



**Perception vs. Reality: Dispelling the Belief of
President Theodore Roosevelt as a War Hawk**

by **Roshan R. Varghese**, 2015 CTI Fellow
David W. Butler High School

This Curriculum Unit is recommended for:
American History II (Honors and Standard): Grade 12
World History (Honors and Standard): Grade 9

Keywords: *American History II*
Theodore Roosevelt & the “bully pulpit”
conservation & the National Park System

World History
imperialism
Russo-Japanese War

Teaching Standards: See [Objectives](#) for teaching standards addressed in this Unit.

Synopsis: The commonly-held beliefs concerning President Theodore Roosevelt are of a leader who consistently evoked hawkish tendencies towards war. It is often taught and discussed in our public educational system that Roosevelt acted often as a “bully” in foreign policy decisions, using the United States military as a means to further American imperialism and American might. Through our exposure to the Spanish-American War, the Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine, and the manifestation of “big stick diplomacy” with the building of the Panama Canal, the American people are often enamored with the perception that President Roosevelt acted ruthlessly towards nations, he felt were inferior and/or could easily be manipulated to achieve the desires of the American republic. However, this Curriculum Unit will argue that many of these perceptions are in fact that, perceptions. In reality, Roosevelt was a man that often used diplomacy that promoted peace and cooperation, while also furthering the advance of the industrialized world. In doing so, he is as acclaimed for becoming the first American president to win the Nobel Peace Prize, as he did so for mediating a peace between Russia and Japan in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905, and the preservation of millions of acres of American landscape through his efforts to establish the National Park System.

*I plan to teach this Unit during the coming year to ~200 students in **Grades 9 and 12, World History and American History II (honors and standard)** courses.*

I give permission for Charlotte Teachers Institute to publish my Curriculum Unit in print and online. I understand that I will be credited as the author of my work.

Perception vs. Reality: Dispelling the Belief of President Theodore Roosevelt as a War Hawk

Roshan R. Varghese

Introduction/Rationale

The history of mankind has been defined by a series of powerful men and women who have used their power and influence to rule and reign over various groups of people, conquer and control vast lands and create and sustain powerful empires and nationalities. The twentieth century was no exception, as many of the most well-known and recognizable figures in world history mark those times. Men whose names are synonymous with power, influence and legacy (positive and negative) come to mind when one discusses the twentieth century. From Winston Churchill of Great Britain, Charles de Gaulle of France, Franklin Delano Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy of the United States of America to Adolf Hitler of Germany and Joseph Stalin of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the 1900s have produced some of the real heavyweights of our historical records. Their charisma, their leadership and their drive took each of their respective nations to places they never could have imagined.

Many historians and scholars would argue that prior to discussing the political heavyweights that dominated in the middle and later stretches of the twentieth century, one must explore the complexities of the leader who ushered in the century for the up and coming industrial power of the world, the United States of America. That individual was Theodore Roosevelt, who in 1901 stumbled upon the presidency in the wake of the assassination of President William McKinley, but quickly and decisively would “usher in the beginnings of an American century,” as Time Magazine Editor-in-Chief Henry Luce would later state. Through pivotal actions domestically and globally, Roosevelt would change the perceptions of the United States as a lightweight in global affairs.

When Theodore Roosevelt became the 26th President of the United States in 1901, the United States lived in the shadows of many of its European counterparts, among those being Great Britain, France and Spain. Even though, the United States had just decisively defeated the Spanish in the Spanish-American War of 1898, Spain was still universally accepted as a stronger player in global affairs due to the relative size of its naval forces. According to the theories proposed by American Admiral Alfred Thayer Mahan in [The Influence of Sea Power upon History: 1660-1783](#), a nation’s strength was directly linked to the strength of its navy. Roosevelt held true to these theories, seeing the navies of Europe as a significant threat to American ascension into global relevance, and intended to change the status quo. In 1901, the United States ranked nineteenth in the world in naval size, ranking even beneath the tiny nations of the Netherlands and Portugal. However, when he left office in 1909, the United States had skyrocketed to third, ranking only behind Great Britain and France, thanks largely in part due to the incredible increase in nautical expenditures under the Roosevelt Administration.

Along with the rapid buildup of the navy, the United States experienced the continued expansion of its industrial might under President Theodore Roosevelt. By the end of his presidency, the nation was the unquestioned industrial leader of the world, even surpassing Great Britain, the nation in which the Industrial Revolution commenced. As a result of this industrial expansion, the United States actively pushed for economic imperialism, in the hopes of acquiring natural resources and new markets from foreign lands. Even though, that desire stretches back to the acquisitions of Alaska in 1867 under Secretary of State William Seward and Hawaii in 1887 under the leadership of Sanford Dole, it was Roosevelt's involvement in the Spanish-American War that signaled true increases in American land deposits. With the Treaty of Paris of 1898, the United States acquired Puerto Rico, Guam and the Philippines, and started to put down economic interests in the country we liberated, Cuba. Since this fiscal growth was funneled by war, many struggle to separate America's rise as a global power with Theodore Roosevelt's supposed insatiable appetite for conflict.

President Theodore Roosevelt, as a leader who evoked hawkish tendencies towards war, and argue that many of those beliefs are in fact inaccurate in comparison to the man behind the beliefs. It is often taught and discussed in our public educational system that Roosevelt acted often as "bully" in foreign policy decisions, using the United States military as a means to further American imperialism and American might. Through our exposure to the Spanish-American War, the Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine, and the manifestation of "big stick diplomacy" with the building of the Panama Canal, we are often enamored with the perception that President Roosevelt acted ruthlessly towards nations he felt were inferior and/or could easily be manipulated to achieve the desires of the American republic. However, it can be argued that many of those perceptions are in fact that, perceptions.

In reality, Roosevelt was a man that often used diplomacy that promoted peace and cooperation, while also furthering the advance of the industrialized world. In doing so, he is acclaimed for becoming the first American president to win the Nobel Peace Prize, as he did so for mediating a peace between Russia and Japan in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905, and the preservation of millions of acres of American landscape through his efforts to establish the National Park System. As stated above, the perception of President Theodore Roosevelt is that of a man of war, a "bully" for all intents and purposes, but the reality is that the man of war we often think of was rather a man who as Edmund Morris writes,

"less solidly but equally enduringly, he left behind a folk consensus that he had been the most powerfully positive American leader since Abraham Lincoln. He had spent much of his two terms crossing and recrossing the country, east and west, south and north, reminding anyone who would listen to him that he embodied all America's variety and the whole of its unity; that what he had made of his own life was possible to all, even to boys born as sickly as himself. Uncounted men, women, and children who had crowded around the presidential caboose to stare and listen to him now carried, forever etched in memory, the image of his receding grin and wave."ⁱ

