



TEACHING AMERICAN HISTORY

READING PACKET FOR OCTOBER 26, 2024 | THE LANGUAGE OF CAMPAIGNING VS. GOVERNING

CORE READING 1: THOMAS JEFFERSON, INAUGURAL ADDRESS | MARCH 4, 1801

SOURCE: <https://teachingamericanhistory.org/document/first-inaugural-address-2/>

Called upon to undertake the duties of the first executive office of our country, I avail myself of the presence of that portion of my fellow-citizens which is here assembled, to express my grateful thanks for the favor with which they have been pleased to look toward me, to declare a sincere consciousness, that the task is above my talents, and that I approach it with those anxious and awful presentiments which the greatness of the charge and the weakness of my powers so justly inspire. A rising nation, spread over a wide and fruitful land, traversing all the seas with the rich productions of their industry, engaged in commerce with nations who feel power and forget right, advancing rapidly to destinies beyond the reach of mortal eye—when I contemplate these transcendent objects, and see the honor, the happiness, and the hopes of this beloved country, committed to the issue and the auspices of this day, I shrink from the contemplation, and humble myself before the magnitude of the undertaking. Utterly, indeed, should I despair, did not the presence of many whom I here see remind me, that, in the other high authorities, provided by our Constitution I shall find resources of wisdom, of virtue, and of zeal, on which to rely under all difficulties. To you, then, gentlemen, who are charged with the sovereign functions of legislation, and to those associated with you, I look with encouragement for that guidance and support which may enable us to steer with safety the vessel in which we are all embarked amidst the conflicting elements of a troubled world.

During the contest of opinion through which we have passed the animation of discussions and of exertions has sometimes worn an aspect which might impose on strangers unused to think freely, and to write what they think; but this being now decided by the voice of the nation, announced according to the rules of the Constitution, all will, of course, arrange themselves under the will of the law, and unite in common efforts for the common good. All, too, will bear in mind this sacred principle, that though the will of the majority is in all cases to prevail, that will to be rightful must be reasonable; that the minority possess their equal rights, which equal laws must protect, and to violate would be oppression. Let us, then, fellow-citizens, unite with one heart and one mind. Let us restore to social intercourse that harmony and affection without which liberty and even life itself are but dreary things. And let us reflect that, having banished from our land that religious intolerance, under which mankind so long bled and suffered, we have yet gained little if we countenance a political intolerance as despotic, as wicked, and capable of as bitter and bloody persecutions. During the throes and convulsions of the ancient world, during the agonizing spasms of infuriated man, seeking through blood and slaughter his long-lost liberty, it was not wonderful that the agitation of the billows should reach even this distant and peaceful shore; that this should be more felt and feared by some and less by others, and should divide opinions as to measures of safety. But every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. We have called by different names brethren of the same principle. We are all Republicans,¹ we are all Federalists. If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it. I know, indeed, that some honest men fear a republican government cannot be strong, that this Government is not strong enough; but would the honest patriot, in the full tide of successful experiment, abandon a government which has so far kept us free and firm on the theoretic and visionary fear that this Government, the world's best hope, may by possibility want energy to preserve itself? I trust not. I believe this, on the contrary, the strongest Government on earth. I believe it the only one where every man, at the call of the law, would fly to the standard of the law, and would meet invasions of the public order as his own personal concern. Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the form of kings to govern him? Let history answer this question.

Let us, then, with courage and confidence, pursue our own Federal and Republican principles, our attachment to union and representative government. Kindly separated by nature and a wide ocean from the exterminating havoc of one quarter of the globe; too



TEACHING AMERICAN HISTORY

high-minded to endure the degradations of the others; possessing a chosen country, with room enough for our descendants to the thousandth and thousandth generation; entertaining a due sense of our equal right to the use of our own faculties, to the acquisitions of our own industry, to honor and confidence from our fellow-citizens, resulting not from birth, but from our actions and their sense of them; enlightened by a benign religion, professed, indeed, and practiced in various forms, yet all of them inculcating honesty, truth, temperance, gratitude, and the love of man; acknowledging and adoring an overruling Providence, which by all its dispensations proves that it delights in the happiness of man here and his greater happiness hereafter^[2]—with all these blessings, what more is necessary to make us a happy and a prosperous people? Still one thing more, fellow-citizens—a wise and frugal Government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government, and this is necessary to close the circle of our felicities.

