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DEDICATION

According to the World Health Organization, an estimated ten million children die every year from the effects of extreme poverty. This amounts to an average of 26,000 per day. In the eight plus years since the tragic terrorist attack of 9-11-01 approximately 80 million children have died from preventable causes.

Meanwhile, the United States, through its annual Department of Defense operating budget, Department of Homeland Security and ongoing War on Terror in Afghanistan and Iraq, spends over $1 trillion per year on military expenses. In the eight plus years since the tragic terrorist attack of 9-11-01 the US has spent approximately $8 trillion for the commodities of war.

This dissertation is dedicated to the memory of the children who were never given a chance for life – those who died because their parents were caught in a poverty trap and were too poor to provide food, adequate shelter, potable water and health care; and because those of us who have resources were unwilling to share.

May God have mercy on their souls.
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ABSTRACT

WORLDVIEW AND PUBLIC POLICY:
FROM AMERICAN EXCEPTIONALISM TO AMERICAN EMPIRE

Wayne Lavender, Ph.D.

George Mason University, 2009

Dissertation Director: Mark Rozell

A worldview provides the framework in which to perceive reality: it is the existential construct through which humans focus and establish a context to the environment in which they live. Linked to the culture in which one lives, it can be expressed as a philosophy, a cognitive map, image, mindscape, symbolic universe, world hypotheses, assumptive worlds or moral orders, and is derived from the German Weltanschauung. A worldview is complex and dynamic and may be held by a majority or a minority within a society. The building blocks for a worldview include history, collective memory, religious heritage, symbols, and myths / legends / folktales.

Every culture, every society and every nation has a unique history, collective memory, religious heritage and collection of myths / legends / folktales. The combination of these factors creates a worldview, a context in which individual and national decisions are framed. The collective experience of the US leads to its current
status in the world as the only superpower, a unipolar status unequaled in history. Total military spending in the US by the Pentagon and Department of Defense (FY2009) is approximately one trillion dollars. This represents approximately 54.5 percent of the total amount of defense spending of the entire world. David Kilcullen writes: “In mid-2008, counting supplemental budget allocations for the Iraq War, the U.S. defense budget is approaching 70 percent of total global defense spending.” The US has stationed at least 267,000 soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines in, according to a Washington Post op-ed piece coauthored by then Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, more than 115 foreign nations.

Meanwhile, federal funding for development and diplomacy combined encompasses only a tiny fraction (5 percent) of total federal revenue designated for military spending. This imbalance has been cited by proponents of 3 – D Security (Defense, Diplomacy and Development) as problematic: a fully “balanced approach,” they argue, will mitigate war and advance peaceful solutions through the application of “smart power.”

Evidence collected and presented suggests the existence of a dominant worldview within the United States that supports redemptive violence and therefore supports the status quo in relation to appropriations for defense, diplomacy and development. The research also indicates the presence of a recessive gene that supports international cooperation, conflict resolution and peaceful coexistence.
Research was conducted using a concurrent triangular strategy methodology, an approach that combined elements of quantitative and qualitative research. Following the presentation and analysis of the data, policy recommendations are offered in an effort to nurture the recessive gene of cooperation in order to address other pressing concerns of the 21st Century such as environmental degradation, pandemic poverty, and a world awash with weapons.
INTRODUCTION

War and peace. Peace and war. Like two sides of the same coin or bookends on a shelf, these contrasting states of being have been paired together since the beginning of human history, framing the spectrum of social interaction. Despite the fact that humanity has moved into the 21st Century and has made what once was considered unimaginable technological advances now seem ordinary, the presence of war and the ongoing threat of future wars remains a stark reality. The existence of weapons of mass destruction (from nuclear to biological and chemical) and the seeming willingness of multiple actors to use these weapons place humanity in a precarious position: Homo sapiens have the potential and capacity to wipe out life on planet earth.

