

# KING'S MEADOW

---

## HUMANITIES CURRICULUM

### *American Culture*



### *Opportunity Answer*

### *Guide*

By Dr. George Grant, Ph.D. Lit.

KING'S MEADOW



Since 1993

King's Meadow Humanities Curriculum: American Culture  
Opportunity Answer Guide  
Copyright © 2011 George Grant

Editing, layout, and design by Lynne Spear

Audio editing by Aaron Johnson

Published and Distributed by King's Meadow  
P.O. Box 37065  
Franklin, TN 37065

Tel. (615) 594-8818

Send requests for information to the above address.

All rights reserved

# *Table of Contents*

|                                 |    |
|---------------------------------|----|
| <i>Introduction</i> .....       | 4  |
| <i>Opportunity No. 1</i> .....  | 6  |
| <i>Opportunity No. 2</i> .....  | 10 |
| <i>Opportunity No. 3</i> .....  | 14 |
| <i>Opportunity No. 4</i> .....  | 18 |
| <i>Opportunity No. 5</i> .....  | 23 |
| <i>Opportunity No. 6</i> .....  | 27 |
| <i>Opportunity No. 7</i> .....  | 28 |
| <i>Opportunity No. 8</i> .....  | 31 |
| <i>Opportunity No. 9</i> .....  | 35 |
| <i>Opportunity No. 10</i> ..... | 38 |
| <i>Opportunity No. 11</i> ..... | 40 |
| <i>Opportunity No. 12</i> ..... | 44 |
| <i>Opportunity No. 13</i> ..... | 51 |
| <i>Opportunity No. 14</i> ..... | 57 |
| <i>Opportunity No. 15</i> ..... | 67 |
| <i>Opportunity No. 16</i> ..... | 72 |
| <i>Opportunity No. 17</i> ..... | 77 |
| <i>Opportunity No. 18</i> ..... | 80 |
| <i>Opportunity No. 19</i> ..... | 87 |
| <i>Opportunity No. 20</i> ..... | 94 |

## *Introduction*

### **About the Answer Guides**

In compiling the information for the Identify and Define Questions in the Opportunities, almost all the information from the *Instructor's Guide* was included. Your students will likely not provide as complete answers as are included below. For the Essay questions, almost all the notes from the *Instructor's Guide* have been copied to remind you what was covered in the lecture.

There were a few questions that relied on themes from an entire lesson. In those cases, a note to see the Lesson Notes in the *Instructor's Guide* was included instead of including the entire lesson.

This document is merely a guide, compiled to help you verify that the information your students give is indeed correct. For the Essay questions, those that require higher-level thinking, the factual information relating to the questions was copied in. In the end, on all the questions, you must assess if enough information was given to specifically identify the item or fully answer the essay question and whether to give partial or full credit.

### **Administering the Opportunities**

There are several ways to administer the Opportunities. Some families use them as given, administering them closed-book according to the schedule in the syllabus. Some families give them open-notebook at first, to help their students learn what is required in their note-taking. Some families set time limits, while others allow unlimited time. Some families use questions in the Opportunities as discussion prompts, either not administering the Opportunities at all or administering some or all of them and discussing them afterward. Some families use the essay questions as writing assignments, either instead of administering the Opportunities or afterward to write a more fleshed-out essay. Some families administer the Opportunities verbally, others written. Most families use a combination of these methods, depending on their family's schedule and their students' growing abilities and individual challenges. The point is that the Opportunities are a tool for you to use as you make the curriculum work for your family and your students, according to your goals and standards. You can even start with one method and adapt as your students grow and improve through the year.

### **Grading the Opportunities**

As there are different ways to administer the Opportunities, there are also various approaches to grading them. Some families approach grading in a formal way, using a numeric grade after an Opportunity has been corrected by a parent against the *Answer Guide*, similar to a large classroom situation. However, because they have fewer students and time isn't such an issue, some families award half credit for corrections once the Opportunity has been graded initially by a parent. Some families rely on parental grading while some instruct their students to verify their answers in their notes and make corrections after first taking the Opportunity closed-book. Some families will give extra credit to certain questions when a student improves in some area; for example, if a student struggles with the essay questions at the beginning of the school year, yet through diligent hard work that student's essays improve, the improved essays will be worth more points for that student than for a student who never struggled with them. Some parents base their grades on their discussions with their students. If, during a formal discussion or an informal conversation, a student refers back to a person or event covered several lessons back, that student obviously knows that

material. Some families keep detailed grade records, while others rely more on an intuitive grade, based on their relational knowledge of their students and their working together through the curriculum all year.

In your evaluation of the identification questions, the following questions might help you:

- 1) Has the item been identified in such a way that it is clearly delineated from other, similar items?
- 2) Was enough information given to show that your student is not confusing this item with another?

In your assessment of the Essay questions, in addition to evaluating basic writing mechanics, there are a few questions you may ask yourself to help you:

- 1) Has the question been answered or did the answer deal with issues the question didn't ask?
- 2) Were words, especially new or unfamiliar vocabulary, used properly, according to their connotation, as well as their denotation?
- 3) Were the examples given appropriate to the point being made?
- 4) Were the connections between ideas and concepts clearly drawn?

## **Why doesn't King's Meadow provide point breakdowns for the Opportunities?**

Assessment should be based on *your* goals and standards for *your* students. Those Opportunity questions that pertain to topics you think are more important should be weighted more heavily than those that you think are less important. When grading, your unique discussions of the lectures and the lesson content should also be taken into account. Your relationships with your students will necessarily color and shade your interactions about the curriculum. While an Answer Guide is provided, our prayer is that you remember to incorporate the bigger picture as you evaluate your students' progress. If point values were provided, those decisions would be made by someone other than those with the God-given authority and practical knowledge to make them. We desire to provide guidance in using the curriculum, not hard and fast rules, because we believe it is more Reformational to give parents the tools to use in their families, according to their goals and in the context of their relationships than to try to provide a Revolutionary, one-size-fits-all education.

## **Assessment**

The purpose of assessment is to evaluate the learning that is taking place in your students, the creative activity of their minds, hearts, and souls. All grading is subjective on one level or another. Please don't fret about needing to come up with a numerical score on the Opportunities. If a student is having difficulty, the important thing is not the score or the grade, but encouraging him in the process and helping him overcome his weak areas.

## **One Final Note**

While the original Opportunities asked pointedly for examples from the lectures, at home, since we are evaluating fewer students, this specific requirement was omitted. Your students should be encouraged to use examples from other reading, research, documentaries you've watched, and your discussions.

## Opportunity No. 1

Administer before Lesson 3

### Identify the following:

1. **hegemony**: Greek; total cultural domination
2. **hamasantal**: A worldview based on *hamas*, senseless and brutal violence.
3. **The Black Legend**: The idea that Hispanic peoples are untrustworthy, manipulative, cruel, and destructive. The black legend was perpetrated because of France, England, and Holland's attempts to stop the onward march of Hapsburg hegemony.
4. **ziggurat**: Step-pyramids built in Meso-America
5. **Mayans**: A Central American people whose society emerged about A.D. 300
6. **stele monuments**: Carved monuments in stone; built by Olmecs and Chavans
7. **Eric the Red**: In 982, Eric the Red and his young family were forced to leave their home on the coast of Norway. It seems that Eric had killed five men, which resulted in a warrant of banishment. Kill two men and you can stay, but five is just a little too much. He was sent into exile and put under the ban; literally, he was cut off from his village and from his people. So he began to do what so many Vikings had done before him; he went exploring for new opportunities and new lands, and it was on one of his great adventures that he made his way all the way to Greenland. He spent some time in Iceland prior to that, but not finding good pastureland, he decided to go to Greenland instead.
8. **Ultima Thule**: The now-Christianized Vikings established a diocese for the Church in a place they called Ultima Thule. In medieval mythology, Ultima Thule was the land on the farthest edges of the world, a land across a great sea, a land that often was bound by ice and snow but at other times of the year abounded with remarkable fruitfulness. Where Ultima Thule actually was, no one is certain, although a number of the ancient seafaring maps put Ultima Thule right where Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, and northern New England are today.  
  
There were actually churches established, a bishop installed, communications back and forth between the Ultima Thule diocese and Greenland and Iceland as early as 1120. Those Vikings who set out on these uncharted seas began to chart the seas. It is from some of the Viking portolan maps that we have remarkable descriptions of the coast of North America. And, of course, now we've got good archeological evidence of villages and settlements and trading centers, and some scholars even believe they have found some of those early primordial log churches on the North American shores.
9. **Shabaka**: As early as the second century B.C., we have the story of Shabaka, who ventured from western Africa across a vast expanse of sea. According to the legend and the chronicles, which are sketchy to be sure, but according to the stories and the legends, the seas were very rough for the first ten days or so and then suddenly the ships of Shabaka moved into a vast, flat, waveless sea filled with seaweed. They believed that they were approaching the very edge of the world and would be swallowed at any moment by sea monsters. It's a remarkable description of the Sargasso Sea, which sits right in the middle of the Atlantic. It's something that people who cross back and forth across the Atlantic say is very disconcerting. From either coast, from Europe or Africa or the Americas, you have rough seas until you reach the middle of the Atlantic, and all of a sudden everything

goes flat and still and there's dense seaweed. The Sargasso Sea almost foiled Christopher Columbus's trans-Atlantic crossing because his navigators were so frightened by the absence of wind and the absence of waves that they were certain that they would be quickly swallowed up. Shabaka describes this but then goes onto to describe a land of lush, dense forests and crystalline springs pouring out into the waters and a whole line of islands guarding the coastline, probably the North Carolina coastline.

10. **St. Brendan:** There was St. Brendan, whose great chronicle is one of the wonderful treasures of the early Christian age. St. Brendan describes his journeys at the beginning of the sixth century to Wales and the Isle of Man and Iona and then either he or his followers onto the Canaries, the Azores, the Faroes, and then what he describes as his great journey across the sea and beyond the sea into the wilds of what can only be taken as America. His great prayer, the prayer of St. Brendan, which has been passed onto us in Celtic lore by the followers of Brendan, describes fierce, fierce struggles on high waves in the deep ocean and long, long weeks alone in the darkness before arriving at a green and verdant land waiting for the message of Christ to be brought to the heathen, distant peoples.

### Essay Questions:

11. ***Explain how each of the Contents and Realities of early Meso-American culture manifested themselves, and then contrast these with the Contents and Realities of Christendom and its culture.*** So the Meso-Americans believed that all of life was somehow connected in a chain of being. There's a kind of hierarchy, the higher you rise on the chain of being. There's an ascent of man to the top of the chain of the being. This chain of being connects all of life. This chain of being is thrown into the midst of a world of unexplained phenomena. This phenomenalism marks the mysteries of the world and sparks the curiosity of man's mind. But the cosmos itself is stable and solid. It has stasis. This leads to a series of realities.

Because there is a chain of being, it is in the natural order of things to stratify society, to recognize the philosopher kings, the elites, and to recognize those who were simply by the fate of their birth or the nature of their genetics or the strength of their mind or the strength of their back, to be a part of a lower caste. Because phenomena occur, great mysteries, they leads to the realization that we live in a very impersonal world where forces are at work around us that are not controllable by us and oftentimes not knowable by us. That means that nothing is really personal. Everything, in the end, is practical. So, societies can literally say, This is not personal. I can like you as a person, but I can still kill you for the utility of the action. This leads to a kind of cultural catastrophism, where you see sudden rises and sudden falls and revolutionary impulses.

The consequence of these contents and these realities is that they create a sociological system rooted in tyranny. There are disincentives imposed upon both the elites who are already at the top, therefore they need no incentives to achieve, creating stability in the hierarchical system, and disincentives for those in the lower castes — they can't improve themselves, they can't go anywhere, and so you have disincentives all across the whole course of the society, leaving the people with a kind of fatalism. That's why Egyptian civilization could last for some two thousand years without much change, despite tumult and disarray and despite the fact that it doesn't function very well, because the people are trapped with no exit from their fatalistic ideas.

When you compare that kind of worldview with the worldview that emerges out of the gospel, out of Christendom, you have a very stark distinction. In the pagan worldview, there is a chain of being that connects all living things, but in Christendom there is a clear Creator/creature distinction. That distinction extends to the whole of our being. Everything about us is altogether distinct from everything about God himself, thus, creating very

distinct realms for us to understand calling, purpose, and destiny under a sovereign God, the ultimate authority. Everything is not just a mad scramble to climb up or down a ladder.

Secondly, Christendom presupposes that we are made in the image of God — *imago dei*. In the pagan worldview of Meso-America, things just sort of happen. Phenomena just occur. So, somehow or another, because the jaguar and the warrior are connected in the chain of being, it's very possible that man came from the jaguar; it's phenomenalism.

But these forces are altogether impersonal. In the Christian worldview, because we're made in the image of God, by his providence, for a purpose, we have clarity about why we're here and what we are to do. That, in turn, gives clarity to our condition, our fallenness and need of redemption.

This leads to a whole series of realities. For the Christian, we understand that there is a God, he is not silent, and he does act. He is sovereign, and he exercises his divine decrees in accordance with his providence. For the pagan, there is just a kind of social stratification that necessarily occurs based upon power and authority. Societies are organized in a Christian worldview according to relationships, because we're connected to one another and to God by covenant. That means that there are some things that are right and they're always right, in the fourth century and in the fourteenth century or at four o'clock this afternoon — it's always right. And there are certain things that are always wrong. Thus we have real clear division and antithesis between those things which are moral and those things which are immoral.

As a result, we can know the difference between right and wrong, and we can begin to understand a sense of calling and responsibility. For the pagans, there are disincentives to calling and responsibility. The antithesis between right and wrong means that change can be incremental and reformational rather than a culture that is stuck in fatalism or left to revolutionary impulses.

Here's the bottom line: the reason Meso-America looked so much like the pagan civilizations of antiquity was not because of visitors from outer-space or even the transfer of blueprints by Carthaginian sailors at some point on a lost voyage or trading mission. There's a convergence because paganism always looks pagan; it always builds pagan; it always acts pagan. Paganism is a worldview that has certain manifestations in art and music and literature and ideas that have strong convergence. Of course there are going to be differences based upon, as Barry Fell says, the elapsing of time and the development of ideas and the peculiarities of climate and geography, but almost all of those are incidental. What Columbus discovered was the ancient world. The great contrast that existed was the contrast between the captive peoples of antiquity and the emerging peoples of Christendom. This laid the groundwork for the clash of cultures that would occur over the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and set the stage for the whole complex of human relations that is the birth of the American civilization.

12. ***What three great lessons can we learn from examining the myths and legends of early America and its discoverers? In your answer, provide specific examples from the tales of Norse, Carthaginian, Sudanese, and Monastic explorers.*** First, I've introduced all of this to you to cause you to remember that sometimes legends and myths are more reliable than the scientific inquiries and the long line of footnotes of the supposed experts. Just when we think we know what we know, we run across something that causes us to say *hmmm... who'd a thunk it?*

The Christian idea of knowledge and of learning about our world is one of constant discovery. We ought to have restless imaginations. We ought to be constantly saying, *Okay, the evidence seems to be pointing in this direction, but could it be that another hypothesis could be proven correct instead?* The great achievement of Christian learning is *not* hav-



ing arrived at a settled conclusion. The real mark is a heart full of repentance, a heart that says, *I don't know everything that I ought to know. I've not yet done everything that I ought to do. I've not yet fully arrived at all that I am to journey towards.* The problem with settled conclusions is that they leave very little room for us to say, *I could be wrong*. Or, *I don't know*. Or, *this could be a mystery that we'll never solve*. Historians hate mysteries. They want to solve them all, kind of like theologians. We want to put God in a box. We want to say we know everything that we need to know — we know all the profiles, we've got the dogmatic schema in our minds — when, in fact, the Bible constantly tells us what Isaiah reminds us of: God's ways are higher than our ways and his thoughts are higher than our thoughts. The world is a marvel of mystery awaiting discovery. That's what these stories tell us. We don't know for sure if Celts and Carthaginians and Sudanese made their way here. We don't have solid evidence. We have a lot of interesting clues and a lot of peculiarities that we don't have solid answers for, but this much we do know: we don't know. And that kind of humility in a scholar is really what leads to great discoveries. If you're hungry to learn and you don't think that you've got all the answers and you're never satisfied with what it is that you do know — in other words, if you have a heart of repentance, that will serve you far better than a loaded portfolio and transcripts with straight A's.

There's a second reason I wanted to introduce these ideas. When we look back at the shrouded myths and legends and fables of the past, we're reminded that we live in a world full of stories and not all the stories have been told. This ought to stir our imaginations and cause us to wonder *what if...*? As we wonder *what if...*, we are sent on journeys of discoveries, both within our own hearts and minds and in this wide world that still has much to tell us about God's glory, God's majesty, and God's splendor, that we don't yet know. The worst thing that can ever happen to a historian is for the historian to be satisfied that he knows it all, that there's nothing left to challenge his pet theories. The whole history of science, of medicine, as well as of the social sciences so-called — like history and sociology and anthropology and archeology — is that the expert opinions of the past become laughable in days to come because they're so short-sighted and so presumptuous and so certain about things that are absolutely false. It was just one hundred fifty years ago that doctors were still using leeches for people who had colds.

Stories like these remind us that in our pathway of learning, we have a lot more learning to go, and we have a lot of great stories that have yet to be told.

Thirdly, they remind us that sometimes the historians think they're absolutely right, and given the shreds of evidence that they're relying on, they have good reason to hold that, but there may be lots of evidence out there that contradicts their whole pet theory, and that sometimes whole cultures can believe untruths for so long and with such fervor that they ultimately lead them astray and undermine the very thing they value the most. That can be particularly true in American history, where the facts that we think we know or the facts that we've forgotten lead to the undermining of the very fruit that we most cherish — fruits of freedom and liberty and opportunity. Who was the first president of the United States? Most Americans would say *George Washington*, and of course most Americans would be absolutely wrong, missing the first president by fifteen administrations, for goodness' sake! How can we get stuff so wrong that's patently obvious? George Washington didn't take office until 1789. Why doesn't the historian say, *1776 to 1789, there's a gap here! We've got Continental Armies and Minutemen running the country?* Those are the questions that we have to ask with humble hearts, questions that push us to a discovery of what *is*, so that we can grow in grace, so we can preserve the truth and so we can stand for right.

## Opportunity No. 2

Administer before Lesson 5

### Identify the following:

1. **Portugal:** a unique nation in that it was a nation by the fourteenth century; had become the international center of nautical experience; became the vortex of navigational discovery and enterprise; had the liveliest and most progressive ports in the world; an enterprising, brash, and ambitious realm where ideas and ideals alike abounded; a culture that reveled in books and maps, azimuths and globes, almucantars and compasses, planispheres and astrolabes, sextants and portolans, and all the other things that went with the maritime, technological world.
2. **honed compass:** magnetic needles set inside nautical instruments; first used in twelfth century; first actual mention of a honed compass in literature was in 1187.
3. **portolan:** map of coastal landmarks; one of the earliest stages of map making; a map that observes the world from a horizontal perspective, not from a vertical one; will describe what a mariner might actually see on the coast and then draw it out; a horizontal map, sort of an elevation view of a coastline. As the ancient world passed into the realm of Christendom, portolans became more and more complex, more and more accurate, and more and more helpful. But it still required that the mariners stay within sight of the coastline in order to make their way.
4. **astrolabe:** invented in about the seventh century or so; a disc-like instrument —almost like a slide-rule; an incredibly complex mathematical instrument designed to enable a mariner to determine where his ship is; a disc of metal that is held suspended by a small ring; has a scale with a series of degrees embossed upon the face of the disc and a ruler for measuring the height of an astronomical body. Essentially, a mariner would create sightlines to, say, the North Star, or in some cases the sun or the moon depending upon the time of the year, and then with a sightline first to the astronomical body and then perhaps to land or a fixed point or a known point, then make some calculations in order to determine just precisely where they were in terms of latitude. Astrolabes can't measure longitude, but only measure latitude. The astrolabe was a huge advance and enabled mariners to get out of sight of land for periods of time.
5. **dead reckoning:** dead reckoning is where you estimate a ship's current location based upon a previously determined location or fix and then advance that location forward along a predetermined trajectory. In other words, I know where I was and so based upon how long it's taken me from where I was when I knew where I was, I'm guessing that this is now where I am. That's dead reckoning and that's all fine as long as you've got calm seas and the sun is shining and everything is wonderful. But in the North Atlantic, that's about four days out of the year.
6. **caravel:** a small, very stable, highly maneuverable sailing ship utilizing multiple lateen sails. The greatest single development bringing together all these other technologies was the development of the caravel, the first great advance in the maritime design of ships since the time of the drakkar and the knorr of the Vikings. The caravel was a very small but very stable and highly maneuverable sailing ship with multiple lateen sails, a deep pitched keel, a strong multiple rudder system with castles — literally fortresses — set upon the deck, and large cargo holds. It was the ship that opened the door for exploration across the Atlantic.

7. **Sagres School:** an observatory in southern Portugal established by Prince Henry
8. **The Sargasso Sea:** It was just a couple of days after that that he ran into his first serious trouble when he entered the Sargasso Sea. Most people are fairly unaware of the Sargasso Sea today, but for centuries it has been the bane of many a navigator. The phenomenon of the Sargasso Sea makes trans-Atlantic journeys quite difficult if you're not aware of its peculiar difficulties. The Sargasso Sea is a sea within a sea. It's this open section in the heart of the north Atlantic where all of the major tidal systems and weather systems move around, leaving this kind of still lake in the center of the sea. It is a place where there is thick, thick seaweed and unusual ocean life. It's probably the source of all the myths of early mariners who described horrific and dangerous seas, not because they had huge waves, but because they entered into this stillness where there was no wind and where the seaweed was very thick and the animal life was frighteningly unusual.
9. **Aragon and Castile:** two Spanish kingdoms on the Iberian Peninsula ruled by Ferdinand and Isabella; after the Reconquista succeeded, Isabella reversed her previous rejection of Columbus
10. **Queen Isabella:** queen of Castile, wife of Ferdinand of Aragon, supporter of Columbus
11. **Reconquista:** The reconquest of Granada from the Muslim Moors, succeeded in January of 1492
12. **Fra Antonio:** while Columbus was wrestling with some of these things, a Franciscan friar came into his life, Fra Antonio, who began to mentor Columbus in the hope of the gospel, in the calling upon his own life, and the uniqueness of his own vision. This gave to Columbus a tenacity that he had not had before. He had always had spunk and adventure, an insatiable appetite to learn more, but he didn't have the strength of his convictions to see them through.
13. **The Grand Enterprise:** what Columbus called his idea to sail west to reach the East

### Essay Questions:

14. **Explain the significance of Henry the Navigator's influence on the world of navigation and exploration. In your answer provide specific examples of how his work demonstrated the motivation of a gospel vision.**

The man who brought all these technological developments together was Prince Henry the Navigator. Prince Henry was the fourth son of King John of Portugal. Future generations would call him Prince Henry the Navigator because of his almost single-handed efforts to coax nautical advancement toward modernity. At the tip of Cape St. Vincent, he built a marine observatory and hydrographic laboratory that transformed the enterprise of discovery from happenstance and accident into science. There he gathered the greatest pilots and navigators, cartographers, shipbuilders, geographers, astronomers, mathematicians, cosmographers, and mariners in all the world, and he accumulated a vast library of sailing charts, portolans, and *roteiros*. He investigated the ancient tales of St. Brendan, of the Norsemen, Ultima Thule, Antipodes, of Prester John and Marco Polo, with the objectivity of an academician. He sponsored the discovery and colonization of innumerable far-flung islands including Madeira, Porto Santo, the Verdes, and the Azores. He advanced the design of the ocean-going vessels by building and then perfecting the caravel. In fact, he's an almost perfect picture of the modern scientific man except for one thing; he was a medieval anomaly of purposefulness, logic, and moderation set in the context of his great and overriding motivation which was to confront the Islamic horde that held the Mediterranean in thrall and boxed Christendom off in isolation. As a result, his great passion was to launch a new crusade.

Prince Henry began to dream of establishing a real scientific school of discovery. Remember, North Africa had once been the jewel of Christian civilization. It had produced some of the finest minds of the early Church — Augustine, Tertullian, Anthony, Clement, Cyprian, Origin, and Athanasius. But throughout the seventh and eighth centuries it was put to the scimitar and vanquished. Almost every trace of Christianity was swept away. Churches were destroyed, libraries were burned, cities were pillaged, treasures were plundered, fields were salted, men were slaughtered, women were raped, and children were enslaved. Europe watched helplessly as their brethren were tyrannized. *Jihad* and *di'himma* swept across the land. Henry wanted more than anything else to remove what he believed was this great shame, and, in the process, he launched the world's greatest adventurers, discoverers, and mariners. It was all for the sake of what he believed was the honor of the gospel in the world.

So in 1421, he established an observatory in southern Portugal called Sagres. At the Sagres school, he began to assemble a great library and brought the finest minds of the day to work on the problems of exploration. Almost immediately they bore great fruit.

All the great adventurers — Dias, Vasco da Gama, onto Columbus — had this passionate vision that combined adventure, mystery, and gospel mission.

**15. Briefly dispel three or four Myths about Columbus. What do these myths reveal about how history and success are remembered? And what do these myths reveal about what is required for true progress?**

Myth: The “Enterprise” was about “glory and gold”.

Columbus's primary motivation was, according to Kirkpatrick Sale in a bestselling book published in 1992 on the quincentenary of Columbus's discovery:

His primary interest in the great enterprise was not glory for the Church but rather it was for his own glory. It was for gold and it was for gluttonous imperialism.

When you read Columbus's own works, you discover that he says absolutely nothing about wealth, and when any question of commercialism comes up, he confesses little interest in the subject apart from "the necessary and vile aspects of financing further enterprise". Over and over again, what you find in Columbus's book is that he desired for the gospel to go to the ends of the earth. He desired for the oppression that he encountered in various places to come to an end, that the hope of the gospel would bring justice and freedom to ends of the earth, that Islam would be overcome by the grace and the mercy of Christ. That was his motivation. The enterprise was not about glory and gold.

Myth: He did sail for Spain.

He most assuredly did not sail for Spain. There was no Spain at the time, merely a loose collection of culturally Spanish kingdoms on the Iberian Peninsula. He sailed for Aragon and Castile.

Myth: Queen Isabella financed the expedition.

Queen Isabella didn't sell her jewels and she didn't finance the enterprise. She didn't have to talk Ferdinand into anything. There were, as Ridley Scott posited in his film *1492*, no romantic sparks going off between Columbus and Isabella. All that is just flap-doodle.

Myth: He was an incompetent navigator.

He most assuredly was not an incompetent navigator. He was one of the great scholars of the age. He had more maps and more technical prowess than virtually any other navigator at the time. His mathematical wizardry was beyond compare.

Myth: Fifteenth-century sailors believed the earth was flat.

Fifteenth-century sailors did not believe that the earth was flat. Henry the Navigator had disproven that old myth — which, by the way, was not believed by the Phoenicians or the Greeks, either — it was well-known in the ancient world that the earth was a globe. Any of the Portuguese navigators who had sailed up and down the Gold Coast of Africa had easily witnessed the curvature of the earth as they watched ships disappear over the horizon. There was no question whatsoever among most navigators that the earth was indeed a globe. The question was how big a globe is it and how dangerous is it when you sail out of sight of land. At this point, there was still no mechanical device capable of measuring longitude. They could measure latitude with astrolabes, and they could measure the passing of time with nocturnes. They had rudimentary sextants so they could find themselves, but there was still the problem of longitude and that wouldn't be solved for another two centuries, until the Harrisons. The fact is they didn't believe in a flat earth. They just believed in a dangerous earth, and they were right.

Myth: He did introduced slavery to the New World. He forcibly indentured a number of Native Americans.

Columbus did not introduce slavery into the New World. In fact, if you read his *Book of Prophecies*, about half the book is about the need to bring the gracious hope of Christ to all of those who lived in darkness. He talks about the native peoples of Africa, of the East, and, most particularly, of the Indian peoples he had encountered in the New World with the utmost tenderness, compassion, and missionary zeal. He did not take captives back to Spain; this is a myth. There is no collaborating evidence for this — there's no primary source evidence for it — and yet it is constantly propounded and has become a propaganda point over and over again.

## Opportunity No. 3

Administer before Lesson 7

### Identify the following:

1. **Giovanni Caboto (John Cabot):** a Genoese explorer hired by the English to search for the Northwest Passage; discovered the Cape Breton Islands in 1497 and laid claim to North American lands for England.
2. **Walter Raleigh:** a well-connected Elizabethan courtier, Sir Walter Raleigh, began to make noises about the possibility of establishing colonial possessions in the southern New England territories called Virginia. Sir Walter Raleigh and his friend, Sir Francis Drake, had brought great wealth to themselves and to Queen Elizabeth through what today we can only call piracy. They had determined that the best and fastest way to bring wealth into the English domain was to go and steal it from the Spanish, so every time a Hapsburg ship would leave Latin America, like a swarm of bees, little privateers and pirates would attempt to take all their Peruvian or Mexican gold for themselves. Francis Drake and Walter Raleigh were particularly proficient at this pirate's trade. But both of them were also courtiers in the queen's circle. Both of them were chivalrous and dashing. They were celebrities in London because they were adventurous, bold, wealthy, and well-positioned. Sir Walter Raleigh began to appeal to the queen for her good graces in commissioning colonial charters to establish trading as well as raiding centers along the North American coastline.

In 1584, he was given permission to establish a colony in what today is the outer banks of North Carolina. There were two attempts to establish this colony. In 1585, the first group of settlers determined that there was not sufficient hunting, timber, or security for them to stay. So after just a short attempt, they went back to England.

The second colony was much more disastrous because it involved some one hundred seventeen settlers, including women and children. This time, Sir Walter Raleigh's attempt to establish a colony took off, it seemed. The colony established itself on Roanoke Island. The colony disappeared, leaving very few clues and a mystery that remains unsolved to this day. Sir Walter Raleigh's piracy was far more successful than his colony.