About to enter, fellow-citizens, on the exercise of duties which comprehend everything dear and valuable to you, it is proper you should understand what I deem the essential principles of our Government, and consequently those which ought to shape its Administration. I will compress them within the narrowest compass they will bear, stating the general principle, but not all its limitations. Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none; the support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against anti-republican tendencies; the preservation of the General Government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet anchor of our peace at home, and safety abroad; a zealous care of the right of election by the people—a mild and safe corrective of abuses which are lopped by the sword of revolution where peaceable remedies are unprovided; absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority, the vital principle of republics, from which there is no appeal but to force, the vital principle and immediate parent of despotism; a well-disciplined militia, our best reliance in peace and for the first moments of war, till regulars may relieve them; the supremacy of the civil over the military authority; economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened; the honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of public faith; encouragement of agriculture, and of commerce as its handmaid; the diffusion of information and arraignment of all abuses at the bar of the public reason; freedom of religion; freedom of the press, and freedom of person, under the protection of the habeas corpus, and trial by juries impartially selected. These principles form the bright constellation which has gone before us, and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation. The wisdom of our sages and blood of our heroes have been devoted to their attainment. They should be the creed of our political faith, the text of civic instruction, the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust; and should we wander from them in moments of error or of alarm, let us hasten to retrace our steps and to regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety.

I repair, then, fellow citizens, to the post you have assigned me. With experience enough in subordinate offices to have seen the difficulties of this the greatest of all, I have learned to expect that it will rarely fall to the lot of imperfect man to retire from this station with the reputation and the favor which bring him into it. Without pretensions to that high confidence you reposed in our first and greatest revolutionary character, whose preeminent services had entitled him to the first place in his country's love and destined for him the fairest page in the volume of faithful history, I ask so much confidence only as may give firmness and effect to the legal administration of your affairs. I shall often go wrong through defect of judgment. When right, I shall often be thought wrong by those whose positions will not command a view of the whole ground. I ask you indulgence for my own errors, which will never be intentional, and your support against the error of others, who may condemn what they would not if seen in all its parts. The approbation implied by your suffrage is a great consolation to me for the past, and my future solicitude will be to retain the good opinion of those who have bestowed it in advance, to conciliate that of others by doing them all the good in my power, and to be instrumental to the happiness and freedom of all.

Relying, then, on the patronage of your good will, I advance with obedience to the work, ready to retire from it whenever you become sensible how much better choice it is in your power to make. And may that Infinite Power which rules the destinies of the universe lead our councils to what is best, and give them a favorable issue for your peace and prosperity.



TEACHING AMERICAN HISTORY

THOMAS JEFFERSON.

FOOTNOTES

1. That is, Democratic-Republicans.
2. Jefferson's invocation of religion is ironic here given that his Federalist opponents had accused him of being "an atheist in religion, and a fanatic in politics." Jefferson was seen as a defamer of churches and a man possessing little to no religious principles. The Inaugural Address casts him in a very different light and Jefferson here uses religion as a way of trying to reunite a fractured nation.



TEACHING AMERICAN HISTORY

CORE READING 2: LETTER FROM THOMAS JEFFERSON TO JAMES MONROE | MARCH 7, 1801

SOURCE: <https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Jefferson/01-33-02-0166>

To James Monroe

Washington March 17. 1801.