Ernest Hemingway once said, "Never think that war, no matter how necessary, nor how justified, is not a crime." In many ways, Nel Noddings would agree with Hemingway in that regard, as she states that in her introduction to her text, Peace Education: How We Come to Love

and Hate War, “the hope is that such an education will encourage more people to oppose war but, even if that does not happen, debate on the topic should be better informed.”ⁱⁱ (Noddings 2012) She will go on to argue that, “William James identified the virtues explicitly with masculinity (or manliness) and asked whether war might be ‘our only bulwark against effeminacy.’ As a confessed pacifist, he rejected this idea and sought a moral equivalent of war, but unfortunately, he inadvertently supported war by defending the notion of masculinity.”ⁱⁱⁱ

As one rationalizes that idea, they begin to wrap their minds around personifications of American masculinity and manliness. And in sometimes the truest sense of the term, the image of Theodore Roosevelt enters the conversation. After all, this is an individual who had a lifelong interest in pursuing what he called, in an 1899 speech, "The Strenuous Life". To this end, Roosevelt exercised regularly and took up boxing, tennis, hiking, rowing, polo and horseback riding, as well as the very well-known habit of skinny-dipping in the Potomac River during those very cold winters residing in Washington, D.C as the President of the United States. So how can a man of so many “manly” attributes be anything more than a man of war? How can a man like Roosevelt ever embody peace and cooperation? This Curriculum Unit desires to look into the answers into those questions, and find the man behind the myth, the man beyond the perceptions.

“Youth, size and strength: these things, surely, would render America proof against the anarchic strain. At forty-two, he, Theodore Roosevelt, was the youngest man ever called upon to preside over the United States—itsself the youngest of the world powers. The double symbolism was pleasing. He refused to look at the future through ‘the dun-colored mists’ of pessimism. Even now (as his train jerked into motion again), the fog outside was evaporating into a clear sky, and light flooded the Hudson Valley. Black night had given way to bright morning. Soon he would take the oath as President of ‘the mightiest Republic upon which the sun has ever shone.’”^{iv}

This mandate that Theodore Roosevelt placed upon himself became the backbone of his presidency, the source of his decisions, and the nature of his personality as he moved the nation into the 20th Century. This Curriculum Unit intends to expand upon that optimism, by examining Roosevelt’s movement from a Colonel on the battlefields of San Juan Hill during the Spanish-American War to that President, who did believe that there was a calling on his life to lead our nation into brighter horizons. Would war and conflict sometimes occur to make those aspirations a reality? Yes, but again, we will dispute that President Roosevelt was driven by his hawkish tendencies, but rather driven by his altruistic aspirations of American advancement. As historian Kathleen Dalton has articulated, "Today he is heralded as the architect of the modern presidency, as a world leader who boldly reshaped the office to meet the needs of the new century and redefined America's place in the world."^v (Dalton 2002)

Teaching Objectives

In correlation with the Common Core Standards (adopted by the state of North Carolina in 2010, to be fully implemented and operational within all of the state's classrooms by 2013) and the North Carolina Standard Course of Study for American History II (formerly United States History) and World History, this Curriculum Unit will individually meet the needs of honors, standard and inclusion students, based upon their instructional needs using a series of differentiation techniques. Since North Carolina has just recently adapted the Essential Standards for Common Core within the last few years, the ability to fully connect the specific content to the required Essential Standard is much more difficult than it was to the previous Competency Goal and Objective, according to the North Carolina Standard Course of Study.

As defined by the state of the North Carolina, the purpose of the Common Core Standards is to strengthen academic standards for students, as they were developed by national experts with access to best practices and research from across the nation. Despite the uniformness amongst states that Common Core has brought, it has been highly speculated within North Carolina, that the state will choose to withdraw its participation within the consortium as early as 2015, so please be mindful that these Essential Standards may not still exist if you use this Curriculum Unit. Please reference www.NCPublicSchools.org for updated information, regarding to the state's curriculum for these specific disciplines.

Below are the Common Core Essential Standards via the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction for American History II (www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/acre/standards/new-standards/social-studies/american-history-2.pdf) and World History (<http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/acre/standards/new-standards/social-studies/world.pdf>) that would effectively correspond to the content discussed within this particular unit:

As part of Essential Standard AH2.H4 of American History II, the student will be able to analyze how conflict and compromise have shaped politics, economics and culture in the United States. Within this Essential Standard, the student will be able to analyze the political issues and conflicts that impacted the United States since Reconstruction and the compromises that resulted (e.g., Populism, Progressivism, working conditions and labor unrest, New Deal, Wilmington race riots, eugenics, Civil Rights Movement, anti-war protests, Watergate, etc.), as part of clarifying objective AH2.H.4.1. Also according to clarifying objective AH2.H.4.2, the student will be able to analyze the economic issues and conflicts that impacted the United States since Reconstruction and the compromises that resulted (e.g., currency policy, industrialization, urbanization, laissez-faire, labor unrest, New Deal, Great Society, supply-side economics, etc.).

As part of Essential Standard AH2.H.5 of American History II, the student will be able to understand how tensions between freedom, equality and power have shaped the political, economic and social development of the United States. Within this Essential Standard, the student will be able to summarize how the philosophical, ideological and/or religious views on freedom and equality contributed to the development of American political and economic systems since Reconstruction (e.g., "separate but equal", Social Darwinism, social gospel, civil service system, suffrage, Harlem Renaissance, the Warren Court, Great Society programs, American Indian Movement, etc.), as part of clarifying objective AH2.H.5.1.

As part of Essential Standard AH2.H.6 American History II, the student will be able to understand how and why the role of the United States in the world has changed over time. Within this Essential Standard, the student will be able to explain how national economic and political interests helped set the direction of United States foreign policy since Reconstruction (e.g., new markets, isolationism, neutrality, containment, homeland security, etc.), as part of clarifying objective AH2.H.6.1. Also according to clarifying objective AH2.H.6.2, the student will be able to explain the reasons for United States involvement in global wars and the influence each involvement had on international affairs (e.g., Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, Cold War, Korea, Vietnam, Gulf War, Iraqi War, etc.).

As part of Essential Standard AH2.H.7 of American History II, the student will be able to understand the impact of war on American politics, economics, society and culture. Within this Essential Standard, the student will be able to explain the impact of wars on American politics since Reconstruction (e.g., spheres of influence, isolationist practices, containment policies, first and second Red Scare movements, patriotism, terrorist policies, etc.), as part of clarifying objective AH2.H.7.1. Also according to clarifying objective AH2.H.7.2, the student will be able to explain the impact of wars on the American economy since Reconstruction (e.g., mobilizing for war, war industries, rationing, women in the workforce, lend-lease policy, World War II farming gains, GI Bill, etc.). With clarifying objective AH2.H.7.3, the student will also be able to explain the impact of wars on American society and culture since Reconstruction (e.g., relocation of Japanese Americans, American propaganda, first and second Red Scare movement, McCarthyism, baby boom, Civil Rights Movement, protest movements, ethnic, patriotism, etc.).