3. **Peter Stuyvesant:** the West India Operations Director in the Caribbean and was so successful that he was promoted to governor of the Caribbean Isles in 1643. Three years later, he was promoted to become governor of the New Netherlands. The New Netherlands were all the territories that Henry Hudson had claimed for the Dutch which included all what is today New Jersey, all of the Hudson Valley, and parts of New York, Long Island, and Manhattan. He was a successful governor and helped to establish New Amsterdam, the city on the southern tip of Manhattan Island as the model settlement in all of the New World. He built a huge dyke along the riverside of the settlement, a kind of retaining wall, and a long street beside it that became the center of marketplaces and commerce in the town. It was called Wall Street. He dug a broad canal, a drainage ditch, that connected the farms in the north, approximately where Central Park is today, with the town settlement in the south, and this broad way became Broadway. He made the whole of the colonial possession prosperous, fair, and tolerant. In fact, it was so tolerant that many of the refugees from Europe who had nowhere else to go flocked to the New Netherlands and to New Amsterdam. It was here that the first of the refugee Jews came to America, both Ashkenazi Jews and Sephardic Jews — those who came from central Europe and those who came from the former dominions of Granada. In addition, it was to the New Netherlands that many of the Swedes went when they were harassed by the English. So that, by 1664, New Amsterdam had more people of other nationalities than they had Dutch.

4. **Henry Hudson:** an Englishman who worked for the Dutch. He was hired originally as a navigator for a new company called the Muscovy Company in 1607. The whole point of the Muscovy Company was to try to find a Northwest Passage so that open trade could be conducted between England and Moscow via a shortcut across North America. The Muscovy Company was eventually swallowed up by the Dutch East India Company, which, in the end, became the Dutch West India Company.

But in 1609, Hudson began to put together a fleet of ships for the first of three exploratory expeditions along the North American coast. He discovered Hudson Bay and the Hudson River. He circumnavigated the island of Manhattan and went all the way up as far as present-day Albany, New York, and there established Ft. Orange.

On his third voyage, he got into a bit of trouble with his crew and they decided they had had enough of his exploring and, perhaps, his surly ways, so they put him in a little rowboat in the middle of Hudson Bay and they sailed away. And that was the end of Henry Hudson. Most of the stories of these explorers wind up being stories of grave complications like that.

5. **Samuel de Champlain:** a great French explorer who was sent out in 1603 by Henri IV, the French king who had formerly been a Protestant, but, in order to inherit the crown of France, renounced his Protestant convictions and was readmitted to the Roman Catholic Church. Henri IV commissioned de Champlain to work on the possibility of a Northwest Passage. In the process of exploring, de Champlain discovered the St. Lawrence Seaway, the river that flows into the Great Lakes. Champlain, on a series of expeditions, explored the whole region of southern Canada and the region of the Great Lakes.

By 1608, he'd founded a fort at Quebec. In 1609, he discovered Lake Champlain, which he nobly named for himself. In 1610, he discovered the Green Mountains or Vermont and staked claim for the French in each of those territories.

6. **Jamestown Settlement:** in 1607, some very impatient adventurers decided to establish themselves at the mouth of the James River. If they had been wise, they would never have selected that spot. It was swampy, filled with mosquitoes, in the summertime excessively humid, the water was tepid and undrinkable, it was indefensible, and there was very little room for farming and no timber available. But, because these English adventurers thought they were going to the New World to make loads of money and it was going to be easy, these second and third sons of nobility got to America, pitched their tents, and thought, *Okay, bring on the wealth.* The problem was that they almost starved because none of them knew how to work. These weren't craftsmen and tradesmen, they were lazy second and third sons of nobility. And in the first year, Jamestown almost failed because of starvation and indolence.

In 1608, a new governor, John Smith began to demand that the settlers work. Some of them didn't like this and twenty-three left. *Work? We came here to get rich, we didn't come here to work!* Over the course of the next few years it was very difficult to carve out a living.

By 1610, the settlers were calling their season there at the mouth of the James River the starving time. But, under Smith's able leadership and because of alliances that were forged with the local Powhatan Indians, including the marriage of John Rolfe to an Indian princess, Pocahontas — who later became royal celebrities back in England when they went on tour there — the colony was finally established, and by 1619 the first colonial institution of democracy was established — the House of Burgesses.

7. **Conquistadors:** The Hapsburg explorers and conquerors of Mexico and Central and South America.
8. **Charles V:** Hapsburg emperor who aimed at worldwide hegemony
9. **Ferdinand Magellan:** First to circumnavigate the world, however he died in the Spice Islands
10. **xenophobia:** from Greek and Latin origins; a hatred of outsiders.

### Essay Questions:

11. **Define hegemony, *hamas* and *hesed*, and explain how the Hapsburgs intentionally employed these ideas to justify and succeed in their conquests. How should our understanding of these three terms shape the way we see our own world?** *Hegemony* is a Greek word. It was devised out of several smaller words in Greek during the time of the Athenian League in antiquity. It literally means total domination by one small group over a vast number of diverse groups. It's domination culturally, politically, and militarily with a centralized control. It was used by the Greeks to describe the *ma'at* governmental system of ancient Egypt and the *hamas* worldviews of the Babylonians and the Assyrians. The idea of hegemony was that one very cunning and resourceful power could gain control over the whole world.

Tears for Fears may say that everybody wants to rule the world, but it is just not true. Only people like Charles V want to.

There's another word that we need to have in our arsenal before we launch too far into this discussion and that is *hamas*. It's a Hebrew word, used in the Old Testament several times, particularly in the minor prophets. It's a word that describes a particular kind of senseless violence. The kind of brutality that is imposed seemingly for no other purpose than to intimidate or to make a point or to exercise bravado with absolutely no concern whatsoever for the consequences of the victims. It was the word that the Hebrew prophets applied to the Babylonians, to the Assyrians, and to the Egyptians when they exercised totalitarian imperial control over the conquered peoples of the ancient world.

The third word is also a Hebrew word, also used often in the minor prophets. It's the word *hesed*. *Hesed* means lovingkindness or overwhelming mercy, unwarranted, undeserved, unmitigated mercy. What's interesting is that, for the Hapsburgs, there was a peculiar combination in their drive for hegemony of *hamas* and *hesed*. They attempted to justify their *hamas*, their brutal violence, their conquests on the basis of *hesed*, that it was actually a mercy for all of the peoples of the earth to come under their control. Why? Because *they* were the experts, *they* understood better, *they* had a better plan, *they* would force people against their wills to be free.

Sound familiar? It should because the peculiar combination of *hamas* in the name of *hesed* is the propaganda line always used by every dictator, by every oppressive government, by every attempt to force people to do what they don't want to do, supposedly for their own good.

12. **What were the three major motivations for colonists to settle in the new world? How did these motivations differ from the French and Hapsburg explorers? What does this reveal to us about what is at the root of America's success?** Now, there were wide differences among many of these colonies, but we can say with certainty that the biggest differences came between those Huguenot, English, Swedish, Scottish, and Dutch settlers who came to farm and make their homes and the French and Hapsburg settlers, who came primarily to establish some sort of imperial or mercantilist control.



The former came as tradesmen, to establish commercial trade companies, and to build homes that were given wide autonomy by their home governments. They were governed by a policy of salutary neglect which we'll look at in some detail in a couple of weeks, but they came to establish families and communities.

The latter were more interested in establishing themselves as privateers and creating vast commercial plantations than they were in establishing families and communities. They were more interested in state-owned monopolies than they were in commercial trade companies. They wanted control from the mother country. They were committed to imperial governance as opposed to the autonomy of salutary neglect of the Huguenots and the English. They were adventurers, soldiers, and traders. They weren't farmers or settlers. They weren't there to pioneer, they were there to clean up. That's the difference. It's always been the difference.

Did you know that Haiti was, in the first hundred years of the colonial era, far and away the richest and most successful colony? But when they exhausted their resources, it collapsed into disarray, and it's been in disarray in the two hundred and fifty years since. The issue was never resources. It's always worldview. What are you here for? What are you trying to do? What are your goals? What drives you? What makes you think? What makes you love? Those differences and the wide disparity between them will steer the course of the next two hundred and fifty years of history and bring shape to the world of the Americas.

## Opportunity No. 4

Administer before Lesson 9

### Identify the following:

1. **War of Jenkins' Ear:** 1739-1743: a war that revolved around pirates and privateering, when Robert Jenkins, an English sailor, presented himself and his severed ear to Parliament and demanded that his ear be avenged.
2. **mercantilism:** The marriage of big government and big business so that big business serves the interests of big government and big government serves the interest of big business. They cooperate for the purposes of elevating their peculiar and particular causes. Thus we have government-created monopolies, government-created sanctions, government-created incentives, and government-created stimulus packages. This squeezes out the small businessman; this squeezes out the guilds and the various tradesmen. This squeezes out the smaller businesses that drive the economy from the bottom up, because now the economy is controlled from the top down. Government sees, as its primary responsibility, driving the economy.
3. **letters of marque:** A government sanction to exercise piracy in regulated areas and against specific targets (your opponent at war, for example).
4. **The French & Indian War:** The Seven Years' War, 1754-1763; in 1754, France and England declared war on one another again, this time launching what is called the Seven Years' War, which was fought on four continents in at least nineteen different theaters, but in the American theater it's called the French and Indian War.

It really began in 1754 not far from where Pittsburgh is today, in the Battle of Great Meadows where the French and their Indian allies overcame the American and the British placement. Calling for a great congress of all the New England colonial powers, the Albany Congress appointed Ned Braddock as the commander of the militia forces and the British forces. This was confused to some degree by Quakers who refused to serve in the militias because of their pacifist convictions and the heavy-handed application of conscription by the new Prime Minister of England, William Pitt. The great battle for regency in Canada which led to the terrible struggle between Generals Wolfe and Montcalm at Quebec. The French and Indian War ended with the Treaty of Paris.

This led to the efforts of Great Britain to raise revenue through taxation on the colonies, which led to the American War of Independence.

5. **Henry VIII:** in 1509, Henry VIII married his brother's widow. His older brother Arthur, who was the heir to the throne, died before he could take the throne. Because of a series of alliances that Henry's father, Henry VII, had made, particularly with the kingdoms of Castile and Aragon, it was incumbent upon the young Henry to marry the older Catherine of Aragon, his brother's widow. So in 1509 he did so and, in short order, succeeded his father to the throne.

Henry was one of the most remarkable humanists — a romantic renaissance man, a fine musician, a good writer, an excellent thinker. He was, with Francis I of France, one of the great learned men of the age. He embraced the Renaissance and wished to bring it to England. He was also an ardent Roman Catholic and a fierce opponent of the reforms of Martin Luther, so much so that in 1521, he was awarded the papal Defender of the Faith medal for a paper he'd written about the heresies of the Reformation.

However, there were dynastic concerns for the Tudor House. The concerns involved the inability of Catherine, at least in Henry's mind, to produce for him a son. Though she had given birth to children, only one of those children succeeded in making it outside of infancy and that child was a daughter, and Princess Mary wasn't sufficient for the dynastic ambitions of Henry VIII. So he began to work with Cardinal Wolsey, the archbishop of Canterbury and his close confidant to somehow obtain an annulment of his almost twenty-year-long marriage.

There were multiple concerns that went back and forth between Rome and London, between Westminster and the Vatican, along with a tremendous amount of diplomacy. But here's the problem: Charles V was the emperor of the Holy Roman Empire and who was Catherine, but his aunt.

So, he fought hard to protect Catherine's integrity in the marriage. The result was that Cardinal Wolsey was unable to persuade the pope to annul the marriage, and so in 1533, Henry decided to divorce his wife and marry his lover in order to produce heirs to the throne and protect his dynastic ambitions. It was a nasty mess. That was the beginning of the break of the Church of England. It wasn't about doctrine: *sola scriptura*, *sola fide*, *soli deo gloria*, or *solo gratia*; it was about authority. As a result, when Henry VIII died, the English church was an autonomous church, but it had not actually been reformed. Theologically it was virtually identical to the Roman Catholic Church. The difference was that it was a national church rather than an international church.

6. ***The Mayflower Compact***: The Pilgrims decided to compact together, to covenant together for a vision that would represent the highest ideals of the Reformation. They wanted to make certain that what they were about would be the advancement of the faith, the honor of king and country, and most of all for the glory of God.

### Essay Questions:

7. ***What were the causes of perpetual war in the two hundred fifty-year span from 1566-1815?*** When you survey the constant warfare from 1566 to 1815, you'll see that the English-speaking peoples were in conflict with the Hapsburgs and the French constantly, for two hundred and fifty years. Reformist movements over the course of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries led to the new dawning of the Renaissance in southern Europe, the Reformation in northern Europe, and the Counter-Reformation in the Hapsburg territories.

The Hapsburg-Tudor Wars and the War of Dutch Independence, from 1566-1604,

were quickly followed by the Thirty Years' War and the genocidal removal of whole people groups like the Moravians. This bled over into the wars of Hapsburg hegemony and then the Anglo-Dutch wars which led to the War of the League of Augsburg, sometimes called the War of the Grand Alliance in the American theater — King William's War which led quickly to the War of Spanish Succession and Queen Anne's War.

There was the war that revolved around pirates and privateering, the War of Jenkins' Ear, when Robert Jenkins, an English sailor, presented himself and his severed ear to Parliament. *See what these barbaric Hapsburgs have done to me and to the English people. Avenge my ear, my brothers! Avenge my ear!!!* Not exactly a great campaign speech, but it did cause a war.

Then the War of Austrian Succession, which, in the American theater was called King George's War, and then the Seven Years' War, which in the American theater was called the French and Indian War

Then came the American War of Independence, which was actually a widespread colonial war that was fought in multiple theaters, as we'll see in a moment. It wasn't just the thirteen Atlantic coast colonies that were fighting for their independence, there were other colonies fighting at the same time in the same war allied with the thirteen. For instance, we'll learn the story of Ethan Allen and the Green Mountain Boys from Vermont, and

you'll remember that Vermont was not one of the thirteen colonies; it was a separate, independent republic called the Republic of Vermont under President Thomas Crittennden. Ethan Allen fought for Vermont, not for the thirteen colonies, but he was allied with them in this wide-ranging colonial war for independence.

That led to the series of continental wars that began first in France, then spread beyond France to the Italian peninsula, leading into the Napoleonic Wars and the War of 1812 in the American theater, which was really just a part of those same Napoleonic Wars.

8. ***When war came to the twenty-one American colonies, how did the ideologies of imperialism and mercantilism drive the colonies to their bold declaration of "liberty or death"?*** The American theaters of each of these wars were affected because there was a rise of a series of global ideologies. The causes of these perpetual wars were these strong ideas. We need to understand these ideas so that, as we make our way through the founding era, we can understand why it is that men like Patrick Henry and Samuel Adams would react so stridently to Parliament and to king. What was it that they were standing against? Obviously, there was disarray in the once-cohesive civilization of Christendom. Christendom was never a united whole. It was never one country or one culture, but it had one credal foundation, one essential principle that bound all the kingdoms and fiefdoms together. But, with the disarray — first in the fourteenth century and the Great Schism and the Babylonian Captivity of the Church and the Avignon papacy, and rival popes excommunicating each other and their supporters — we start to see a breakdown of that unity and that led to the greater schisms that came in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, making a confusing and divided world in Christendom where rivalries became the pitting of one nation-state or people group against another — the beginning of xenophobia. We start to see outbreaks of various pogroms, persecutions of Jews, Huguenots, and other minorities, gypsies, etc.

That created the reemergence of the old pagan ideal of *hamas* — violence for violence's sake, violence as a tool of political pressure, violence as a tool of ideology, terror. This fed the ambitions of imperial hegemony. Remember what *hegemony* means, right? Absolute control over everything, the desire to embrace and control everything.

If you've got disarray and confusion, conflict at every turn, and manifestations of senseless violence, then it's going to be a very easy step for someone to come along and say, *It's time for change, change that matters. Rally around me and I will bring hope to the world, again.*

As a result, you have the rise of these great figures who cannot be questioned because they have a messianic character about them. It's the rise of the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings — kings like Louis XIV of France who declared that he was appointed by God directly, that, in fact, his birth was nearly as miraculous as Christ's, therefore he was an unquestioned sovereign over all. He ruled with an autocratic hand and he ruled over everything, which led to economic mercantilism.

You know what *mercantilism* is, right? *Mercantilism* is the wedding of big government with big business so that big business serves the interests of big government and big government serves the interest of big business. They cooperate for the purposes of elevating their peculiar and particular causes. Thus we have government-created monopolies, government-created sanctions, government-created incentives, and government-created stimulus packages. This squeezes out the small businessman; this squeezes out the guilds and the various tradesmen. This squeezes out the smaller businesses that drive the economy from the bottom up, because now the economy is controlled from the top down. Government sees, as its primary responsibility, driving the economy.

Mercantilism has had many forms. Socialism is a form of mercantilism in all its forms — there's international socialism, which follows a Marxist model, and there's national socialism, which is what we in the modern world

refer to as *fascism*. But it's all varying forms of mercantilism. This policy creates disincentives for small businesses and dries up the bottom two-thirds of an economy, which necessitates government providing benefits for those who no longer can run their businesses and that means that new tax burdens have to be imposed in order to pay for these benefits.

So you have the imposition of these overbearing tax burdens in order to pay for programs that are designed to relieve the miseries that have been created by the government itself. This became the basis for, not colonialism — colonialism can be simply the scattering and settling of a diaspora, of a people out across a wide range of the earth — but of colonial imperialism, where the colonies essentially become supply stations for the centralized authority back home.

With the lower two-thirds of the economy dried up and the overbearing tax burden upon those who try to stay in the economic marketplace, there becomes a sort of fringe desperation that drives people to piracy and privateering. Because piracy and privateering become such an important part of the economy, the government gets involved in regulating the piracy and the privateering and providing the pirates with letters of marque or sanction to exercise their piracy but only in regulated areas. It's like getting a taxi medallion, but you're only allowed to drive in Manhattan. So the government says to Sir Francis Drake or Sir Walter Raleigh, *Sure, we'll give you a letter of marque. You can function, in a sense, as an arm of our foreign policy as long as your piracy only targets Hapsburg ships. You can't ever raid an English ship, but as long as you're making life miserable for the French and the Spanish, go to it and here's a letter of sanction. Bravo. We'll knight you if you bring back enough gold.*

That's the situation that created a two-hundred-fifty-year-long period of warfare. It became a vicious cycle. The wars became necessary in order to protect the ideologies and the economic policies. The economic policies needed war in order to drum up more support at home for the overbearing tax burdens. Because the benefits went to those who most directly affected the ongoing efficacy of the day to day operations of the government, it's the people who were on the fringes, often those in the colonial possessions, who paid the price for the cost of the government's programs and ambitions. That's the world as it existed when the American founders started carving out a home for themselves on the shores of the New World.

9. ***Provide a brief account of the English Reformation and its influence on migrations to the Americas. Why is it fair to say that the English Reformation was not about doctrine, but about authority?*** There were multiple concerns that went back and forth between Rome and London, between Westminster and the Vatican, along with a tremendous amount of diplomacy. But here's the problem: Charles V was the emperor of the Holy Roman Empire and who was Catherine, but his aunt.

So, he fought hard to protect Catherine's integrity in the marriage. The result was that Cardinal Wolsey was unable to persuade the pope to annul the marriage, and so in 1533, Henry decided to divorce his wife and marry his lover in order to produce heirs to the throne and protect his dynastic ambitions. It was a nasty mess. That was the beginning of the break of the Church of England. It wasn't about doctrine: *sola scriptura*, *sola fide*, *soli deo gloria*, or *solo gratia*; it was about authority. As a result, when Henry VIII died, the English church was an autonomous church, but it had not actually been reformed. Theologically it was virtually identical to the Roman Catholic Church. The difference was that it was a national church rather than an international church.

The English Reformation was not a reformation about doctrine, it was a reformation about authority. It wasn't a fight about whether or not the Roman Catholic Church taught what was true. It was whether or not the pope had authority over the affairs of local kings. This is one of the reasons why, by the time we get to the seventeenth century, there were many English reformers who believed that the work of the Reformation had never been done in England, even though the Anglican Church had broken away under King Henry VIII.

Edward VI succeeded Henry when he was only nine years old in 1547. He was an ardent believer in the doctrines of the Reformation. He immediately set about putting in place real reforms in the English church, including, in 1548, a call for radical reforms of the prayer book that was used in English worship services.

In 1550, exclusion statutes were ratified which essentially put into place bans on Roman Catholics from holding high office or from succeeding to the throne in England.

Alas, Edward was a sickly child. He was succeeded by his older half-sister, Mary, who was the daughter of Henry and Catherine in that first marriage. Mary was determined to avenge her mother's shame. While she didn't reunite the Anglican Church — the English Church — with Rome because of a series of impediments along the way that were both political and personal, she did unleash a horrific persecution against the Puritans, those who had brought about the reforms of Edward.

In 1553, Mary I successfully overthrew the claims of her cousin, Lady Jane Grey, and had her executed at the Tower of London.

By 1554, she had arranged an alliance with Philip of Hapsburg, and by 1556, she had unleashed a fierce persecution — one that earned her the name *Bloody Mary* — launched against those English Protestants who were attempting to reform the English church along the lines of the Reformation in continental Europe under Calvin, Luther, and Zwingli.

Mary died after only five years on the throne and she was succeeded by her half-sister, Edward's still older sister, but the only remaining child of Henry VIII, Elizabeth I.

Almost immediately Elizabeth, who was sympathetic to the Protestants but who desired the dignity and the glory of the Catholics, signed an agreement called the Settlement Policy, or the *Via Media*, the middle way. In 1562, she issued a series of royal injunctions that consolidated authority and power. Elizabeth was the consummate politician, regal presence. She ignited the land, settled the disputes between warring factions to a remarkable degree and the Anglo-Catholics and the Puritans settled into an uneasy peace during *Pax Virginia*. She was known as the great Virgin Queen, and the peace that reigned during her time on the throne was quite remarkable. Alas, because she was the Virgin Queen, she died without issue. She never married.

In 1603, the crown was passed to her Scottish cousin, James VI of Scotland, James I of England.

In 1605, he imposed the Decree of Conformity requiring all Dissenters, all Puritans, all Non-Conformists to submit to the decrees of a centralized Anglican Church. That decree sent all these various groups into reaction mode.

## Opportunity No. 5

Administer before Lesson 11

### Identify the following:

1. **John Winthrop:** John Winthrop wrote the sermon, "A Model of Charity". In 1630, the largest and best organized group yet, with the strongest leadership yet, under John Winthrop, some seven hundred six made their way across the Atlantic, well-provisioned with lots of communications back and forth across the Atlantic. They came, and just across the river from Charlestown, they established their little village on a series of three hills that they called Trimountain. *Trimountain* was an awkward name, and in honor of one of the pastors that they had brought with them, a man by the name of John Cotton who was the pastor of St. Botolph's in the village of Boston in England, they renamed Trimountain Boston; thus was established this great establishment. Winthrop helped to establish the Massachusetts General Court; became the governor of the entire Massachusetts Bay Colony and writing its laws and gathering its legislature and founding all of the essential infrastructure of a flourishing society. He was, in many ways, the founding father of the American experiment; one of the governors of the Massachusetts Bay Colony in the early years — reelected twelve times because of his strong leadership
2. **Anne Hutchinson:** a gifted Bible teacher who grew a home Bible study to a point where there were about eighty people in it. She was charismatic and thoughtful, but she also had an antinomian perspective. *Antinomian* simply means anti-name or against the law. Her basic premise was that the doctrine of the security of the saints means that after Christ has redeemed a person, he can just go do whatever he wants. He can sin however he wishes and his salvation is not placed in jeopardy. She did not recommend that this be taken to the extreme. In fact, she was quite prim and proper, but the doctrine itself the Puritans believed was sowing seeds of disaster and created a tremendous amount of disruption.  
  
a remarkably brilliant and articulate woman. She began to gather what we would today call a home Bible study following sermons on Sundays to discuss the ideas in the sermon with a number of women in the village. Over the course of months and years, she began, like Roger Williams, to form strong theological opinions. It was said in the early years that she had remarkable theological discernment. She was also opinionated and began to take an issue with various things that were said in the sermons, so much issue that she began to undermine the authority of the local church. The church would come to her and work with her and see if there were issues of merit that were involved. She became more and more and more contentious, began to polarize members of the community. She also began, during this time, to have some bizarre visions and revelations. Eventually she too was sent into exile. She made her way to Rhode Island, although Roger Williams was not sure of her salvation and therefore she was forced to go to live outside the secured walls of Providence and eventually established her own little farm elsewhere where she got into a bit of trouble with the Indians, whom she also disturbed greatly. Eventually the Indians came and scalped her and all of her children, though she survived — I'm not sure I'd want to survive a scalping, but she did — and one of her daughters did as well.
3. **Solomon Stoddard:** a prominent pastor in one of the western cities of the new Massachusetts Bay Colony, a place called Northampton. It was there that he wrestled with the peculiar trouble of second and third generation Puritans who might not have had any evidence of a conversion experience. Here's the question: if you have covenantal succession, if you have a society that's built around the life of the church, if everybody goes to church and everyone's expected to go to church — if you don't go to church, and if you don't tithe, you're

probably some sort of a renegade and you might even be prosecuted in the law — everybody goes to church but obviously not necessarily everybody is actually converted. What happens if you have a second and third-generation Puritan, a young man who marries a young woman, neither one of them have ever expressed or shown evidence of conversion experience and they have children. Do you baptize those children? How do the parents take vows? Do you wait until they have a conversion experience? Solomon Stoddard wrestled with these things, and he came up with something called the Half-way Covenant, which allowed non-Christians to become members of the church without conversion but with only essentially half the privileges that come with church membership. This created a huge amount of turmoil and great confusion going forward because it was neither a covenantal view nor a Baptist view, and it created a governmental structure where non-Christians could gain control of the apparatus of the church. Therefore, the ground was laid for apostate churches, not just apostate individuals.

Solomon Stoddard was a pastor in Northampton, Massachusetts. He was the grandfather of Jonathan Edwards. He devised a theological system called the Half-way covenant. The Half-way covenant essentially said, You can be a member of the church. You can have some of the privileges of the church, but not all of them. And if you have been a member of the covenant, even though you're not a professing Christian, you can have your children admitted into the covenant. This created a kind of category of Christian in the church that could create all sorts of havoc within the church. A group of unbelievers in the church with power, but not with the full privileges of life in the body was a rather large mess.

4. **Anne Bradstreet:** the first American poet. Her poetry provided a vision for the Puritan ideal, the ideal family, the ideal hunger for productivity and opportunity, the Puritan ideal of living under the rule of law, raising up godly seed, and sending forth succeeding generations; wife of governor Simon Bradstreet
5. **jeremiads:** warnings like the warning the prophet Jeremiah issued, warnings that God's judgement was imminent.
6. **The Great Awakening:** a revival of religious faith that took place in the New World; began in Georgia in 1738 with the preaching of George Whitefield, and in Massachusetts with the preaching of Jonathan Edwards
7. **Jonathan Edwards:** Edwards, the grandson of Solomon Stoddard, was trained at Yale University, had the opportunity to have a fine classical education, became an intern to his grandfather, and eventually the assistant pastor at the Northampton Church there in Massachusetts.

Edwards' impact upon the town and upon the fledgling colonies was remarkable. Many historians believe that he, to this day, remains the finest mind — philosopher, scientist, theologian, thinker, writer — that America has ever produced. If we were to make a top ten list of the most brilliant Americans ever, right at the top of the list would be Jonathan Edwards and Cotton Mather. They were stunningly brilliant. Cotton Mather wrote more than four hundred thick volumes during his life and ministry, besides pastoring the Old North Church in Boston. Jonathan Edwards was an expert in science. He wrote a number of important science textbooks, including one of the most remarkable textbooks on spiders that has ever been produced in the United States — still in print; it's been continuously in print since he first wrote it — as well as encyclopedic works on theology, history, biography, across the wide span of history. His was a remarkable mind.

He learned from the nascent renewal movement the methodology of revival preaching and calling for conversion.

Because of a whole series of conflicts which started with a series of exhortations to the youth group at the Northampton Church. (Watch out for choirs and youth groups, there's always trouble there.) He gave a series



of strong exhortations to the youth to live in a pure and chaste fashion that rubbed some of the parents the wrong way, and they started a kerfluffle which went from being a kerfluffle to a hubbub, eventually moving from kerfluffle and hubbub straight to crisis. Jonathan Edwards — who, over the course of his ministry, was responsible for the conversion of virtually every person in that congregation, who had had a wide effect all across the colonies, who was one of the most esteemed thinkers in theology, who had been offered positions at Cambridge and St. Andrew's in Scotland — was voted out of office. He was fired by the church. So, he went back home to the parsonage where his wife and his children were and informed them that they would have to move. Of course, they had nowhere to move and no money, no means. They were on their way out when the committee that had just fired him realized that it was Thursday and they didn't have anyone to preach on Sunday. So they came back to Jonathan Edwards and asked him if he would fill the pulpit that he was just fired from in a church that he had pastored for the past twenty years. He said yes. He filled the pulpit for the next six months and never once mentioned the controversy. He picked up in his preaching exactly where he'd left off the previous Sunday and made no mention of it whatsoever.

Eventually, he went out to the far western frontier, to Stockbridge, Massachusetts, to minister among the Indians and was shortly thereafter appointed the new president of Princeton, which was then called the College of New Jersey. He never took his post as president of Princeton because, ever the scientist, he was experimenting with a smallpox vaccination, and, in the experiment, he succumbed and died — a remarkable man, a remarkable impact.

His one sermon, "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God,"

8. ***George Whitefield:*** Jonathan Edwards' friend and partner in the proclamation of the glorious truths of the gospel was George Whitefield. He was from England and only visited America for preaching tours. He came seven times.

He was the son of an innkeeper who came first to Georgia in 1738 to establish an orphanage, which exists to this day. In order to raise funds for the orphanage, he'd go forth and give the vision for caring for orphans and widows in their distress, and inevitably he would preach the gospel. The purpose was to give the vision and take an offering, but eventually preaching the gospel became the center point of his work.

His open-air preaching caused great disruption back in England. His friends and protégés, whom he greatly influenced and brought into his open-air preaching movement, the Wesleys — John and Charles — eventually took over the work in England, and Whitefield focused on his work in America.

9. ***Presbyterian Parsons' Rebellion:*** what George III called the American War of Independence because of the influence of the Scots Covenanters.

## Essay Questions:

10. ***Explain the significance and impact of the Great Awakening in America.*** The effects of the renewal were widespread. For the first time, there was real unity and cohesion in all the colonies. George Whitefield was the first American celebrity, the first person who was known in all of the colonies. Those colonies that, heretofore, had been isolated from each other, were now united because of a common faith, a common vision, and a common renewal, a Great Awakening.