New stressors (overcrowding, global climate change, energy needs, biodiversity loss) have merged with age old problems (disease, famine, war) to create this reality: approximately 40% of the world’s population live in extreme poverty, and an average of 26,000 children die daily from the effects of these conditions. If the worst case scenarios predicted by many of the world’s scientists are true, global warming will threaten the lives of millions, perhaps billions, of people in the 21st Century from extensive food shortages, mass migrations, escalating tension / conflict / war between the haves and have-nots, etc.
In a world of limited resources, funds used to prepare and win wars are assets that could be used to mitigate human suffering, find solutions to energy needs, feed, clothe, shelter, educate and provide health care to the world’s population. Known for centuries as the “Guns vs. Butter” competition, money allocated to the war industry is money spent to build weapons and train soldiers to kill other human beings: capital spent on life enhancing capacities improves the human condition.

Theologian William Sloan Coffin understood the real dangers facing humanity at the beginning of the 21st Century:

The axis of evil is not Iraq, North Korea, and Iran. A much more formidable trio is environmental degradation, pandemic poverty, and a world awash with weapons. It would be very good American policy, for the sake of our national security, to wage war against global poverty. If we waged war seriously against global poverty, it would be very hard to recruit new terrorists.2

I was born in 1957 and came of age during the War in Vietnam. Like many others of my generation, I developed a healthy skepticism of the US military – political complex (from President Lyndon Johnson and Secretary of Defense McNamara to President Richard Nixon and Lieutenant William Calley). I watched the evening news with my parents and saw raw war footage, heard the daily death totals, and learned of members of my community who had been sent to fight. I learned of the tenacity of the Vietnamese who, despite great odds, were able to continue the war against a technically and materially superior nation and who eventually were successful in driving the US from their nation.

I was therefore an interested observer in the 1980’s as the US military re-branded itself under the political leadership of President Ronald Reagan and again captured the hearts and minds of the US public. The coming out event of the new and improved
professional army took place during the Gulf War under the leadership of Generals Norman Schwarzkopf and Colin Powell. Acting as the primary strength of a multi-national force, the US led coalition was successful in liberating Kuwait from Saddam Hussein’s Iraqi forces, thus restoring Kuwait’s constitutional monarchy. The curse of Vietnam had been exorcised and the US military restored to the exalted status it achieved following World War II and early decades of the Cold War.

The status, importance and reputation of the military and those who serve have increased in the years since, even in the face of two ongoing wars (Afghanistan and Iraq) with waning public support. Individuals who question or critique the policy decisions regarding these wars are branded as unpatriotic or disloyal. “Support the Troops” has become similar to a religious affirmation of faith, a mantra repeated at sporting events, schools, churches and other public events. When President Barack Obama compared the costs of a reformed health care program to the costs of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan during his health care speech on September 9, 2009, it elicited this reaction from former Alaska Governor Sarah Palin, who spoke for many Americans:

President Obama delivered an offhand applause line tonight about the cost of the War on Terror. As we approach the anniversary of the September 11th attacks and honor those who died that day and those who have died since in the War on Terror, in order to secure our freedoms, we need to remember their sacrifices and not demonize them as having had too high a price tag.³

It is somewhat ironic that this kind of support for the troops and the US military takes place despite the fact that I have yet to meet a person who believes that war is a moral good: that war, in and of itself, is righteous or virtuous. Having said that, the existence of war at this point in humanity’s social development highlights a total systemic failure of
individuals and nations to act in a civilized manner. Carl von Clausewitz’s assertion “that war is not merely a political act but a real political instrument, a continuation of political intercourse, a carrying out of the same by other means” has been accepted unchallenged for nearly two centuries. Within this context, war has been studied and scrutinized, discussed and debated, evaluated and assessed by many of the greatest minds in human history who have rationalized the most basic truth about war: the making of war is an evil activity. Defended at best as a necessary evil – it is never the less, morally speaking, an evil activity.

It is a striking paradox that many of the military and political leaders of the United States understand the full moral gravity of making war. Among an enormous amount of anti-war statements from US history are these three, spoken by men well acquainted with war:

- General William Tecumseh Sherman: "I am sick and tired of war. Its glory is all moonshine. It is only those who have neither fired a shot nor heard the shrieks and groans of the wounded who cry aloud for blood, for vengeance, for desolation. War is hell." 
- Franklin Delano Roosevelt: I have seen war. I have seen war on land and sea. I have seen blood running from the wounded. . . . I have seen the dead in the mud. I have seen cities destroyed. . . . I have seen children starving. I have seen the agony of mothers and wives. I hate war.
- Harry Truman: “Let us not become so preoccupied with weapons that we lost sight of the fact that war itself is the real villain.”