DEAR SIR

I had written the inclosed letter to Mrs Trist, and was just proceeding to begin one to you, when your [favor of the 6th](#) was put into my hand. I thank you sincerely for it, and consider the views of it so sound, that I have communicated it to my coadjutors as one of our important evidences of the public sentiment, according to which we must shape our course. I suspect, partly from this, but more from a letter of J. Taylor's which has been put into my hands, that an incorrect idea of my views has got abroad. I am in hopes my inaugural address will in some measure set this to rights, as it will present the [2](#) leading objects to be conciliation, and adherence to sound principle. this I know is impracticable with the leaders of the late faction, whom I abandon as incurables, & will never turn an inch out of my way to reconcile them. but with the main body of the Federalists, I believe it very practicable. you know that the manoeuvres of the year XYZ. carried over from us a great body of the people real republicans, & honest men under virtuous motives. the delusion lasted awhile. at length the poor arts of [tub-plots](#) &c were repeated till the designs of the party became suspected. from that moment those who had left us, began to come back. it was by their return to us that we gained the victory in Nov. 1800. which we should not have gained in Nov. 1799. but during the suspension of the public mind from the 11th. to the 17th. of Feb. and the anxiety & alarm lest there should be no election & anarchy ensue, a wonderful effect was produced on the mass of Federalists who had not before come over. those who had before become sensible of their error in the former change, & only wanted a decent excuse for coming back, seized that occasion for doing so. another body, & a large one it is, who from timidity of constitution had gone with those who wished for a strong executive, were induced by the same timidity to come over to us rather than risk anarchy. so that according to the evidence we receive from every direction, we may say that the whole of that portion of the people which was called federalist, was made to desire anxiously the very event they had just before opposed with all their energies, and to receive the election, which was made, as an object of their earnest wishes, a child of their own. these people (I always include their leaders) are now aggregated with us, they look with a certain degree of affection & confidence to the administration, ready to become attached to it if it avoids, in the outset, acts which might revolt & throw them off. to give time for a perfect consolidation seems prudent. I have firmly refused to follow the counsels of those who have advised the giving offices to some of their leaders, in order to reconcile. I have given & will give only to republicans, under existing circumstances. but I believe with others that deprivations of office, if made on the ground of political principle alone, would revolt our new converts, & give a body to leaders who now stand alone. some I know must be made. they must be as few as possible, done gradually, & bottomed on some malversation or inherent disqualification. where we shall draw the line between retaining all, & none, is not yet settled, and will not be till we get our administration together: and perhaps even then we shall proceed [à taton](#), balancing our measures according to the impression we perceive them to make.—this may give you a general view of our plan. should you be in Albemarle the first week in April, I shall have the pleasure of seeing you there, and of developing things more particularly, and of profiting by an intercommunication of views.—[Dawson](#) sails for France about the 15th. as the bearer only of the treaty to Elsworth & Murray. he has probably asked your commands and your introductory letters. present my respects to Mrs Monroe & accept assurances of my high & affectionate consideration & attachment.

TH: JEFFERSON



CORE READING 3: WILLIAM TAFT'S POPULAR GOVERNMENT | 1913

SOURCE: <https://teachingamericanhistory.org/document/popular-government/>

There is one other proposed reform that has been associated with the new methods of initiative, referendum and recall,^[1] though not necessarily involving them or involved in them. I mean the direct primary. That is a method of selecting the party candidates to be voted for in the election by a preliminary election of the members of the party. It is also usual and necessary to have a declaration of party principles so that the whole electorate may know what may be expected if the party succeeds in electing its candidates and controls the legislature and the executive. The direct primary itself cannot furnish this, and it is usually accompanied by some plan for securing such a declaration either from a party committee or from a conference of candidates. The same evils which have prompted a resort to such radical methods as the initiative, the referendum and the recall, have also stimulated a wish to change the old methods of party government, of the selection of party candidates, and the declaration of party principles.

... But to return to the party primary. A party is a voluntary organization, and originally the natural theory was that the members of the party should be left to themselves to determine how their party representatives were to be selected and their party principles were to be formulated; but the abuses to which completely voluntary organizations of this kind led, brought about a change of view as to the function of the government with reference to such party procedure.

... The reports leave no doubt whatever, indeed the statistics of the elections frequently conclusively confirm the conclusion, that in State and other primaries, thousands and tens of thousands of Democrats vote at Republican primaries, and vice versa.^[2] It often happens that in one party, a primary issue, like the selection of a candidate, is settled in advance by general agreement as to who the candidate shall be or what the principle shall be. In such a case the voters of that party feel entirely free to go into the primaries of the other party, and sometimes, with malice aforethought, to vote for the candidate in that party whom it will be most easy for the candidate of their own party to defeat at the general election.

Of course, this is all wrong. This is not taking the voice of the party. It is taking the voice of men who are not interested that the party should succeed, and who do not intend to be genuine supporters of the men whom they put upon the party ticket.

... It seems to have been the opinion in the Courts of some States that in carrying on an election of this sort, no citizen, whatever his party, could be deprived of the right to vote in either primary.^[3] Such a construction may turn upon peculiar language in a state constitution, but the result is so absurd in the provision for a party primary that it cannot for a moment be sustained on general principles and is utterly at war with fairness and honesty in party control.