Because of the Great Awakening, there was a renewed interest and emphasis on missions to the Indians and those Africans who had been brought as indentured servants to the Americas.

There was a widespread new emphasis on the establishment of schools and training colleges, on Christian education and the spread of classical education. It was really the beginning of the movement that, today, we broadly call evangelicalism, that crossed denominational boundaries, that tied together those conservative, Bible-believing Anglicans, Baptists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists, and that provided the basis for a whole new kind of culture that was the essence of the American culture.

11. ***What does the Great Awakening reveal about the nature of the American Vision?*** There's controversy among some scholars who wonder whether or not America really was ever established as a Christian nation, who wonder whether or not the Christian influence was ever really very strong. They question the legitimacy of Christians today speaking into civic affairs, saying that the founders of the American experiment in liberty had always intended a strong separation between church and state. They've obviously not read the Cambridge Resolves. They've obviously not read the Connecticut Constitution. They've obviously not read any of the orders of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. They obviously don't know a thing about John Witherspoon or Arthur St. Clair. Because the fact is that America, its uniqueness, its vision, the creation of its remarkable documents, the establishment of its remarkable civilization is not impossible, it's inconceivable, can't be thought of, imagined, dreamed about apart from the distinctive work of the gospel in this land.

Cotton Mather said it well in *Magnalia Christi Americana*, when he said, "If a hope of freedom is to endure, it will endure as the fruits of the gospel, for only the gospel proclaims liberty to mankind." He understood. From the very beginning, the renewal of hearts in Christ was intimately tied to the renewal of the idea of liberty and freedom. To look at the unique providence of God to stir a great awakening with Dutch, American, and English preachers, to fill churches with Scots Presbyterian elders and pastors at just the right moment to lay the foundations for an unflinching commitment to liberty. This is not possible apart from the truth that America can only exist as a Christian experiment and its influence around the world has only been as powerful as it has been because it is indeed a Christian vision.

## Opportunity No. 6

Administer before Lesson 13

### Identify the following:

1. **Peyton Randolph**: scion of a great Virginia family; first president of the First Continental Congress
2. **epistemology**: the study of how we learn, how we know what we know.
3. **ontology**: the essence of being
4. **repentance**: acknowledging that I don't know everything that I need to know, I have not yet become everything I ought to become, I haven't done everything I ought to do, I don't know what I need to know.
5. **mercantilism**: the marriage of big government and big business; You have two cows, the government takes them both, then sells you the milk at a premium.
6. **salutary neglect**: the neglect of the mother country in the internal affairs of the colonies; salutary because this neglect left the colonies to develop structures of self-government.
7. **Boston Tea Party**: The Sons of Liberty dressed as Indians and threw the tea that was to be taxed into the harbor.
8. **The Boston Massacre**: What Samuel Adams called the incident where the Redcoats in Boston, having been heckled and possibly threatened, shot into the crowd, killing five and wounding six.

### Essay Questions:

9. **Describe the relationship between a specific English act (or set of acts) and either mercantilism or Salutary Neglect.** Answers will vary
10. **In what ways did the founders of American culture use their substantial heritage as learned English citizens to resist oppression?** Because they understood the world around them, because they had the insights, the discernment, and the discretion of ages and ages of wisdom catalogued in their hearts and their minds, they were able to establish for themselves a worldview that was rooted in the faith. The more well-informed they became, the more thoroughgoing in their faith.

The more informed they became, the more they realized the value of covenantal connectionalism, the more passionate they became in the protection of families and the more committed they were to put first things first.

Obviously the more they read, the more they understood and recognized how important it was to work hard, to labor diligently.

Their substantive preparation enabled them to risk everything — their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. They were bold in their defense of truth, they understood the cost of freedom, and they were willing to suffer through controversy for the sake of a greater cause, a cause greater than they were.

## Opportunity No. 7

Administer before Lesson 15

### Identify the following:

1. **Samuel Adams:** a Boston brewmaster and tavern owner, leader of the Sons of Liberty, the man who named the Boston Tea Party and the Boston Massacre; truly conservative, not ideological at all; just wanted to mind his own business, focus on his family, tend his garden, and brew his beer; worked with Patrick Henry on the Declaration of Colonial Rights; initiated the Committees of Correspondence in 1773; helped draft the Stamp Act Resolutions; helped call together the first Continental Congress in 1774; the British were looking for Adams and John Hancock in Lexington and Concord the night the first shots of the war were fired.
2. **Patrick Henry:** argued the Parsons' cause in 1763; worked with Sam Adams on the Declaration of Colonial Rights; helped call together the first Continental Congress in 1774; delivered the great "Give Me Liberty or Give Me Death" speech before the House of Burgesses, meeting just outside Richmond in the St. John's Parish in 1775; first governor of the state of Virginia; member of the first Continental Congress
3. **lex rex:** the law is king, as opposed to the king is the law. This means that the king is also under the law and everyone is accountable to God.
4. **Sons of Thunder:** Samuel Adams, Roger Sherman, Patrick Henry
5. **Forgotten Presidents:** the men who served as presidents of the Continental Congresses and under the Articles of Confederation from 1776-1789, when the current Constitution was ratified.
6. **Olive Branch Petition:** a petition sent to the Crown and Parliament in July of 1775; one final attempt at a peaceful settlement with England.
7. **magistratal interposition:** the idea that lower magistrates should interpose themselves between the people they serve and higher magistrates when those higher magistrates begin acting tyrannically.
8. **sphere sovereignty:** the idea that the four spheres — self, family, church, government — each have specific areas of authority which must be respected by the other spheres. Sphere sovereignty essentially argues that, because man is inevitably a sinner, there are no perfect, unquestionable, unassailable institutions or offices that men or nations can erect. Therefore, it's important to recognize the various spheres of authority that God puts into place to check and balance them. So, for instance, God gives to the family certain rights, privileges, and authorities that the state does not have. And God gives to the state certain rights and authorities that the church does not have. God gives to the church certain rights and authorities that neither the family nor the state have. These spheres are to operate in the realm of their jurisdictions with a level of sovereignty, so that if one of the other jurisdictions gets out of line, steps out of bounds, exerts authority that does not belong to it, then the other spheres can check and balance, correct and bring back into line, that other jurisdiction.
9. **federal theology:** the word *federal* is actually just another word for *covenantal* and means taking many parts and bringing them together so that they do not lose their distinctiveness and yet, they're pulled into a coalition that allows them to cooperate. So *many* function as *one*, but they remain distinctive as *many*. The idea for this theology of the one and the many is derived directly from the Scriptures, where we see it not only in the Godhead, in the Trinity, one and many, but we see that applied to society, when we come to nations like Israel, which is both

one and many. The governance of institutions in the Bible is always one and many, so that there are always ways to appeal. There are always ways to come to some sort of council or tribal meeting or to stand before judges, to have causes of justice prevail.

### Essay Questions:

10. ***What made America's founding fathers so extraordinary? In your answer, provide details about one person in particular.*** Answers will vary

11. ***What is a covenant lawsuit sequence? In your answer, list and explain the four major principles Jefferson depended on in his writing of the Declaration of Independence.*** So, Jefferson and his committee began to work. The work that they did was really quite remarkable. They understood that the liberties that we enjoy in America have been secured against the arbitrary and fickle whims of men and movements by the rule of law. Our social system was not designed to depend upon the benevolence of magistrates, the altruism of the wealthy, or the condescension of the powerful. Every citizen, rich and poor, man or woman, native born or immigrant, hale or handicapped, young or old, is equal under the standard of unchanging, immutable, and impartial justice.

This is what Thomas Paine talked about when he wrote a little booklet that helped spark the thinking of so many in the American War of Independence, *Common Sense*, "In America, the law is king." This was derived directly from the English common law tradition. Essentially, those who forged this covenant lawsuit understood that if left to the mere discretion of human authorities, even the best intended statutes, edicts, ordinances, and laws inevitably devolve into some form of tyranny. That's because they will always serve somebody else's interest rather than the interests of the people. There must, therefore, be an absolute against which no encroachment of prejudice or preference can ever interfere. There has to be a foundation that the winds of change and the waters of circumstance cannot, ever, erode. There has to be a basis for law that can be depended upon at all times, in all places, and in every situation. They understood that, apart from this uniquely Christian innovation in the affairs of men and nations, there can be no enduring freedom. There never has been before, there never will be again. Our Founding Fathers understood that only too well.

So, the opening refrain of the Declaration of Independence affirms the necessity of that kind of absolute standard upon which the rule of law can then be established — "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men." To secure these rights, we elect representatives so that they don't kill babies, and when we elect magistrates who do with profligacy, our freedom is lost. Appealing to the Judge of the world for guidance, relying on his divine providence for wisdom, the framers committed themselves and their posterity to the absolute standard of the laws of nature and of nature's God.

They're not ambivalent about this, they're not namby-pamby, they're not dancing around all this stuff. They're as clear as they can possibly be. When these just powers are turned to some other course, they become destructive of the ends for which they were established, and at that point, it becomes the right and the duty of the people to throw off the shackles. A just government exists, they argued, solely and completely to provide guards for the future security of that unchanging standard. Take away those guards and the rule of law is no longer possible. That's precisely why they felt compelled to so boldly declare their autonomy from the British Crown. The activist government of the Crown had become increasingly intrusive, burdensome, and fickle, and thus the possibility of the rule of law had been thrown into jeopardy. The founders merely protested that the fashion and

the fancy of political, bureaucratic, and systemic innovation, change that people can believe in, had alienated that which was inalienable.

So they followed that Old Testament pattern. They said that the king's government had erected a multitude of new offices and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance. In other words, the government had become essentially a series of bureaucratic rules where the people had to stand in line to get one thing after another stamped by officials, and in so doing they had to pay at every turn, thus eroding all their prosperity.

It had called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with the king's measures. It had refused assent to laws, the most wholesome and necessary to the public good. It had imposed taxes without consent, taking away our charters, abolishing our most valuable laws, and altering fundamentally the forms of our government. It had plundered our seas, ravaged our coasts, destroyed the lives of our people, and so excited domestic insurrections among us. They enumerated all the ways that the Crown and Parliament had broken covenant. It was a covenant lawsuit.

Thus they acted boldly to form a more perfect union. They launched a sublime experiment in liberty, never before surpassed and never again matched. The founders believed that no one in America, no one, in fact, in Britain could be absolutely secure under the king because absoluteness had been thrown out of the constitutional vocabulary. Because certain rights had been abrogated for at least *some* citizens by a smothering, dominating, political behemoth, *all* liberties of *all* the citizens were at risk because suddenly arbitrariness, relativism, and randomness had entered into the legal equation. The checks against petty partiality and blatant bias had been disabled.

## Opportunity No. 8

Administer before Lesson 17

### Identify the following:

1. **Benjamin Franklin:** 1706-1788, American polymath; born in Boston, ran away to Philadelphia; founder of countless societies, the first circulating lending library in America, inventor, writer, publisher, diplomat
2. **Silence Dogood:** the pseudonym Benjamin Franklin chose in his letters to the editor of his brother's paper
3. **Poor Richard's Almanac:** a little almanac of wit and wisdom published beginning in 1733
4. **George Whitefield:** 1714–1770; the first American celebrity; a British preacher who founded an orphanage in Georgia in 1738; while on a preaching tour to raise funds for the orphanage, revival broke out — the beginning of the Great Awakening
5. **The Holy Club:** a collection of like-minded searchers, some of them skeptics, some of them Deists, some of them Enlightenment thinkers, none of them actually Christians. But they desired something far more substantial. It was there at the Holy Club that George Whitefield, in studying the Bible, was converted.
6. **Bethesda Orphanage:** The orphanage founded by George Whitefield in 1738 which led to his preaching tours in the colonies
7. **Watauga Territory:** In 1769, the Whitefield and Franklin got together — they'd been corresponding for some months about an idea. *What if we took all these ideals, brought them together, and established the ideal town?* It was long before nineteenth-century utopianism would shake the Western frontier. Franklin was fascinated by the notion that perhaps Whitefield understood how a culture could be reformed. So why not go out to the West, establish a little colony, and bring all these principles together. Franklin said that he was on the verge of receiving the Christ that Whitefield proclaimed. He made note of it several times in their correspondence back and forth. Franklin, the great skeptic, the great intellect, the engine of productivity and creativity, had met his match in Whitefield and was ready to relent his heart. He was ready to throw in his lot to establish a new colony in the West, over the mountains from Virginia and North Carolina in the lush valleys of the Watauga province. They began to pursue the possibility of getting a land grant for the territory.

Alas, they were never able to speed their vision to fruition. Having traveled his entire life cross the ocean and on horseback and in rugged conditions, Whitefield's body finally just wore out. While on a preaching tour of New England, he died in 1770 in Newburyport, Massachusetts, where he was buried in the crypt of the First Presbyterian Church. Whitefield's instructions to Franklin, concerning that ideal Christian community, were never altogether lost. Some of Franklin's associates, who had likewise been greatly influenced by Whitefield's preaching, journals, and sermons, decided to pursue that vision themselves. They brought that vision to the Watauga province — among the men who fought at the Battle of King's Mountain, men like Gideon Blackburn and Sam Houston. Ultimately, though much diminished in its form, the idea of that ideal community, now named for one of the great men just recently departed, was established, but the vision has yet to be realized.

**Essay Questions:**

8. ***List the first fourteen presidents of the United States of America who served prior to George Washington. Below your list, write a few sentences about why we often ignore these men in our study of history.***

1. Peyton Randolph
2. Henry Middleton
3. John Hancock
4. Henry Laurens
5. John Jay
6. Samuel Huntington
7. Thomas McKean
8. John Hanson
9. Elias Boudinot
10. Thomas Mifflin
11. Richard Henry Lee
12. Nathaniel Gorham
13. Arthur St. Clair
14. Cyrus Griffin

One is simply that we're really sloppy when it comes to doing history, and we are very prone in every generation to rewrite the history books to suit our present fads, fashions, and fancies. That's what's happening right now as textbook committees are rushing after political correctness to try to rewrite the history books to suit the mood of the day. That's just sloppy history.

A second reason is that we always remember the things that we think are important, and we're quick to forget things that are inconvenient truths. We have selective remembrance. We all do this. We all have highlight reels in our minds of those events that are great and are always surprised when someone who was at the same event notices something that we didn't see. They remind us of it, and we say, *Really? I don't remember that.*

The trouble is that when selective remembrance is combined with political correctness, you come up with a myopic, out-of-focus view of the events of the past. This is largely due to the fact that in the nineteenth century, particularly in the middle of the nineteenth century, all around the Western world there was a new ideological fashion that gripped the minds of the intelligentsia, the academics, the politicians. It was the idea of ideological nationalism, a peculiar idea that arose in the nineteenth century. It's why all the fiefdoms, kingdoms, principalities, and duchies of once-diverse lands like the Germanies and the various Italian Republics in the middle of the nineteenth century were forged into multilingual, often multicultural, amorphous entities called nation-states. You'll recall that before the nineteenth century, there was no such thing as a place called Spain, no such thing as a place called Italy, no such thing as a place called Germany. These were forged through a series of civil wars



that afflicted virtually all of the Western world. We have to understand that the Russian Revolution was essentially a civil war fought over various factions of ideological nationalism. We can understand the Napoleonic wars in terms of ideological nationalism. Bismarck's uniting of the Germanies is a hallmark of ideological nationalism. Garibaldi's reunification of the various Italian kingdoms was ideological nationalism. The last and perhaps the most grotesque was the unification of all the Spanish kingdoms under Generalissimo Franco in the twentieth century, creating modern-day Spain. These are all manifestations of an ideological movement that has afflicted us as well.

So, men who did not fit in with that notion of ideological nationalism were left out of our remembrance, and those who fit conveniently in became a part of our civil religion, and we give it sanctity and the blessing of our historiography.

So, political correctness and incorrectness created this rift. When you start talking about men like Elias Boudinot and John Jay, there's a lot of political correctness there. You don't want to talk about John Jay very much because you can hardly find a quote where he's not talking about Jesus and why it is that, apart from Jesus, the American experiment in liberty cannot long endure or survive.

That leads to the whole question of anti-federalism and federalism, which was a raging controversy at the time. We, in these postmodern times, talk about it in terms of Tea Party principles versus progressive principles or states' rights or nullification, but these are all part and parcel of the question of anti-federalism versus federalism, covenantalism versus anti-covenantalism, and these are things that we just don't talk about, so we think that George Washington was the first president. It's just easier that way. It's also wrong and gives us a false impression of the founding of the nation and the principles that our nation was founded on and the principles that might yet ensure freedom for our children, our grandchildren, and great-grandchildren.

9. ***Why was a skeptic like Benjamin Franklin drawn to a friendship with a pious man like George Whitefield? How did they share the ideals of virtue, vision, and freedom?*** Both Whitefield and Franklin greatly valued virtue. They both believed that the transformed life, living in accordance with that which is right, good, and true, can change the world. They believed that virtue could transform lives, cultures, and communities, and that that was the only hope for the future. They both believed that the virtuous man was always able to claim the moral high ground in any battle, in any struggle.

The difference, of course, was that Benjamin Franklin believed that virtue could be achieved by the sheer pluck, the hard work, the diligence, and the unflinching, visionary purpose of man himself. Benjamin Franklin believed in works righteousness. George Whitefield believed that grace and grace alone could produce the virtuous works necessary for the transformation of culture. Benjamin Franklin had never heard anything like that in all his life and he was stunned by it. He became absolutely fascinated with Whitefield and thoroughly investigated his life and his works.

Franklin was fascinated by this man. He began to read his books, listen to his sermons, and he became smitten by this idea that there was a God, that he had spoken, that he extended his grace, and that lives could be transformed not by just the sheer energy of man but by the mercy and kindness of God.

Both men also shared a great vision. Both men were able to see the connections between different disciplines and ideas. They believed that beauty, goodness, and truth made way for progress for mankind. They believed that there were objective standards for beauty, goodness, and truth and that those objective standards, when properly adhered to, could produce a better society, a greater hope, a brighter future. Their vision was a vision

largely fixed not on the present. They believed it was necessary for their generation to defer gratification for a greater day yet come.

In the eighteenth century, this was rare.

## Opportunity No. 9

Administer before Lesson 19

### Identify the following:

1. **Psalm 97:** Psalm 97 outlines a vision of how the world works. You know, from personal experience, that if you do something that is out of concord with the way the world works you get hurt. “You don’t tug on Superman’s cape. You don’t spit into the wind,” to quote a great American philosopher.

If you do something stupid, you’re going to get hurt. Doing something stupid is doing something that is out of sync with the way things actually are. Psalm 97 tells us how things are. “The Lord reigns.” God is sovereign. It doesn’t matter what Rahm Emanuel or Emma Thompson say. God is sovereign. He is there; he is not silent. He rules and reigns over all of the earth. If you try and live as if that is not true, you will stumble and fall. Your policies will fail, you will be hurt, the economy will falter, the military will have setbacks, families will be disrupted — if you don’t recognize this basic reality.

2. **Will Rogers:** His epitaph would one day read, “I joked about every prominent man in my lifetime, but I never met one I didn’t like.” Will Rogers was the great American humorist of his day, and he was a practical, some would say, cowboy, philosopher. This cowboy philosopher would often stand in front of crowds doing a starched lariat rope trick while he told his jokes, capturing the nation’s attention at a time of great crisis. He was the voice of reason through the worst of the Great Depression. He was the voice of practical concern throughout the whole season of disruption when, by various terms, the Socialists and the Communists seemed ready to seize power in several states in the United States, when wild-eyed ideas of utopian design from Woodrow Wilson’s Fourteen Points all the way to FDR’s New Deal seemed to be a harbinger of bigger and bigger government, more and more intrusion, and design of life by the experts. Will Rogers was a voice of restraint and of reason. It’s amazing that during that time between the death of Teddy Roosevelt and the rise of the conservative movement under Robert Taft, there was virtually no strong voice of reason — Calvin Coolidge perhaps being the one great exception, other than a humorist named Will Rogers.

He was a man of astonishing perception and reach. His wisdom carried the day with a large part of American society and life. Will Rogers clearly understood those lessons that we saw last time from Psalm 97, the basic principles of statesmanship and politics laid out in Psalm 97, broadly arranged in the two great categories of God’s sovereignty over all the nations. Remember Psalm 97 begins by saying, “Our God reigns. Let the nations be glad.” It outlines essential principles of a global kingdom of absolute rule and reign by a sovereign God whose purposes cannot be foiled or flustered and whose end is to bring truth, justice, and righteousness to all of the earth and to cause the worthless idols of men to be exposed and to crumble under the weight of their own absurdity. But God exercises this sovereignty through the responsibility and faithfulness of his people, as he delegates authority to them in certain jurisdictions — the jurisdiction of the church, the jurisdiction of the family, the jurisdiction of the wider community, and the jurisdiction of the civil sphere.

Will Rogers understood that ultimately tyranny is the result of the spheres violating one another’s jurisdictions and that biblical reason results in justice and truth when the natural and normal inclinations of sinful men and institutions are checked. In other words, the genius of Psalm 97 is that it portrays for us separation of powers, checks and balances, accountability, and the rule of law. It’s an astonishing notion. The experiment in liberty known as the American Republic is such an anomaly in American history because our foundations were laid with these essential principles.

3. ***John Quincy Adams:*** John Adams' son; candidate for president in 1824; won the election when it was thrown to the House; possible participant in the "Corrupt Bargain".
4. ***Andrew Jackson:*** Candidate for president in 1824; lost when the vote was taken in the House even though he had won a plurality of the popular vote; accused Adams and Clay of conspiring together to throw the election to Adams; began his campaign for the 1828 election the week after Adams' inauguration
5. ***Henry Clay:*** Candidate for president in 1824; allegedly threw his votes to Adams in exchange for the vice presidency; also became vice president under Andrew Jackson in 1828
6. ***List the four major areas of biblical jurisdictionalism:***
  1. Ecclesia
  2. Familia
  3. Communitas
  4. Civitas
7. ***List Daniel Webster's seven principles of leadership:***
  1. Leaders are always controversial.
  2. To affirm one thing is to deny another.
  3. Accept the nature of the struggle.
  4. If we have to fight, fight fairly.
  5. Admit the mystery and complexity of the world.
  6. Run toward the roar.
  7. Leadership is an inherently dangerous affair.

### Essay Questions:

8. ***How do Daniel Webster's seven principles of leadership help provide answers to the difficulties of the election of 1824, as well as to the difficulties of our own day?*** One of the men standing on the outside of this whole escapade was Daniel Webster, the great orator of the North. Webster outlined some basic principles for Congress to reform itself. He called for a Congress that would return to principle over party and partisanship. His idea was simply this: politics never solves anything in the long run. It can only divide. But statesmanship can lead, is rooted in principle, and can have long-lasting effects. (Very much paraphrased, summarized and, quite frankly, cherry-picked, the principles of Webster are outlined here.)

He said, first of all, leaders can never play to the camera. Real leaders have to shut their eyes to public opinion polls while at the same time opening their ears to the voice of the people. That's a delicate balance. You have to hear what the people are saying, but you have to lead. You have to understand that when you lead you will always invite criticism. Do anything and you're going to be criticized. Do nothing and you can stay safe. But if you actually step forward and do something, you are going to be criticized.

Secondly, if you're going to stand for anything, that necessarily means that you are standing against some things. There are a lot of politicians out there who just want to affirm everything, they're *for* everything. You can't be for everything. If you are for anything, you've got to be necessarily, by the nature of things, against some things.

Third, it is hard, it is laborious. It takes cunning and skill, it takes courage. It's a battle to get anything done. The least little thing requires a tremendous amount of effort. As Helen Keller, the great life philosopher of the last generation said, out of her world of silence and darkness, "It is the little pushes of unrelenting labor that move civilization forward." "It is the *little* pushes of *unrelentingly* labor that push civilization forward."

At the same time, while it is a battle, while it's inevitable that we are going to have to fight, if we are principled, we must always fight fairly. We must always realize that pragmatism is, at its root, a lie at some level. To do whatever you need to do to accomplish your agenda is a very dangerous thing because inevitably you have to violate your own principles to get there.

Fifth, we live in a world that is mysterious. We're mysterious, our world is mysterious, the electorate is mysterious. The mood of the nation is mysterious. We just have to accept it. It's not a science. There's no such thing as political *science*. It is *not* a science.

Sixth, the battle is, wherever the clash of arms is, that's what you have to run toward. You don't run away from abortion because it's a contentious issue. If you are a statesman, you run toward it. You deal with the stuff. That's what leaders are for.

Leaders aren't supposed to tip toe around the dangerous things. Leave that to the dainties of King George. If we are actually going to do something, we've got to wade in, roll up our sleeves, and muck it out in the mess. We made a mess. You can't clean up a mess unless you get messy. Run toward the roar. That necessarily means that whatever you do, if you take a stand, if you wade in, if you talk about something that people don't want you to talk about, if you deal with issues that people don't want to deal with, you have to acknowledge, *Look, it's dangerous*. Every single time I sit in my office and I have a counseling appointment, I know it's dangerous if I tell the truth. I could be nice, I could be, oh, dear Pastor Grant, oh we just love Pastor Grant, as long as I don't tell the truth, as long as I just dry the eyes and pat the back and do the little sideways Christian hug with the three pats for the Trinity. As long as I do that stuff, I'm great! But if I tell the truth and I say, *No, it is not a phobia, and no, it is not a psychosis — it's sin and you've just got to stop it. Got it? Stop it! Stop it, stop it, stop it!* That's dangerous. Now, the question is, at this point, with the map crimson, do we have the guts to do that?

9. ***What three traits would you most like to see in an elected official? How would these particular traits enable one to lead our nation through its current issues. Provide specific examples in your answer.*** Answers will vary.

## *Opportunity No. 10*

Administer before Lesson 21

### **Identify the following:**

1. ***List the “forgotten” presidential administrations:***

1. Peyton Randolph (two terms)
2. Henry Middleton
3. John Hancock (two terms)
4. Henry Laurens
5. John Jay
6. Samuel Huntington
7. Thomas McKean
8. John Hanson
9. Elias Boudinot
10. Thomas Mifflin
11. Richard Henry Lee
12. Nathaniel Gorham
13. Arthur St. Clair
14. Cyrus Griffin

2. ***Put the following events in chronological order:***

- a. The Battle of Bennington***
- b. Washington lost New York City***
- c. Lexington and Concord***
- d. Patrick Henry’s “Give me liberty” speech***
- e. The ride of Dawes and Revere***
- f. Washington crossed the Delaware River***
- g. Winter at Valley Forge***
- h. The Battle of Bunker/Breeds Hill***
- i. The Battle of Princeton***

**j. *The Battle of Ticonderoga***

- a. Patrick Henry's "Give me liberty" speech
  - b. The ride of Dawes and Revere
  - c. Lexington and Concord
  - d. The Battle of Ticonderoga
  - e. The Battle of Bunker/Breeds Hill
  - f. Washington lost New York City
  - g. Washington crossed the Delaware River
  - h. The Battle of Princeton
  - i. The Battle of Bennington
  - j. Winter at Valley Forge
3. ***The Sons of Liberty***: a group founded by Samuel Adams that focused on the righteousness of the cause; produced pamphlet after pamphlet, communicating with people, reminding them that their cause was just.
  4. ***Committees of Correspondence***: put together by John Hancock; a network so that communities could communicate with each other, understand what the needs and concerns were, and build bridges of support and reconciliation throughout all the colonies
  5. ***magistratal interposition***: drawn from the biblical directives for magistrates in Romans 13 and the call to submit to authorities, but authorities who themselves are under God and have only delegated powers in the face of rights that are given to the people. When those delegated powers are abused and those rights are subverted, then it's necessary for justice to be done by lower magistrates interposing themselves between the abusers and the abused.

**Essay Questions:**

6. ***Choose one of the fourteen forgotten presidents and briefly describe his life. In your answer, explain how the forgotten presidents provide an example of true leadership.*** Answers will vary depending on which president was chosen. Please see Lesson 19.
7. ***How did the story of Jonathan and his servant encourage those who fought for independence?***  
The Americans told themselves that story over and over and over again because the facts of the promises of history didn't seem to match the facts of their circumstances. So which facts would they trust? That's a question that we all have to ask ourselves constantly, isn't it? What are we going to believe — what we know to be true because God has said it, or what we feel, think, or desire? Do feelings have dominion? Do our thoughts rule or is God sovereign? The big question that faced the patriots was, God is God, we are not, so who should we believe, us or Him? Amazingly, astonishingly, all out of character with most of the rest of history, and certainly all out of character with most of the rest of the people at that time, they chose to believe God. It was crazy. It seemed next to impossible. But that was the stand that they took.

## *Opportunity No. 11*

Administer before Lesson 25

### Identify the following:

1. **Robert Morris:** a Philadelphia merchant of great wealth who became the financier of the American War of Independence. He frequently risked his fortune on behalf of the Continental Army, and in the end, he lost everything. With Roger Sherman, Morris shares the distinction of having signed all three of the principal founding documents — the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, and the Constitution. He was a close friend of George Washington, and Washington would often come to him, as did Congress, when the fledgling government ran out of money. Innumerable times he would use his own personal credit in order to secure ammunition and supplies for the Continental Army. This occurred again and again and again. At Yorktown, for instance, Morris backed the purchase of ammunition and supplies with his personal pledge, which enabled American independence to be won on that remarkable afternoon when Lord Cornwallis surrendered, and the world was turned upside down. After the war, Morris continued as a principal finance office for Congress, but he was caught constantly between the demands of the Confederation and the states' refusal to support the Confederation. He exhausted his own credit repeatedly and planned to resign but he stayed on. He established the first national bank, but Pennsylvania challenged the charter. By 1784, when he finally resigned, the United States had practically no credit abroad, but it had largely cleared up its most egregious debts due to his tireless efforts. He was an attendee at the Annapolis Convention in support of the idea of a Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia. He believed that was the only way that the strained finances of the American Republic could survive. He argued that any government that spent more money than it had — in other words any government that indulged in deficit spending was “morally bankrupt, filled with charlatans, and deserving of the scorn of all of mankind”. Morris declined George Washington's offer of the position of the Secretary of the Treasury in the new government and was elected one of Pennsylvania's first senators. But he had to turn attentions to his own now bankrupted fortunes, that he had borne the responsibility and the burden of carrying first the Continental Army, then the Continental Congress, and then the new government under the new Constitution, and his credit was ruined. Eventually, his debts caught up with him, and in 1798, he was thrown into debtors' prison and was incarcerated there until 1801. He came out a broken and forgotten man and died just four and a half years later. It's one of those stories that is almost impossible to believe. The man most responsible for securing the financial future of the nation was broken and tossed aside.
2. **Annapolis Convention:** 1786; included twelve delegates from five states — New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Virginia. There, Alexander Hamilton appealed to some of the greatest statesmen from those states to press forward a new compact, a new covenant, that would more securely establish the new nation.
3. **Assumption Plan:** Alexander Hamilton's plan to repay the debt of the United States by centralizing all the debt and paying back the debt dollar-for-dollar,
4. **François Genet:** the ambassador to the United States; Citizen Genet. He came to the United States in 1793 and began to solicit ship owners in places like Savannah and Charleston to become privateers for the French under the protection of the French government. The idea was that these privateers would raid British ships in their trade to the Indies, the Caribbean. The French government would supply them with arms, protection, and letters of marque.