Approximately 110 million persons were killed in the wars of the 20th Century, more than any other century in human history. Joseph Stalin once quipped: “When
one man dies it is a tragedy: When thousands die its statistics.” Perhaps we have become more interested in statistics than in human existence.

The optimism created by the collapse of the Soviet Union and conclusion of the Cold War did not eliminate nor, in fact, even reduce the specter of war and violence. The “statistics” speak for themselves: during the 1990’s alone, there were “2 million dead in Afghanistan; 1.5 million dead in the Sudan; some 800,000 butchered in ninety days in Rwanda; a half-million dead in Angola; a quarter of a million dead in Bosnia; 200,000 dead in Guatemala; 150,000 dead in Liberia; a quarter of a million dead in Burundi; 75,000 dead in Algeria.” Add to this total those killed in the Persian Gulf War, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Chechnya, Sri Lanka, Northern Ireland, Kosovo, Sierra Leone and the statistics continue to grow. The first decade of the 21st Century suggests little hope for change and it is possible that future wars will produce more death and destruction than those of the past.

Just War Theory is a doctrine with origins in Greek and Roman philosophy and Roman Catholic theology. Aristotle and Cicero described conditions for the state in which wars could be described as “just,” and St. Augustine used theological language to established similar conditions for Christians. Through the centuries theologians such as Maimonides, Aquinas, Vitoria and Suarez defined the religious argument and writers like Hugo Grotius and Michael Waltzer shaped it in a secular manner. Among the conditions to be met under the terms of a so-called “just war” are those of last resort, serious prospects or success, proportionality and proper authority to declare and wage war. Although meeting the standards of Just War have been problematical to meet in the
past, in the 21st Century these conditions are becoming increasingly difficult to address because warfare has evolved in its ability to kill and destroy.

One of the major planks in the “Just War” tradition is that the weapons used in war must discriminate between combatants and non-combatants. Civilians are never permissible targets of war, and every effort must be taken to avoid killing civilians. The deaths of civilians are justified only if they are unavoidable victims of a deliberate attack on a military target. But in the 20th Century this policy became increasingly irrelevant. “Only 5 percent of those who died in World War I were civilians; in World War II the figure increased to 66 percent.” It is generally assumed that 80 to 90 percent of those killed in today’s war are civilians. During the early stages of World War II the Germans intentionally bombed civilian targets in Great Britain such as London and Coventry: toward the end of the war the allies intentionally bombed civilian targets in Germany and Japan. The bombing campaign by the US during the War in Vietnam was a premeditated, deliberate attack on civilian targets and civilian activities (agriculture, schools, hospitals) designed to kill the civilian population of Vietnam.

The United States came out of World War II as the most powerful nation on the planet. Although the Soviet Union challenged the US during the Cold War, the power and influence of the United States, in terms of military strength, economic and culture domination, was never usurped. Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, the United States emerged as a unipolar power. Today, the United States is the strongest nation in the history of the world. The United States has 725 military bases in 140 nations and has, according to Niall Ferguson, made the British Empire look “like a half-baked
thing.” Charles Krauthammer writes: “On December 26, 1991, the Soviet Union died and something new was born, something utterly new – a unipolar world dominated by a single superpower unchecked by any rival and with decisive reach in every corner of the globe.” Paul Kennedy adds: “Nothing has ever existed like this disparity of power; nothing. . . . No other nation comes close. . . . Charlemagne’s empire was merely western European in its reach. The Roman Empire stretched farther afield, but there was another great empire in Persia, and a larger one in China. There is, therefore, no comparison.”

