as darkness fell. The escape was said to have been planned originally by two families, but five other families joined the group at the last minute.

**Question:** According to this article, how did East Germans respond to the Berlin Wall?


“Comrade Ulbricht [East German head of state] himself told me that the economy of the GDR immediately began to improve after the establishment of border control. [It] had a very positive effect on the consciousness of the people. It strengthened them and reminded them that the task of building Socialism was a challenge of solid and lasting importance, dwarfing the temporary phenomenon of West German propaganda which had been used to tempt the East Germans over to the side of capitalism. The establishment of border control restored order and discipline in the East Germans’ lives (and the Germans have always appreciated discipline).”

**Question:** How did the Soviet Union and East Germany defend the construction of the Berlin Wall?
7. United States Presidents Discuss a Divided Berlin. Compare the speeches by President Kennedy and President Reagan. Identify similarities and differences in their themes, phrases and objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpts from President Kennedy’s speech in the Rudolph Wilde Platz, West Berlin, on June 26, 1963.</th>
<th>Excerpts from President Reagan’s speech at the Brandenburg Gate, West Berlin, on June 12, 1987.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Today, in the world of freedom, the proudest boast is “Ich bin ein Berliner.” There are many people in the world who really don’t understand, or say they don’t, what is the great issue between the free world and the Communist world. Let them come to Berlin. There are some who say that communism is the wave of the future. Let them come to Berlin. And there are some who say in Europe and elsewhere we can work with the Communists. . . . Lass’ sie nach Berlin kommen. Let them come to Berlin. . . . Freedom is indivisible, and when one man is enslaved, all are not free. When all are free, then we can look forward to that day when this city will be joined as one and this country and this great Continent of Europe in a peaceful and hopeful globe. When that day finally comes, as it will, the people of West Berlin can take sober satisfaction in the fact that they were in the front lines for almost two decades. All free men, wherever they may live, are citizens of Berlin, and, therefore, as a free man, I take pride in the words “Ich bin ein Berliner.”</td>
<td>We come to Berlin, we American presidents, because it’s our duty to speak, in this place, of freedom. . . . Behind me stands a wall that encircles the free sectors of this city, part of a vast system of barriers that divides the entire continent of Europe. . . . Here in Berlin where the wall emerges most clearly; here, cutting across your city, where the news photo and the television screen have imprinted this brutal division of a continent upon the mind of the world. Standing before the Brandenburg Gate, every man is a German, separated from his fellow men. Every man is a Berliner, forced to look upon a scar. . . . I find in Berlin a message of hope, even in the shadow of this wall, a message of triumph. . . . There is one sign the Soviets can make that would be unmistakable, that would advance dramatically the cause of freedom and peace. General Secretary Gorbachev, if you seek peace, if you seek prosperity for the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, if you seek liberalization: Come here to this gate! Mr. Gorbachev, open this gate! Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Tearing Down the Berlin Wall
A. “East German’s Great Awakening,” The New York Times, November 10, 1989, 36. “Physically the Berlin wall still stands. But its capacity to divide a country and a Continent seems at an end. East Germany’s hastily reshaped politburo now promises its people what even two weeks ago was still unthinkable: unrestricted travel to the West; free elections; market-oriented economic reforms. Deathbed conversions are always suspect. But what Marxists call objective realities suggest this great awakening will endure.”
B. “Cheers as Brandenburg Gate Reopens,” The New York Times, December 23, 1989, 7. “Leaders of the two Germanys reopened the Brandenburg Gate today, breaching a barrier that more than any other had come to symbolize the division of the nation. Tens of thousands of Germans, oblivious to a steady drizzle, packed both sides of Berlin’s most famous gate to celebrate the formal inauguration of two new pedestrian crossings. . . . Although it has been six weeks since the Berlin wall fell open and at least half the East Germans have visited the West, the reopening of the two-century-old landmark offered symbolic confirmation that the German nation was again seeking to become whole.”
C. “Final Month of Berlin Wall,” The New York Times, June 16, 1990, 4. “East Germany has set a deadline of December for total demolition of the Berlin wall, which sealed citizens off from the West for 28 years. The state press agency quoted Maj. Gen. Dieter Teichmann, chief of the border troops, as saying that the concrete barrier would be gone by December. On Wednesday, East Germans began knocking out wall slabs all over the city to reopen blocked streets.”

Question: How do these articles document the historical significance of the Berlin Wall and its demise?