5. **XYZ Affair:** realizing that the great ally of the United States, particularly in Atlantic shipping, was slipping away from them and realizing the animosity of the president of the United States, John Adams, to the new French government, the French decided to use dirty tricks. They had three of their diplomats, Diplomat X, Diplomat Y, and Diplomat Z,<sup>4</sup> attempted to undermine the government of the United States, exacting bribes with threats of piracy on the high seas.
6. **Shays' Rebellion:** the great rebellion that broke out in Massachusetts in 1786 and 1787, known as Shays' Rebellion, caused the patriot leaders to spring into action. Shays' Rebellion broke out largely among veterans of the Continental Army. They had not been paid. They returned to their homes broken men, many of them wounded, forever impaired. They returned to their homes only to find that massive land taxes had been placed on their farms or their shops. When they returned home, it was necessary for them to rebuild and to restore what had been neglected during the war years, so there was a massive amount of consumption, based on debt. They didn't have hard currency, they hadn't been paid. They attempted to neglect the paying of taxes.

Daniel Shays was a veteran. He had fought at Saratoga and Yorktown. He had given his life for the cause of freedom, but he looked around and he saw predatory banks destroying the livelihoods of his neighbors. He even witnessed an old woman lying crippled in her bed while it was confiscated by a bank for the repayment of loan that her husband, who had been dead for four years, had not been able to repay. This was too much for Shays and he rounded up, first, local militia men, and then some six hundred volunteers, and he began to march towards Boston. There was conflict in Springfield. By the time he was outside of Springfield, he had more than one thousand men under arms. This frightened everyone — all the elites, all the Boston Brahmins — to death and very quickly they put down Shays' Rebellion.

7. **Write the Preamble to the Constitution from memory:** We the People of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.
8. **The Connecticut Compromise:** also known as the Great Compromise; between big and small states; a bicameral legislature, one house elected by state legislatures (two per state) and the other by the people (according to population)
9. **Vox populi, vox Dei:** Latin: the voice of the people is the voice of God
10. **The Whiskey Rebellion:** 1794; When excise taxes were placed on stills to try to raise funds to repay the federal debt, more than five hundred farmers and distillers took to arms and were ready to march against the government. It was the first real Tea Party revolt in American politics. It was a reminder that those who wanted a centralized government and large federal controls had a real problem with the ordinary people of America.

### Essay Questions:

11. **Explain the six characteristics of George Washington's leadership strategy, and provide a few examples of how his leadership united his divided cabinet.** First of all, he was persistent, he simply would not take no for an answer. When he knew what was right, when he knew what had to be done, he realized there would be great obstacles, and he simply pushed through those obstacles, unrelenting. He was willing to lose in the short term in order to fight another day. He knew what his calling was, and he never stinted in it. It didn't matter what the odds were. If something were right, he knew that he had to do it, no matter what was stacked up against him. No matter what kind of sacrifice it called for him, he simply pushed forward.

This is an astonishing but simple leadership trait. Leaders are simply stubborn when it comes to their principles. They won't give up. You see this in people like Winston Churchill who was washed up, who actually wrecked his political career innumerable times, but he simply stood. He wouldn't give in. You see the same thing with Teddy Roosevelt and Calvin Coolidge and a host of others. They simply said, *I am going to persist in this.*

Secondly, Washington was honorable. When you read any of the biographies or the contemporary accounts, the funeral sermons that were preached all over the United States following his death, the thing that emerges was that everybody called him an honorable man. There was nobility and *gravitas* that adhered to him. Virtue was the basis of his leadership and the basis of all his commands. He always knew that he was accountable *to* someone and accountable *for* someone at all times, thus it was easy for him to submit to authority even when the authorities around him seemed to be so wrong-headed. It's also what enabled him, at the end of the day, to simply lay down his sword, lay down his offices, and go home. He had no aspirations to do anything other than to be a man of honor.

And of course, he was a visionary. He could see what nobody else could see. He had that surveyor's eye — he could look out across the landscape and see potential that no one else saw. He saw value and was able to lead a ragtag, recalcitrant army. He was able to forge them into a fighting force that became completely loyal to him. As a visionary, he didn't have to constantly restate his vision, he simply lived it. He didn't have to constantly preach his vision, he carried it out. He bore his vision. He incarnated his vision. And he walked constantly with a farsighted purposefulness that others would see in glimpses, but it was usually only after he had done a thing or fought a fight or resolved a conflict and they would look back and say, *Hmm! He knew what he was doing all along. He had this in mind all along. This was where he was going all along, and we didn't really know it, but now we see it.* Washington believed that kind of vision was far more effective than simply issuing manifestos or preaching the points continuously. It wasn't just a matter of rhetoric for him. Vision was a matter of life for him.

This translated into his whole leadership strategy. This rooted in establishing that vision, constantly asking all those around him to think beyond themselves and think beyond this moment, to seize something greater. He was the ultimate optimist, believing that the sovereignty of God matched with the obedience of the people would bring about right results.

He also believed that if it was right, there was a way to persuade everyone by finding common ground. He was able to make Adams, Jefferson, and Hamilton work with Randolph and Osgood to create a formidable eight-year-long experiment in liberty, the likes of which the world had never seen before. It was like herding cats, and he did it by simply being himself, casting the vision, being unrelenting, not countenancing nonsense or fools easily. And his steadfastness created a kind of loyalty in the hearts of his lieutenants that defied all logic. Once, Alexander Hamilton came out of cabinet meeting and one of his young charges asked him how things went, and he said, "Splendidly. I lost on every point, but how I love Washington."

Washington also knew what was his job and what wasn't his job. He was able to delegate. He knew what his strengths and weaknesses were. He didn't try to pretend where he was weak, to try and cover it up. He was not at all insecure about those things in areas that he knew he wasn't called to. He believed in the division of labor. He was able to make these five guys work together because he gave each of them their jobs and turned them loose and let them do it. He used cabinet meetings primarily as a time to encourage others in front of their foes, so that the foes could begin to see the common ground.

It was Supreme Court Chief Justice John Marshall who said that the greatest honor that any man would ever receive was encouragement from Washington for a job well done. He did it all the time. He simply was a man who understood the power of gratitude and the power of encouragement, and he practiced it.

All of this meant that Washington had to balance the details of leadership. He understood that meant that he had to pick his battles, he had to prioritize what was important and what wasn't, and what wasn't important he simply would not make a matter to fight over. What was important, he would simply hammer over and over again.

He warmly embraced multiple perspectives. As a result, he had supporters who loved him but who hated each other. Their only common point was that they loved Washington. They couldn't ever understand why Washington was loved by the other camp. But it was because Washington could understand multiple perspectives, and he embraced the diversity and then worked hard at building bridges between those opposing camps. What's really remarkable is that the fiercest foes in Washington's cabinet went on to fight many bitter political battles in the days to come.

But, for instance Thomas Jefferson, the great Republican, and John Adams, the great Democrat, became best friends in their old age. Indeed, as Jefferson lay dying on July 4, 1826, among his final words were, "At least John Adams lives." What he did not know was that within the same hour, John Adams lay in his bed and he died on the same day. Astonishingly, these two men carried on this warm, rich dynamic friendship after being enemies for years. Washington, though dead, yet spoke into their lives and continued to build bridges and connect them in the great cause of liberty.

So, George Washington did not cut down the cherry tree. George Washington never said to his father, "I cannot tell a lie." George Washington did not throw a silver dollar across the Potomac. George Washington was not the first president of the United States. But George Washington was "first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen," precisely because he understood what it meant to be a leader from an entirely Christian perspective. And, thus, the great experiment in liberty was launched on a firm foundation, and George Washington won the day.

12. ***Explain in what ways the Constitution is a remarkable document.*** It is remarkable for its brevity, for its simplicity. The Ten Amendments that were added immediately made it remarkable for its clear preservation of freedom for the people and for local communities. It's remarkable for its covenantal structure of checks and balances, separation of powers, and mixed government. But what really makes it remarkable is that it had an enduring impact. It became the lodestone of freedom for nations all across the globe, straining and yearning to be free.

No other constitutional document in the history of mankind has been copied more times than the Constitution of the United States, and it's only two hundred plus years old. More provisions, more structures from this document, have been copied by the constitutions of other nations than any other document.

## Opportunity No. 12

Administer before Lesson 27

### Identify the following:

1. **Napoléon Bonaparte:** dictator of France; sold Louisiana to the United States to fund his continuing wars in Europe.
2. **Church Concordat:** Napoléon made peace with the Roman Catholic Church and the pope. In 1800, the Concordat that he forged with the Vatican freed France from its continental enemy, which were all of the faithful in the Roman Catholic Church.
3. **The Treaty of San Ildefonso:** the treaty that ceded control of the Louisiana Territory from the Spanish Hapsburgs to the French under Napoléon
4. **Louisiana Purchase:** territory west of the Mississippi River which belonged to France (via the Treaty of San Ildefonso) and was purchased by the United States for just over \$10M in 1803
5. **The Alien and Sedition Acts:** a series of four laws in 1798 called the Alien and Sedition Acts. The four laws attempted to clamp down on these dangerous and illegal activities.

Naturalization Act: Citizenship Conditions

The Naturalization Act established citizenship conditions. They were the citizenship conditions that remained in place all the way up until the Fourteenth Amendment was passed in 1868, and then adjusted further in 1898, to ensure that Asian Americans could obtain citizenship. It wasn't until 1920 that citizenship was guaranteed for Native Americans. This Naturalization Act is at the center of the current debate about whether or not people who were born in the United States automatically get citizenship rights. It goes all the way back to that time. The purpose of the Naturalization Act was to ensure that people from Europe couldn't just come here and automatically claim citizenship rights. It's not a matter that was clarified in the Constitution.

Alien Act: Expelling Malcontents

The second act was called the Alien Act. The purpose of this act was to expel malcontents whether they claimed to be American citizens or not. The idea here was *we've got to maintain calm and if someone is disrupting the public peace then we need to have a mechanism that can expel them from the United States.*

Enemies Act: Jailing Insurrectionists

The third act was called the Enemies Act. This enabled the federal government to put into jail political insurrectionists.

Sedition Act: Particularization of Speech

And then there was the Sedition Act, which limited the kind of political speech that political malcontents might have. These laws all passed through Congress. They were driven by John Adams' Federalist agenda, but the Republicans like Thomas Jefferson saw them as terrible threats to freedom, particularly freedom of speech, assembly, and protest. As a result, Adams was stigmatized by the growing press of the Republicans and was made out to be an enemy of freedom.

6. ***Ordinance of Religious Freedom:*** written by Jefferson; the declaration of freedom that became the bedrock of the Virginia Commonwealth; what he was most proud of

### Essay Questions:

7. ***Briefly describe the impact of John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, and Alexander Hamilton in establishing the direction of the United States of America.*** As influential as John Adams and Thomas Jefferson were and as important as they were, it was really Alexander Hamilton who laid out the vision of federalism that endured throughout the founding era.

Essentially, it was Hamilton's vision of separate spheres of political distinctives and cultural distinctives that made America's strong start possible.

He believed in a two-party system but he believed in a two-system culture, meaning that politics needed to operate in its own sphere and not intrude in or try to govern and shape the culture itself.

He believed in political economics so that in the private sphere there could be individual initiative, freedom, growth, and opportunity.

He had this strong vision of a united Americanism that would be strangely apolitical. It was Alexander Hamilton who said that if we set up this government right, then Americans don't have to always have to be thinking about government, working in government, guided by government. Americans can actually have lives and be in a sense apolitical. In other words, Alexander Hamilton thought that it might be a really good thing if Americans were disinterested in government. You can't be disinterested in government in a time of crisis because everything is at stake, our freedoms are at stake. But when the system is stable and the freedoms are unshackled, then he believed that Americans could be apolitical.

He believed that the political system needed to be populist in the sense that it really was the voice of the people and that would, in turn, release a kind of entrepreneurial spirit, a spirit of invention and opportunity, throughout the wider culture, unencumbered by the intrusion of a constantly meddling bureaucracy and government.

He believed that America might become divided between the rural and the urban. He wanted to ensure that the majority protected the minority and that the minority respected the majority and that this was best achieved by creating a culture in which hard work and achievement could be rewarded. That was his vision for federalism. Amazingly, despite his rivalries with the others, despite the fact that he never lived to see the fullness of his vision, Alexander Hamilton's legacy was laid, and it became the benchmark for American exceptionalism, for American federalism, all through the founding era. It is really interesting that the old Federalists and the new Republicans splintered into two separate spheres; it was Alexander Hamilton who said, "A pox on both your houses." He didn't want to be a part of either big political party. Instead he wanted to create a kind of local grassroots movement, that's what the Christian Constitutional Party was called. Interestingly, he had a great rally in Copley Square not far from where the Patriot's Trail runs through Boston today, and there in Copley Square he called for a new American Tea Party, envisioning a time when both political parties would be held accountable by the grassroots of the American people. He was far-seeing and far-reaching in his influence.

8. ***Briefly summarize the career of Napoléon Bonaparte and explain how he impacted the shaping of America.*** He was born in 1769, an auspicious year. It was the year that Captain Cook sailed into Botany Bay. It was the year of the births of the Duke of Wellington, Beethoven, Hegel, Andrew Jackson, John Quincy Adams, Lord Metternich, Sir Walter Scott, Coleridge, and Wordsworth. It was a remarkable, turning-point year.

He was born on the island of Corsica in a little village. Corsica was the long-held possession of Genoa, which, along with Venice, through the period leading up to and beyond the Renaissance, was one of the leading trading centers and merchant city-states on the Italian Peninsula. Corsica and Sardinia are the two large islands that lie just to the west of the Italian peninsula, and thus just to the south and east of the coast of France. Following the period of the Renaissance, Corsica changed hands between various imperial powers. The English held it twice for short periods but determined that it wasn't worth their effort. France held it a time or two, but it was essentially an Italian island with an Italian culture, and so it was that the young Napoléon grew up in this Italian world, caught between the various imperial powers that existed in those days.

Early on, he determined that his best course for advancement was to become a military officer. The military was promising at the end of the eighteenth century and would be the course for advancement for many ambitious young men through the course of the nineteenth century because this was the period of great unrest, growing nationalism, and revolution after revolution. From the time of Napoléon's birth all the way through to the advent of the twentieth century, there were more wars, more revolutions, more tumults, and more new nations born in that century and a quarter than in all of human history combined up until then. It's astonishing.

So he went off to military school first at Brienne, later gaining admittance into the great French school for the military, kind of the French West Point, l'École Militaire, and studied as an artillery officer. He was very good at mathematics. He wasn't a particularly fine physical specimen, so he decided not to become a cavalry officer. He used his mathematical skills to develop all kinds of new ways of determining the trajectory of cannon fire and that created quick advancement for him.

By 1788, he had tied his lot to the rising radicalism of the Jacobins. Napoléon wasn't particularly ideological or political himself. He was an opportunist, so he looked at all the various factions in the emerging chaos of what would become the French Revolution, and he decided that the more radical the better, the faster the course of his advancement. So he tied himself to the Jacobins and the cause of men like Robespierre. He was deployed by the Jacobins as an artillery commander in the siege of Toulon, and there he proved his new techniques for artillery fire and was noticed by the military apparatus as a rising military genius. He was a fine strategist. He had this remarkable ability to see the whole of the battlefield, and he had a strong sense of command, which was quite remarkable because he was a tiny, little man and not exactly your imposing military figure.

He did not have a strong voice or a strong presence, but he had soaring ambitions and a brilliant mind, and he began to strategize his own rise. By the next year, through his alliance with the Jacobins, he had been named a general of the revolution and was deployed first as the commander of the armies of Lombardy and then later the commander of the Army of the Interior, charged with protecting the French Revolution from all enemies, from within and from without.

By 1796, he was the leader of several expeditionary military incursions mostly in Lombardy, where he had one success after another because of his brilliant field strategy. And while he had very few resources and France itself was descending into absolute chaos, he had total command of his army, and he won the deep affection and loyalty of his soldiers simply because he was able to win everywhere he went.

This paid off in the realm of great influence. He was able to convince the constantly changing leadership in Paris that the key to the strategy of the rise of French influence in the world — if they really wanted to remake the world — the key was to first gain Jerusalem and build a base for world conquest from Jerusalem. In other words, he suggested a new Crusade.

He tapped into all the romanticism, and that chapbook chivalry that every French schoolboy had read since his youth. He had this magnificent ability to stir patriotic fervor, and he used the romanticism and the nostalgia to create in these ideologues what was seemingly a nonsensical notion. If they took their communist ideology seriously, why on earth would they be launching a Crusade to recapture Jerusalem when their real enemy was across the English Channel in England? They wanted Napoléon to invade England, and he said that if they wanted to cripple England, then first they must capture the Middle East. I'd love to spend a long time talking about that, but Napoléon was on to something incredibly brilliant.

Already England was casting the lot of their future upon their imperial acquisitions around the world. If Napoléon could control the hinge of history, then he could check and stop British imperial ambitions around the world. He was so far-sighted, he was brilliant. So he launched a campaign to Egypt because Egypt was the quick and natural way around — control the Nile, control Alexandria, control Cairo, then move up through the Negev, control Joppa, and then move and gain the symbolic throne at Jerusalem — that was his plan.

Along the way, he was very much a modern man and encyclopedist in the true French tradition, so he took with him scientists and archaeologists because what he was going to do was prove the great ascendancy of French culture and French vision over and against the whole of human history. So he took all of the world's great Egyptologists and in a sense invented Egyptology. He dug out the Sphinx, discovered the Rosetta Stone, and dragged to Paris all of these great artifacts. This is the beginning of Egyptology. Up to this point, the tombs of the Pharaohs, all the pyramids, the Sphinx, all that stuff is just buried in the sand. Napoléon had this idea that he could use this symbolism for the creation of a new and greater Pharaoh — himself.

He had great success initially in Egypt, but the British weren't sitting idly by. They recognized the threat, and in Alexandria they were able to trap and destroy the French navy. Napoléon was forced to make his way in a hasty fashion up towards Joppa. There, a plague struck his army. He realized he was not going to be able to accomplish what he wanted.

Meanwhile, back in France there was chaos again in Paris. Napoléon saw this as his opportunity. He escaped his army there in Joppa and went back to Paris. In 1799, he participated in a *coup d'état* against the current regime and established a three-man consulship with Napoléon himself named First Consul. In other words, it was a military dictatorship with three men in control but with Napoléon being named first among his equals. This led to a comprehensive military consolidation of all French interests. Napoléon was suddenly on the rise.

He postured himself for global dominance. He made peace with the Roman Catholic Church and the pope. In 1800, the Concordat that he forged with the Vatican freed France from its continental enemy, which were all of the faithful in the Roman Catholic Church. He didn't do this because he was particularly religious. He didn't do this because he wanted to reconcile the French Revolution with the old traditions of Christendom. He did this because he was an opportunist. He was strategizing again. He thought, *What allies do I need, how do I eliminate the enemies within and the enemies without, how do I proceed?* By 1802, Napoléon has been named Consul for life.

He began a colonial reorganization plan at that point. By 1803, he had completely rewritten the legal code for all France and for all its territories. He began to forge a really strategic foreign policy that positioned France for hegemony — control of all Europe.

The Treaties of Fontainebleau and Ildefonso were treaties with the old kingdom of Spain, which was teetering on the point of collapse at this point and which had fallen under the sway of the influence of Napoléon. These treaties had to do with territorial possessions in the New World including most of the North American continent. The Treaty of San Ildefonso, a secret treaty, essentially transferred back to France all the territories of

New France that had been ceded to Spain some forty years earlier. Now France controlled the Mississippi River, the city of New Orleans, and the territory that extended all the way up to the border of Rupert's Land, which was the British territory in the Dominion of Canada.

The United States had strategic interests in the West, but the Mississippi River was the boundary of the United States. The Mississippi River was the key shipping lane for all the products of the West, from the Indiana Territory and the Illinois Territory, and so in order for the United States to really exploit its interior it needed to have navigational access to the Mississippi River. But Spain had decided that the United States was an emerging power and too much of a threat to all its western holdings. It denied the United States access to the Mississippi River and to the port of New Orleans. When Thomas Jefferson, president of the United States, discovered from his friend, the nobleman, du Pont, that France had secretly gained control of New Orleans and the Mississippi and the whole territory of the West, he dispatched Robert Livingston and James Monroe to Paris to begin to negotiate for port rights to the city of New Orleans and navigational rights on the Mississippi River.

At the same time this was going on, France has got its hands full with a slave revolt that seemed to be an intractable problem that they simply could not solve in the colony of San Dominique, what we know of today as Haiti. The slave revolt was simply one disaster after another for the French forces. Napoléon even sent his brother-in-law as commander to try to quash the revolt, but yellow fever practically wiped out the entire French army and navy sent to Haiti. The result was that Napoléon, now contemplating an invasion of Britain and an invasion of Austria in order to consolidate his continental possessions, needed fast cash, and he needed to rid himself of colonial troubles. He determined that he simply did not have a long-term strategic interest in North America and he needed to just go ahead and abandon Haiti to the chaos that would be Haiti for the next two hundred years. So, he got out of Haiti, and he told his negotiators to parlay Monroe's and Livingston's interest in New Orleans and navigation rights into the Mississippi into a possible sale of all the territory.

The United States had set aside ten million dollars for long-term treaty rights to access the port of New Orleans and the navigation rights of the whole of the Mississippi. About seven million dollars was actually owed by France to American banks and interests. So, Napoléon's deal was forgive the debt, the seven million, and add in an additional eight million cash, which is less than they were willing to pay in the first place for just port and navigation rights, and we'll give you the whole lot of it. It comes out to, if you combine the seven and eight together, comes out to about three cents an acre for the entire territory. Napoléon was now planning to make himself the emperor and he needed cash — for his armies and for his lavish vision of the French imperium. So he said, *Take these eight-hundred twenty-eight thousand square miles for three cents an acre.* Livingston and Monroe believe this was the greatest deal and that it would transform the United States.

Napoléon was being an opportunist again. In a sense, he created a natural adversary for Great Britain. The former colony America now became a world power. He created a natural adversary for Spain, for all of its Spanish dominions along the West Coast and down into Latin America. He provided himself with ready cash, and he eliminated all the hassle of the bureaucracy of those overseas colonies. It was an astonishing acquisition.

9. ***Contrast the French experience of revolution with the American experience of reformation.***

We've seen from the man-centered, humanistic nature of the French Revolution where everything was measured against man's experience, man's desires, or man's aspirations, and the American experience which was all bound up in a matter of principle — what is right, what is good, what is true, what binds us together as a people and into a covenant.



So, for instance in the French Revolution you see the assertion of a kind of humanistic secularism looking to no divine principle, no eternal standards, no unchanging, unbending laws to guide the course of man. Instead, man operates in accordance with his own wits, according to his own reason.

If you read the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, for all the flaws of the founders — and there were many; there were holes in their logic and they had blind spots galore, blind spots that we've been wrestling as a society to rectify ever since, but, for all that, they recognized that they were not the final authority. They recognized that there are principles that remained essential across all time and in the midst of all circumstances. They acknowledged that there was one who was sovereign. And that one was God, and they were not God. That's a radically different set of principles, and it will take you in radically different directions.

For the French this meant that all people were not just equal, they were thrust into an egalitarian system, meaning that the playing field had to be leveled for all. The great had to be brought down and those who had been deprived had to be brought up. There could be no system of merit because merit means that some will rise and some will fall. Therefore it was largely a communist kind of sociology that was imposed.

The Americans, on the other hand, recognized that there was a hand of Providence that guided the affairs of men, that there were penalties that life necessarily imposed upon wrongdoing. There were benefits for walking in the way of right and faithfulness.

That inevitably meant that there were opportunities to improve the lot of anyone willing to take the risks, do the work, learn the trades, and practice the truth. For the French, there was this sort of imposition that the whole society had to be leveled, while in America there was this sense that anyone through their wits, hard work, or opportunities could progress in life. The French focused all their changes on what they thought might be good — rationalism, pure rationalism — never assuming that what they thought might not test out well in the laboratory of reality. Whereas, Americans argued that there's a way that seems right to man, but its end often ends in disaster and death, as the book of Proverbs puts it. So, they looked to standards that were outside of themselves beyond their mere rational faculties to guide them — biblical ethics.

The French were naturally anti-traditionalists. In other words, anything that had been passed on to us from the past needed to be dispensed with. *Tear up the old foundations. Start over. New and improved. Break new ground daily. Start over.* That was the philosophy of the French Revolution.

Whereas, the Americans understood that because of the consequences of the Fall, we needed to learn the lessons of the past in order to build for the future. The Americans weren't so much traditionalists, being stuck in the past, as they were careful moral philosophers, building for the future based upon the past, recognizing that the past often provides us insights into the path ahead simply by the projections of the trajectory of the past paths that man has taken.

This led to a kind of unfounded optimism, idealism, almost utopianism among the French. They believed that they could, by their own wits, by the invention of this new society that they were creating, bring about a new world order that would be far better than anything that ever existed in the past. And this new world order would be of their own making. They were like the builders of the Tower of Babel. They were building a stairway to heaven.

The Americans, on the other hand, actually believed that there were consequences to man's actions and that what they needed to do was to hold on to the promise that if they did their jobs well, laid the foundations well, and provided a proper path forward, the succeeding generations would actually be able to progress beyond them. So, there was a sense of hopefulness that was not utopian — a sense of optimism that was not un-

grounded but was rooted in deferred gratification, hard work, and vision. The Americans were planning far out into the future. Whereas the French, if they came across a problem, they were more likely to take a sledgehammer to it, to try and simply destroy it through revolutionary means than to try to fix it and enable it to progress. That is the radical difference between revolution and reformation.

Alexander Hamilton laid out this exact argument in one of the founding papers of his new Christian Constitutional Party. His idea was that we have to be careful to guard ourselves constantly against the temptation of revolution. Revolution is incredibly appealing to us because it promises instantaneous change. You just want to clear the deck, clear the tables, get rid of all the junk from the past, throw out all of the riff-raff. But the danger with Revolution is that when you clear the deck you create a void. It's like the parable that Jesus told about the man who was possessed of spirits. He said if he casts this one out, seven worse than the first will come in, and if the house is not swept clean, he will be in far worse shape than he was before. With Revolution, you never know what ultimately will arise once the chaos has completely wrecked the old apparatus of the society.

## Opportunity No. 13

Administer before Lesson 29

### Identify the following:

1. **Sacajawea:** the pregnant, Shoshone wife of French trapper, Toussaint Charbonneau; traveled with Lewis and Clark as an interpreter
2. **Jean Baptiste Charbonneau:** son of Sacajawea and Toussaint Charbonneau, born at Fort Mandan
3. **Grinder's Stand:** the place in Tennessee on the Natchez Trace where Meriwether Lewis died under suspicious circumstances
4. **transcontinental hegemony:** the idea that the United States should control the entire continent, from sea to shining sea; Manifest Destiny
5. **President Jefferson:** third president under the current Constitution; purchased the Louisiana Territory from France
6. **Fort Mandan:** established by the Lewis & Clark expedition as a place to winter in 1804-1805; where they met Charbonneau and Sacajawea; where Jean Baptiste Charbonneau was born
7. **Meriwether Lewis:** born in 1774 in Albemarle County. That is the same county that Thomas Jefferson was born and raised in. It's where Charlottesville, Virginia, is and where the University of Virginia is. It's where Monticello is, so you can see the connection that he would've had. He knew Jefferson as a young boy, and Jefferson was, of course, the hero of the county as he was growing up. Lewis relocated for a time to Georgia, but his roots ran deep in the Virginia minor gentry.

In 1794, he graduated from Liberty Hall, a preparatory school, and immediately went into the Army Corps. There he served honorably until the election of 1800, when he worked hard for the election of his mentor and hero, Thomas Jefferson.

Jefferson, of course, won the election of 1800, and as he was assembling his new administration, he faced a particularly difficult challenge. In the final days of John Adams's administration, Adams made a whole slew of appointments to the federal bench, to the then very small federal bureaucracy, and a whole slew of new appointments in the United States military, advancing a number of Federalists to high posts in the army. Now this was a very delicate situation. The United States was a very young country. In Europe, at that time, there were military regimes overthrowing longstanding monarchies and ushering in an age of nationalism. If there was a divide between the civilian political establishment and the military establishment, if they're at odds, then the nation could easily collapse. We've seen that just the last couple of weeks in Egypt. The big question that the media and all the politicians have been asking is "Is the Egyptian army gonna stand by Mubarak?" If there is a divide between his civilian government and the military, the nation is no longer viable.

So Jefferson saw all these Federalists being appointed to high positions in the army. He needed a trusted confidant to be his liaison to the army. He appointed Meriwether Lewis as his most trusted aide in the White House. He would have been the equivalent of the White House Chief of Staff. The whole reason he was there was to smooth over relations with this now adversarial army. By all accounts, Lewis did a fantastic job as secretary to

Thomas Jefferson. So much so that, by 1802, all fears that there might be a rift between the military and the civilian government had completely passed.