The cost to project and maintain this extensive military power is extensive – Robert Higgs calculated that total US military spending surpassed the $1 trillion mark in 2007, and that number has continued to increase in the years since. The US military spending dwarfs the military budgets of other nations. David Kilcullen writes: “In mid-2008, counting supplemental budget allocations for the Iraq War, the U.S. defense budget is approaching 70 percent of total global defense spending.” Stated again – the US spends more money on its military than all of the other nations of the world combined. US Secretary of Defense Robert Gates points out this imbalance by identifying that the US Navy is larger (in terms of tonnage) than the next 13 navies of the world combined (11 of which are US allies).

Attempts to limit or roll back military spending are met with great derision and contempt within the US, causing current Secretary of the Defense Robert Gates to quip: “Only in the parallel universe that is Washington, D.C., would that [an increase in the DoD budget for FY 2010 but not as large an increase as some argued for] be considered
‘gutting’ defense.” Military spending in the United States has become a sacred cow and those who challenge the rising costs labeled unpatriotic, naïve or disloyal.

The $1 trillion military spending figure is many times greater than the amount the US spends on diplomacy and development, the 2nd and 3rd components of a 3-legged stool known as 3–D Security (Development, Diplomacy and Defense). Jeffrey Sachs writes: “It is a hallmark of U.S. military national security doctrine that U.S. security rests on the pillars of defense, diplomacy, and development, but to understand the true nature of policy, it’s good to follow the money.” As already stated, total US military spending surpassed the $1 trillion mark in 2007: in the same fiscal year the US spent $14 billion for development and humanitarian assistance, and $11 for diplomacy (US embassies, the State Department, etc.). The combined development and diplomatic totals for 2007 ($25 billion) pales in comparison to the $1 trillion spent through the Department of Defense and represents only 2.5 percent of that total. These figures are “a startling and vivid display of the lopsided nature of our national security investment.”

This current imbalance towards military spending is relatively new for the United States. Until the 1940’s and post–World War II, the US maintained a long history of disarming after periods of war and a return to a peacetime economy with a comparatively small standing army. In his farewell address, George Washington warned the young nation of “foreign entanglements:” why, he concluded, should the US interweave “our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor or caprice? It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world.”
A generation later (1825) John Quincy Adams, echoing Washington, spoke these words in the newly constructed US Capital building: “[America’s] glory is not dominion, but liberty. Her march is the march of the mind. She has a spear and a shield: but the motto upon her shield is, Freedom, Independence, Peace.”

But this peaceful, cooperative strand has been woven into a far different fabric today wherein the United States occupies a position tantamount to an empire. What is it within the US society that has brought about this change? Adrian Lewis argues, “The United States became a ‘superpower’ through war, and has retained that status because of war.” Conquest and war have played an important role in the development of the US, and this history is playing an important role in shaping our current policies.

From its origins as a small colonial outpost of Europe in the early 17th Century to its contemporary position, the history of the US can be seen as a series of punctuated equilibrium moments, each raising the bar and moving towards a more powerful position. Some of these significant moments are:

- The Monroe Doctrine. In 1823 President James Monroe articulated what would become known as the “Monroe Doctrine” in his annual State of the Union Address to Congress. This doctrine asserted that European nations should refrain from further colonial activities in the Western Hemisphere and that the US would correspondingly refrain itself from meddling in European matters.

- Manifest Destiny. First used in 1839, the phrase was introduced to a wider audience by a newspaper journalist John L. O’Sullivan in his call for the annexation of Texas. In its most inclusive application, supporters advocated the US expansion of the entire North American continent, from “Artic to Tropic.” The spread of the US is, within this framework, both obvious (manifest) and virtually pre-determined (destiny).
- **Fifty-four Forty or Fight.** A slogan from the Oregon Dispute during the 1840’s with Great Britain / Canada, this catchphrase sums up the position of a bully: give it to me my way or I will fight you for it. Due to a variety of issues, the US settled for the boundary south of this position at fifty-four degrees without a fight.\(^{31}\)

- **Speak softly and carry a big stick.** President Theodore Roosevelt’s slogan, the “Big Stick Foreign Policy” is virtually an oxymoron – a phrase that carries seemingly contradictory terms – in that it suggest peaceful negotiations while threatening military repercussions. Roosevelt used the phrase in a speech twelve days before becoming the president after the assassination of William McKinley.\(^{32}\) It echoes the ideas of realpolitik and Machiavelli.