As part of Essential Standard WH.H.8 of World History, the student will be able to analyze global interdependence and shifts in power in terms of political, economic, social and environmental changes and conflicts since the last half of the Twentieth Century. Within this Essential Standard, the student will be able to evaluate global wars in terms of how they challenged political and economic power structures and gave rise to new balances of power (e.g., Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, Vietnam War, colonial wars in Africa, Persian Gulf War, etc.), as part of clarifying objective WH.H.8.1. Also according to clarifying objective WH.H.8.2, the student will be able to explain how international crisis has impacted international politics (e.g., Berlin Blockade, Korean War, Hungarian Revolt, Cuban Missile Crisis, OPEC oil crisis, Iranian Revolt, “9/11”, terrorism, etc.). With clarifying objective WH.H.8.3, the student will also be able to analyze the “new” balance of power and the search for peace and stability in terms of how each has influenced global interactions since the last half of the Twentieth Century (e.g., post-World War II, post-Cold War, 1990s globalization, New World Order, global achievements and innovations). The student will also be able to analyze scientific, technological and medical innovations of postwar decades in terms of their impact on systems of production, global trade and standards of living (e.g., satellites, computers, social networks, information highway), according to clarifying objective WH.H.8.4.

Continuing within the previous Essential Standard of WH.H.8 of World History, the student will be able to explain how population growth, urbanization, industrialization, warfare and the global market economy have contributed to changes in the environment (e.g., deforestation, pollution, clear cutting, ozone depletion, climate change, global warming, industrial emissions

and fuel combustion, habitat destruction, etc.), as part of clarifying objective WH.H.8.5. Also according to clarifying objective WH.H.8.6, the student will be able to explain how liberal democracy, private enterprise and human rights movements have reshaped political, economic and social life in Africa, Asia, Latin America, Europe, the Soviet Union and the United States (e.g., U.N. Declaration of Human Rights, end of Cold War, apartheid, perestroika, glasnost, etc.). And finally within this Essential Standard, in accordance with clarifying objective, WH.H.8.7, the student will be able to explain why terrorist groups and movements have proliferated and the extent of their impact on politics and society in various countries (e.g., Basque, PLO, IRA, Tamil Tigers, Al Qaeda, Hamas, Hezbollah, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, etc.).

Demographic Background

David W. Butler High School is one of the twenty-plus high schools within the Charlotte-Mecklenburg School System, but the only located within the town limits of Matthews. Opened in 1997, Butler High School was named in honor of David Watkins Butler, an outstanding mathematics teacher at West Charlotte High School who tragically lost his life in a house fire while attempting to save his family. In 2010, David W. Butler High School was recognized as an Honor School of Excellence, a distinction held by only 35 high schools in the state. This means that our composite End-of-Course Scores exceeded the requirement of 90th percentile. David W. Butler High School also met 20 out of 20 goals for 2011-12, fulfilling the federal guidelines for the No Child Left Behind mandate. The graduation rate at BHS in 2012 was at 89.74%.

Out of the current student enrollment of 2066 at David W. Butler High School, the racial/ethnic breakdown is, as follows: 47.3% white, 30.4% African-American, 13.6% Hispanic, 4.2% Asian, 12.5% multi-racial, 5.4% Native American and 0.2% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander. Of those numbers, 49% and rising, subscribe to free/reduced lunch requirements, due to economic hardships and disadvantages.

Why share this information? By examining the demographic background of the entire school population, it will give a glimpse of the breakdown within our own individual classrooms. Unlike most, if not all, schools with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, David W. Butler High shows a tremendous amount of diversity amongst its student body. Since the end of the *Swann* era (the legendary Supreme Court case, *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, 1971* was overturned in 2001), most CMS schools are predominately white or predominately African-American. Examples include Providence and Ardrey Kell High Schools (suburban), which are at least 97% white, while schools like West Charlotte High School (urban) are decidedly African-American (98%+). For Butler to be nearly a 50/50 split between whites and non-whites is eerily similar to how all schools with Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools looked like in the *Swann v. CMS* era between 1971 and 2001.

These figures are only mentioned, in order that one might compare and contrast their own classrooms to the classroom setting that this Curriculum Unit was not only written for, but will be implemented upon. It has been effectively tailored to meet the learning needs and styles of the students involved, with the understanding that it may be adapted and altered accordingly for any educating practitioner for their specific classroom setting.

Content Knowledge

According to author Nel Noddings, there is a centrality of war in history. She would state, “despite the efforts of individuals and organizations devoted to peace, little has been done to change the culture that supports war.”^{vi} As a result, Noddings would probably argue that if an individual is closely associated with war and conflict, it would probably be difficult to separate them from that, in order to associate them with peace and tranquility. For President Theodore Roosevelt, a man often known for his hawkish beliefs and tendencies towards war, it is problematic to become better known as a man that ends conflicts and restores peace. After all, this is the Roosevelt that poet Martin Espada, wrote a poem, “Bully,” in which he writes about Roosevelt,

“In the school auditorium,
the Theodore Roosevelt statue
is nostalgic
for the Spanish-American War
each fist lonely for a saber,
or the reins of anguish-eyed horses,
or a podium to clatter with speeches
glorying in the malaria of conquest...

Roosevelt is surrounded
by all the faces
he ever shoved in eugenic spite
and cursed as mongrels, skin of one race,
hair and cheekbones of another.”^{vii}

When an individual has that type of controversial reputation, it is hard to refute that type of stigma. But, why does Theodore Roosevelt have that reputation? Is it because he simply is a man? Or is it because he is a man that embodies many of the masculine attributes that most pursue? And if so, is that fair to throw that type of assertion on him just because. Nel Noddings states that it is,

“necessary to examine human nature from evolutionary and psychological perspectives. Are males violent by nature? If, as many evolutionists believe today, males have indeed inherited an evolutionary tendency to violence, why do our patterns of socialization aggravate the tendency by promoting a model of masculinity that makes the willingness and ability to fight virtues?”^{viii}

In fact, Noddings will go a step further and assert Roosevelt’s as the prototypical example of masculinity. By all of his characteristics, to Noddings, you cannot talk about masculine characteristics that embody men without discussing what Roosevelt brings to the table.