Until some method has been devised successfully to prevent this fraud I have been describing, we cannot be said to have a successfully primary law. Of course, it is helpful to have party primaries of all parties on the same day. In this way, if there is a real controversy in all parties, the voters are likely to divide themselves according to their real and sincere party affiliations, because one can only vote in one primary; but the case of a lively fight in one party and none in another is so frequent that the difficulty I have suggested is often a real one.

The first impulse, and a proper one, of the honest legislator, in dealing with this subject, is to give all the members of the party an equal voice in the selection of candidates and in the declaration of party principles. Therefore all the rules which limit the caucus to the active



TEACHING AMERICAN HISTORY

few, or which exclude regular members of the party, have been properly abolished under such primary statutes, and provision is made for every such member to cast his ballot.

The question upon which opinions differ vitally is whether these electors of the party shall cast their ballots directly for their candidates to be run at the general election, or whether they shall select delegates to local conventions, the candidates to be selected in the local conventions. The modern tendency is toward the direct selection of candidates by the party electors themselves, without the intervention of a convention. I am inclined to think that for a time at least this elimination of the party convention in local politics is a good thing.

Theoretically the convention would be better for reasons which can be very shortly stated. If all the electors, divided into wards and precincts, could select honest and intelligent delegates to represent them in a convention, and these delegates were to give their best thought and disinterested effort to the selection of candidates, I have no doubt that the candidates selected would be better for the party and better for the people than the candidates selected directly at a primary. And this is because the delegates can better inform themselves as to the qualifications of the party candidates than can the people at large. And, secondly, the delegates of a party have a sense of responsibility in selecting the party candidates to secure the support of the people at the general election which is utterly absent in the votes which are cast by the electors of the party at the direct primary polls. There the party electors vote for the men who have been brought favorably to their attention by the newspapers and other means of publicity which the candidates themselves are able to adopt and use. They cast their votes very much as the electors at a general election cast their votes, for the men whom they like, or the men whom they know, and frequently without much knowledge or preference at all. Whereas, in a convention, the leaders and the delegates have the keenest care with respect to what is going to happen at the general election.

In the selection of State and national candidates, this becomes a very important matter. One tendency in a direct election of candidates in a national party will be to select a popular partisan, while that of a convention system will be to take a more moderate man whose name will appeal to the independent voter. Thus a primary election in 1860 would certainly have nominated Seward, not Lincoln; in 1876 would have nominated Blaine, not Hayes.⁴¹

A third objection to the direct election of candidates by the people is the obvious advantage which the men with wealth and of activity and of little modesty, but of great ambition to be candidates, without real qualification for office, have over the men who, having qualifications for office, are either without means or refuse to spend money for such a purpose, and are indisposed to press their own fitness upon the voters. In other words, the direct election of candidates very much reduces the probability that the office will seek the man.

. . . The direct primary puts a premium on self-seeking of an office. After men are nominated as party candidates, the party is behind them, and can elect them even though they modestly refrain from exploiting themselves. But in the stage previous to this, when the candidates are to be selected at a direct primary for a party, modest but qualified men are never selected. This substantially lessens the number of available candidates capable by reason of their intelligence and experience of filling the offices well.

I have thus stated three serious objections to the direct election of candidates by the people for local offices and for representatives in Congress and the legislature, and yet I do not think that they are sufficient to overcome the present necessity of avoiding the evils that have arisen from the delegate and convention systems so far as these local and district officers are concerned. The delegates selected for the local convention are many of them usually not of a character to resist the blandishments and the corrupt means which will in such cases be used by bosses and the principals of bosses. The local convention of local delegates offers such a rich opportunity for



TEACHING AMERICAN HISTORY

manipulation of those who are corruptible,—things are done so quickly by committees of credentials, and on resolutions,—that the opportunity of the unscrupulous boss in such a convention is very great. I sympathize, therefore, with the movement to abolish the local convention, at least until the exercise of the direct primary shall have broken up the local machines and shall have given an opportunity to the electors of the party, even with the disadvantage of inadequate information, to express their will.