- **The Truman Doctrine.** Articulated by President Harry Truman on March 12, 1947, the Truman Doctrine declares the US as the leader of the free world and therefore is the defender of democracy in a worldwide fight against communism. Set in the midst of the crisis in Turkey and Greece, Truman concluded with these words: “If we falter in our leadership, we may endanger the peace of the world, and we shall surely endanger the welfare of this nation.”\(^{33}\)

- **The Bush Doctrine.** A phrase used to describe the policy or preventive war against nations that represent potential or perceived threats to the United States combined with the policy of spreading democracy around the world and a unilateral approach to international relations.\(^{34}\)

Too much of the time, talent and resources of the US are devoted to learning how to win wars vis-à-vis in learning how to avoid wars. Herein lays a troubling reality: the waging
of war is costly in terms of financial and human resources, especially when considered in relation to diplomacy and development. The old aphorism that “talk is cheap” points to a certain profound truth about conflict resolution and the making of peace. Aircraft carriers, fighter jets, “smart bombs,” sophisticated tanks, helicopters and other contemporary weapons are tremendously expensive, as are the costs of training, maintaining and deploying an army. During wartime, expenses literally explode. Nobel Prize winning economist Joseph Stiglitz and colleague Linda Bilmes have calculated the immediate and long-term costs of the war in Iraq at three trillion dollars.\textsuperscript{35} The book, published in February 2008, reminded readers that the meter was still running, i.e. the total costs of the war were still increasing since the war had yet to conclude. Additionally, their book did not include the immediate and long-term costs of the War in Afghanistan. While talk is cheap, money talks, and the US is spending inordinate sums of money on military expenditures.

Contrast these costs with the Peace Corps. In its 46 years of existence, the Peace Corps has sent 190,000 US citizens to 139 foreign nations.\textsuperscript{36} The budget for fiscal year 2007 was $336 million, a trifling amount compared to the DoD budget. In 2009 13,000 persons applied for 4,000 jobs at the Peace Corps indicating a demand for positions unable to be supplied by the US. Furthermore, twenty new nations have asked that the US expand the Peace Corps to incorporate their countries in the Peace Corps mission: these requests, however, have been denied because of budgetary limitations.\textsuperscript{37} Why, we might ask, is the Peace Corps denied this funding when the Pentagon’s budget continues to grow and expand at a greater rate? I might suggest that there is a matter of priorities
and that this is a manifestation of US policy procedures at work within the US today, and these priorities are somehow rooted and supported by our culture and worldview.

The existing imbalance between the US military spending and that of the other nations of the world, and the imbalance between the US military spending and US spending for development and diplomacy raise this important question for academics, policy makers and the public at large: why is the US military budget so proportionally high in comparison to what other nations spend for defense, and why is this spending so high in relation to funding spent by the US on development and diplomacy?

There is no single, or simple, answer to this question. Policymaking and budget setting in the US is a complex, nuanced process that includes competing stakeholders, politicians, triggering events, agenda setting and public opinion. A systematic study of any of these could uncover vast amounts of data and literature that could contribute to understanding the status quo.

The literature and research do suggest a number of factors that contribute to the existing US military spending patterns. Among these factors is the theory that there is no grand plan or scheme behind the extensive military spending, it has just happened by default. This line of thinking maintains that there is no conspiracy, plot or scheme for the US to put so many of its resources into military spending, this spending imbalance and dependence on military spending has just evolved through a “perfect storm” set of circumstances. Accordingly, a gradual re-ordering of the US priorities along the lines of a more balanced approach will most likely take place in the coming decades.\(^\text{38}\)

A second explanation is that special interests in the military – industrial – political...
complex (the so-called “Iron Triangle”39) have created a spending monster with an insatiable appetite that can no longer be checked nor reigned in. An analysis of the recent debate regarding the F-22 fighter jet supports this theory. Construction jobs for the F-22 jet are distributed to 46 separate states – not because it is more efficient or economical to construct the jets in this manner, but because this will insure Congressional support of the project. Even when the DoD said that it no longer wanted this particular jet, Congress continued to fund it for an additional decade, finally, reluctantly, voting to halt production in 2012 pending the completion of 4 more jets.