Lewis was thinking about returning to civilian life and making his fortune in the West as a surveyor and a land speculator. That was one of the quickest pathways to wealth and prominence in early America along the frontier. But Jefferson had another idea. What if he were to serve as Jefferson's personal emissary in exploring the possibility of the westward expansion of the United States? This is at the same time that James Monroe had been sent to Paris to negotiate port rights and navigation rights to New Orleans and the Mississippi River. The Louisiana Purchase is not even a gleam in anyone's eye at this point except maybe Napoleon's. So Lewis was given the task of beginning to think about what it would be like to try and expand the Northwest frontier beyond the Illinois Territory, beyond the Northwest Territory, beyond even perhaps the Mississippi and the Missouri Rivers.

So he was already thinking about this, beginning to do the research, assembling a team of French trappers and explorers who could give him reliable tales about what it was like out in the far frontier. Then the Louisiana Purchase occurred, and Jefferson seized upon the opportunity. He knew that Britain, Russia, and perhaps Spain would try and scramble to consolidate their borders out in the West and on the North. And he also knew, because of the history of exploration, colonization, and of the claiming of territories, that the first to arrive, the discoverers, the explorers, those who planted the flags and made the contacts, had first right to the territories.

So here's the irony of it all: Thomas Jefferson was the great Republican, the adversary of monarchies, the friend of the French Revolution. He hated elitists, he despised colonial empires, he was a strict constitutionalist. He wanted to adhere to the law at all costs, and here he was dreaming about a great transcontinental colonial empire for the nation. Lewis was just the guy to help him realize this dream. The real purpose behind the Louisiana Purchase and the Lewis and Clark Expedition wasn't just to give the nation more breathing room. It really was a kind of strategic and ideological play by Jefferson, seemingly against his best principles. In the long run, though it proved to be incredibly farsighted.

Britain and Russia tried to dispute the claims, but Jefferson had everything covered, based upon the council of Meriwether Lewis. He did several things. First of all, he went to the federal mint and had special medallions minted. These coins were solely for the purpose of distributing to all the peoples, the Native Americans, that they would encounter along the way. This would be documentable, objective, demonstrable proof that the Americans were there first. They negotiated friendship treaties with all the peoples all along the way. They planted their flag. They made their maps, not just because they were great explorers, but because they were claiming the territory. This is like Christopher Columbus as he steps ashore and plants the flag and claims San Salvador for Castile and Aragon. That's what Lewis and Clark were doing. They were claiming the territory. This is America's first great colonial conquest.

Lewis, after the expedition, was named the governor of the whole vast Louisiana Territory, which was now much larger than the actual Louisiana Purchase. The Lewis and Clark Expedition not only explored and claimed for certain all the territory that the United States had just bought from Napoleon, from France, they went well beyond that and claimed all the way from northern California up to the top of the sounds of Washington. Their purpose was to create a transcontinental hegemony. Now Spain still controlled a great deal of the Southwest, and there would be a whole series of negotiations that would resolve that. As we saw last time from the map, there was still some disputed territory along what would become the Canadian border; those would be negotiated. In fact, it would take some nine different treaties after Lewis and Clark claimed their territory to consolidate all that land, but all the groundwork for it was laid by the expedition.

Amazingly, in 1809, this brilliant, accomplished, highly-placed, influential man met an untimely demise just about forty miles from here down the Natchez Trace at a place called Grinder's Stand. Historians still argue about whether or not Meriwether Lewis was murdered there or whether or not he committed suicide. If he committed suicide it was messy business, four gun shots to the chest and one to the head. You've got to be really determined, and he didn't even die after that. The shots were heard in the night by the innkeeper just adjacent. Part of his skull was actually blown away, but he lived all the way through the morning when those who were accompanying Lewis found him, brought him back to the inn, and tried to save his life, but he expired later in the day. You can go down the Natchez Trace and find the place. It's marked well. There's a monument there to Lewis that tells the whole story. It's quite a remarkable mystery. He was, for whatever reason, making his way from New Orleans back up to St. Louis, and he took the Natchez Trace, the road that goes from Natchez all the way to Nashville, a sort of turnpike. So, Lewis's great career ended in great mystery which only reinforces several principles that embody this whole story.

8. **William Clark:** Captain William Clark was born in Caroline County. From there, he made his way to Kentucky. He was four years older than Lewis, and in 1786, when, he was sixteen years old, he followed his brother into the Army Corp and there had a sterling career, demonstrated able administration, was a strong leader, earned the loyalty of his men, and, as a result, rose very quickly in the ranks of the army administrators.

In 1807, because of his work along the frontier, he was made the Commissioner of Indian Affairs following the Lewis and Clark Expedition. By this time, he had made his home in St. Louis. Interestingly, he had kept in touch with Sacajawea and her husband, Toussaint Charbonneau, and decided that he was going to provide the means for young Jean Baptiste to get an education. Clark was his sponsor, and Charbonneau lived with Clark in St. Louis, was schooled and trained, and went on to become a great frontier explorer and kind of a mythic figure himself in the opening of the American West.

In 1813, Clark was named the governor of the Missouri Territory, and he died in 1838, in St. Louis, a hero to the nation and one of the great gateways to the West. In fact, the original monument, The Gateway to the West, was dedicated to Clark, and, of course, now it's marked by this vast arch right on the Mississippi River as you are coming into St. Louis.

9. **war hawks:** particularly in the mid states, the American South, and all throughout the American West, there was a popular sentiment that it was time to go to war, to fight the French by sea for the rights to trade with whomever they wished, and to fight back with the British forces on North American soil that were conspiring to steal away America's sovereignty.

These war hawks lost no opportunity to talk about how important it was to defend America's shores, how important it was to take the war to the enemy, how important it was not to allow terrorists on the high seas to dictate American policy, how important it was to reclaim the economy from those who wished to decimate America's future — fairly familiar language.

10. **hubris:** overweening pride and arrogance
11. **Battle of New Orleans:** by the end of 1814, having vanquished the Creek, Andrew Jackson was dispatched immediately to the front lines at the city of New Orleans because it seemed that the British were launching a massive invasion of that strategic port city. While, this massive invasion was being launched, there were peace treaty delegates hammering out an agreement between the United States and Great Britain to end the war. In fact, the Treaty of Ghent, negotiations for which went from August to December of 1814, was actually signed before the Battle of New Orleans. Word had not gotten to Jackson or the British that the war was over, so the

British launched this massive invasion from the Gulf of Mexico, using hardened Napoleonic War veterans, crack elite troops, against the American placements.

The Americans arrived just before the fleets got there. They had about two days to dig themselves into placements. Jackson was a brutal commander, demanding absolute loyalty from his troops. It paid off in a stunning victory. The British suffered some two thousand casualties, the Americans, less than one hundred. The battle was over within a matter of hours on January 8, 1815, but the war had ended several days before, officially, with the signing of the Treaty of Ghent.

12. ***Berlin & Milan decrees:*** in 1806, in order to squeeze out the English, and then again in 1807, to enforce the isolation of Britain, he issued two decrees: the Decree of Berlin and the Decree of Milan. The purpose of these decrees was to forbid any European power from trading with the English. That meant that all trade between Britain and France, Spain, Portugal, Holland, all the Germanies, any of the Italian states, Austria, the Hapsburg realms, and then on into Eastern Europe — it was all banned.

A blockade was put up around the coast lines so that pirates and various mercantile runners would not be able to slip British goods into Europe and European goods back to Britain. The whole purpose was to impose a massive embargo on British goods, and it was somewhat successful.

13. ***The Monroe Doctrine:*** John Quincy Adams hammered out something called the Monroe Doctrine in the aftermath of this great war. If there's anything we can say that was really good that came out of the War of 1812, it was the Monroe Doctrine, which essentially argued that European powers were not to meddle in the affairs, either mercantile or political, of any of the American states in North or South America. It limited colonization and the stretch of colonization. It created a kind of, as the Americans called it, holy alliance between the American powers in North and in South America. It brought to the fore one of the greatest minds of the first part of the nineteenth century, John Quincy Adams, who developed a plan for unilateral American action against the incursion of European powers. It was the beginning of the true rise of American diplomacy and power in the world.

### Essay Questions:

14. ***Describe how the Lewis and Clark expedition radically affected our nation in terms of politics, economics, and culture.*** The Lewis and Clark Expedition had enormous consequences for the nation in almost every single sphere.

In the realm of politics, it opened the way for a population shift. Almost immediately following the Lewis and Clark Expedition, the West gained power and authority. Prior to this, virtually every single president of the United States was either from Virginia or was named Adams. Following the Lewis and Clark Expedition and the opening up of the West, there was a population shift and a power shift because the opportunities to make great wealth also shifted, and therefore infrastructures were built in the West. Suddenly Kentucky, Tennessee, Illinois, and Ohio became the center point of the nation, the launching of the future. The East was sort of considered the elitists, but if you wanted to make your way, if you wanted to pull yourself up by your own bootstraps, if you wanted to live the American dream, then you moved West. And the expedition really opened that up.

Because the West was remote, it meant that the communities in the West had to be self-reliant. It meant that the communities of the West became distinctive. Often, whole immigrant communities would move to one area together, so they would have this very clear, local stamp. You can see this to this day if you go and visit a Nor-

wegian community or a Dutch community in Michigan or in Wisconsin. You immediately see it; they wear cheese on their heads, for heaven's sakes. This marked out those communities and gave them a real distinctiveness that was simply not the case in the urban areas in the East.

On top of that, because they were remote and because they really had to rely upon themselves, they had this independent spirit in politics. They didn't like the meddling of federal regulators or government bureaucrats. They had a natural disdain in the center of the country for anything that smacked of meddling politics. They had a great love of salutary neglect. *Leave us alone. Let us plant our crops, tend our gardens, and raise our children without the interference of outsiders.* This still marks the middle of the country as a real distinctive.

Economically, the United States suddenly became a potential world power. Instead of a few merchants and planters clinging to the Atlantic coast, America became a place where land speculation, natural wealth, and wide variety of agriculture beyond anything that had ever been imagined, the development of new industries and new merchant enterprises, the development of a new distribution networks, the digging of canals, the building of railroads, the opening up of new forms of communication. If there was going to be a way to reach Sioux City, Iowa, then you had to find new ways of communication — at first, things like the Pony Express and then telegraph and telephone. It pushed innovation and technology faster than it could've ever been pushed any other way.

And of course, culturally, it changed the nature of the American experience. It wasn't just that suddenly America became transfixed with cowboys and Indians. There was a spirit of adventure that ran through the whole American experience. There was this sense that anyone could with, risk and pluck, with courage and conviction, carve out a life for himself and his family. He could charge into the future with great confidence, depending upon no one but himself and his wits. It defined the American experience, provided a way for America to open its arms and welcome to the shores of this new land tens of thousands, millions of immigrants from around the world, which in turn made America the world's great melting pot. Other nations would have similar kinds of experiences, but America paved the way. It paved the way for Canada and Australia. It paved the way for modern-day Brazil. This melting pot experience made Americans far more diverse, richer in culture and in heritage, than almost any other people up to that time.

It meant that people who would never have an opportunity anywhere else in the world could find opportunity in this land. It also caused Americans to have a peculiar knack for being future-oriented rather than past-oriented. In Europe, everything was conditioned by what had been done before, what was appropriate, what was proper, what was allowed, but in America, you could make your own way. You didn't like the town you were in? Move seventy-five miles west and start your own town. You don't like the saloon? Go to another town and start your own saloon. Just go!

And Americans did. This provided a rich opportunity, the likes of which the world had hardly ever seen before. Of course, as they came, they established a kind of frontier faith that was rugged and individualistic but, at the same time, rooted in the peculiar values of the places where they had come. As a result, the American West became not just a hodgepodge but this rich amalgam of faith, division, purpose, and industry, and that became the basis of the American dream. If it had not been for the opening up of the West, if the thirteen original colonies, adding a handful of adjacent states like Vermont, Kentucky, Tennessee, and some of the states of the Northwest Territory, if that had been it, if the West had not been opened, it would have been a radically, radically different nation. We often hark back and herald the foundations of the nation and the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, but it really was the expansion of that vision to be larger than the small domain at the beginning that made America what it is today and that made America great.

15. ***Why is it fair to say that the War of 1812 was an unnecessary war?*** Briefly explain your answer. See Lesson 28
16. ***What important lessons does the War of 1812 teach us about the dangers of hubris and unclear motivations? Support your answer with details from the lecture.*** See Lesson 28



## *Opportunity No. 14*

Administer before Lesson 31

### Identify the following:

1. **John Quincy Adams:** the author of the Monroe Doctrine. He was the primary negotiator for the Treaty of Ghent. He had served as the Secretary of State to James Monroe during the Era of Good Feelings. He really was probably solely responsible for the foreign policy successes of the Monroe administration — the acquisition of Florida, the admission of Mississippi and Missouri, as well as four other states to the Union. It was a stunning series of great successes in the Monroe administration, and Monroe himself admitted that most of those successes were attributable to John Quincy Adams.

He was a stunning intellectual. He really began his great intellectual career on an afternoon at the top of a tree above a knoll when he was seven years old, looking down at the Charles River and across the Charles River to Bunker and Breed's Hills. He sat with a notebook and began to record, in his first journal ever, the Battle of Bunker Hill. He kept that journal for the rest of his life; it's available to this day in the Adams Archives in Quincy. The insights of this seven-year-old sitting in a tree watching a battle for the first time are astonishing. He makes references to the Gallic wars of Cæsar and to the campaigns of Charlemagne. He includes quotations in the Greek from Plutarch. He has Latin inscriptions at the top of every single page, and what's really stunning is, apparently, while he was sitting in a tree during a battle, overlooking the battle of Bunker Hill, he first began to practice what became his habit throughout the rest of his life and that was writing simultaneously with his right hand and his left hand, on two different pages, on two different subjects, just so that he could move through the pages more quickly. For those of us who have difficulty chewing gum and walking at the same time, this is a stunning feat. He started practicing this — he wasn't very adept at it at the age of seven, but by the time he was eleven years old, his father, soon to be president of the United States, John Adams, was sent to France on a diplomatic mission. John Adams took his young son with him and made his son his personal secretary. He was eleven years old at this time. He was on his first diplomatic mission, and he became the official secretary to his father, who was the equivalent of the ambassador to France, but he wasn't called this yet because this title wasn't used. His eleven-year-old son was his personal secretary. As the personal secretary, young John drafted all his father's correspondence, took his dictation, kept the minutes of various meetings, kept his own personal journal, made copies in a separate journal of every piece of correspondence that went out, and sat in on all high-level meetings. No wonder he was considered the ultimate insider, a member of the great New England dynasty that established him as an intellectual and a gentleman.

His refinement was unparalleled. His education was astonishing, and on top of all the rest of it, he learned, at his father's knee, exactly how to undertake delicate diplomacy and negotiate difficult issues with grace, holding to principle, never veering to the right or the left from those essential republican ideals of checks and balances, separation of powers, and liberty and freedom that gave rise to the American experiment in liberty. It is just amazing.

He was refined in all his tastes. There's a letter that he wrote to his mother, Abigail Adams, while he was in France. He had just arrived, and he wrote in his letter to his mother, "Please excuse the coarseness of this quill and the wretchedness of this paper. It seems that the French have yet to understand the importance of archival papers."

He was obviously classically educated. The family library back in Quincy was one of the greatest libraries. It's there to this day. You can visit this magnificent library. It's in a large, two-story room with a balcony and stacks all the way around on all sides with some of the finest bindings available from England, France, and Germany during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. This library was his playground in his early years and became the place of his deep study for the rest of his life. He was not just classically trained, he was a man who went back to the sources of his learning and the richness of his pleasure for the rest of his life.

In his older years, he became a champion against slavery and, like Athanasius, pretty much stood in the United States House of Representatives *contra mundum*. Despite the fact that there was a gag rule imposed on discussions about slavery in the House of Representatives, every single day that he was given an opportunity to rise and speak, John Quincy Adams for years, with almost a William Wilberforce-kind of willfulness, stood and asked for permission to speak on the issue. Every time he did, he was eloquent in quoting sources from antiquity and long passages of Scripture from the Old and the New Testaments, from the rich tradition of Christian classical writing, from Augustine forward through to the intricacies of Aquinas. All of this just sort of flowed out of him because it was part and parcel of the way he thought, the way he talked, the way he lived. It was a part of the fiber of his being. He was a man who cut, from an early early age, a strong sense of sophistication. The French, when he was about thirteen years old, often quipped that he surely was but an underdeveloped adult because though he had the body of a thirteen-year-old, he really had the mind, the bearing, the presence, and the conversational abilities of a much much older man.

That's why, by the time he was fourteen years old, he was sent on diplomatic missions by his father alone, to negotiate difficult aspects of various kinds of either treaty arrangements or trade agreements. By this time, they were no longer in France. They were in Britain, and John Quincy Adams was the chief negotiator of several very delicate trade agreements in those years leading up to the impressment of American seamen that would break out in the War of 1812 — the hostilities between Britain and America. He was chief negotiator.

When he was fifteen, he was sent alone as the American diplomat, again, the equivalent of the American ambassador, to Russia. Over the course of two and a half months, he taught himself Russian, boned up on his French because in the Russian court they spoke French as often as they spoke Russian, and at fifteen he went off and was essentially the ambassador to the Russian court for the new American republic. At fifteen! This is mind-boggling! What's really remarkable is that he did a fabulous job. He was able to hammer out a series of agreements with the Russians that would lay the framework for the eventual acquisition of the American Pacific Northwest following the Louisiana Purchase years later.

2. **Andrew Jackson:** Andrew Jackson seemed like, in almost every conceivable way, the exact opposite of John Quincy Adams. He was by no means refined. He was by no means an intellectual. He was by no means a gentleman. Instead, he was a western adventurer.

He was originally from North Carolina, and when he was a young boy, the American War of Independence had broken out and he quickly became known, after the death of his father and all his brothers going off to war, as a real scrapper and fighter. When the British occupied his little town and took him and many other of the young boys in town captive to do menial service for the British troops that were quartered there, Andrew Jackson, little Andy as he was called in those days, was constantly doing things to undermine their authority and to booby-trap the closets, lockers, and uniforms of those whom he was to do service for.

One time he was forced by a British officer to polish the British officer's boots, and he absolutely refused. He would not kowtow, so he was grabbed by the top of his head and forced to his knees at the feet of the British officer, at which point Andy did what any self-respecting, rebellious patriot would do — he spit on the boots.

The British officer was outraged, took his sword, and whacked Andy across the side of the head. It left a giant gash across Jackson's cheek, which he prided himself on for the rest of his life. It was his medal of honor from the War of Independence. He was too young to fight, but he was not too young to be wounded for the cause of American liberty.

As a young man, he decided to go West after the war and was an adventurer and a scrapper. He came with some of the earliest settlers into middle Tennessee and made his home just to the east side of where the Nashville airport is today, on that great spread of beautiful bottomland called the Hermitage.

But he was also closely involved in all the political affairs that were emerging around Fort Nashborough, which became Nashville. He got involved in land speculation. He had himself certified as a lawyer. Though he had never studied law, he bought his way into the legal profession. He was barely literate; he had only bits and pieces of education. He was a very simple man, who lived with simple tastes. The only reason that he built as nice a home as he did at the Hermitage was because his wife complained of the wind whistling through the cracks in their original log cabin, and he wanted to make Rachel, his beloved, feel well cared for; so he built a new house, and then he built a new house after that. If you go to the Hermitage, you can see the series of buildings that he erected there.

He was involved in so many different things, that it was inevitable that he was a bit of a scrapper and a fighter. We know of at least nine duels that he fought at various times, two of them with swords and the other seven with pistols.

It was said of him that he had more scars, more wounds, and more pistol lead in his body than any other man who has ever become president of the United States. Over at Carter House, if you go around to the back of one of the outbuildings, you can see the most battle-scarred buildings still standing in North America. It looks like Swiss cheese on the back side of this outbuilding. It's often said by the historians at the Hermitage that in many ways Andrew Jackson's body was like Mr. Carter's outbuilding, he was riddled with holes and scars. Someone once saw the lower part of his leg in the White House. Being a scrapper like he was, being as shot up and scarred up as he was, he had lots of aches and pains by the time he was president. One day, he was standing in the White House, pulled up his pant leg, and was massaging his calf. The observer saw this leg and said that it was the most disgusting looking thing that he'd ever seen in his life, and he did not understand how a man could walk on such brittle and torn up stalk of a leg. This was Andrew Jackson.

He became an effective field commander and soldier. We've already talked about his exploits in the Battle of New Orleans and in the Creek War. He learned his battlefield techniques in fighting against the Indians, when he was an army leader, and that ensured that vast portions of land in the southeast would be cleared for European settlers. He was greatly beloved by his soldiers because they knew that this was a man who could win in the most difficult of circumstances. But he was also a bit of a tyrant. He wasn't the diplomat that John Quincy Adams was. He didn't generally negotiate.

There is a story of one time when he was in the White House, he had a heated disagreement with a member of his cabinet. In fact, it was his Secretary of War, and the disagreement became so heated that Andrew Jackson got up out of his chair — he was six foot one, gaunt and thin, but he was an imposing figure; his hair was a mane, straw-like, spiky hair. He stood up over the table, loomed large over his Secretary of War, and they started yelling at each other over the table. The Secretary of War was an old diplomat and been accustomed to these kinds of political battles for years, but he had never seen anybody do what Andrew Jackson did next. Andrew Jackson didn't just leave it at words. He crawled over the table, grabbed the guy by his vest, pulled him up out of his chair, threw him down, and said, "Get up man. It's time to fight!" The Secretary of War said, *I*

*thought that we were just doing politics here. I had no idea that my life was in jeopardy.* He promptly resigned and left the cabinet. Nobody survived Andrew Jackson's cabinet for more than three years; even his vice-president quit in the middle of a term because he didn't want to have to deal with this fighter and scrapper.

But Andrew Jackson was also a man of extraordinary principle. Though he was coarse, and though he was barely educated, he understood the need to stand by the basic principles of the American Constitution. He fought for those principles and was therefore able to stir up fierce loyalty among the people, among the nation, and among his closest followers.

3. ***“The Corrupt Bargain”***: in the previous fall, a presidential election had taken place, in which five presidential candidates, all from the same party, and four vice-presidential candidates, also all from the same party, ran in a kind of free-for-all presidential election. As you might expect, no one won a clear majority, and worse than that no one had sufficient numbers of electoral college votes to resolve the issue. So, by the Constitution, the election was thrown to the House of Representatives to decide. Each member of the House was not bound to vote according to the way that their states had voted in the presidential election. In a sense, the campaign began all over again.

Henry Clay was the Speaker of the House. He was also one of the candidates. He came in third in the popular vote, and there was virtually no chance for Clay to win the election, even though he had great sway in the House of Representatives. That would've been way too corrupt. But he could sway the election. So after a whole long series of closed-door meetings and lots of smokey room caucuses, the House of Representatives took a vote, and in their vote, they awarded the election to John Quincy Adams, who had been beaten soundly in the popular vote by the front-runner, Andrew Jackson. So John Quincy Adams became president of the United States. Shortly thereafter, Henry Clay was appointed to be his new Secretary of State.

Many believed that the deal that had been struck on this day, February 8, in 1825, was some sort of Corrupt Bargain in which Henry Clay said to Adams, *I will throw the election to you, if you give me my choice of cabinet posts.*

The Corrupt Bargain was never proven, but a whole series of meetings occurred to determine the presidency, and Henry Clay did indeed receive the office that he sought, Secretary of State, thinking that, at least in the next election, it would be his stepping stone to the presidency.

4. ***Jonathan Edwards***: men like Jonathan Edwards, made concerted efforts to think through a missionary strategy that would have theological integrity — reaching the peoples of the native tribes in a way that would not compromise the integrity of the Word or the character and nature of the Church — and that, at the same time, would be sensitive to their cultures, that would not simply be an assimilative process, but a truly evangelistic process. One of Jonathan Edwards' young disciples was a remarkable visionary, evangelist, and a brilliant writer named David Brainerd. David Brainerd saw as his primary calling to bring the gospel to the frontier and to establish gospel inroads in the native peoples' cultures and languages. He was one of the first to advocate the translation of the Scriptures into native American tongues. He was one of the first to call for assimilative dress for the missionaries who went to the Indians in an attempt not to destroy those aspects of native American culture, dress, and mores that could legitimately be brought under the umbrella of the gospel. It was a beautiful picture.

Jonathan Edwards himself, when things became difficult and he was asked to leave the pulpit that he had so gracefully occupied for more than twenty years in Northampton, Massachusetts, determined not to go to Scotland to take one of the prominent pulpits that he was offered there, and not to go eastward to Boston to receive great compensation for teaching at Harvard, or even to go to the new College of New Jersey, which would later

become Princeton. Instead he went to the frontier because he believed that perhaps America's greatest destiny would be found as we, the peoples of Europe who had migrated in now large numbers to New England and up and down the Atlantic coast, gained a heart for the lost, the despised, the rejected, those who lived in darkness, not necessarily culturally but theologically — they did not know Christ — as we gained a heart for them, Jonathan Edwards believed that the future of America would be bright and glorious. He wrote a little booklet entitled, *It is More Blessed to Give than to Receive*, arguing, quick on the heels of Cotton Mather's argument in *Magnalia Christi Americana*, that our prosperity would be our undoing if we did not have a heart for the native American peoples.

This was the theological legacy that was passed to Americans by the Puritans who settled in America. However, not all the people who came to America to settle were Puritans and not all the people who came to America to settle were even theologically inclined.

(Your students may also including information from past lectures.)

5. **assimilate:** absorb or integrate into a wider society or culture
6. **Battle of Tippecanoe:** in the Indian territories, now renamed by the government of the United States, Indiana, later Indiana, the territorial governor, who was the son of one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, William Henry Harrison, was given instructions by Washington to somehow quell these terrorist attacks on the frontier. In the great Battle of Tippecanoe in 1811, Harrison and his troops, along with his young protégé, Winfield Scott, and a number of others who would later become prominent in American military history, launched a massive strike against Tecumseh and his warriors and won a decisive victory, driving the Indian Confederacy northward into the Canadian provinces. Tecumseh himself would be killed during the course of the War of 1812, but he would harry American troops all along the way until his final death in battle just north of the Great Lakes in the Canadian territories.
7. **Americanize:** to bring into American culture; as opposed to Christianize, which is to bring native cultures in line with Christianity, even if that doesn't bring them into line with American culture
8. **Cherokee Republic:** the Cherokee were able to so process this notion of Christian civilization that by 1824 they had established a capital that was a genuine Christian capital city, New Echota, near what is today Calhoun, Georgia, not very far from where the little strip mall is there in Calhoun selling Nikes and last season's Bugle Boy jeans. There the Cherokee began to draft things like a Christian constitution, a Christian framework for government and, in 1827, they established the Cherokee Republic. They began to publish a newspaper for the Cherokee. The Bible was translated — first the New Testament and later the entire Scriptures were translated into the Cherokee language. Cherokee towns and cities began to spring up. Cherokee industries were built, particularly along the bluffs in what is today Chattanooga. And a rising civilization began to emerge.
9. **Treaty/Ridge Party:** as a result of the Supreme Court decisions, a small group of the Cherokee called the Treaty Party or the Ridge Party, following John Ridge's portion of the Cherokee tribe, representing about 10% of the total Cherokee nation, decided to negotiate with the United States, to see what kind of deal they could get for their eastern lands and in exchange receive some sort of allotment of lands out in the West, in what were then called the Indian territories, much of that in what is today Oklahoma.
10. **1830 Removal Bill:** in 1830, Andrew Jackson tried to push through Congress a series of measures that were assimilated into a single bill called the Removal Bill of 1830 that would authorize the federal government to take action and bring federal troops to bear if the Cherokee resisted any kind of removal following treaty agreements.

**Essay Questions:****11. Compare and contrast the administrations of John Quincy Adams and Andrew Jackson.****Traits in Common**

You think about two guys like this. Andrew Jackson, the frontiersman, fighter, scrapper, rapper, brawler — he could cuss the wallpaper off of any parlor in middle Tennessee — and there's John Quincy Adams, prim, proper, a gentleman, refined, upset that the French had not yet understood the advantage of archival papers and fine quills. These two men were thrown together into one of the great, classic battles of wills. Here's why Paul Johnson says that, though they were very much opposites, they were also very much alike: a lot of it has to do with the character that lay beneath these exterior veneers.

**Both Were Decisive Leaders**

Both, for instance, were decisive leaders. They knew what they stood for. They understood the need for laying out strategies, goals, objectives, and they were unafraid of making decisions to pursue those strategies, goals, and objectives. Both men were able to cut deals. Both men were able to see through the clutter of a crisis, maintain their heads, and steer the advantage to the cause of America. Both men understood the value of fighting for what was right, so both were decisive leaders and had strong followings. People were equally impressed by these two men.

**Both Were Principled Doers**

Secondly, both were principled doers. They were willing to stake their lives and their reputations on the causes that they believed were right, good, and true. When principle demanded that they risk everything, they did it, immediately. They showed extraordinary character and courage throughout their entire lives. They were often wrong, but seldom in doubt; they lived their lives that way. Part of the reason why they clashed so fiercely is that their principles would not allow them to relent, so they took action.

**Both Created Rabid Opposition**

Both had tremendous negatives. Both were the kind of guys that you either really, really liked or really, really hated. It was said of Andrew Jackson, "No man was ambivalent in his presence." In other words, nobody was neutral. Nobody thought that Andrew Jackson was just okay. You either hated the guy or you loved the guy. You'd follow him anywhere, you'd do anything to see that he was elected, that his cause was satisfied, that his principles were implemented, that his policies were put in place. You're either all the way in or you can't stand him, like Peyton Manning or Dubya or Hillary. You can see that. Some people have this polarizing effect. They have such a presence and such command of their ideas and their principles, and they stand so strongly that there is no sense that people can ever be neutral about them. Their positives and negatives almost equally balance out.

Both men therefore had huge opposition. Out in the West, John Quincy Adams was basically considered to be effete and out of touch with the real America. He was one of those ivory tower intellectuals. He talked in long and complicated phrases, filled with purple prose and arcane references to books that had never made it past the Appalachian Mountains and had never crossed into the frontier. As a result, they assumed that he was simply a man unable to lead the new America. He was a blue blood. He was tied to the old line. He was a man of privilege, and out in the West that was despised.