FOOTNOTES

1. The initiative is the right of voters to initiate legislative action. The referendum allows voters to vote on a single political question which has been referred to them for decision. The recall allows voters to vote an elected official out of office before their term of office is up.
2. As Taft states later on, state courts had ruled in several places that no citizen could be deprived of the right to vote in either primary regardless of party affiliation.
3. See *Freeman v. Board of Registry & Election of Metuchen*, 76 N.J.L. 83 (1907). For a contrary view see *Rouse v. Thompson*, 228 Ill. 522 (1907).
4. William Seward (1801–1872) was secretary of state from 1861 to 1869 and earlier served as governor of New York and US senator. Abraham Lincoln (1809–1865) was the 16th president of the US and guided the nation through the Civil War until his assassination in 1865. James Blaine (1830–1893) was a Republican politician who served in the US House of Representatives (serving as Speaker from 1869 to 1875) and then later in the Senate. He was nominated for the presidency in 1884 but lost to Democrat Grover Cleveland. Rutherford B. Hayes (1822–1893) was the 19th president of the US from 1877 to 1881.



SUPPLEMENTARY READING 1: JOSEPH CANNON'S SPEECH ON THE REVOLT OF 1910 | MARCH 19, 1910

SOURCE: <https://teachingamericanhistory.org/document/speech-on-party-leadership-in-congress/>

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen of the House of Representatives: Actions, not words, determine the conduct and the sincerity of men in the affairs of life. This is a government by the people acting through the representatives of a majority of the people. Results cannot be had except by a majority, and in the House of Representatives a majority, being responsible, should have full power and should exercise that power: otherwise the majority is inefficient and does not perform its function.

The office of the minority is to put the majority on its good behavior, advocating, in good faith, the policies which it professes, ever ready to take advantage of the mistakes of the majority party, and appeal to the country for its vindication.

From time to time heretofore the majority has become the minority, as in the present case, and from time to time hereafter the majority will become the minority. The country believes that the Republican party has a majority of 44 in the House of Representatives at this time; yet such is not the case.

The present Speaker of the House has, to the best of his ability and judgment, cooperated with the Republican party, and so far in the history of this Congress the Republican party in the House has been enabled by a very small majority, when the test came, to legislate in conformity with the policies and the platform of the Republican party. Such action of course begot criticism—which the Speaker does not deprecate—on the part of the minority party.

The Speaker cannot be unmindful of the fact, as evidenced by three previous elections to the Speakership, that in the past he has enjoyed the confidence of the Republican party of the country and of the Republican members of the House; but the assault upon the Speaker of the House by the minority, supplemented by the efforts of the so-called insurgents, shows that the Democratic minority, aided by a number of so-called insurgents, constituting 15 percent of the majority party in the House, is now in the majority, and that the Speaker of the House is not in harmony with the actual majority of the House, as evidenced by the vote just taken.

There are two courses open for the Speaker to pursue—one is to resign and permit the new combination of Democrats and insurgents to choose a Speaker in harmony with its aims and purposes. The other is for that combination to declare a vacancy in the office of Speaker and proceed to the election of a new Speaker.

After consideration, at this stage of the session of the House, with much of important legislation pending involving the pledges of the Republican platform and their crystallization into law, believing that his resignation might consume weeks of time in the reorganization of the House, the Speaker, being in harmony with Republican policies and desirous of carrying them out, declines by his own motion to precipitate a contest upon the House in the election of a new Speaker, a contest that might greatly endanger the final passage of all legislation necessary to redeem Republican pledges and fulfill Republican promises.

This is one reason why the Speaker does not resign at once; and another reason is this: In the judgment of the present Speaker, a resignation is in and of itself a confession of weakness or mistake or an apology for past actions. The Speaker is not conscious of having done any political wrong. [Loud applause on the Republican side.] The same rules are in force in this House that have been in



TEACHING AMERICAN HISTORY

force for two decades. The Speaker has construed the rules as he found them, and as they have been construed by previous Speakers from Thomas B. Reed's incumbency down to the present time.^[1]

Heretofore the Speakers have been members of the Committee on Rules, covering a period of sixty years, and the present Speaker neither has sought new power nor has he unjustly used that already conferred upon him.

There has been much talk on the part of the minority and the insurgents of the "czarism" of the speaker, culminating in the action taken to-day. The real truth is that there is no coherent Republican majority in the House of Representatives. [Loud applause on the Republican side.] Therefore, the real majority ought to have the courage of its convictions [applause on the Republican side], and logically meet the situation that confronts it.