“Two apparently opposite evolutionary forces predispose males to warfare: a tendency on the one hand to violence and on the other to behave altruistically toward close kin. The

evolutionary tendencies are then aggravated by cultural patterns of socialization that elevate “manliness” and the virtues of the warrior over gentler, more peaceable attributes. Centuries of warrior worship have continued to support aggressive evolutionary tendencies. Indeed, when enlightened thinkers began to praise peace and condemn the violence of war, men like Theodore Roosevelt and Henry Cabot Lodge expressed fear that the “race was becoming ‘over-civilized’ – too soft ... the solution ... would come from tapping into more primitive instincts, the kind brought out by sport, especially hunting and most of all by war.”^{ix}

But is it fair to pigeonhole Theodore Roosevelt into that capacity, knowing yes, he embodied the strength and grandeur of your prototypical masculine specimen, but he also embodied the intelligence and perseverance not often seen with those “brutish” men that he is often associated with. Edmund Morris describes all of the complexities involved with understanding the full breadth of a man of Roosevelt’s acclaim and appeal:

“Yet there was no doubt that Theodore Roosevelt was peculiarly qualified to be President of all the people. Few, if any Americans could match the breadth of his intellect and the strength of his character. A random survey of his achievements might show him mastering German, French, and the contrasted dialects of Harvard and Dakota Territory; assembling fossil skeletons with paleontological skill; fighting for an amateur boxing championship; transcribing birdsong into a private system of phonetics; chasing boat thieves with a star on his breast and Tolstoy in his pocket; founding a finance club, a stockmen’s association, and a hunting-conservation society; reading some twenty thousand books and writing fifteen of his own; climbing the Matterhorn; promulgating a flying machine; and becoming a world authority on North American game mammals. Any Roosevelt watcher could make up a different but equally varied list. If the sum of all these facets of experience added up to more than a geometric whole—implying excess construction somewhere, planes piling upon planes—then only he, presumably, could view the polygon entire.”^x

According to Edmund Morris, Theodore Roosevelt was so multifaceted as an individual that to shortchange all of his accomplishments, down to only being defined by his physical prowess, takes away everything that made Roosevelt into not only who he was, but what him impressive. As often for most men, society has the tendency to view them according to their physical strength, affirming their role as protector and provider. But can a man be more than the numerical figures of how much he bench presses or how many animals he has shot and killed for survival and sport? The answer is obviously yes. And Roosevelt is indeed the perfect specimen, to effectively balance that physical prowess with that intellectual repertoire.

But, examples needed to be given to dispel this notion that Theodore Roosevelt is not just a man of war, but a man of peace, stability and order. That he is not just simply a hawk, a proponent of using military force in order to advance national security interests. Yes, it can be easily argued that he is most definitely not the opposite of hawk, a dove, which is often characterized as a proponent of pacifism. But Nel Noddings would argue that to pigeonhole an individual a dove, is almost as difficult as pigeonholing an individual a hawk. So, if we cannot

easily characterize an absolute pacifist, how can characterize Roosevelt as an absolute hawk, in regards to war, destruction and domination?

“Pacifism has been a conceptually adaptive movement. The idea that no force of any kind should be used was for the most part abandoned in favor of nonviolent activism. But even to oppose all violence has proved to be unrealistic. Almost all peace lovers admit they would fight to defend themselves and, even more certainly, their children. (Martin) Buber was surely right when he said that (Mohandas) Gandhi’s *satyagraha* would not succeed against the Nazis. There are few absolute pacifists. We now more often hear of conditional, pragmatic, relative or contingent pacifism. It might be best to drop the term pacifism entirely and just speak of peace movements or working for peace.”^{xi}

So, if that logic is applied towards Theodore Roosevelt, one will discover an individual who acted in a movement towards peace and worked on behalf of peace. He sought peaceful relationships between the races, primarily between the white majority and the often-persecuted African-American minority, through his relationship with prominent civil rights leader Booker T. Washington. He sought peaceful relationships between the warring nations of Russia and Japan, when he effectively ended the Russo-Japanese War of 1905. Those actions will garner Roosevelt the Nobel Peace Prize, the first American politician, let alone President, to win this esteemed and highly-regarded award. He sought peaceful relationships with the environment, pushing through with a comprehensive conservation policy, setting aside millions and millions of acres of pristine, untouched American land for the creation of a National Park System, rather than be gobbled up and destroyed by the very powerful business tycoons. So, Noddings has previously directly identified Roosevelt as the epitome of a man of war, but maybe, just maybe, her same characterization has equally identified Roosevelt as a man of peace.

“On 16 October 1901, the President heard that Booker T. Washington was back in town, and invited him to dinner that night. Roosevelt had a momentary qualm about being the first President ever to entertain a black man in the White House. His hesitancy made him ashamed of himself, and all the more determined to break more than a century of precedent. He received Washington at 7:30 P.M. and introduced him to Edith. The only other non-family guest was Philip B. Stewart, a friend from Colorado...

The President felt entirely at ease. It seemed “so natural and so proper” to have Washington wield his silver. Here, dark and dignified among the paler company, was living proof of what he had always preached: that Negroes could rise to the social heights, at least on an individual basis...But a black man who advanced faster than his fellows should be rewarded with every privilege that democracy could bestow. Booker T. Washington qualified *honoris causa* in the “aristocracy of worth.”^{xii}

What a powerful example of advancing peace by Theodore Roosevelt! We often think of peace, as the extinguishing of military conflict and strife. But, often the greatest conflicts are internal. The conflicts of behavior, attitude and action, by one man towards another. In the United States, that has ever been present in our history in regards to the relationship between the races, primarily between whites (Caucasians) and blacks (African-Americans). Going back to the times of slavery, blacks have been relegated to an inferior status by the white majority. With

slavery abolished with the passage of the Thirteenth Amendment in 1865, and citizenship and suffrage established with the passage of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments respectively, life for blacks should have improved in this land to which they were forcibly brought. But, it had not, especially in the South. With the rise of the Ku Klux Klan, the passage of the so-called Jim Crow laws, establishing grandfather clauses, literacy tests and poll taxes as the way of the land, many African-Americans could not escape the ever-present hardships of inferiority. And with crystallization of racial separation with the recent decision in *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896), establishing “separate but equal” as not only commonplace, but constitutional, what Roosevelt did that night in October 1901 is not only astounding, it borders on shocking! He had brought an African-American to the White House, as not a slave, not a servant, but as his own personal guest, to sit and eat a meal with the President, the First Lady and their family, as equals, knowing all too well that his decision was not only highly unpopular, but highly scandalous. Yet, he did it. And he was angry at himself, for even thinking twice about it.

Theodore Roosevelt’s decision to invite Booker T. Washington to dinner that evening in October 1901 caused a tremendous scandal on Capitol Hill that winter. Many of his most loyal Republican Party colleagues criticized his overt disregard for the status quo of racial relations. They questioned his judgment to lead effectively, and some even questioned whether he was worthy to be the Republican nominee for President, should he decide to run for reelection in 1904. Even more steadfast in their opposition to Roosevelt’s decision to dine with Washington came from the Democratic Party, who was known throughout the nation at the time as a party of white supremacists, and as result, dominated the political atmosphere of the South. The response from Southern Democrats and the Southern press was harsh and vulgar.

