

Historical Terminology Practice

Directions: With your partner, read the sources I give you and match each historical term with the source that most closely displays it's meaning. Annotate and highlight in order to explain why you've made these designations. Be prepared to discuss.

Stipulations:

- Multiple terms may be applied to a single source
- Each term must be used
- You only have one of each, therefore you cannot use a term more than once. If you feel strongly that a term applies to more than one of the sources please write your argument in the margin next to the source.

Primary Source	Secondary Source	Bias	Chronology	Evidence	Artifact	Historical Interpretation	Historiography
----------------	------------------	------	------------	----------	----------	---------------------------	----------------

- You only have one of each, therefore you cannot use a term more than once. If you feel strongly that a term applies to more than one of the sources please write your argument in the margin next to the source.

Doc 1

Put your term tickets and comments in the margin here.

In sponsoring the Cuban operation, for instance, we would be deliberately violating the fundamental obligations we assumed in the Act of Bogota establishing the Organization of American States. The Act provides:

"No State or group of States has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State. The foregoing principle prohibits not only armed force but also any other form of interference or attempted threat against the personality of the State or against its political, economic and cultural elements.

"No State may use or encourage the use of coercive measures of an economic or political character in order to force the sovereign will of another State and obtain from it advantages of any kind.

"The territory of a State is inviolable; it may not be the object, even temporarily, of military occupation or of other measures of force taken by another State, directly or indirectly, on any grounds whatever"

I think it fair to say that these articles, signaling an end of US unilateralism, comprise the central features of the OAS from the point of view of the Latin American countries.

To act deliberately in defiance of these obligations would deal a blow to the Inter-American System from which I doubt it would soon recover. The suggestion that Cuba has somehow "removed itself" from the System is a transparent rationalization for the exercise of our own will.

More generally, the United States is the leading force in and substantial beneficiary of a network of treaties and alliances stretching around the world. That these treaty obligations should be recognized as binding in law and conscience is the condition not only of a lawful and orderly world, but of the mobilization of our own power.

We cannot expect the benefits of this regime of treaties if we are unwilling to accept the limitations it imposes upon our freedom to act. (Chester Bowles, Under Secretary of State, 1961)

Doc 2



Doc 3

Put your term tickets
and comments in the
margin here.

I suppose I could beat my generational drum here about Beinart's youth; starting college with the fall of the Berlin Wall (autumn 1989) instead of the invasion of Afghanistan (December 1979) makes a huge difference in perception, I suppose, but writers and scholars can and should transcend their own time. Besides, the notion of the Cold War as just another schoolyard shoving match is a cherished rationalization of the American intellectual establishment, including journalism and the academy.

Interestingly, I have heard younger scholars in international relations actually express relief at not being tainted by having lived through the Cold War experience. The idea is that without experiencing the warping tension of the Cold War, they can be more objective. This is along the same lines as the argument that the World War II generation, caught up in the Good War, cannot be objective about the nuclear bombing of Japan.

Perhaps there's something to be said for this line of argument. But I have to note that over the years I have found that this kind of "objectivity" never carried much water for me when I've made the same argument among older and more liberal academic colleagues who lived through the New Deal or Camelot, periods I have no particular affection or admiration for. So it goes. (Prof. Tom Nichols, U.S. Naval War College, 2011)

Doc 4

"The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States. To prove this, let Facts be submitted to a candid world.

He has refused his Assent to Laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

He has forbidden his Governors to pass Laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operation till his Assent should be obtained; and when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.

He has refused to pass other Laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of Representation in the Legislature, a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only.

He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their Public Records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures.

He has dissolved Representative Houses repeatedly, for opposing with manly firmness his invasions on the rights of the people...

He has endeavoured to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the Laws for Naturalization of Foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migrations hither, and raising the conditions of new Appropriations of Lands..."
(Thomas Jefferson, 1776)