The Speaker does now believe, and always has believed, that this is a government through parties, and that parties can act only through majorities. The Speaker has always believed in and bowed to the will of the majority in convention, in caucus, and in the legislative halls, and today profoundly believes that to act otherwise is to disorganize parties, is to prevent coherent action in any legislative body, is to make impossible the reflection of the wishes of the people in statutes and in laws.

The Speaker has always said that, under the Constitution, it is a question of the highest privilege for an actual majority of the House at any time to choose a new Speaker, and again notifies the House that the Speaker will at this moment, or at any other time while he remains the Speaker, entertain, in conformity with the highest constitutional privilege, a motion by any member to vacate the office of the Speakership and choose a new Speaker [loud applause on the Republican side]; and, under existing conditions, would welcome such action upon the part of the actual majority of the House, so that power and responsibility may rest with the Democratic and insurgent members who, by the last vote, evidently constitute a majority of this House. The Chair is now ready to entertain such a motion. [Loud and long-continued applause on the Republican side; great confusion in the Hall.]

Mr. BURLESON.^[2] Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution.

Mr. SHERLEY.^[3] Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. TAWNEY.^[4] The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] has been recognized.

Mr. SHERLEY. The motion is not debatable.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SHERLEY. I make the point of order that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]^[5] offered a motion to adjourn—

Mr. BURLESON. I demand the reading of my resolution.

Mr. SHERLEY (continuing). And out of courtesy to the Speaker, withheld it pending the Speaker's remarks to the House. That motion is now properly before the House.



TEACHING AMERICAN HISTORY

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER.^[6] We have no rules now.

Mr. SABATH.^[7] A motion to adjourn is always in order. [Great confusion in the Hall.]

Mr. BURLESON. I ask for the reading of the resolution, and demand the previous question on its adoption.

Several MEMBERS. It has not been read.

The SPEAKER. No business can be transacted until the House is in order. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BURLESON. I ask for the reading of the resolution, and upon that resolution I demand the previous question.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the motion—

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not advised, and is trying to find out what the motion of the gentleman from Texas is.

Mr. SHERLEY. I make the point of order that there is now pending before the House a motion to adjourn, which is not debatable. [Cries of “No!” “No!” and great confusion in the Hall.]

Mr. BURLESON. I demand the reading of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order. Gentlemen will be seated. No rights shall be lost and no unparliamentary action had in the premises. There are matters that take precedence of a motion to adjourn. [Loud applause on the Republican side.] Speaker Carlisle and many other Speakers have so ruled. Until the chair knows what it is that the gentleman from Texas proposes the chair does not know whether the motion to adjourn is of superior quality.

Mr. BURLESON. I demand the reading of the resolution.

Mr. SHERLEY. I make the point of order that there is a motion to adjourn pending.

The SPEAKER. The clerk will read.

The clerk reads as follows:

Resolved. That the office of the Speaker of the House of Representatives is hereby declared to be vacant and the House of Representatives shall at once proceed to the election of a Speaker.

Mr. BURLESON. On that I move the previous question.



TEACHING AMERICAN HISTORY

FOOTNOTES

1. Thomas Brackett Reed served as the 32nd Speaker of the House from 1895–1899. Under Reed, the power of the Speaker increased significantly. Many of Reed’s reforms of House procedure were intended to bypass minority party opposition. For more on Reed, see "Rules of the House of Representatives" and "Obstructions in the National House" and "A Deliberative Body".
2. Albert Sidney Burleson, a Democrat from Texas, served in the House from 1899–1913 when he resigned to become President Woodrow Wilson’s postmaster general. Burleson is credited with being originator of the parcel post and air delivery services of the U.S. Post Office. However, he is largely considered one of the worst postmaster generals for his reactionary views that led to the re-segregation of federal offices and railway mail services.
3. Joseph Swagar Sherley, a Democrat from Kentucky, was a member of the House from 1903–1919. In 1933, Sherley was offered the director of the Bureau of the Budget position under President-elect Franklin Delano Roosevelt, he declined the offer due to poor health.
4. James Albertus Tawney, a Republican from Minnesota, was a representative in the House from 1893–1911 and served as the majority whip from 1899–1905. After his defeat by Sydney Anderson, a Progressive Republican who was supported by Theodore Roosevelt, Tawney was a member of the International Joint Commission to dispute boundary waters between the U.S. and Canada.
5. George William Norris, a Republican from Nebraska, served as a representative from 1903–1913 and as a senator from 1913–1943. Norris led the revolt against Speaker Cannon, dubbed "Czar Cannon" and is widely considered to be one of the top-five best senators in U.S. history.
6. Henry Clay Loudenslager, a Republican from New Jersey, served in the House from 1893–1911 when he died in office.
7. Adolph Joachim Sabath, a Democrat from Illinois, was a member of the House from 1907–1952, serving as the Dean of the House from 1934–1952. Sabath was an ardent opponent to Prohibition legislation, particularly the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead Act and secretly informed the president about Speakers Bankhead and Rayburn.