The Iron Triangle components (Congress, Pentagon and Defense Industry) were identified in C. Wright Mill’s book, The Power Elite,40 and depicted more recently by Robert Gates during his speech to the Economics Club of Chicago on July 16, 2009:

First, there is the Congress, which is understandably concerned, especially in these tough economic times, about protecting jobs in certain states and congressional districts. There is the defense and aerospace industry, which has an obvious financial stake in the survival and growth of these programs.

And there is the institutional military itself – within the Pentagon, and as expressed through an influential network of retired generals and admirals, some of whom are paid consultants to the defense industry, and some who often are quoted as experts in the news media.41

A third argument explaining the US imbalance towards defense spending is that these funds are appropriate and necessary and without them conditions around the world would be worse. Proponents of a strong military point to a weak United Nations and fragile international system in which the US serves by default as the world’s police. The US military serves, effective, to keep shipping channels open, maintain a minimum rule of law for international transactions, provide for common security, defend weak nations
from attack and invasion, etc. Because there is no control group or alternative universe, it is difficult to argue for or against the efficacy of this explanation.

What is of interest to me, however, is another reason – an explanation that is perhaps more fundamental and root orientated than some of the other factors mentioned. This is the possibility that there exists a dominant worldview within the US that believes in the redemptive role of violence and sees the US military as a means through which the US will spread peace and prosperity, democracy and freedom to all parts of the globe. Rooted in American Exceptionalism, it is the line of thinking that supports Abraham Lincoln’s wish that “America will once again be seen as the last best hope of earth.” An extreme example of this worldview is perhaps found in the words of George W. Bush who, speaking in response to the attacks of 9 – 11, said the following:

Our responsibility to history is already clear: to answer these attacks and rid the world of evil.42

A worldview provides the framework in which to perceive reality and create “truth:” it is the existential construct through which humans focus and establish a context to the environment in which they live. Located in the culture (the word “culture” itself is derived from the “Latin cultūra, from cultus, cultivation.”43) in which one lives, a worldview can be expressed as a philosophy, a cognitive map, image, mindscape, symbolic universe, world hypotheses, assumptive worlds or moral orders, and is derived from the German Weltanschauung. It is unconscious rather than conscious, and shapes how individuals think, organize the world and establish meaning in events and activities.44 A worldview is complex and dynamic and may be held by a majority and / or
a minority within a society. The building blocks for a worldview include a nation’s special history, collective memory, religious heritage, symbols and myths / legends / folktales.

Every culture, every society and every nation has a unique history, collective memory, religious heritage and collection of myths / legends / folktales. This eclectic, unique combination of factors creates a national identity and worldview, a context in which individual and national decisions are framed. We can say, therefore, that there is something “in the soil” of a culture. What is of importance for this dissertation is the expression of a particular worldview within the US regarding war, and how this worldview affects public policy. Thus, if we place as an output the US imbalanced military spending within a framework of worldview, we must ask ourselves, what is the input, i.e. what is the worldview that supports this output? Indeed, is there a dominant worldview at work within the US culture that unconsciously supports this extraordinary spending level for the military?

If there is a dominant worldview within the culture of the US it might be, as mentioned above, be discovered within the framework of “American Exceptionalism.” Alexis de Tocqueville first coined this phrase to refer to his impression that the young nation (Tocqueville visited the United States in the 1830’s) held a unique spot among nations due to its historic development, self-definition, political and religious institutions. He wrote: “There is no country in the world where the Christian religion retains a greater influence over the souls of men than in America.”
Religion plays an important role in the US, and as an ordained United Methodist pastor I have observed firsthand its influence. In addition to preaching from the pulpit in churches where I have served, I have also had the opportunity of speaking multiple times at Memorial Day and Veteran’s Day observances, public school dedications, the inauguration of a mayor and elected officials, and the dedication of a 9-11 memorial in the town where I was serving in 2004. These, and numerous other public moments in which religious leaders participate, help create and perpetuate worldview – and the peculiar relationship between church and state in the US culture contributes to its national identity.