“But during the afternoon, distant rumblings warned that a political hurricane was on its way up from the South. An early thunderclap was sounded by the *Memphis Scimitar*:

‘The most damnable outrage which has ever been perpetrated by any citizen of the United States was committed yesterday by the President, when he invited a nigger to dine with him at the White House. It would not be worth more than a passing notice if Theodore Roosevelt had sat down to dinner in his own home with a Pullman car porter, but Roosevelt the individual and Roosevelt the President are not to be viewed in the same light.

It is only very recently that President Roosevelt boasted that his mother was a Southern woman, and that he is half Southern by reason of that fact. By inviting a nigger to his table he pays his mother small duty. . . . No Southern woman with a proper self-respect would not accept an invitation to the White House, nor would President Roosevelt be welcomed today in Southern homes. He has not inflamed the anger of the Southern people; he has excited their disgust.’

The word *nigger* had not been seen in print for years. Its sudden reappearance had the force of an obscenity. Within hours, newspapers from the Piedmont to the Yazoo were raining it and other racial epithets on the President’s head.

‘ROOSEVELT DINES A DARKEY

A RANK NEGROPHILIST
OUR COON-FLAVORED PRESIDENT
ROOSEVELT PROPOSES TO CUDDLE THE SONS OF HAM'

Some of the more sensational sheets expressed sexual disgust at the idea of Edith Roosevelt and Washington touching thighs, so to speak, under the table. The President was accused of promoting a “mingling and mongrelization” of the Anglo-Saxon race. Booker T. Washington was sarcastically advised to send his daughter to the White House for Christmas: “Maybe Roosevelt’s son will fall in love with her and marry her.”^{xiii}

Despite the terrible treatment, Theodore Roosevelt remained in his steadfast in his belief that Booker T. Washington deserved to not only be his equal, but deserved the opportunity to speak on behalf of Negroes to the President of the United States. And he would stand by that, regardless of the unfair circumstances. He knew what he did was right and he knew that history would honor his courage. And with the election of President Barack Obama as the nation’s first African-American president, Roosevelt’s fortitude to invite Washington a century earlier, has not only been rewarded, it has been justified. Again, here was the President of the United States taking the right stand for the sake of peace. Too much tension had been built up between the races, and unless someone took a monumental stand, that tension would continue to increase. As Roosevelt appropriately understood, short-term friction could not override long-term truth, and we are all better off because of that bravery and that audacity.

“I have not been able to think out any solution of the terrible problem offered by the presence of the Negro on this continent, but of one thing I am sure, and that is that in as much as he is here and can neither be killed nor driven away, the only wise and honorable and Christian thing to do is to treat each black man and each white man strictly on his merits as a man. . . . Of course I know that we see through a glass dimly, and, after all, it may be that I am wrong; but if I am, then all my thoughts and beliefs are wrong, and my whole way of looking at life is wrong. At any rate, while I am in public life, however short a time it may be, I am in honor bound to act up to my beliefs and convictions.”^{xiv}

Often, peace is often labeled as the absence of war, but it can also be the ceasing of conflict through means of diplomacy. In 1904, war broke out between two of the world’s fiercest empires, Russia and Japan. Russia, long an imperial power, dominated the affairs of Northern and Central Asia by its sheer size and historical legacy. Japan, an empire for thousands of years, but only recently industrialized, sought to imprint its footprint in Asian and world affairs, as well as escape the looming shadows of its much larger neighbors, Russia and China. As expected, the imperial assertions of each power could result in conflict and it ultimately did, harkening Theodore Roosevelt and the United States to take notice.

“Half a world away, the Far East exploded into war. For months, State Department officials had known that Japan would not tolerate Russia’s expansionism in Manchuria and her designs on Korea. However, even John Hay was surprised by the ferocity and speed of the first attack, on 8 February. Dispatches confirmed that Admiral Heihachiro Togo had virtually annihilated the Russian Oriental fleet in a single swoop on Port Arthur. On the ninth, reports of further naval attacks followed like claps of thunder. In

under twelve hours, Russia's two biggest battleships were sunk, another seriously damaged, and four cruisers disabled or destroyed. Japan was now the superior power in the Yellow Sea. Minister Kogoro Takahira could hardly conceal his elation as he delivered the Mikado's proclamation of war to Hay. On 11 February, Roosevelt announced that the United States would remain neutral."^{xv}

After a year of intense fighting, a resolution to the conflict between Russia and Japan in the Russo-Japanese War looked very unlikely. Both imperial powers were throwing their full weight into seeking victory. Japan because it was on the front foot, as it had been from the beginning due to its fierce initial assault. Russia because it was a proud imperial power, who had been humiliated by that aggression that Japan brought to the fight. Neither was willing to retreat. Neither was willing to concede to their opponent. Neither was budging. When these conditions exist, it is vital for a third party to intervene to resolve an impasse. When no one else could bring these nations together to discuss peace, Theodore Roosevelt could, in ways that only Theodore Roosevelt could only do.

“(George von Lengerke) Meyer's joyful bombshell hit the White House the next day with no outside reverberation whatsoever. Not until 10 June, after both belligerents had accepted (Theodore) Roosevelt's formal “invitation,” did the press get official word of what had been going on, and who was responsible for the sudden decrease in international tension. The London *Morning Post* hailed the emergence of a new world peacemaker:

Mr. Roosevelt's success has amazed everybody, not because he succeeded, but because of the manner by which he achieved success. He has displayed not only diplomatic abilities of the very highest order, but also great tact, great foresight, and finesse really extraordinary. Alone—absolutely without assistance or advice—he met every situation as it arose, shaped events to suit his purpose, and showed remarkable patience, caution, and moderation. As a diplomatist Mr. Roosevelt is now entitled to take high rank.”^{xvi}

However, it is not enough just to get two conflicting parties to the table, to be deemed an effective arbitrator. It is necessary to have all parties reach an effective conclusion to hostilities. And Theodore Roosevelt was able to do that, despite all the odds being stacked against him. And these actions, will not only make Roosevelt himself proud, it will make the President known as a peacemaker, not just a warmonger. The Norwegian Nobel Committee, on behalf of the estate of Alfred Nobel, awarded Theodore Roosevelt the Nobel Peace Prize in 1906 for "for his successful mediation to end the Russo-Japanese War and for his interest in arbitration, having provided the Hague arbitration court with its very first case.”^{xvii} Not bad for a man, too often associated with war and not often known for his efforts to bring about lasting peace. Even Roosevelt will go on to brag, as he had every right to do so, about his efforts.

“Witte accepted this acceptance, and said that the island would be cut at the fiftieth degree of latitude north. The Russo-Japanese War was over...