SUPPLEMENTARY READING 2: MEMO ON LANGUAGE, GOPAC | 1995

SOURCE: <https://users.wfu.edu/zulick/454/gopac.html>

This document, a working paper from GOPAC, Newt Gingrich's political action committee, was circulated to freshman Republican members of the 104th Congress in 1995. It functions as a rudimentary rhetorical handbook, providing inexperienced political speakers with a lexicon of terms that drive a wedge of distinctions between themselves and members of the opposing party. At the same time it educates them in a common language that will give evidence of their solidarity with the Speaker of the House and his goals for the Republican majority.

- 1. As you know, one of the key points in the GOPAC tapes is that "language matters." In the video "We are a Majority," Language is listed as a key mechanism of control used by a majority party, along with Agenda, Rules, Attitude and Learning. As the tapes have been used at intraining sessions across the country and mailed to candidates we have heard a plaintive plea: "I wish I could speak like Newt."**
- 2. That takes years of practice. But, we believe that you could have a significant impact on your campaign and the way you communicate if we help a little. That is why we have created this list of words and phrases.**
- 3. This list is prepared so that you might have a directory of words to use in writing literature and mail, in preparing speeches, and in producing electronic media. The words and phrases are powerful. Read them. Memorize as many as possible. And remember that like any tool, these words will not help if they are not used.**
- 4. While the list could be the size of the latest "College Edition" dictionary, we have attempted to keep it small enough to be readily useful yet large enough to be broadly functional. The list is divided into two sections: Optimistic Pos[i]tive Governing words and phrases to help describe your vision for the future of your community (your message) and Contrasting words to help you clearly define the policies and record of your opponent and the Democratic party.**
- 5. Please let us know if you have any other suggestions or additions. We would also like to know how you use the list. Call us at GOPAC or write with your suggestions and comments. We may include them in the next tape mailing so that others can benefit from your knowledge and experience.**



Optimistic Positive Governing Words

6.1 Use the list below to help define your campaign and your vision of public service. These words can help give extra power to your message. In addition, these words help develop the positive side of the contrast you should create with your opponent, giving your community something to vote for!

6.2 share, change, opportunity, legacy, challenge, control, truth, moral, courage, reform, prosperity, crusade, movement, children, family, debate, compete, active(ly), we/us/our, candid(ly), humane, pristine, provide, liberty, commitment, principle(d), unique, duty, precious, premise, care(ing), tough, listen, learn, help, lead, vision, success, empower(ment), citizen, activist, mobilize, conflict, light, dream, freedom, peace, rights, pioneer, proud/pride, building, preserve, pro-(issue): flag, children, environment; reform, workfare, eliminate good-time in prison, strength, choice/choose, fair, protect, confident, incentive, hard work, initiative, common sense, passionate

Contrasting Words

7.1 Often we search hard for words to define our opponents. Sometimes we are hesitant to use contrast. Remember that creating a difference helps you. These are powerful words that can create a clear and easily understood contrast. Apply these to the opponent, their record, proposals and their party.

7.2 decay, failure (fail) collapse(ing) deeper, crisis, urgent(cy), destructive, destroy, sick, pathetic, lie, liberal, they/them, unionized bureaucracy, "compassion" is not enough, betray, consequences, limit(s), shallow, traitors, sensationalists, endanger, coercion, hypocrisy, radical, threaten, devour, waste, corruption, incompetent, permissive attitude, destructive, impose, self-serving, greed, ideological, insecure, anti-(issue): flag, family, child, jobs; pessimistic, excuses, intolerant, stagnation, welfare, corrupt, selfish, insensitive, status quo, mandate(s) taxes, spend (ing) shame, disgrace, punish (poor...) bizarre, cynicism, cheat, steal, abuse of power, machine, bosses, obsolete, criminal rights, red tape, patronage.



TEACHING AMERICAN HISTORY