The US self-perception as a unique, special and religious nation dates to John Winthrop and the pilgrim’s establishment of the Massachusetts Bay Colony in the 1630s. During his transatlantic trip Winthrop preached to his fellow travelers aboard their ship the Arbella the following words:

For we must consider that we shall be as a city upon a hill. The eyes of all people are upon us. So that if we shall deal falsely with our God in this work we have undertaken... we shall be made a story and a by-word throughout the world. We shall open the mouths of enemies to speak evil of the ways of God... We shall shame the faces of many of God's worthy servants, and cause their prayers to be turned into curses upon us til we be consumed out of the good land whither we are a-going.48

The “City on a Hill” image is derived from Jesus’ Sermon on the Mount, found in the Gospel of Matthew, chapters 5 – 7. Matthew records Jesus’ words in this manner: “You are the light of the world. A city built on a hill cannot be hid.” (Matthew 5: 14)

The first European settlers to what is today the United States perceived their mission as a re-enactment of the Biblical story of Joshua within a Christian context.
Having “escaped from Europe,” many pilgrims saw themselves as the spiritual heirs of the children of Israel who were liberated from Egypt and then conquered Israel.49 The willingness to use military actions to pursue “just policies” and spread “Christian values” extended beyond the Indian Wars and was cited to defend other military campaigns. Colonial political and religious officials made moral arguments during the Revolutionary War and US political and religious officials made similar claims during the War of 1812 for the elimination of monarchies; in the Mexican War it was to defeat the Roman Catholic superstitions; the Civil War was fought by the Union to eliminate slavery; World War I was fought to make the world safe for democracy; World War II, Korea and Vietnam were fought to oppose totalitarian regimes.50

Positively, Americans do support democracy, freedom, liberty and peace. Throughout US history a moralistic streak has been present – the striving towards becoming “a city on a hill,” a vision or peace and justice for the whole world. This metaphor has been evoked throughout US history, including Presidents John Kennedy and Ronald Reagan. John Kennedy, himself a native of Massachusetts, spoke these words eleven days after winning a close presidential and in preparation for taking the office of president:

I have been guided by the standard John Winthrop set before his shipmates on the flagship Arbella three hundred and thirty-one years ago, as they, too, faced the task of building a new government on a perilous frontier. "We must always consider," he said, "that we shall be as a city upon a hill—the eyes of all people are upon us." Today the eyes of all people are truly upon us—and our governments, in every branch, at every level, national, state and local, must be as a city upon a hill—constructed and inhabited by men aware of their great trust and their great responsibilities.51
Ronald Reagan’s use of the phrase came at the end of his presidency: on January 11, 1989, nine days before leaving office, Reagan said:

I've spoken of the shining city all my political life, but I don't know if I ever quite communicated what I saw when I said it. But in my mind it was a tall proud city built on rocks stronger than oceans, wind-swept, God-blessed, and teeming with people of all kinds living in harmony and peace, a city with free ports that hummed with commerce and creativity, and if there had to be city walls, the walls had doors and the doors were open to anyone with the will and the heart to get here. That's how I saw it and see it still.52

But dangerously, perhaps, Americans have convinced themselves that God has poured out his special blessings on the US – that God has given a special blessing to America. This conviction comes with a potentially negative consequence: the belief in a special US blessing can be translated to mean a global responsibility that allows some Americans to take the next logical step in declaring that God has blessed the US military activities as an extension of the divine army to bring democracy, freedom, justice and peace to the people of the world. In Biblical or religious terms, there are those within the US who are convinced the US is on God’s side in the cosmic struggle between good and evil.

Although most citizens of the US do not perceive their nation as militaristic, the excessive military spending (remember Kilcullen’s analysis that the US military spending in 2008 approaches 70 percent of the world total) speaks to a different reality. Marc Gopin writes:

In every militant movement in the world, from movements in Arab Islam to American Southern Christianity, ancient religion is used highly selectively, carving out what encourages self-worship, hatred and violence, and silencing what encourages passivity, tolerance, acceptance, self-criticism and self-examination...53
Arguably the three most important wars that have shaped the United States are the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, and World War II. As previously noted, these wars helped shape important aspects of US identity: the United States gained its independence from Great Britain through the Revolutionary War, and it was the Civil War through which the unjust and immoral institution of slavery was finally overthrown. In World War II the United States was able to help defeat Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan through victories achieved on the battleground. I am convinced that these three wars have each helped shape the worldview of US citizens and may have contributed to the belief that war can be successfully employed to achieve peace and justice.