The peace the President had made possible at Portsmouth was the result of just such an inexplicable ability to impose his singular charge upon plural power. By sheer force of

moral purpose, by clarity of perception, by mastery of detail and benign manipulation of men, he had become, as Henry Adams admiringly wrote him, “the best herder of Emperors since Napoleon.”

After the Treaty of Portsmouth was signed on 5 September (1905), he allowed himself a characteristic moment of self-congratulation. “It’s a mighty good thing for Russia,” he allowed, “and a mighty good thing for Japan.” And, with a thump of his chest, “a mighty good thing for *me*, too!”^{xviii}

Lastly, Theodore Roosevelt was a champion for a peace, in the fight against the environment. For too many years, nature had taken a beating at the expense of productivity and efficiency. Powerful business leaders like John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie and Cornelius Vanderbilt had lived up to their “robber baron” nicknames, in how they treated the nation’s natural resources. Land and resources was being overrun and the Earth did not have an advocate for its cause. Obviously not until Theodore Roosevelt became President of the United States! Sometimes peace is standing up for the innocent and the disenfranchised, and throughout our history as a nation, that is the environment we often so take for granted. And Roosevelt was not going to miss this chance to take a stand for those that could not stand up for themselves. And he was not going to be “gun shy” in letting the Congress and the American people know of his intentions, and if necessary, he was going to use the “bully pulpit” of the American presidency to back up his beliefs and convictions.

“The bulk of the American public had probably not noticed that in his last Message to Congress, he had for the first time used the plain word *Conservation* as a subject heading. There had been *Forest Conservation* and *Water Conservation* in his First Message, but they had denoted specific and separate programs, on par with *Reclamation* in 1903 and *Public Lands* in 1905. *Conservation*, by itself, was at once more general and more philosophical—religious even, a writ preaching the common sanctity of wood and water and earth and flora and fauna. It even had its menorah: the many-armed drainage basin, WJ McGee’s “harmonious interrelationship of parts,” purging the countryside of pollution, restoring the ravages of erosion, imposing order on human settlement, controlling floods, nurturing species, and generating power.”^{xix}

Using the power of the presidency and his own personality, Theodore Roosevelt was able to carve out huge areas of the nation for national parks and natural reserves. The importance of protecting the environment, land, fawn and fauna, was personal to Roosevelt and he was not going to be intimidated by the “robber barons” or Congress. He intended to use every action available to the President to achieve his goals and purposes, whether that be legislation through the Congress, executive orders or personal conservations with each individual business leader. He was steadfast in his resolve and because of his bravery and audacity to tackle this fight, the United States of America is better off as a result. Whether it is the national parks, families visit for tourism purposes or the dams built to create necessary hydroelectric power for rural communities, the nation has benefited by a man who believed in fighting for peace, in the war between productivity of industry and sensibility about conservation.

“Americans began to be aware of the extent to which he, often by stealth over the past six years, had used his powers (Joseph Cannon would say, misused them) to set aside an extraordinary large and varied swath of the national commons. He had created five national parks, doubling the total bequeathed to him in 1901, and struggled against mining interests to make a sixth of the Grand Canyon. Unsuccessful in that quixotic task, he had made the canyon a national monument instead, under the new Antiquities Act, effectively preserving it for future parkhood. In fewer than six months, since passage of the Act, he had proclaimed fifteen other national monuments, interpreting the latter word loosely to include environments as different as Muir Woods, California, and Gila Cliff Dwellings, New Mexico. He had initiated twenty federal irrigation projects in fourteen states under the National Reclamation Act. He had declared thirteen new national forests—a total that (Gifford) Pinchot intended to vastly multiply, now that “Conservation” was at last part of the American ethos.

Perhaps nearest to (Theodore) Roosevelt’s own heart, he had created sixteen federal bird refuges, starting with Pelican Island, Florida, in an executive coup that was already part of his legend. (“Is there any law that will prevent me from declaring Pelican Island a Federal Bird Reservation? Very well, then I so declare it.”) At Wichita Forest, Oklahoma, he had made the first federal game preserve. His three environmental commissions, on public lands, inland waterways, and national conservation, had embarked on the probably ill-fated but historically important task of educating corporate skeptics to an awareness of the rape of the American wilderness.

And (Theodore) Roosevelt had nine months left in office to expand on these beginnings, as relentlessly as he was able.^{xx}

As stated earlier, Nel Noddings effectively deemed Theodore Roosevelt as the ideal example for her argument that men are evolutionary slanted to associate with war. But to judge Roosevelt in such a manner is the exact opposite of what Noddings argues in the last chapter of her text, Peace Education: How We Come to Love and Hate War. In Chapter 10, she argues that “The Challenge to Education” is the overwhelming tendency to lean towards studying history by means of war, instead of by means of peace. Strange what happens when the other shoe falls, and it is men like Roosevelt who are judged by actions of war, but are defined by actions of peace. To use Noddings’ own words,

“In such a climate, a question arises immediately about whether, while acknowledging our own feelings, we can listen to possibly opposing views without prejudging them. Cass Sunstein has pointed out that we are afflicted by something he has called “group polarization”; we tend to believe those with whom we somehow identify and disbelieve or distrust those who belong to a different group...

Open-minded provisional belief is a tremendous aid to learning, and the belief involved is neither naïve nor necessarily permanent. It is a strategic way of listening. Eventually, something the writer has written will challenge you, the reader, and you will have to put the bit of challenged text in the context of the whole work and explore what it is that seems wrong or inadequate...

At least, thinking of such alternatives should remind us that there is more than one story to be told, and the underlying stories will have some influence on the way in which the facts are discussed.”^{xxi}

Strategies and Activities

This particular Curriculum Unit will be broken down to consist of four days of instruction, followed by the formal assessment for this particular unit on the fifth day. Arguably, it could be compressed into a smaller timeframe, but to provide students enough depth, as well as review, it is vital to follow the designated pacing suggested. It is suggested that the instructor assigns an overarching homework assignment, such as a unit qualifier, that would be due on the date of the formal assessment, as it will provide adequate practice for students as they learn the content throughout the duration of the Curriculum Unit.

The initial day of the Curriculum Unit will focus on the introduction of Unit 4: Imperialism, The Emergence of the United States in World Affairs (1890-1914), as outlined in Essential Standards AH2.H4-7 of the Common Core Standards and the North Carolina Standard Course of Study, which focuses on the rise of American imperialism. Students will begin instruction by working on a warm-up activity, highlighting the six key terms necessary to know in order to understand imperialism effectively. Those terms are: 1) imperialism, 2) nationalism, 3) diplomacy, 4) domination, 5) accommodation, and 6) jingoism. After the warm-up activity, students will be led by the instructor in Enhanced Direct Instruction into the causes of American imperialism, economically, socially and politically, including the importance of Captain Alfred Thayer Mahan’s text, The Influence of Sea Power upon History: 1660-1783 and its impact on the future Secretary of the Navy and future President, Theodore Roosevelt. Within this, students will study the acquisitions and annexations of Alaska and Hawaii, as well as preview the Spanish-American War. As a “Ticket Out the Door” activity, students will do a 3-2-1, in which on a notecard, they will write down three items they learned, two questions they still have, and one overarching term or phrase that could sum up the entire class period.