John Quincy Adams was as hated as Andrew Jackson ever was. But he was also fiercely loved. People would disagree with him on the floor of the House of Representatives, but they would go home with a begrudging respect. *This man will not take no for an answer. This man will stand on principle no matter what. This man is unflinching. This man is an intellectual bulwark that cannot be swayed.*

Both Ran toward the Roar of the Lions

Third, both men ran toward the roar. If there was a battle, if the combatants were raging, you could always be sure that these two men would be right in the middle of the fray. They never ran from a fight. They always ran to it, not because they simply loved to fight, but because they had this strong sense that, when trouble was about, it was their responsibility to stand in the midst of the fray and either bring about a hopeful resolution that would preserve American principles of liberty or they would die trying. They ran toward the roar.

Comparisons and Contrasts

This is what made them such remarkable leaders. It's why, in latter days, though these men were painted as fierce, fierce political enemies throughout most of their careers, both of them begrudgingly admitted that they loved the pluck in the other.

Adams

When Adams was fourteen, he got his appointment to become a minister to Russia. When he was fifteen, he arrived at St. Petersburg and began his career there. At sixteen, he was sent back to Paris and served the diplomatic mission there. He served in the Netherlands and Portugal. He went to the rising nation of Prussia, which ultimately united all the Germanies, and there in Prussia, he became the leader of a kind of international diplomatic corps that dealt with the difficulties of the expansion of Russia and the United Kingdom's vast colonial acquisitions that would lead the world into a century of bitter warfare, from the Napoleonic wars to the Franco-Prussian Wars which led directly to World War I and then to World War II. There at the center of the diplomatic corps in the Prussian capital of Berlin, John Quincy Adams began to lay out principles for American foreign policy, warning that the world was on the precipice of an age of conflict and war, of revolution, and ideological upheaval that would change the world forever. He was incredibly farsighted, and he understood all that stood before the nation from that point forward.

He was elected into the Senate from his native Massachusetts and then was sent back to Europe to negotiate the Treaty of Ghent, which brought to an end the War of 1812. Afterwards, he became James Monroe's Secretary of State, hammering out the agreements that would give rise to America's great ascent and the Era of Good Feelings.

It was during that time that he negotiated with the Spanish to acquire all of Florida, meaning both Spanish Florida and the Republic of West Florida. But it was that peculiar, little independent republic that ran from the Mississippi River all the way across to Mobile Bay, that little stretch of land to the south of the Deep South, known as the Florida parishes, parts of modern-day Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana, with the capital at Red Stick with Fulwar Skipwith, the nephew of Thomas Jefferson, as the president there at Red Stick, or Baton Rouge. He negotiated the acquisition of all that and brought all that into the emerging United States.

During the campaign of 1824, he was thrown into something that he was entirely unfamiliar with in what had been a charmed existence in American politics and life. He'd always been the golden boy. He'd always been well liked. He'd always been the child prodigy. He'd always been the brilliant genius who could talk his way out of any trouble. With the campaign of 1824, suddenly he was being vilified across the nation. Supporters of

Andrew Jackson painted him as out of touch with America. He was astonished by this. He was the man who had crafted the acquisition of what was then America. He was there at the Battle of Breed's and Bunker Hills.

He was there during the negotiations that ended the War of Independence. He was there to negotiate the agreements between France and Britain. He was there during the War of 1812, negotiated the end of that, had served the nation in all the great capitals of the world. He'd acquired all the lands peacefully from the Indians that needed to be acquired in the Louisiana Purchase. He had staved off difficulties with the Spanish monarchy, and had acquired all that land thus gaining full access to the Gulf of Mexico. Now here was this man saying he was out of touch with America?

When he won the election, he was thrown into a kind of presidential quagmire. At the advent of the Monroe administration, all the political parties basically fell apart. Everybody was a member of the same party, the Democratic Republican Party. After the election of 1824, the Democratic Republican Party broke apart. The Jackson faction became known as the Democrats. The John Quincy Adams and Henry Clay faction became known as the National Republicans. They would later become known as the Whigs, and then when the Whig party fell apart in the middle of the century, it came back together — at least bits and pieces of it came back together — as the new Republican Party in 1856, but now there was a new fracturing.

John Quincy Adams found himself as the lightning rod. While he had succeeded in everything that he'd ever done in his life, the opposition of the new Democrats and the determination of Andrew Jackson to wage a four-year long presidential campaign — examining every policy, every statement, every appointment that John Quincy Adams made — under the scrutiny of fierce opposition, suddenly nothing was getting done in Washington. Obstructionism was the rule of the day.

From 1824 to 1828, the American system essentially ground to a halt in terms of its governance. The good news about that is that the American system ground to a halt, which meant that there was a kind of new salutary neglect, and because this was the Era of Good Feelings, the expansion of the West, vast new economic resources pouring into the marketplace, America was able to function quite well. Europe was so tired of war. Quick on the heels of the Napoleonic campaigns, the threat of foreign invasion had been negotiated away by John Quincy Adams before he took the role of president. For four years America could coast, and coast quite nicely. The world remained quite happy and prosperous and peaceful.

With the election of 1828, John Quincy Adams lost the presidency and briefly retired to private life. John Quincy Adams was not a man to sit back and give speeches, build a presidential library, and appear in the news every so often to make a comment or two. Instead, he decided to go back to Congress. For seventeen years, he served in Congress. He opposed the gag rule day after day after day in Congress. A former president of the United States, now bound by a gag rule, not being able to talk about the only thing that he wanted to talk about for the next seventeen years. For seventeen years, day after day after day, he stood up and sought permission to speak on the subject of slavery. For the rest of his life he ran toward the roar.

## Jackson

Jackson had gained his law degree by the frontier method. He'd learned a few basic principles from the law books and then paid a judge to swear him in. He was a soldier and an Indian fighter. He made his way to Congress having cornered all the primary offices in middle Tennessee and being appointed to the supreme court of the state of Tennessee. He lived all his life with very very ill health, the results of his multiple duels. This is one president of the United States who could have never made it through a metal detector; he had bullets in



him. It was said that there was at least three inches of a knife blade that broke off in him during a knife fight; it was in him for the rest of his days. He suffered for the rest of his life.

In 1824, the election debacle in which he was thrown into this quagmire of a fight, no political parties anymore, no real differences on the basic policies. John Quincy Adams from Massachusetts ran. Henry Clay of Kentucky ran. William Crawford of Georgia ran. John C. Calhoun of South Carolina ran. And, of course, Andrew Jackson. Jackson, hero of the War of 1812, a dashing and debonair figure, and a hero of the West, won the popular vote, but, of course, it was thrown into the House of Representatives. He was the man who came up on the short end of the Corrupt Bargain, so he began the campaign for presidency in 1828. When that election came around, there were only two candidates. John Quincy Adams was not able to split the vote. He only won the New England states, and Andrew Jackson won by a landslide and became president.

The inauguration of Andrew Jackson provided one of the greatest spectacles that Washington had ever seen. People from the frontier came riding into town on their horses and in their big flatbed wagons. With their muddy boots, they stormed their way into the White House, and they had a *Beverly Hillbillies* scene like nobody's business. With the muddy boots on the velvet couches of the White House, they did in those days what was about \$120,000 worth of damage in one night to the White House — just in a big party. In those day \$120,000 would have been somewhere in the neighborhood of about \$5.5 million today. But boy did the nation ever have a party.

He fought a series of battles — the nullification crisis and the national bank crisis. There were personal scandals. There was a kind of Wild, Wild West atmosphere that surrounded him. Interestingly he became, during the presidency, a man who really was refined and urbane. He proved that, despite the fact that he was not well-educated, he was an intellectual. He demonstrated that, though he had not traveled abroad like John Quincy Adams, he was a man of the world, and he understood the world. He became a remarkable leader who defined the age, the same way that this period in Europe is known as the Age of Napoléon. In America this became known as the Age of Jackson.

12. ***How do the evangelism and betrayal of Native Americans testify to the importance of biblical principles in leadership?*** Illustrate your answer with historical details. Here's the thing about the Indian wars — if you enter into a conflict, and you're not certain what your principles are, no matter how well-intentioned you are, you will make a mess of it. There were lots of people with lots of good intentions, but they never resolved what their principles were, so there was never a stable framework for negotiation. Nobody could ever count on anything. Every Native American treaty in the course of American history, every single one, has been violated — *every single one* — because, if you don't know what your principles are, and you don't settle them ahead of time, when you enter into conflict, you will make a mess of it.

You can see this over and over and over again, in politics, in families, and in churches. How many times have you seen that people all agree that there is a problem, but nobody can agree on the solution. Even though they're all like-minded in recognizing the problem, they're all like-minded in realizing they've got to do something about it, they're all like-minded about the urgency of it, if there's no principle guiding the solutions, the solutions will always be worse than the problems were in the first place.

Usually expediency and greed will win out. This is one of the reasons why Christian leaders have to have well-articulated principles long before they enter into a conflict. You've got to know ahead of time what's right and what's wrong. You've got to know ahead of time how people ought to be treated. You've got to know ahead of time how to fight fair. You've got to know ahead of time what you'll stand for and what you will give in on. You've got to know ahead of time or you will make a mess of it, every single time. This is one of the key things

about true leadership. True leadership is always bound up in character, not skill, precisely because of this. Very, very skilled people entered into this mess and made it messier because skill was not enough. For the lack of character, the lack of principle, for a lack of consensus about a simple matter of what is right and what is wrong, what Henry Adams called the most shameful episode in American history was perpetrated in the name of right and good.

## Opportunity No. 15

Administer before Lesson 33

### Identify the following:

1. **nullification:** the idea that individual states have not only the right but they have the duty to examine every federal law. If those federal laws violate the Constitution or abrogate the rights of the people in the individual states, then those states must nullify the federal law. Make it null and void in the state.
2. **compact theory:** developed by Thomas Jefferson and James Madison; states had entered into a compact together and that's what the federal union was. The federal union did not stand on its own but only at the initiative of the states. Therefore, if the states saw that the compact has been violated, the states had a responsibility to step in, to interpose themselves and/or nullify the laws.
3. **The American System:** developed largely by Calhoun, Clay, and Webster, designed to balance sectional concerns and a whole series of complicated tariffs to build the American economy.

At the core of the American System were three ideas. One, we protect our own native industry and our own employment base, first and foremost. If there were foreign inducements to export jobs or to export the natural resource base for industry, then that must be penalized with a tax base.

The second platform of the American System was to create a strong national bank to regulate the currency, both its value and international trade and interest rates that were charged.

The third primary platform of the American System was to create infrastructure inducements to build the American economy. The federal government, according to the American System, was to build the roads, maintain the railways, regulate the utilities, and create the infrastructure. This is a mercantilist system, developed initially from the ideas of Alexander Hamilton, but pushed forward largely by Calhoun, Clay, and Webster. It later became the basis of the modern economy. The modern economy is essentially the American System, a moderated version of mercantilism which came from Britain, or more commonly called fascism in places like Germany and Italy. It's where big government and big business partner together to regulate the economy to the benefit of the national entity.

4. **tariff:** a duty or tax to be paid on a particular class of imports or exports
5. **regionalist:** one who focuses on the good of his region over that of the nation
6. **nationalist:** one who focuses on the good of the nation over that of the separate regions
7. **ideologue:** those with hardened, principled opinions to support their particular political philosophy or policies. They were typically unbudging and uncompromising.
8. **concurrent majority:** the idea that if you have a large majority of the nation taking one view, but in a smaller section of the nation, you have another dominating majority even though nationally it's a minority. If it's a regional majority, Congress ought to take into account both opinions and allow both to be pillars or foundations for national policy. In other words, the idea of concurrent majorities was that you've got to take into account minorities as well as majorities in the development of national policy because if you have a strong and large

minority, which happens to be a majority in a region, and the federal union runs roughshod over that minority, then the minority has the right to protect itself even to the point of seceding from the Union.

9. **common law tradition:** the traditions of law handed down from the English, whether written or unwritten

10. **Kentucky & Virginia Resolutions:** the Kentucky Resolutions, written by Thomas Jefferson say this,

[I]n cases of an abuse of the delegated powers, the members of the general government, being chosen by the people, a change by the people would be the constitutional remedy...

In other words, if your government starts to abuse its power, Jefferson says, *Vote them out. Vote them out!* But then he goes on and says,

...but, where powers are assumed which have not been delegated, a nullification of the act is the rightful remedy: that every State has a natural right in cases not within the compact, (*casus non fœderis*) to nullify of their own authority all assumptions of power by others within their limits: that without this right, they would be under the dominion, absolute and unlimited, of whosoever might exercise this right of judgment for them."

One of the things that Jefferson realized was that it's possible to have a tyranny that is the tyranny of the fifty-one percent.

It's actually very possible for a mere majority to impose a kind of tyranny and elect an elitist governmental structure that's unassailable and can do whatever it wants — decides which laws they will enforce, and which laws they won't enforce. So Jefferson in the Kentucky Resolutions says it is absolutely vital that there be some means of nullification.

In the Virginia Resolutions written by James Madison there's a similar argument. This is what Madison wrote, the resolutions, having taken this view of the federal compact proceed to infer

that in case of a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous exercise of other powers, not granted by the said compact, the states who are parties thereto, have the right, and are in duty bound, to interpose for arresting the progress of the evil, and for maintaining within their respective limits, the authorities, rights and liberties appertaining to them.

The Constitution of the United States was formed by the sanction of the states given by each in a sovereign capacity. It adds to the stability and dignity as well as to the authority of the Constitution when it rests on this solid foundation. Do you see what they are saying? The Constitution can't be like Gumby and Pokey—stretched in whatever direction you want it to stretch. You just can't make it whatever you want to make it. Even if fifty-one percent, a majority of the voters, say, *It's okay, go ahead*. And those who recognize the dangers are duty-bound, even if they stand alone, to stand against the imposed tyranny.

11. **Nullification Ordinance:** attempted to provide that structure, that mechanism, for the nullification of federal laws. But again, this was not constitutional construct; it was an elaboration of constitutional principles at best. It was an addendum at worse.

The respective States have a duty to preserve the integrity of the Constitution and the rights of the people by denying Congress any authority not specifically delegated to it.

And we, the people of South Carolina, are determined to maintain this, our ordinance and declaration, at every hazard, do further declare that we will not submit to the application of force on the part of the federal government, such actions being inconsistent with the longer continuance of South Carolina in the Union.

Calhoun drew up this compact to try to articulate and draw out a little bit more of the ideas of the Preamble of the Bill of Rights and the Tenth Amendment. Essentially the Nullification Ordinance, this compact drawn up for South Carolina's legislators, said that the states have a duty to preserve the integrity of the Constitution and the rights of the people by denying Congress any authority not specifically delegated to it. In other words, they were saying, *We really want to do what the Bill of Rights says what we ought to do. We want to hold to the principle of the Tenth Amendment.*

12. **Hartford Convention:** a group of legislators drawn from New England states, who gathered together to decide whether or not New England should secede from the Union over issues that arose during the War of 1812. They gathered together, they evaluated the questions and threatened secession but did not follow through, partly because the War of 1812 ended just before Christmas in 1814.
13. **The Force Bill:** gave the federal government the authority to bring military force against its own citizens to force them to comply with the regulations of federal policy whatever they might be, to collect the tariff taxes and to impose order from the federal level down to the state level.

### Essay Questions:

14. **Briefly compare and contrast John C. Calhoun, Henry Clay, and Daniel Webster. How does the example of their leadership demonstrate the idea that "all politics is local"?**

Calhoun

War Hawk and States Rights: American System  
Tariffs and Nullification to Protect Minorities  
Original Intention of the Constitution

Webster

War Hawk and States Rights: American System  
Tariffs and Interposition to Protect Business  
National Integrity and Constitutional Property

Clay

War Hawk and States Rights: American System  
Compromise to Protect and Preserve the Union  
Constitutional Cooperation and Purpose

Calhoun was a War Hawk. Webster was a War Hawk. Clay was a War Hawk. Calhoun fought for states' rights. Webster fought for states' rights. Clay fought for states' rights. Calhoun fought for the American System. Webster and Clay did as well. They built their careers around issues that were very similar. How do you accommodate industrialism in the North and the impulse to tariffs? How do you accommodate the cotton economy in the South and its peculiar institution, slavery? Two of the men were fiercely opposed to slavery.

One of the men was a fierce defender of it. But they all wrestled with the constitutional issues and arrived at very similar conclusions.

What do we make of all of this? How do we measure the impact of lives like this? The first thing you need to know is that the questions that they raised are the questions that continue to be raised in American politics today. If you see some sort of a disconnect when you turn on CNN versus when you turn on Fox, you're witnessing the debate of Calhoun, Webster, and Clay. If you go to a Tea Party or a Michael Moore rally you will hear the rhetoric and the questions of Calhoun, Webster, and Clay. If you look at the great constitutional scholars of today, they're still wrestling with the questions that these three men raised, and we've barely made any advances over them. The questions still remain controversial. The questions remain entirely unresolved. It is the heart of the great American conflict even today.

Here is what I think is the biggest take-away. It has nothing to do with ideology or policy. Tip O'Neil, a famous machine politician from Massachusetts, a good ole Boston Irishman, famously said, "All politics is local." What the lives of these three men show us is that we need to take that one step further and that is that all politics, all cultural impact, is personal. It's rooted in personal relationships, personalities, and character, which is why character is more important than policy.

Have you noticed when you read the Bible that there is not a specific charter about how government ought to be set up? Instead there are ethical standards that rulers and peoples are to follow. These guys agreed and wrestled with the same things. Why was it that they were so fiercely opposed to one another all through their lives? Well they came from different places and they were marked by their regions, and that was a part of it. But at the heart of it was that they just didn't like each other.

The nation wound up being marked by the personalities, the characters, and the conflict among these persons. We got to make sure that we always remember this. Leadership is always personal. Ministry is always personal. Politics is always personal. It's part of the reason that American voters can violate their principles over and over and over again and vote for somebody because they have good teeth and great hair — because it's personal. And you know what? God made us for the personal. We don't live by principles, we live by relationships; that's why in the Bible, we're constantly told that truth must be married to virtue and that truth and virtue must produce in us joy, delight, and winsomeness. An ugly truth doesn't win the world. A mean-spirited, well-argued principle gains few followers. What these three guys remind us is that these dominating personalities were just that — they were dominating personalities. Yes, the issues that they argued were important; they're still important. But the biggest thing that we learn from these men is that they were men, with relationships and character flaws, and that made all the difference. It'll make all the difference with you as well.

**15. Briefly describe the Nullification Crisis and explain how it reveals the necessity of recognizing the effects of the Fall in politics and policy.**

Conflicts over intrusive federal power, an imperial presidency, and an irate citizenry are nothing new.

The first lesson is that conflicts over intrusive federal power, an imperial presidency and an irate citizenry are nothing new. If you read the headlines and look at Tea Party protests, the occupation of Wisconsin's State House, teachers unions marching, and all the rest, and you think, *This is craziness. This nation is coming apart the seams. This is unprecedented.* You need to remember, we've been doing this kind of crazy stuff for a long time.

Because politics is just a predictable manifestation of human ambition and aspiration in a fallen world, political conflicts are just predictable manifestations of the sin patterns of fallen men.

Because politics is just a predictable manifestation of human ambition and aspiration in a fallen world, political conflicts are predictable manifestations of the sin patterns of fallen men. In other words, the reason history repeats itself is that we're fallen creatures. The reason the same conflicts keep coming up over and over again is that those conflicts are rooted in who we are not just what we do. This is so important for us to realize. There are actually people out there who believe that they can educate AIDS away, or educate bad driving away, sit down with a little film about scary driving moments and that's supposed to scare teenagers and cause them to drive carefully. Yes, it'll scare you the first time you watch it, but then what happens is that you have this default mode called *being a teenager*. Watching a film about something is not going to change what you are. There has to be something far more substantial to change what you are. You can't just legislate something away or educate something away. Part of the problem of modern politics is that we've forgotten the most basic principle of all — the principle of the Fall. People aren't just stupid, they're sinful. People aren't just misinformed, they're sinful. Do you think somebody walking up to Charlie Sheen and telling him the way he ought to act is going to fix Charlie Sheen?

Ignoring or subverting constitutional limitations is not an innovation of modern politics.

This brings us to another principle: ignoring or subverting constitutional limitation is not an innovation of modern politics.

There's a direct corollary to that, which is when we run across these same old problems in our contemporary context, perhaps the best insights that we can gain are not the innovations of our creative minds but sometimes maybe we ought to go back and look at the way these conflicts have been dealt with before so that we can learn lessons from the past. One of things that drives me absolutely crazy when I look at the State Department's policy program for dealing with conflict in the Middle East is that they ignore fifteen hundred years of history when they are doing it. They are assuming that they can deal with Gaddafi or with Mubarak as if they came from California or Iowa. Let me tell you something, Gaddafi did not grow up in Iowa. You can't use the same logic, the same approaches, the same inducements, and incentives. You can't assume that fifteen hundred years of history didn't happen.

Great men are generally exaggerated men — in both their strengths and their faults.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, we always have to remember that great men are generally exaggerated men. They have exaggerated gifts; that's what makes them great, if they are great. They're kind of stretched out of normal proportions. But, if their strengths are exaggerated, their faults are probably exaggerated too.

## *Opportunity No. 16*

Administer before Lesson 35

### Identify the following:

1. **lectio**: reading, hearing, and seeing
2. **meditatio**: thinking, meditating, and connecting
3. **oratio**: praying and inscripturating
4. **contemplatio**: living, applying, and obeying
5. **GIGO**: garbage in, garbage out; principle for evaluating our reading
6. **List the six steps in Shaeffer's cultural progression:**
  - a. philosophy
  - b. literature
  - c. music
  - d. art
  - e. theology
  - f. popular culture

### Essay Questions:

7. **Describe the way cultures change using the progress of Romanticism during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.** Following the founding period, American culture became subject to this cultural progression with a new set of ideas that, in time, was identified as philosophical Romanticism. Philosophical Romanticism emerged at the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth century as a kind of reaction against Enlightenment norms, political norms, and stratified social norms. It was a reaction to the hardened strata of old Christendom that had been shaped by the secularizing ideas of the Enlightenment. The new thinkers looked at this old, encrusted system of nobility, what Alexis de Tocqueville called the ancient regime, *l'Ancien Régime*, and said this allows for little social mobility, it's often rooted in a tenured place in society, not upon merit. Economies are throttled. So, philosophers began to rail in reaction against the Enlightenment norms.

They also began to resist what they felt was the cold, machine-like philosophies of scientific rationalism. Romantic philosophers began to look at where Darwinism and pre-Darwinism would ultimately take the world. They started to look at the deterministic ideas of people like David Hume, and they resisted those ideas, thinking that they were terribly inhuman and gave very little room for the human spirit. In the process, there was sort of a nostalgic attachment to old folk wisdom and a real love for the sort of rustic old tradition of the homeland, of the motherland.



## Emphasis

This eventually gave rise to a whole new emphasis on faith, family, and tradition. There was a love of the old ruins of Christendom. Suddenly you have people making trips to go and observe the ruins of old abbeys and castles. They were romantically attached to the ruins themselves. Suddenly a philosophy emerged that says we ought to protect the ruins — not rebuild the old castles, but protect the ruins themselves. This gives rise to a whole new emphasis on archaeology, historic preservation, etc.

There was an emotional connection to nature. One of the things that Romanticism does is that it romanticizes nature itself. This is the beginning of environmentalism and the ecological movements, but it's also the beginning of the travelers, the wanderers, the hikers, the kayakers, the mountain climbers — people who didn't climb mountains to get to the other side, but who climbed mountains to, well, climb the mountain. It's the beginning of outdoor sports. It's the beginning of an affection attached to nature itself.

There were very rustic affections and affectations that were attached to Romanticism. Suddenly the old peasant breads and the old peasant recipes came back into vogue and the old rustic folk songs found their way into the compositions of classical composers. Folk art, folk music, folk stories, and folk legends suddenly came in vogue. Fashionable men and women began to dress up like they were peasants. They wore the garb of rustic and deliberate sloppiness. Or, perhaps they recovered old, rough fabrics.

There was an affection for the natural and a strong emphasis on the common man, the wisdom of the common man as opposed to the elite, the intellectuals, the effete, the ivory tower philosophers. Suddenly there was a distrust of everything that had been established before, and a love, a romantic attachment, to the strong emotion of what was real, transparent, substantive, honest, and natural. That's Romanticism.

The Progress of Romanticism

## Philosophy

Romanticism came to define American culture because these philosophical ideas that were worked out, largely by the arcane philosophers reacting to Enlightenment norms, began to be seeded into the rest of the culture. The philosophers were part, initially, of a German movement, a philosophical movement called, *Sturm und Drang*, the storm and the crisis, or the emotion. Philosophers like Johann Georg Hamann, who lived from 1739 to 1788, hammered out the ideas, railing against nobility, railing against Christendom's stratified society, the four estates, all the things that were wrong with, say, French society of the time, epitomized by Versailles and the opulence and the effete nature of high society. But what Hamann argued was that it is far better to sit in a pub in a tiny German hamlet with peasants who tell real stories, who have real jobs, who work with real gusto in their real trades — far better to have a mug of local beer and peasant bread in a place like that than to go and slip about on your silk footies in Versailles with a finger in the air while you sipped silly, little, made-up drinks with people whose heads were as vapid as their lives. That was the philosophy.

It was picked up by Johann Wolfgang Goethe who wove it into his storytelling, his poetry, and his plays. Of course, he was a strong advocate of cultural change.

It was picked up by the national poet of the German language, Friedrich von Schiller. These ideas begin to gain currency among philosophers. Immediately, thinking writers began to pick up on the ideas as well.

## Literature

The Romantic poets, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Byron, Keats, and Shelley, began to work with these ideas. Though they themselves were often quite elite — Lord Byron was a man who never had to work at all in his life; he lived off a nobleman's largess — nevertheless, he loved the cause of the common man. He actually died in a previous Greek civil war.

And then there is Robert Burns who also picked up these ideas and wrote of the rustic life of the ordinary people of Scotland. These poems become wildly popular. Sir Walter Scott took the ideas of Romanticism and wove them into narrative storytelling and the recovery of the history of the ordinary Scottish people. Suddenly, Scottish clans, Scottish songs, Scottish food, including haggis, the kilts, and the bagpipes suddenly came in vogue, even though these things are all rough and peasant-like. Suddenly, nobles were going about and carrying on as if they were just like the common people.

In America, Washington Irving picked up these same things and started telling stories about ordinary village life and ordinary people — *Sleepy Hollow* and strange men who discover that the progress of the world is perhaps not all it's cracked up to be. Rip Van Winkle goes to sleep in a sleepy little village and wakes up years later to discover that the world has gone mad; it's in a hurry for progress, when, in fact, progress may not be terribly desirable.

With the *Leatherstocking Tales* — tales of half-breed men living on the frontier, fighting the Indians, the lore of the West, the rugged pioneer spirit — these ideas emerged in the stories of James Fenimore Cooper. They then filtered into the ideas of people like Emerson and Thoreau, Hawthorne, and Melville. Suddenly you've got this idea that America is a different place altogether. It's the place where Romanticism, where the roughhewn man who pulls himself up by his own bootstraps, the pioneer who constantly longs for the wandering life, who crosses the next divide and finds a new way and a new life. That became the definition of American. From the philosophers, to the writers, from the writers to the musicians.

## Music

Why is Mozart different from Bach? Bach with his carefully regulated fugues, his structured interplay of call and response, that Baroque majesty. Mozart sings circles around the fugues, often seeming undisciplined, borrowing old folk tunes from places like the peasant's world of Hungarian workers in the old Austro-Hungarian Empire. He weaves them into this sort of romantic spell that tells the story of the ordinary man. He even weaves for himself a storyline for his own life. Even though he's been brought up as a pampered child living off the largess of nobility, he portrays himself as a kind of rogue, a barbarian in a gentleman's game. And the mythos of the real artiste begins to emerge. The emotion of Beethoven, the pouring out of passion — the unrestrained, “Da da da DUM!”

This is the boldness of Romanticism.

Hayden took these ideas and began to explore previously untouched realms, a Romantic's view of romance, the tenderness of a lover's touch, the sweetness of the morning air. Suddenly these become the themes of the musical parlance of the day.

In America, we have people like Stephen Foster, who was a classically trained musician who turned his attention to instruments like banjos, guitars, and dulcimers because these were the instruments of the people. He began to write simple folk songs about “Jeannie with the Light Brown Hair” and “Oh, Susannah!” and “Camptown

Races". They tried to capture the essence of that roughhewn populist, pioneer spirit — the American. The rugged Marlboro man and the sweet southern belle meeting on a porch, falling into one another's embrace like a romantic novel.

Scott Joplin came along, and he took the old spirituals of former slaves and wove in the syncopation of Delta blues and created the category not just of Ragtime but he laid the foundations for what will become country music, Blues, and rock 'n roll, all of which are sort of muscular and hewn out of that idea that America is the place for the pioneer, for the ordinary man and his ordinary music. That stirs passion in the soul and causes a person to want to shout, scream, and jump.

## Art

This kind of music will naturally affect the graphic arts. We start to see the rustication of the home arts and architecture, through the writings and the practice of people like William Blake, John Ruskin, and William Morris. Homes began to reflect more of this pioneer spirit. Architecture was driven back to its more primal roots.

Then there are the paintings of J.M.W. Turner and John Constable and, in America, the emergence of the Hudson River School. Great artists like Thomas Cole and Albert Bierstadt, and Frederick Edwin Church. They were fascinated by the ideas of old Christendom — the romance, the chivalry, the pageantry, and the glory — back before it became encrusted by the cold machinelike maws of the Industrial Revolution and Enlightenment norms. But even better for them than the marvel of ancient chivalry was the current estate of those chivalric norms, was the romance in the ruin that's not even evident immediately in its original glory. Here there's a kind of melancholy haunting. All of the sheen is off and now there's a ruggedness, a power, a wistfulness, a nostalgia for what is lost but a kind of glory in what remains. So, the ruin has more attraction than the original.

Likewise, there's this kind of backward glance to the glory of ancient civilizations, the marvel of what the Greeks, the Romans, the Babylonians, and the Egyptians accomplished. Perhaps even more powerful are the ruins of those old civilizations. Here's where Romanticism really makes its mark. Romanticism almost always expresses itself in sad songs of longing and loss. It's why country music is the perfect reflection of Romanticism. It's the mud, the blood, and the beer in the face of the loss of what once was, but the opportunity for what soon can be out on the rugged frontier, the world of real possibility.

These ideas start with philosophy. They filter into the literature and then the music, and then the art, and then right into theology.