For day two of the Curriculum Unit, there are three individual focuses. Students will begin with the second warm-up activity of the unit, exploring the two nations who possessed the largest navies in the world, upon Theodore Roosevelt’s ascension to the presidency. After identifying Great Britain and France, students will be asked to explain where Roosevelt derives his desire to strengthen the American Navy, leading students to discuss Captain Mahan’s text. At the end of the activity, the instructor will explain to the students that by the time that Roosevelt leaves the presidency, the United States will have moved up from #19 in size of naval forces among industrialized nations, to #3 just behind the aforementioned Great Britain and France. After the warm-up activity, the instructor will continue the Enhanced Direct Instruction of the previous class session, but now including the full context of the Spanish-American War, along with the foreign policies of the three presidents of the Imperial Era, Theodore Roosevelt (“big stick

diplomacy”), William Howard Taft (“dollar diplomacy”) and Woodrow Wilson (“moral diplomacy”). With the Spanish-American War, students will explore the effects of yellow journalism, the explosion of the U.S.S. Maine, the charge up San Juan Hill by Colonel Theodore Roosevelt’s Rough Riders, the Treaty of Paris acquiring Puerto Rico, Guam and the Philippines, and the subsequent liberation of Cuba with the Teller Amendment, only to reacquire the island with the Platt Amendment. To close out the class session, students will complete a map activity, highlighting twenty areas of the world that the United States “acquired and still owns,” “acquired but no longer owns,” and “only had a strong influence.” This map will be due on day four of the Curriculum Unit, the same day that they will be quizzed (informal assessment) on the locations of these twenty places. Students are also informed that in the next class session, day three of the Curriculum Unit, they will be quizzed (informal assessment) on the content they learned during the first two days of the unit.

For day three of the Curriculum Unit, students will once again begin class instruction with a warm-up activity. This particular warm-up activity is a matching exercise, highlighting areas of American intervention during the era of imperialism, including Puerto Rico, Cuba and the Dominican Republic. After discussing the warm-up activity, students will take a fifteen-question multiple choice quiz (informal assessment) on the content for American imperialism. After collecting the quizzes, the instructor will guide students in an Enhanced Direct Instruction of Theodore Roosevelt’s new place in world affairs. Among the topics of discussion, the United States’ response to the Filipino insurrection under Emilio Aguinaldo, the Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine, the Panama Canal, the Great White Fleet and the peaceful resolution to the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905. Once students have a solid grasp of this content, they will write a five-paragraph essay analyzing the following essay prompt, “How did Theodore Roosevelt view foreign policy? What type of role did he believe the United States should take in global politics?” They should spend roughly ten to fifteen minutes on brainstorming and planning, with thirty to thirty-five minutes reserved for writing. They will turn in their brainstorming pages in, along with their completed handwritten essay. If students are not able to finish during the course of a class session, the instructor may choose to allow students to finish the assignment at home to turn in during the following session. Prior to student dismissal, the instructor should remind students of their imperialism maps being due during day four of the Curriculum Unit, along with the corresponding map quiz (informal assessment).

The last official day of the Curriculum Unit, day four, will be invested on finalizing the unit, including review content material prior to the formal assessment during day five. As expected, students will begin with a warm-up activity, with this warm-up intended to prepare students for their map quiz (informal assessment). It will emphasize six of the twenty places in the world students will be expected to know, including Hawaii, Cuba, Puerto Rico, Panama, China and the Philippines. After reviewing the warm-up activity, students will turn in their map assignment and then take their imperialism map quiz (informal assessment). Once all students have completed their assessment, the instructor will distribute a reading on the effects of yellow journalism as a

cause of the Spanish-American War. After discussing the reading, the instructor will use two pieces of children's literature to emphasize that yellow journalism can be found and understood in ways outside of simply reading educational texts about William Randolph Hearst and Joseph Pulitzer. Multiple pieces of children's literature could be chosen, but the two that are suggested are Dr. Seuss' "And to Think that I Saw it on Mulberry Street" and Jon Scieszka's "The True Story of the Three Little Pigs." Not only will students be challenged but they will smile to know that complex American History content can be found in the confines of texts that they read or had read to them when they were in elementary (primary) school. Finally, if enough time permits, the instructor may use multiple review pages to assess preparation for the next class session's formal assessment. If less time remains than is necessary to use those review sheets, the instructor may just choose to answer any last minute questions concerning the content of the unit, verbally for the entire class to benefit.

Day five of the Curriculum Unit is the formal assessment for Unit 4: Imperialism, The Emergence of the United States in World Affairs (1890-1914). It will feature a combination of multiple-choice, short answer and fill-in-blank questions. For honors and advanced placement students, essay questions may be added upon the instructor's discretion. Students will be expected to have adequately prepared themselves for this formal assessment, based on the previous four days' worth of instruction. Prior to beginning the formal assessment, students will turn in their unit qualifier, which was assigned on day one of the unit and is expected to be turned in at the time of the formal assessment.

Data from this formal assessment, from score analysis to question item analysis, will be used to assess the effectiveness of this Curriculum Unit, from a Common Core perspective. If positive data affirms the effectiveness of the unit, in correspondence with data-driven instruction, then other Curriculum Units could be strengthened what has been previously prepared and utilized. If negative data shows a lack of comprehension and understanding by students, then the Curriculum Unit will be adapted and altered to highlight the Curriculum Unit's strengths and remedy the Curriculum Unit's weakness for future growth and development as both as an educator and a practitioner.

Annotated Bibliography

- 1) Dalton, Kathleen. Theodore Roosevelt: A Strenuous Life. Copyright ©2002 by Kathleen Dalton via Vintage.

---Kathleen Dalton is an effective biographer of Theodore Roosevelt and this text is fantastic to examine the multiple complexities that make Roosevelt one of the most complex figures in American history, and not just from a political standpoint.

- 2) Espada, Martin. "Bully". Copyright ©1990.

---Martin Espada's poem is short, sweet and to the point of looking at Theodore Roosevelt as just that, a "bully." It is from the perspective of a Latin American author, viewing through the lens of citizen of Latin America. Effective for a reader, to see from the viewpoint of a non-American, looking at America's foreign policy.

- 3) McCullough, David. Mornings on Horseback: The Story of an Extraordinary Family, a Vanished Way of Life and the Unique Child Who Became Theodore Roosevelt. Copyright ©1982 by David McCullough via Simon & Schuster.

---David McCullough's text on Theodore Roosevelt was accessed, but not utilized.

- 4) Morris, Edmund. Colonel Roosevelt. Copyright ©2010 by Edmund Morris via Random House.

---The third part of Edmund Morris's trilogy on Theodore Roosevelt was accessed but not utilized.

- 5) Morris, Edmund. The Rise of Theodore Roosevelt. Copyright ©1979 by Edmund Morris via Coward, McCann & Geoghegan.

---The first part of Edmund Morris' trilogy on Theodore Roosevelt was accessed but not utilized.

- 6) Morris, Edmund. Theodore Rex. Copyright ©2001 by Edmund Morris via Random House.

---The primary external text used over the course of this Curriculum Unit, Edmund Morris' biography of Theodore Roosevelt is absolutely superb. The second part of Morris' trilogy focuses in on Roosevelt from his ascension to the presidency in 1901 until the completion of his two terms in 1909.

- 7) Noddings, Nel. Peace Education: How We Come to Love and Hate War. Copyright ©2012 via Cambridge University Press.

---The primary internal text used over the course of this Curriculum Unit. It was used during every Seminar meeting throughout the duration of the 2015 Charlotte Teachers' Institute Seminar, *Peace Education: Psychological Factors that Endorse War*, facilitated by Seminar Leader, Dr. Rick Gay of Davidson College.

- 8) Thomas, Evan. The War Lovers: Roosevelt, Lodge, Hearst, and the Rush to Empire, 1898. Copyright ©2011 via Back Bay Books.

---Evan Thomas' text on Theodore Roosevelt, Henry Cabot Lodge and William Randolph Hearst among others was accessed, but not utilized.

Reading List for Teachers

- 1) Espada, Martin. "Bully". Copyright ©1990.

---Martin Espada's poem is short, sweet and to the point of looking at Theodore Roosevelt as just that, a "bully." It is from the perspective of a Latin American author, viewing through the lens of citizen of Latin America. Effective for a reader, to see from the viewpoint of a non-American, looking at America's foreign policy.

- 2) Dyal, Micah. "The Yellow Press".

<http://iml.jou.ufl.edu/projects/Spring03/Dyal/Page2.htm>. University of Florida.

---In correlation with day four's activities and strategies of the Curriculum Unit.

- 3) Geisl, Theodore as Dr. Seuss. "And To Think That I Saw It On Mulberry Street". Originally published in 1937. Your Favorite Seuss. Compilation by Janet Schulman and Cathy Goldsmith. Copyright ©2004 by Random House: New York.

---In correlation with day four's activities and strategies of the Curriculum Unit.

- 4) Morris, Edmund. Theodore Rex. Copyright ©2001 by Edmund Morris via Random House.

---The primary external text used over the course of this Curriculum Unit, Edmund Morris' biography of Theodore Roosevelt is absolutely superb. The second part of Morris' trilogy focuses in on Roosevelt from his ascension to the presidency in 1901 until the completion of his two terms in 1909.

- 5) Noddings, Nel. Peace Education: How We Come to Love and Hate War. Copyright ©2012 via Cambridge University Press.

---The primary internal text used over the course of this Curriculum Unit. It was used during every Seminar meeting throughout the duration of the 2015 Charlotte Teachers'

Institute Seminar, *Peace Education: Psychological Factors that Endorse War*, facilitated by Seminar Leader, Dr. Rick Gay of Davidson College.

- 6) Scieszka, Jon and Lane Smith. The True Story of the Three Little Pigs. Copyright ©1996 by Puffin Books.

---In correlation with day four's activities and strategies of the Curriculum Unit.

Reading List for Students

- 1) Espada, Martin. "Bully". Copyright ©1990.

---Martin Espada's poem is short, sweet and to the point of looking at Theodore Roosevelt as just that, a "bully." It is from the perspective of a Latin American author, viewing through the lens of citizen of Latin America. Effective for a reader, to see from the viewpoint of a non-American, looking at America's foreign policy.

- 2) Dyal, Micah. "The Yellow Press".

<http://iml.jou.ufl.edu/projects/Spring03/Dyal/Page2.htm>. University of Florida.

---In correlation with day four's activities and strategies of the Curriculum Unit.

- 3) Geisl, Theodore as Dr. Seuss. "And To Think That I Saw It On Mulberry Street". Originally published in 1937. Your Favorite Seuss. Compilation by Janet Schulman and Cathy Goldsmith. Copyright ©2004 by Random House: New York.

-----In correlation with day four's activities and strategies of the Curriculum Unit.

- 4) Morris, Edmund. Theodore Rex. Copyright ©2001 by Edmund Morris via Random House.

---The primary external text used over the course of this Curriculum Unit, Edmund Morris' biography of Theodore Roosevelt is absolutely superb. The second part of Morris' trilogy focuses in on Roosevelt from his ascension to the presidency in 1901 until the completion of his two terms in 1909.

- 5) Noddings, Nel. Peace Education: How We Come to Love and Hate War. Copyright ©2012 via Cambridge University Press.

---The primary internal text used over the course of this Curriculum Unit. It was used during every Seminar meeting throughout the duration of the 2015 Charlotte Teachers' Institute Seminar, *Peace Education: Psychological Factors that Endorse War*, facilitated by Seminar Leader, Dr. Rick Gay of Davidson College.

- 6) Scieszka, Jon and Lane Smith. The True Story of the Three Little Pigs. Copyright ©1996 by Puffin Books.

---In correlation with day four's activities and strategies of the Curriculum Unit.

-
- ⁱ Morris, Edmund. Theodore Rex. pg. 554-555.
- ⁱⁱ Noddings, Nel. Peace Education: How We Come to Love and Hate War. pg. 1.
- ⁱⁱⁱ Noddings. pg. 4.
- ^{iv} Morris, Edmund. Theodore Rex. pg. 8-9.
- ^v Dalton, Kathleen. Theodore Roosevelt: A Strenuous Life.
- ^{vi} Noddings. pg. 2.
- ^{vii} Espada, Martin. "Bully." Stanzas 1 and 3.
- ^{viii} Noddings. pg. 3.
- ^{ix} Noddings. pg. 37.
- ^x Morris. pg. 10-11.
- ^{xi} Noddings. pg. 107.
- ^{xii} Morris. pg. 52.
- ^{xiii} Morris. pg. 54-55.
- ^{xiv} Morris. pg. 58.
- ^{xv} Morris. pg. 311.
- ^{xvi} Morris. pg. 391.
- ^{xvii} http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/themes/peace/lundestad-review/index.html
- ^{xviii} Morris. pg. 414.
- ^{xix} Morris. pg. 486.
- ^{xx} Morris. pg. 519.
- ^{xxi} Noddings. pg. 139-141.