## Theology

The Oxford movement, a movement in Oxford, England, of Church of England practitioners longing for the richness of tradition, longing for smells and bells, a liberating escape from fierce Modernity, longing for something deeper or something profounder, something far more rugged, something far more ancient, gave rise to distributivism and agrarianism, a new vision of men and women in free communities, covenantally associating with one another, so unlike the corporatized world of modern industrialism, and advocating the warrior poet's reemergence. It's why affections for knights in shining armor, chivalry, the old Celtic ideals, Celtic jewelry, affection for the land reemerged and became part of the whole vision of American culture.

This in turn led theology to become attached to causes of liberation and social reform. The Social Gospel movement emerged from that. It's not feasible to think that a liberation theology or process theology could've

ever emerged in Belgium or France or Germany. These are distinctively American ideals, flowing through this long series of progressions — Romanticism made evident.

## Popular Culture

This is what made American culture what it is. Americans aren't natively hard workers; we're the heirs of a progressive cultural shift that gave rise to this bootstrap ethic.

We love the voice of the people, the common man. The idea of public opinion polls is not an idea that would arise in a place like Moscow. Where do you think the idea of going around to ordinary people and asking, "So, what do you think about the 2012 GOP line-up?" comes from? That's not something the French people ask themselves. This is distinctively American, from that milieu of loving the common man and the voice of the people. It's tied to the ideals of freedom and our peculiar notions of liberty, but the liberty that we speak of is far different from, say, the liberty of Venezuela. Why? Because of this unique cultural transition.

We're constantly inventing new traditional folk art forms. And by saying we *invent* tradition, I mean that very deliberately. We've got all these fake traditions.

Country music is really an invention that emerged in the first three decades of the twentieth century around a single place, Ryman Auditorium and the Grand Ole Opry. It's an invented thing; it hasn't always been around. But it's got its rootedness in the rough-hewn character of the ordinary person and of the travails of the working man. It's part and parcel of philosophical Romanticism. Thus, Blues, country, folk, Americana, and even hip-hop are all derivatives of this Romanticized philosophical view of society.

Why would we ever glorify gangstas? Because we've always sort of gloried in the gangsta from Bonnie and Clyde all the way back to James Fenimore Cooper's rogues and vagabonds in the *Leatherstocking Tales*. We sort of love the bad, good guy. Lil Wayne didn't invent this! He just figured out how to make millions of dollars on it while giving himself bad face tattoos. This whole pioneer spirit that we have affected in American culture is the result of this cultural flow. And so we have this natural progression through the whole of culture.

## Opportunity No. 17

Administer before Lesson 37

### Identify the following:

1. **Manstealing:** Robert Glanville, in 1787, wrote a masterful book entitled *Manstealing*, in which, for the first time since de las Casas, he portrayed the horrific nature of the slave trade itself: the manstealing, the contributions to tribal warfare in Africa, proffering the coffers of the Islamic slave traders, the horrific, unhygienic, and terribly brutal transport of the slaves over the Atlantic, and then the dehumanizing character of the slave trading markets. It was a powerful, powerful indictment.
2. **servants:** a hireling is simply an employee, where they are bound by a covenant or a contract, for either a certain amount of time or to accomplish a certain task. In other words, if I were to hire Jonathan Swift to come to my house to mow my lawn, he becomes my hireling until the lawn is mowed, at which time I release him from his bonds. That is what a hireling is. This is described in Leviticus Chapter 19.
3. **indentures:** contractors, who are bound specifically for a period of time. This can involve some kind of debt or some kind of task, but an indentured servant is someone who commits himself for a particular length of time, for a particular task. These days those kinds of arrangements are taken care of in contracts, but the Bible describes entering into these relations for some sort of mutual exchange.
4. **serviles:** debtors who cannot repay their debt. In order to repay the investment of the one who has loaned the debtor the money, the farm, the crop, or whatever it might be, the debtor has to enter into the service of the master until the debt is repaid. It is a form of restitution.
5. **bondsmen:** then there was true criminal restitution. A bondsman is someone who is called the restitor, someone who has committed a crime perhaps or violated property and is bound to repay the one that he has injured. It is another form of servant.
6. **vassals:** vassals were peasant yeoman. They were those who indentured themselves for the privilege of working a piece of land, and their debt back to the master was a part or a parcel of the harvest or of the products that they produced.
7. **doulos:** a *doulos* is a servant who is covenantally bound to a master. A *doulos* can only be covenantally bound to a master voluntarily. The Bible describes this as a servant who loves a master and desires to serve the master for the rest of his life. There is an intricate ceremony where the *doulos* puts his ear against a doorpost and a golden ring is affixed after a nail is driven through the ear — not exactly mall piercing — and then that *doulos* will voluntarily serve the master for the rest of his life. He is not property.
8. **chattel:** the Bible of course hedges all these different forms of servitude with a series of laws about justice and the jubilee and the year of release, etc., the forgiveness of debts. But there is a form of slavery described in the Bible, often taking the form of prisoners of war dragged off into captivity from their homelands and made property. This form of slavery in the Bible is uniformly condemned, along with the sins that precipitate it, including man-stealing.

9. **Preston Smith Brooks:** senator from South Carolina, a fire-breather, who caned almost to death on the floor of the Senate, Senator Charles Sumner, for Sumner's speech in which he impugned the honor of Brooks' cousin, the other senator from South Carolina.
10. **The Secret Six:** Thomas Higginson; Samuel Gridley Howe; Theodore Parker; Franklin Sanborn; Gerrit Smith; George Luther Stearns; men who funded John Brown's activities
11. **John Brown:** a radical abolitionist; organized and led the raid on Harpers Ferry.
12. **William Wilberforce:** the Member of Parliament who worked for eighteen years to end the slave trade in Great Britain.

### Essay Questions:

13. ***Why is it accurate to call slavery in America a complicated historical issue? To what extent did people complicate it further? In your response, refer to elements of history, politics, and statistics, and provide a moral philosophy conclusion about the importance of reformation at such times in history.*** See Lesson 36.
14. ***Briefly recount either the anecdote of Preston Smith Brooks & Charles Sumner or the anecdote of John Brown and the raid on Harpers Ferry.*** May 22, 1856. Standing above, Senator Preston Brooks is caning, almost to the point of death, Senator Charles Sumner. Sumner and Brooks were on opposite sides of an ideological divide. Brooks, of South Carolina, had been offended three days earlier by a speech in which Sumner, who was one of the most articulate orators in all of the United States Senate, the esteemed senior senator from Massachusetts, excoriated Brooks' cousin, the senior senator from the state of South Carolina, Andrew Pickens Butler. Butler was one of the strongest advocates for nullification and the possibility of secession. Sumner was one of the strongest abolitionists and had taken up the issue of slavery in order to drive his agenda for high tariffs and manufacturing protectionism for Northern industry. They were intractable foes, and they had sparred any number of times on the floor of the Senate. Sumner decided to make one of his great orations. In it, he decimated the character of Butler, and he used the imagery, not very carefully veiled, of Butler being a profane adulterer, having taken as his mistress the slavery system. It was a lurid, although brilliant, oration. It went far beyond the bounds of propriety for speeches in the Senate, as was acknowledged even by many of the Massachusetts senator's own friends and allies. It was crude, but effective.

Butler was not present; however Brooks was. He took umbrage at the way his cousin, his senior senator, friend, and mentor had been taken to task by the petulant, impudent Sumner. So, three days later, with a friend of his standing guard with a pistol to hold off any would-be rescuers, he attacked Sumner at his desk in the Senate chambers, literally caning him to the ground, to within an inch of his life. Sumner would not return to the Senate for two years, convalescing at home and trying to overcome his fears of ever stepping outside again, he was so traumatized. The nation was outraged. Well, most of the nation was outraged. Massachusetts was inflamed, and South Carolina was proud.

It was in the midst of the conflict over the new territory that has been carved out for a new state called Kansas. Because of, first, the Missouri Compromise, and later, the Compromise of 1850, the territories of Kansas and Nebraska could vote to determine whether or not they would be free states or slave states. The issue was to be open to a free vote of the settlers in the states. Upon the announcement of territorial distribution, partisans from both the North, mostly from Massachusetts, and the South, mostly from South Carolina, flooded into the territory through Missouri to stake out claims and to make a political point. Invariably, the free settlements and

the slave settlements in the new territory came to a clash of arms, became violent almost overnight. In fact, so violent that, in the rest of United States, the territory was known as Bleeding Kansas.

There was a farmer, born in Connecticut and lived for a time in Ohio, for a little while in New York, a man with twenty sons, by the name of John Brown. He decided to take up the cause of the free settlements. Some twenty years earlier, with his father, he had heard some inflammatory abolitionist rhetoric at the Oberlin Institute,

which was a liberal New York state college designed to foment radical reform. It was at the leading edge of the temperance movement, the women's rights movement, and the abolitionist movement. It was Unitarian, even though Charles Finney had a great deal to do with the establishment of Oberlin. It was the center for radical, liberal thought. Brown and his father had heard a flaming, fire-breathing, abolitionist talk and immediately took up the cause of radical abolitionism. What I mean by *radical abolitionism* can be summarized in the statement that Brown made that day in 1837 after hearing the speech. He said, "I will forever commit my life to the violent overthrow of any institution that perpetuates slavery in any form. I will commit myself to raise an army, to become a martyr, if need be, for this cause." That's a long, long way from the attitude that William Wilberforce had when he made his resolution to commit his life to end the blight of slavery in the world. So, Brown went off to Bleeding Kansas with several of his sons.

## Opportunity No. 18

Administer before Lesson 39

### Identify the following:

1. **Booker T. Washington:** born in 1856 into slavery. His eight years of slavery were nothing more than a hard-scrabble existence, but the next eight years were just as hardscrabble, as former slaves tried to figure out how to make their way in the world without the patronage of masters. It was not an easy thing. Nevertheless, this young man proved himself to be remarkably diligent, and at the age of sixteen, he gained admittance to the Hampton Institute, one of the first schools established for former slaves. Though he worked full time as a janitor in order to pay for his tuition, he graduated with honors in three years with a triple major. Upon graduation, he returned to his family and taught in the local grammar school, but before eighteen months had expired, his mentor back at Hampton beckoned him to return to the institution where he became an instructor and an assistant to the president. Shortly afterwards the state of Alabama contacted the school about the possibility of establishing a similar college there in Alabama. Washington was recommended for the job. Thus on July 4, 1881, at the age of twenty-five, Booker T. Washington founded the Tuskegee Institute. The obstacles facing him were enormous. There was no money, no faculty, no campus, no land, and no student body. The only books that he had were the books that he had been able to collect himself over the previous ten years. There was actually nothing but the resolution of the state to launch a school and the determination of Booker T. Washington to raise up a whole new generation of leaders. Nevertheless by the time of his death in 1915, Tuskegee had grown to encompass a two thousand-acre campus with one hundred and seven buildings, all of them built by the students themselves from materials that the students actually created themselves, cutting down the trees and forging the hinges and making the bricks as part of their responsibility as students. There were more than fifteen hundred students and nearly two hundred faculty members. As a result of his efforts, Washington became a celebrity and the first great leader for civil rights for all Americans. It's fascinating that during his chapel services every Sunday night for the students, he reminded them again and again that the great animosity that had divided black from white and North from South was altogether obliterated in the gospel and in the gospel only, and that the gospel was the great hope for the future, not politics, not activism — as important as both politics and activism were, he was engaged in both — but he believed that it was the gospel that could bring genuine healing and the reality is that when we look at our tasks, the tasks before us resolve themselves entirely in gospel faithfulness.
2. **Davis Resolutions:** Jefferson Davis, as we saw, was a senator from Mississippi, who was appointed in 1853 by Franklin Pierce in the new Pierce administration to become the Secretary of War. At the end of Franklin Pierce's administration, Davis returned to the Senate and in 1858 made a series of speeches, admonishing the fire-breathers to tone down the rhetoric and to preserve the Union. He was an ardent supporter of the right of secession, but he believed that secession was foolish in this circumstance, that it could only bring devastation and destruction to both sides of the Mason-Dixon Line.

It's really interesting that in 1858, while recovering from an illness, Jefferson Davis, the senator from Mississippi made his home in Portland, Maine, where he was a part of Portland's social life. He made close and dear friends and determined that he would own a home there for the rest of his life. He loved Portland, Maine. It was there in Maine and in traveling just a little to the south to Boston, where he made some of his most anti-secessionist speeches. In fact, the next year he introduced into the Senate a whole series of resolutions called the



Davis Resolutions, designed to hold off the partisan spirit that was dividing the nation. Each of the Davis Resolutions was defeated, largely by the fire-breathers in the North.

3. ***Ft. Sumter***: an island just outside of Charleston, South Carolina, where the first shots of the Civil War were fired
4. ***Confederate Constitution***: there was a call for a convention of these confederated states. The convention convened in Montgomery, Alabama. Jefferson Davis was elected president, and the states began the process of drafting a constitution. The constitution was almost identical to the original American Constitution. In fact, the seal of the Confederacy harkened back to those early days of the founding fathers, memorializing those great Virginia patriots and emblazoning George Washington's regal figure at the center of the seal. They believed that it was the North that was in rebellion, that the Union was the revolutionary force, and that they were simply trying to preserve the legacy of the founding fathers.
5. ***Abraham Lincoln***: a congressman from Illinois; ran for president on the Republican ticket in 1860; won; his election finally caused the southern states to secede (see Lessons 37 and 38 for more information)
6. ***James Buchanan***: U.S. president before Lincoln; willing not to push the situation at Ft. Sumter
7. ***Gen. P.T. Beauregard***: Southern general responsible for the defensive forces of the South Carolina militia; ordered Ft. Sumter to be fired upon.
8. ***First Battle of Manassas***: July, 1861; also known as the First Battle of Bull Run; The Union army was met almost immediately just outside the little village of Manassas. Southern resistance was immediate and fierce, catching the Union soldiers by surprise. The Union was so confident, both in their numbers and their prowess, that many of the wives and daughters, friends and socialites from Washington, D.C., had made their way out from Washington in their carriages and lined the roadway to cheer on the Union army as they passed. They planned to have a picnic above the battlefield to watch the slaughter and the destruction of the Confederate forces. Instead, Stonewall Jackson, at the time a little known colonel, earned his name. He was a stone wall. With a tiny corps of men, he was able to repulse the thrust of the Union attack, throwing the Union forces into utter disarray. As they began an orderly retreat, the corps behind them began to panic, and they started scrambling back toward Washington, D.C. Before long, it was full flight and utter chaos. As they ran past, in absolute fear, all the socialites, wives, and daughters gathered for their picnic, suddenly all the wives and daughters began to gather up their belongings and tried to crowd their carriages onto the narrow roadways back to Washington, D.C., clogging the roads, creating a terrible traffic jam. A devastating defeat, both moral and military, against the vastly superior Union army went into the books, and suddenly, fear ran through the whole land.
9. ***Second Battle of Manassas***: August 1862; Another battle was fought at Bull Run just outside of Manassas, Second Bull Run, resulting in a devastating Union defeat.
10. ***Battle of Shiloh***: April-July, 1862; Shiloh really lasted from April through July. The pitched battle itself, the first great pitched battle of Ulysses S. Grant, ended in a stalemate, but it was a stalemate that was costly for the South.
11. ***Anaconda Plan***: Winfield Scott's plan to squeeze the South and cut them off. He would put into place a blockade across the Atlantic and much of the Gulf Coast. And then he would attempt to control the Mississippi River.

12. **Jefferson Davis:** a former military commander who had fought in the Mexican War; a U.S. senator from Mississippi; elected president of the Confederacy
13. **Robert E. Lee:** one of the most brilliant battlefield strategists; he could get more out of nothing than almost any other commander that America has ever had in the field of battle, besides perhaps General George Patton.
14. **Stonewall Jackson:** one of those great prodigies. He was a peculiar character. He was a dynamic Christian and, like Lee, a strong anti-slavery man, who actually started, at first, an illegal Sunday school for slaves and was the founder of a number of African American churches throughout western Virginia and all the way down south to Roanoke. In fact, this great little Missionary Baptist Church in Roanoke has this beautiful stained glass window that shows Stonewall Jackson with his friends teaching them the Bible. He was a remarkable man of faith, but what was most remarkable about him was that he was a battlefield innovator. He wasn't technically precise, but he had a gut instinct for where to be and how to get there. He was so unpredictable that he just bumfuddled Union commanders. He was one of the most feared men in all the Civil War.

### Essay Questions:

15. ***Link the growing reality of secession to some of the cultural differences between the American North and South.***

### Northern Culture

We see that in North and South, this worldview perspective was seeded into the culture from the earliest days. Northern culture emerged from the Puritans, Pilgrims, and Roundheads. It was mostly profoundly influenced by the cultures of England but also from the cultures of Germany and Italy.

They had an Alexandrian hermeneutic. In other words, they believed that the way to interpret events was largely allegorical. In other words, they did not have to take things literally but rather had a much more poetic approach to the interpretation of facts, events, or even constitutional decrees.

This is where the Federalist, Whig, and Republican parties came from. Their interests were primarily industry, finance, science, and trade, rooted in the theological principles of Unitarianism and largely Teutonic Baptist influences.

### Southern Culture

The South, on the other hand, was settled largely by Scots and Celts, meaning the Scots Irish and the Irish, as well as the English Cavaliers, very distinct from the English Roundheads. Thus they were influenced most by Scotland, but also had grand affections for France and Spain. You see this sort of northern European versus southern European and Celtic difference.

Southern cultures had an Antiochian hermeneutic, meaning that they were much more literal, which is why they tended toward the politics of the Anti-Federalists, the Tories, and the Democratic Parties. They were much more interested in agriculture, land, history, and legacy, as manifested in the theologies of Methodism and Presbyterianism.

If you look at the cultural manifestation of North and South, it's easy to understand how the worldview mindset settled in, and why the divide was so stark. We'll explore this a little bit further, but here's what I want you to do. I want you to be thinking about the differences. For instance, when we talk about battles, ask yourself how the Germans would have approached a battle as opposed to Celts, Irish, and Scots. Would there be a difference?

As the North and the South began to write the histories of the war, what would be the difference between say a Celtic understanding of history versus a Germanic or English Roundhead view of history?

16. ***Briefly describe the unfolding events around Ft. Sumter and the outbreak of the American Civil War.*** By December 20, the states in the South were already beginning to line up secessionist referenda in their state legislatures. South Carolina was first, voting almost unanimously to secede from the Union. In response, President Buchanan ordered that Fort Sumter, an island just outside of Charleston, South Carolina, should be re-garrisoned and re-supplied for the Feds. That greatly increased the tensions.

Meanwhile back at Fort Sumter, the lame-duck president, President Buchanan, ordered that the garrison remain in place, but that it not be re-supplied, and nothing was to be done to provoke hostility with the new sovereign state of South Carolina. Essentially, Buchanan did what he almost always did: he saddled the fence and said, *For now let's just do nothing, okay? Let's just pretend that everything is okay.*

When President Lincoln assembled his Cabinet, the first order of business was what to do with Fort Sumter. Lincoln wanted to re-supply the fort, bring it provisions, food, and replacement for spent ammunition. Every single member of Lincoln's Cabinet voted against that resolution. They believed that they if they re-supplied the fort it would be a provocation to war. Several members of the Cabinet believed that it would be a just provocation to war.

For several weeks, President Lincoln wrestled with the issue but finally, the first week of April, he determined that he would push ahead. He sent orders to his military command, entirely against the counsel of his Cabinet. Immediately, the military command sent wires back to Washington essentially saying, *What?! Are you sure?* President Lincoln sent the order again. An appeal was sent from the dispatch colonel saying, *Surely, in Washington, you must understand that this will mean war.* A third time, President Lincoln sent the order.

Meanwhile former President Tyler had convened a series of peace talks, a parley, among a number of sympathetic congressman and senators from the North and the South, desiring to avert the possibility of genuine conflict, believing that a negotiated peace could be achieved and eventually, re-union. But before the peace parley could find substantial room for agreement, on April 12, ships entered Charleston Harbor and re-supplied Fort Sumter. Major Robert Anderson, commander of the Fort Sumter garrison, realized when he saw the ships that he needed to prepare for battle.

General P.T. Beauregard, who was responsible for the defensive forces of the South Carolina militia, when he saw the ship enter the harbor, turned to his aide and lieutenant, John Wilson, and said, "Oh, God! Help us all. Has it truly come to this?" Beauregard and Anderson were friends. Some say that they were closest friends, best friends. Now they would be forced into battle against one another. Politics does this sometimes. It's a wretched thing. As a result, Beauregard ordered the bombardment of the fort, and the fort was forced to capitulate. Immediately, Beauregard sent supply garrisons to make sure that the men that he had just been bombarding were fed, cared for, and received whatever medical treatment they might need.

17. ***Briefly recount the story of the McGill family, and explain how their experience demonstrates the great tragedy of the War Between the States.*** The McGills were a clan of Scots Irish immigrants who made their way into America and made good. They settled in Scottsville, Kentucky. Harlan and Thelma McGill had six children: Angus, Ian, Stuart, James, Louisa, and baby Margaret. Each of these children worked hard alongside Harlan and Thelma in building up the family estate there in Scottsville, Kentucky, just over the border from Tennessee. They worked hard and developed a prosperous little truck farm and dairy operation.

Being fiercely patriotic and loyal to their adopted homeland, they raised their children to be real patriots. Angus, Ian, and Stuart, all went off to study at West Point and entered the United States military. Angus and Ian fought together in the Mexican War and rose to, in Angus' case, a lieutenant colonel, and in Ian's case, a major in the United States Army Corps. Stuart was too young to fight in the Mexican War, but, by the time the War Between the States broke out in 1861, he was already in his third year at West Point. James was back home working at the farm; he was only fourteen in 1861, when the war broke out. Louisa had married at the age of eighteen. She married the best friend of Angus and his roommate from West Point, Walter Evans, who was from Tennessee.

So here's this family, a great patriotic family, a great success story. They came as immigrants with absolutely nothing, established themselves, worked hard, raised their family, sent them off, and saw great success. They were so proud of their accomplishments and of their family. When the war broke out, Angus and Ian were both in command of separate corps in the U.S. Army. They were deeply torn. Kentucky, which had tried to secede from the Union and join the South, ultimately was constrained from doing so by a detachment of the Army of the Potomac, which was sent to surround the state capital to prevent Kentucky from seceding from the Union. Martial law was imposed, and that created a great deal of conflict within the state itself, even rioting a time or two in towns like Louisville. There was a sense in which most people in Kentucky thought the squabble between the North and the South would resolve itself quickly because, as the McGills often said, "We have so much. Why would we risk it all on a fight that matters so little?"

Harlan became active in local politics and was a leader in his community in trying to bring together partisans of North and South for healthy dialogue, to wrestle with the big issues, and, hopefully through communication, to hold their community together.

Meanwhile Angus and Ian had difficult decisions to make. Both were offered promotions in the Union Army and both were summoned by their friends in the Confederacy to assume positions in the hastily constructed Confederate armies of each of the Southern states. Angus and Ian got together just outside Washington, D.C., and Fredericksburg, Virginia. They sat down and talked together, they prayed together, and they wrestled over the course of some eighteen hours spanning two days, where they just fought within their souls to make a decision about what they should do.

Could they actually enter either army and fight against what they knew would be their friends. Almost every West Point class over the course of the last fifteen years was almost evenly divided, some siding with their sovereign states in the South and some siding with the sovereign states in the North, some having to flip flops sides and wrestling all the while. In the end, when they had to go back and report to their corps back in Washington, D.C., neither Angus nor Ian had firmly resolved in their minds what they would do. Before the end of 1861, Angus decided to ally himself with the South, and Ian decided to remain in the Union army. Stuart, who was still at West Point, was likewise torn. He didn't have the benefit of spending those eighteen hours of prayer, conversation, and, as Ian would later say, "obscene amounts of good coffee". Instead, he had to resolve himself on his own. His best friend, and his roommate, had determined that, though he was from Mississippi, he could not take up arms against the Stars and the Stripes; he determined that he would stay in the Union Army. His mentor, and now his brother-in-law, Walter Evans, had likewise determined to stay with the Union. Though he was from Tennessee and married to Louisa, he simply could not imagine fighting against his beloved nation, the United States of America. But Stuart, wrestling with constitutional issues and wrestling with his own sense of Southernness, finally resolved that he would join Angus and fight for the South.

That Christmas the whole family got together on the little farm in Scottsville. With Mom and Dad and all six kids and their families — by this time, there were nine grandchildren — they prayed together and wept together. They had always been anti-slavery. They had always been American patriots. Now they found themselves pitted on opposite sides. On Christmas morning, they gathered around the tree to sing hymns, Angus in his Confederate gray and Ian in his Union blue. Stuart did not yet have a uniform, but he wore the Stars and Bars on his shoulder. As they held one another, gathered around the tree, they wept. Before the year was out, they would find themselves on opposite sides of some of the fiercest battles of the war.

In fact, already Angus and Ian had been on opposite sides at the Battle of Bull Run. It was the first great battle of the war after Fort Sumter. It was just outside Washington, D.C. The Union army, which outnumbered the Southern forces some eight to one at the beginning of the war but was poorly organized, determined in haste to end the war quickly by marching on the newly-minted capitol of the Confederacy, Richmond, Virginia. It was simply a matter of crossing over the river from Washington, D.C., into Virginia, marching southward, and surrounding the city. It was a fine plan except that the corps had not developed good communication techniques and the commanders were not entirely in sync, and there were still rivalries among various commanders as they jockeyed for proper positioning within the army. There was an interesting note exchanged between Angus and Ian. Angus writing to his brother, “If this be war, it is utter foolishness, indeed.”

The Union army was met almost immediately just outside the little village of Manassas. Southern resistance was immediate and fierce, catching the Union soldiers by surprise. The Union was so confident, both in their numbers and their prowess, that many of the wives and daughters, friends and socialites from Washington, D.C., had made their way out from Washington in their carriages and lined the roadway to cheer on the Union army as they passed. They planned to have a picnic above the battlefield to watch the slaughter and the destruction of the Confederate forces. Instead, Stonewall Jackson, at the time a little known colonel, earned his name. He was a stone wall. With a tiny corps of men, he was able to repulse the thrust of the Union attack, throwing the Union forces into utter disarray. As they began an orderly retreat, the corps behind them began to panic, and they started scrambling back toward Washington, D.C. Before long, it was full flight and utter chaos. As they ran past, in absolute fear, all the socialites, wives, and daughters gathered for their picnic, suddenly all the wives and daughters began to gather up their belongings and tried to crowd their carriages onto the narrow roadways back to Washington, D.C., clogging the roads, creating a terrible traffic jam — which Washington, D.C. has had ever since. A devastating defeat, both moral and military, against the vastly superior Union army went into the books, and suddenly, fear ran through the whole land. Ian and Angus were both there. They witnessed from the rear of the battlefield and later exchanged letters. “It was almost comical,” Ian said, “but only almost, for I fear we are in for a long terrible tragedy.” Meanwhile, young Stuart had joined the corps, and he was part of the Texas Sixth. Fourteen-year-old James snuck off from the farm one night late in the winter of 1861 just after that Christmas gathering. Before the end of January, he had linked up with the army of Tennessee, and all four brothers found themselves on the battlefield of Shiloh that summer in West Tennessee in 1862. Fortunately, three of the brothers, before the calamitous days of the final battle, had been dispatched elsewhere, but in the bloodiest days of the war up to that time, they began to realize that their family was torn asunder forever just like their nation.

In the end, Angus, Ian, Stuart, James, Walter, Louise’s husband, as well as Margaret’s husband, Patrick McKilligan, were all killed in the war, every one of them. Harlan and Thelma survived the death of all of their sons and both of their sons-in-law. They wrote a small account of the war afterwards and described the tragedy and the horror of the destruction of their family, their hopes, and their dreams, and, they believed, the possibility of the nation to endure long in freedom and liberty.

One of the interesting side lights in all that is that Angus and Ian actually met one time on the battlefield. It was during the valley campaign in the Shenandoah Valley. Angus was under the command of General Stonewall Jackson. He was a part of that evasive strategy of Stonewall's that enabled the Southern forces to march six hundred fifty miles in forty days, zigzagging through the Shenandoah Valley, evading the North. There were only sixteen thousand men in Stonewall's corp. There were some sixty-five thousand men in the Union army. They were outnumbered more than three to one, almost four to one. Nevertheless, were able to score victory after victory after victory.

One night in a raiding party, Angus was out with five scouts and came across a small encampment of Union soldiers who were likewise scouting the lines trying to find Stonewall in the midst of this crazy zigzag through the Shenandoah Valley. Angus mobilized his five men in a triangulating formation to sweep in on the small corps of Union soldiers. They made it in without loss of life on their side; they wound up killing two of the Union soldiers. Angus burst into one of the tents to find the commander sitting on a campaign stool with maps in front of him, and it was his brother, Ian. He had his pistol drawn and was ready to fire when he saw that it was his brother, and with trembling hand he dropped his weapon. Ian picked up his side arm, aimed it straight at his brother, and he said, "You're under arrest." His brother said, "You're surrounded." Ian laid down his weapon and said, "Story of the war." They walked away, killed on separate battlefields later the next year. Their story was told by their men ever after as one of the great tragedies of the war. Brother against brother.

It was at the Battle of Franklin, that the last of the McGills met his fate. Young James was just fourteen when the war began. Now, almost eighteen years old and a hardened veteran, he stood with his commander atop Winstead Hill when the order was given to charge the battlements down at Carter House. He was in the same brigade with E.M. Bounds, his friend and his chaplain, who had become a pastor of the Methodist Church here in Franklin and who was responsible for securing the land and identifying the bodies that would be buried at Carnton. He was just behind Patrick Cleburne when that firebrand Irish general was struck down right about where the old Pizza Hut used to be on Columbia Avenue. James fought all the way to the trenches that had been dug in across the property of the Carters, from the house all the way over to their cotton gin across the street from the house on Columbia Pike. He was actually climbing over the battlements when a Minié ball struck him — one of those Minié balls that you can see the effects of on the backside of the most battle-scarred building still standing in the United States, one of the outbuildings there at Carter House here in Franklin. Young James was struck in the chest by a Minié ball. It didn't kill him immediately. It nearly tore off his left arm, shattered his chest, and left a gaping hole in his windpipe. As he gurgled his last words on the battlefield, he said, "Why? Why did we do this to each other?"

## Opportunity No. 19

Administer before Lesson 41

### Identify the following:

1. **Ulysses S. Grant:** in 1864, Ulysses S. Grant became the commander of the Union armies; a genuine turning point in the war
2. **1848 revolutions:** attempted revolutions throughout Europe, fought by socialist ideologues
3. **Siege of Vicksburg:** May-July, 1863; a crushing defeat for the South; fought at Vicksburg, Mississippi
4. **Joshua Chamberlain:** a Northern general and Christian; fought at the Battle of Gettysburg
5. **The Battle of Gettysburg:** battle fought in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania; June-July, 1863
6. **total war:** the idea that, to win the war, the North should abandon in theory all pretense, which had been abandoned in practice long before, of attempting to follow Augustine's just war theory. Abandon all pretense of not taking the battle to the citizenry because as the argument went, the problem with the South is the culture of the South. It was the people back home. It wasn't just the army. Sherman and Grant argued that, in order to beat the South, they had to crush the *South*, not just the South's army. It wasn't enough to just beat Lee in the field, they had to burn Atlanta to the ground.
7. **Nostalgia:** there was diagnosed in the Southern field manuals for the very first time a disease that Southern soldiers often got. Medics and chaplains were guided in the field manuals about how to deal with this disease. The disease was called nostalgia, defined as a paralyzing longing for home. In the South, the Southerners were fighting for their homes. They weren't fighting for a cause. They weren't fighting for a political ideology. They were extraordinarily diverse. Ninety-two percent, it is estimated, of Southern fighters in the field had no investment whatsoever in the trade and tariff issues. They didn't even know what trade and tariff issues were. They probably couldn't even have defined a tariff. And, of course, they owned no slaves and had no commitment to the slavery issue. They thought they were fighting for home. They had this deep and abiding longing for home. With every battle and with every loss, they longed for home all the more. It was what they set their affections on. It was what they staked their lives on. As the war dragged on and on, their longing for home became greater and made them a less able fighting force. They just wanted to go home.
8. **E.M. Bounds:** a chaplain for the Southern armies, even though he had affections for the North and was brother to four Union soldiers and always had supported the Union cause. Because of a very strange quirk in the laws of Missouri, just outside St. Louis, where he pastored a church, because he wouldn't surrender the church's property to Union soldiers who were doing pledges of allegiance throughout the region, he was arrested and, in a prisoner exchange, wound up in the ranks of the Confederates and thought that this was God's purpose for him, although he wouldn't have ever chosen it. He served as a chaplain in the Confederate army. He found himself in the Battle of Franklin. It was Bounds who, after that terrible battle — which the South interestingly technically won but because of the devastating losses could never really mount a fighting force again — Bounds went through the whole battlefield and identified bodies, secured a little plot of land over at Carnton Plantation, and ensured that there would be a memorial to all those who lost their lives. He would later pastor the little Methodist Church off the square in downtown Franklin. As an old man, he penned classic books on prayer, some of the greatest books on prayer that have ever been written in the English language.

9. **Luddites:** those who saw that new industrial mechanizations in the factories of Western Europe meant that technology could conceivably replace human beings, that jobs were at risk because machines were far more efficient. There was the real beginning of the clash between Old World peasantry and New World technology.
10. **Communist Manifesto:** by 1848, Karl Marx and Frederick Engels had written their grand manifesto that ignited the fires of revolution throughout Europe. *The Communist Manifesto* made ten specific demands. Read today, the demands of the Communist Manifesto sound hardly radical at all. In fact, the list of demands sounds like the Republican Party platform. Marx and Engels wanted to adjust property rights so that government had a hand in what private property owners could or could not do — regulation of those properties. They wanted a graduated or progressive income tax. They wanted adjustments to inheritance rights. They wanted to be able to confiscate the rights of rebels or aliens. They wanted state control and regulation of banking and trade. They wanted state control and regulation of transport and communication. They wanted state control of economic exchanges so that government's primary job was to stir up, to move along, and to regulate the economy. They wanted state-controlled labor and industry so that labor stoppages and strikes could be regulated and controlled by the government. They wanted regulation and corporatization of agriculture, and of course, comprehensive regulation and control of education — the ten points of the Communist Manifesto. All of which have been fulfilled, satisfied in spades, in virtually every society in Western civilization.
11. **Origin of the Species:** book written by Charles Darwin in 1859 promoting evolution
12. **Plan for Reform:** in 1854, Horace Mann drew up his *Plan for Reform*. Horace Mann was primarily an educator and educational philosopher, but his vision was the transformation of all society, with public education as the primary tool to bring about this radical transformation of the whole culture and society. His primary outline followed closely that of Marx and Engels but with slight adjustments. He argued that there needed to be equitability in time, gifts, and possessions, and that, therefore education's primary purpose was to level the playing field for everybody, treat everybody exactly the same. He wanted progressive civic responsibility. He wanted generational egalitarianism, with a diminution of the importance of the elderly. In other words, it's a Pepsi generation mentality — let's remove the elders and bring about a generational change. He wanted universal protection in times of emergency — the ability of the government, for instance, to restrict travel or to restrict privacy rights in the name of safety, when you fly or when you take a train or whatever. He wanted equitability in organized commerce, equitable access to expression and travel, and a centrally organized economic exchanges, organized justice, labor, and industry, equitable distribution of resources and universal access to education. In other words, it was *The Communist Manifesto* fleshed out into a curriculum form, a scope and sequence that could be taught to children at the earliest ages, so they could be brought along and thus become helpful, useful members of the larger, stratified, societal structure.
13. **ideological nationalism:** in the nineteenth century, particularly in the middle of the nineteenth century, all around the Western world there was a new ideological fashion that gripped the minds of the intelligentsia, the academics, the politicians. It was the idea of ideological nationalism, a peculiar idea that arose in the nineteenth century. It's why all the fiefdoms, kingdoms, principalities, and duchies of once-diverse lands like the Germanics and the various Italian Republics in the middle of the nineteenth century were forged into multilingual, often multicultural, amorphous entities called nation-states.
14. **Reconstruction:** various plans to rebuild the South and readmit the seceding states back to the Union; some Reconstruction plans were about reconciliation, but some were about punishing the South
15. **Carpetbaggers & Scalawags:** *Carpetbaggers* were people from the North who came to the South to exploit new opportunities, so-called because they carried their belongings in what was then a very popular style of lug-



gage made out of what appeared to be carpets. *Scalawags* were Southerners who likewise seized the opportunity to exploit these new circumstances, and they were considered scoundrels by their fellows.

### Essay Questions:

**16. Using the unlikely friendship of Abraham Lincoln and Alexander Stephens or the friendship of Winfield Scott and Robert E. Lee, explain the personal nature of history.**

Abraham Lincoln (1809–1865) and Alexander Stephens (1812–1883)

One of the most unusual friendships was Abraham Lincoln and Alexander Stephen, Lincoln's best friend for years in Washington, D.C.

Southern State Sovereignty v. Northern Federal Hegemony

Conservative Democrat v. Liberal: Nationalist

Urbane Scholar v. Backwoods Lawyer

Devout Presbyterian v. Skeptical Convert

Successful in Life v. Disappointing Life

Diminutive and Frail v. Lanky and Rugged

Stephens became the vice president of the Confederacy. Lincoln, of course, was president of the Union. They couldn't have been more opposite. Stephens barely weighed one hundred and ten pounds and was, he claimed, just over five-foot-two, but in fact, he was probably wasn't quite five-foot-one. Abraham Lincoln, on the other hand, was tall and lanky at six-foot-three. Stephens was a man who believed ardently in Southern state sovereignty while Lincoln believed in Northern federal hegemony. Stephens was a conservative Democrat while Lincoln was a liberal and a nationalist. Stephens was a classical scholar, bookish and urbane, whereas Lincoln was largely self-taught; he was a backwoods lawyer. His greatest fame came in his early days in rail-splitting contests. He was widely regarded as an inventor of various mechanisms for river rafts. Stephens probably never set foot on a river raft, maybe never even saw one. Stephens was a devout Presbyterian all his life. Lincoln was a skeptic most of his life until his rather dramatic conversion in the last two years of his life. Stephens was successful in everything that he ever tried — investments, land acquisition, and politics — whereas Lincoln seemed to have failed at everything, whether it was in his personal life, in his business life, or in his political life. Stephens was diminutive and frail. Lincoln was an outdoorsman, lanky and rugged. Nevertheless, there was something that drew these two opposites together when they were in Washington, D.C. *Harper's Weekly* has an interesting little sketch of the two men from 1849, walking along the Potomac together. It looks like a daddy and his child almost. They made quite a sight. Stephens was always freezing cold, so he would always have big woolen jackets, and then he would always drape around himself a great cloak. Lincoln was always hot, mopping his brow that was inevitably sweating with dripping torrents, sleeves always rolled up.

Stephens: 1843–1860 v. Lincoln: 1847–1849

Christian Defensive War v. Total War

Conditional Peace v. Unconditional of Victory

Stephens was impeccably attired, and Lincoln could care less about his appearance. Often before they would enter the Capitol building, Stephens would sit Lincoln down on a bench so that he could mop down the dust off his friend's jacket. Stephens served in Congress from 1843 until he resigned at the secession. Lincoln only had two years in Congress. Stephens believed that the war could only be conducted as a Christian defensive war. Lincoln came to believe in total war. Stephens was a long advocate of what he called conditional peace. In other words, let's negotiate; let's find a way to moderate the claims of both North and South. Lincoln wanted unconditional standards for victory. They couldn't have been more opposite, yet, even during the course of the war, they carried on an affectionate correspondence. They cared for one another. It's a great reminder that even in the midst of fierce conflicts we can treat each other like human beings, maintain appropriate cordiality, and that this might even be our strength. It is said that Lincoln's plan for Reconstruction was largely shaped by his friendship with Alexander Stephens. The great tragedy following the war is that Lincoln was never able to implement his plan. Instead his plan was hijacked by the Radical Republicans, and the fury of the North was unleashed on the South. Lincoln would never have allowed that. He had already asked his friend, Alexander Stephens, to help him to gently rehabilitate the South.

Robert E. Lee (1807–1870) and Winfield Scott (1786–1866)

State Sovereignty Virginian v. Unionist Virginian

Conservative Democrat v. Liberal Nationalist

Apolitical Military Careerist v. Political Careerist

Devout Episcopalian v. Skeptical Convert

Scion of Virginia Gentry v. Self-Made Man

Quiet Engineer v. Brash Cavalry Officer

Another very unlikely friendship was the friendship between Robert E. Lee and Winfield Scott. Again, they could hardly have been more different. Lee was a state sovereignty Virginian. Scott was a unionist Virginian. Lee was a conservative Democrat, whereas Scott was a liberal nationalist. Lee couldn't care less about politics — he was a military man through and through — whereas Scott, though he was in the military, was in the military because of his political aspirations. Lee was a devout Episcopalian all of his life. Scott was a skeptic all the way up until his failure in command of the Union forces, at which point, the horrors of war and his own failure brought him to Christ. Lee was the scion of Virginian gentry. Scott was a self-made man. Lee was a quiet, unassuming engineer, whereas Scott was a brash, cavalry officer brandishing his sword at Washington soirées, always wearing silk about his neck and an impeccable uniform. It was as if he was always in costume and in character, wherever he was. Lee was quiet, unassuming, and unpretentious.

Determined to Focus on Family v. Determined Politician

Brilliant Strategist v. Astute Opportunist

Principled Decisions v. Pragmatic Decisions

Lee was determined all throughout the whole conflict to focus on his family. Scott abandoned his family for the purpose of his political aspirations. Lee was a brilliant strategist. Scott was an astute opportunist. Lee based all his decisions on carefully worked-out principles, whereas Scott was a pragmatist, and his decisions were based on what would work and what would work fastest and best for himself. Amazingly, the two men were friends from

the time of the Mexican War all the way up through the conflict of the War Between the States. The two men had great affection for one another. In fact, it is said that Scott came to Christ largely because of the influence of Lee and Lee's family.

I highlight these two unlikely friendships for a couple reasons. One, it's helpful to remember that in a war that was so brutal and so awful, there really was a human dimension to the story that went beyond the sorrow of loss. These were real people who had real stories and real connections with one another over the course of time. They were not one dimensional. They were complex human beings, and their story is incredibly complex. It's part of the reason that there is so much pathos in this war, because the people who were involved were so extraordinary and so complex. This is not something that can simply be caricatured.

The second reason that I highlight these friendships is that often when the war is discussed by historians, they only talk about the deep animosities that existed. There were a lot of personal enemies. Anytime you have a war, anytime you have a conflict, broken personal relationships figure in. More often than not, great conflicts are more about the personal conflicts between individuals than the actual issues. This has recurred again and again in the course of the history of nations. It occurs in families. It's a regular occurrence across the whole of history.

17. ***Briefly explain the ten major issues that the victors faced as they readmitted Southern States while seeking to maintain their vision of National Union.*** Following the Civil War, the victors, who were ideological nationalists, had a whole series of questions that they had to answer. There were issues that were really pressing. Once you win, what do you do with Louisiana? Abraham Lincoln had a plan for Reconstruction. Three days before he was assassinated, he outlined his plan. It was really remarkable. He said,

If we reject and spurn [our Southern brothers], we do our utmost to disorganize and disperse them. We, in fact, say to the white man: You are worthless or worse; we will neither help you nor be helped by you. To the blacks we say: This cup of liberty which these, your old masters, held to your lips, we will dash from you, and leave you to the chances of gathering the spilled and scattered contents in some vague and undefined when, where, and how. ... We [need to] encourage the hearts and nerve the arms of twelve thousand to adhere to their work, and argue for it, and proselyte for it, and fight for it, and feed it, and grow it, and ripen it to a complete success.

He wanted to bring what remnants of the South he could back into the Union as quickly as possible. He argued that the forensics of how and when and why the states left the Union in the first place were unhelpful in the political discourse in bringing them back; all that should be set aside, like the war should be set aside.

Loyalty Pledges to the Union

Suffrage and the Franchise to Vote

The Right to Stand as Officeholders

To be sure, there were questions. For a person to be able to vote in the future, does he have to take loyalty pledges to the Union? Is that even constitutional? How do you expand suffrage and the franchise to vote? Do those who have never had any freedoms before, do they need to be *taught* how to have freedom or do you just *give* them freedom? Who has the right to stand as an officeholder? Does a former member of the Confederate Army have the right to stand as an officeholder? Do former members of Congress in the United States, who then seceded and remained loyal to their state, have the right to be officeholders? Do we convict them of crimes?

### The Passage of Constitutional Amendments

#### Resolution of Bonds, Debts, and Titles

#### Reversion of Property Rights and Claims

Almost immediately there was concern that the Emancipation Proclamation, though having the form of an executive order, did not have the force of law, therefore constitutional changes would have to be undertaken. How do you resolve the war bonds, debts, and titles? Who owns what property? Do property rights revert to their pre-war status? Properties that were seized during the war, do they now belong to the victors? How do you settle those issues?

#### The Integrity of State Borders

There was the question of the integrity of state borders. Some states had divided. Contrary to the Constitution, one state was even split and recognized by the federal government with West Virginia receiving its own sovereignty. What about East Tennessee, should they have that same right? Should borders revert to their old boundaries, or should new states be created by fiat, like the nations of Europe? Should new lines be drawn? Texas was too large, many said. Florida did not make sense in its present boundaries. South Florida had very little in common with the panhandle of Florida. "Chop it up. Give those pieces to other states." "Georgia is too vast," they said.

#### The Constitutionality of Structural Change

There was the whole question of whether or not the federal government even had the constitutional right to bring about these structural changes. Read the Constitution and the federal government doesn't have a right to do any of this. Lincoln said in his Reconstruction address that we had no authority and no precedent to do any of the things that are now forced upon us to do.

#### Citizenship Restoration and Full Civil Rights

#### Military Districts and Re-admission to the Union

How do you restore citizenship and to whom do you restore citizenship? Is there a tiered process? Who gets full civil rights? How do military districts gain re-admittance to the Union?

18. ***Why is it fair to say that the American Civil War was not an isolated event? Support your answer with specific details.*** They led to a whole host of wars. We tend to think that the American Civil War was a stand-alone event, unique to America, that it was a peculiar after-effect of a uniquely American experience. I suppose all peoples love to flatter themselves with their own uniqueness and the peculiarity of their experience. But the fact is that ideological nationalism wrought civil war of a peculiar sort all throughout Christendom, all at the same time. In fact, there was a great deal of overlap between these various wars.

Did you know that Garibaldi, the hero of Italian Republicanism, was offered the full command of the Union armies by Abraham Lincoln in 1862? The only reason Garibaldi didn't take it is that he wanted the title commander in chief, and Lincoln told him, constitutionally, he was incapable of bestowing that honor. Garibaldi replied, *Change the Constitution*. Lincoln replied, *We're trying to*. Ultimately he did, but not in order to affect that.

Latin America: Bolívar: 1807–1852

In Latin America, nationalistic, ideological, revolutions and civil wars were exported to a whole host of Spanish colonies led by Simón Bolívar, beginning in 1807 and extending all the way to 1852, all across the Latin American continent. Most of the nations that exist today from Ecuador and Bolivia to Peru, Colombia, and Venezuela, were first liberated in a series of civil wars.

Germany: Bismarck: 1859–1866

Germany, as you know, was not a single nation throughout the whole of its history. Rather, in 1848, what we today call Germany was still some nineteen separate kingdoms and principalities and electorates. It was during the nineteenth century under the leadership of Otto von Bismarck and the Prussian royal house of the Hohenzollern that a civil war was fought, a civil war that also brought other nations into the fray. The Prussian-Franco War, the war between Prussia and France, was a direct result of this long engagement of civil war that forced a union of the once seceding states.

Italy: Garibaldi: 1833–1866

Garibaldi wrenched the five different kingdoms of Italy through a long and difficult series of civil wars and revolutions and forged them into a single nation-state.

Ideological nationalists believed in centralization. They believed in union. They believed that it was necessary to have, if possible, transcontinental national empires, ignoring age-old differences between cultures, peoples, and languages, to force together a political union because they believed that artificial political union was more stable and more progressive than the old idea of peoples, commonwealths, and culture determining boundaries.

North America: Lincoln: 1860–1865

The American Civil War was just one more in this long list of nationalistic, ideological civil conflicts. It was unique in many ways, as were each of the others. It had its own distinctive flavor, and, quite frankly, the American Civil War was among the bloodiest of all of them if you exclude the Russian Civil War. But it was just one in a long line.

Boer: Kitchener: 1895–1902

Russia: Lenin: 1896–1922

There was the Boer War in South Africa from 1895 to 1902, and then the horrific Russian Civil War, which really began with armed conflict in 1896. It was not concluded until finally the White Russian army was annihilated by Trotsky's Red army in 1922. It was the bloodiest civil war in human history up to that point, outstripping the American Civil War three-to-one in casualties.

Spain: Franco: 1936–1939

The Spanish Civil War under Generalissimo Franco, just prior to World War II, was yet another of these.

We could add to this long list, a host of other wars across the North African littoral and throughout the Middle East. In fact, Victor Davis Hanson, a brilliant scholar of antiquity particularly focusing on the influence of Greek civilization but now a consultant to the State Department, has argued that the current unrest in the Middle East is just the backlash, the final whimpers, of ideological nationalism. You can explain the conflicts of the Ba'athist Party in Syria and Iraq and the amalgamation of the Arabian peninsula under the Saud family and the subsuming of the Hejaz in the Tri'lhas mountains altogether into a single nation-state. All of that is really a part of this whole movement of nationalism.

## Opportunity No. 20

Administer before Lesson 43

### Identify the following:

1. **Manifest Destiny:** the idea was that somehow or another it was woven into the fabric of the nature of things, if not the will of Almighty God, that the whole American continent be united in one culture, for one purpose, for the spreading of freedom around the world, the establishment of certain peculiar ideas. The philosophy of Manifest Destiny became the dominating theme of early American civilization. It was woven into the stories and became the theme of its songs and poetry. It was reflected in its architecture and art. At every turn, there was a reinforcement that America was *supposed* to spread across the entire continent.
2. **American exceptionalism:** other nations find their identity and cohesion in ethnicity, or geography, or partisan ideology, or cultural tradition. But America was founded on certain ideas — ideas about freedom, human dignity, social responsibility. It was this profound peculiarity that most struck Alexis de Tocqueville during his famous visit to the land at the beginning of the nineteenth century. He called it American exceptionalism.
3. **Transcendentalism:** a hybrid of old Greek Platonic philosophy with a few Christian ideas and virtues tossed in, but dispatching the idea of a sovereign God, the Trinity, and redemption and sin. It was a sort of popularized civil religion with a hefty dose of romanticism thrown in for good measure.
4. **American Utopianism:** a hybridized version of what the Puritans and Pilgrims had as they crossed the ocean looking to find a new land where they could carve out a home for themselves, where there would be freedom — freedom for their faith, freedom for their children, and freedom for their futures. Now with the influence of Manifest Destiny and transcendentalism, this romantic view became the idea that people could go out, and they could create a perfect community where everyone could live in harmony. If everyone ate right, had the right jobs, and pitched in together, then the horrible effects of sin could be blunted and even kept at bay.
5. **Hudson River School:** a group of painters who focused on the ideas of old Christendom — the romance, the chivalry, the pageantry, and the glory — back before it became encrusted by the cold machinelike maws of the Industrial Revolution and Enlightenment norms. But even better for them than the marvel of ancient chivalry was the current estate of those chivalric norms, was the romance in the ruin that's not even evident immediately in its original glory. Here there's a kind of melancholy haunting. All of the sheen is off and now there's a ruggedness, a power, a wistfulness, a nostalgia for what is lost but a kind of glory in what remains. So, the ruin has more attraction than the original.

Likewise, there's this kind of backward glance to the glory of ancient civilizations, the marvel of what the Greeks, the Romans, the Babylonians, and the Egyptians accomplished. Perhaps even more powerful are the ruins of those old civilizations.

Artistic expression the likes of which the world had hardly ever seen before. It portrays a romanticized nature, man coming into the midst of majestic glories the likes of which man had hardly ever seen before. The mountains are taller, the cliffs are steeper, the sunshine is brighter, the water is cooler, and everything is pure.

Many of the members of the Hudson River School were decidedly anti-Romantic. Many of them were committed Christians, attempting to resist the tug of Romanticism, but even as they painted the scenes of the West, they fed the popular hunger for a Romantic vision.

6. **conestoga**: covered wagons used by pioneers migrating West.
7. **Jamestown**: the first permanent English settlement in North America; went to war with the Native Americans quickly
8. **Cherokee Republic**: amazingly, among the Cherokee, there was ready reception of the gospel. In fact, there were old stories, sort of bridges to Christianity, that made supreme sense to Cherokee leaders when they heard the gospel. It was as if God had prepared their culture ahead of time. So the Cherokee people became a Christian tribe. They began to reform their tribe in accordance with the principles that they saw in the gospel.

1824: Capitol at New Echota

By 1824, they had established a sort of federal government for the Cherokee Republic and had established a capital at New Echota.

1827: The Cherokee Republic

Elias Boudinot, John Ridge, and John Ross

By 1827, they had sought recognition with foreign governments as the Cherokee Republic. A host of tribal leaders and great Cherokee chiefs, including the adopted Elias Boudinot, John Ridge, and John Ross, led the Cherokee people and sought to negotiate peaceful settlements with the government of the United States.

9. **transcontinental railroad**: a railroad line that connected both the East coast and the West coast
10. **Ellis Island**: an island in New York Harbor overlooking the Statue of Liberty that was used as an immigration processing station from 1892–1954
11. **Statue of Liberty**: a gift from the French to celebrate the United States' centennial celebration in 1876; designed by Frédéric Bartholdi

### Essay Questions:

12. **Briefly explain the pattern of cultural progress as it is manifested in the Westward expansion of the United States. In your answer, provide specific examples of this pattern in the areas of literature, art, music and politics.** Inevitably philosophies don't become popular and widely accepted in the ordinary populace until they are filtered through a whole series of cultural influencers. The idea of Manifest Destiny and transcendentalism and utopianism, the cowboy ethic of America, didn't come to America naturally, it had to be nurtured and imbibed, in a sense, with all the tenacity of a modern-day Madison Avenue branding marketer. This idea had to be filtered through the whole of the culture from philosophers to those who wrote the stories, to those who created the music, to those who painted the paintings and carved the sculptures and forged the technologies and built the buildings and crafted the economic relationships and ultimately wrote the bills in Congress, and only then did the whole culture get it.

We see this westward glance filtering through the whole of the cultural apparatus. It really started with Thomas Jefferson and the Louisiana Purchase in 1803, the Lewis and Clark Expedition in 1804, and the first foreign war fought by the United States, the war against the Muslim pirates, the Barbary Pirates, along the coast of the North Africa littoral. In fact, it was at Tripoli that Marines first charged onto the shore and gained one of the most famous lines in their fight song: "from the Halls of Montezuma to the shores of Tripoli".

To open up this vast new territory, it was necessary to have covered wagons, Conestogas; the use of the super highways of the day, the rivers, with huge flatboats to navigate them; and stagecoaches. With the transcontinental railroad, there was the ability to connect from point to point, but it would really require things like the cutting of vast new trails and passes through the mountains, steamboats, and clipper ships to keep the flow of goods and peoples going.

#### Communication

##### The Pony Express

The Pony Express was an extraordinary experiment. It only lasted eighteen months, but it left a kind of indelible mark on the American West.

##### Stringing Telegraph Lines

And then there was the stringing of telegraph lines — the reason the Pony Express failed was the invention of the telegraph and the immediate extension of that technology to the whole of the West.

##### Tabloids, Newspapers, and Magazines

With the vast expansion of that technology utilizing new automation and the ability to receive news instantaneously by telegraph, suddenly tabloids, newspapers, and magazines sprung up everywhere. It was an explosion of technology and information the likes of which the world had never seen before. It was astonishing. Something could happen in Boston on a Tuesday, and by Wednesday morning people in San Francisco could know about it. The world had never seen such a thing.

#### Migration

##### Oregon and Santa Fe Trails

##### The 49'ers and the Gold Rush

##### The Great Land Rushes

This paved the way for mass migrations along the Oregon Trail and along the Santa Fe Trail. Tens of thousands of people rushed to California to cash in and find their gold in the California Gold Rush of '49. Then the federal government opened up vast swaths of land to settlers and homesteaders in the great land rushes. It was an incredible time.

Thus a new ideological foundation was laid for America. Initially, the old world vision of Christendom had prevailed, which was that cultures predominated and governments were subservient to cultures. Now, covering this vast territory and the necessity of holding it all together, it became important to transfer authority from the culture to the government. Likewise, the old world, which was held together by covenants, now demanded the complexities of new agreements to be sealed with contracts. Thus was forged a transcontinental empire.

13. ***How do the rapid changes in America through immigration and modernization demonstrate the advantages and disadvantages of our idea of change? Support your answer with specific examples.*** Transformation was so fast and so furious that it changed everything about the nation and everything about our world. It created an astonishing amount of urban growth. Did you know that, in 1850, ninety percent of America lived out on the farms? Ninety percent of America! By the year 2000, ninety percent of



America lived in cities or suburbs. That's a pretty dramatic flip-flop. In 1900, fifty percent of America was rural, which meant that this massive change had occurred in just fifty years' time.

With the world wars, the process was accelerated. Do you realize that in America today ninety percent of buildings are less than thirty years old? *Ninety* percent of all the buildings that you see anywhere are less than thirty years old. Part of that is, you know, if a building gets to be about twenty-five or thirty years old, we just tear it down; we build something new. When I was a little boy, I remember sitting on my grandfather's lap in Houston, Texas, at a Colt 45's baseball game when Judge Roy Hofheinz, the owner of the team and one of the most prominent citizens of Houston, announced that he was going to build the eighth wonder of the world. They rolled out these giant, butcher-paper renderings of something that was going to be called the Astrodome. The experts thought he was crazy. *No one can build a dome!* Engineers said that the stress on the dome would be impossibly great, the dome would be dangerous, and it would surely collapse. But there was Judge Roy Hofheinz, standing behind home plate saying, "Just one hundred fifty yards from home plate in Colt 45 Stadium, we're going to build a brand-new stadium that will be an enduring mark and put Houston on the map of the world forever." By the time I was a young adult, the Astrodome was a dump. And the only thing that it was worth using for was a rodeo. Today, it is still standing, amazingly, but only used for things like truck pulls and country western concerts. Right next to it is this massive Reliant Stadium. You could actually put two Astrodomes on the inside of Reliant Stadium. That's taken place in just forty years' time. There have been nineteen Major League® or NFL® stadiums that have been built and torn down in that time. Do you know how much a stadium costs? The Giants/Jets Stadium, \$1.2 billion. And Jerry Jones' Palace in Dallas...

We're a brand-spankin' new country and our cities are brand-spankin' new. We go through urban renewal. Cities like Detroit bemoan the fact that half of downtown has fallen apart and is abandoned. Did you know that a quarter of the buildings that are abandoned in downtown Detroit have been built since 1970?

That means that America is unique among all the nations of the earth, and not just because of the people that were brought here and melded together, and not just because of the technological changes that facilitated it, but because our very environment itself has been this melting pot, this constantly transforming sort of image.

#### Factory Growth

1850: 10% of Jobs Were Industrial

1950: 45% of Jobs Were Industrial

2000: 15% of Jobs Were Industrial

Factory growth — not only do we have sudden urbanization, but we have sudden industrialization. Prior to the Civil War, the United States' factory presence was largely confined to a narrow strip from Boston to Philadelphia, with a smattering of new outposts of industrial aspiration on the Great Lakes. Ten percent of all the jobs in America at the outbreak of the Civil War were industrial jobs — most of those were in the textile business. By 1950, forty-five percent of all jobs were industrial jobs. Most of those jobs have now been exported, and today only about twelve percent of all American jobs are what we would consider industrial, factory jobs.

#### Private Property

1850: 70% of Citizens Owned Homes

1900: 55% of Citizens Owned Homes

### 2000: 25% of Citizens Owned Homes

In 1900, fifty-five percent of all Americans owned their own homes. That was a dramatic change from 1850 when seventy percent of all Americans actually owned their own homes. Today, less than a quarter of all Americans own their own homes. That figure is rather deceptive because most of us who say that we own our own homes really don't—the banks own them. America was suddenly transformed. Paul Johnson said “In less than fifty years, America was transformed into an engine of productivity and industry.”