What would this “dominant worldview” look like? Neoconservative Robert Kagan has captured this worldview, and describes it in these terms:

When employed fairly neutrally to describe a foreign policy worldview neoconservatism usually has a recognizable meaning. It connotes a potent moralism and idealism in world affairs, a belief in America’s exceptional role as a promoter of the principles of liberty and democracy, a belief in the preservation of American primacy and in the exercise of power, including military power, as a tool for defending and advancing moralistic and idealistic causes, as well as a suspicion of international institutions and a tendency toward unilateralism.54

Is it possible that this worldview described by Robert Kagan is, in fact, the dominant worldview of the US public? Although the US has been described as a pluralistic society comprised of many sub-cultures, it also can be understood as the “melting pot” wherein individual and communal characteristics give way to national tendencies. Tracing the possible existence of a dominant worldview within the US culture regarding war could provide key information regarding US priorities and help policy makers who are seeking
to change the status quo.

The purpose of this study is to determine if evidence exists of a dominant worldview within the United States that supports an imbalance in relation to appropriations for defense, diplomacy and development. Evidence has been collected indicating the existence of this dominant worldview: evidence has also been collected demonstrating a recession worldview within the United States that supports a more peaceful, balanced, cooperative approach between defense, diplomacy and development, and in terms of understanding the role and place of the United States on the world stage.

This study begins with a chapter designed to introduce and explain the meaning of the concept “worldview” (Chapter 1): the purpose of this chapter is to establish an in depth understanding of this important concept. The chapter will include a brief description of the history of the concept, relevant literature, and it’s building blocks of history, collective memory, religious heritage, symbols and myths / legends / folktales. This chapter will provide the basic definition of worldview for which this analysis will be based.

Chapter 2 is devoted to a description of the discipline of Public Policy. Like the first chapter, this chapter will include a brief history of the discipline, relevant literature, and its associated fields. This chapter will provide the basic definition of Public Policy for which this analysis will be based.

Having established the definition for these worldview and Public Policy, Chapter 3 will provide definitions for the word “dominant” and phrase “redemptive violence.” The word “dominant” and phrase “redemptive violence” are important components of
this study that seeks to determine if there is a dominant worldview within the US that supports redemptive violence and thus the imbalance between the components of 3 – D Security.

Chapter 4 provides the research question, a working and alternative hypothesis and the methodology to be employed. The research question provides the point of departure from which the research will be collected. Thus, this analysis seeks to obtain data to establish if this dominant worldview exists or does not exist. A concurrent triangulation strategy for been selected as the methodology for obtaining data, a hybrid of quantitative and qualitative research appropriate for ascertaining the potential existence of a dominant worldview within a social order, i.e. the United States. This approach will provide quantitative data drawing from war memorials, monuments and plaques, peace memorials, monuments and plaques, US flags displayed within United Methodist Churches, US state preambles, and US history books from public schools at the elementary, middle and high school levels. Qualitative data will include interviews, a content analysis of five selected states frameworks and guidelines for approving US History textbooks, and ethnographic field research.

I present the data I have collected in Chapter 5. I first describe my quantitative data, based on counts of war and peace memorials, the coverage of key subjects in history texts, and other countable evidence. Tables and charts are provided to support my explanations of the key findings. I then describe my qualitative data, based on interviews with a wide variety of military, government, and civilian leaders. I also draw on illustrations of monuments and pictures taken from texts to emphasize key points in my
argument.

In many respects, this is the heart of the dissertation and will provide data, in relation to the research question, both for and against the hypothesis. The data presented is the creation of new knowledge and have been collected over a six-month period using phone calls, email, use of the Internet, personal visits of important sites and the reading of academic and non-academic literature.

Chapter 6 is an analysis of the data collected. Interpreting what this new material means for worldview and public policy has been a process of wrestling with the data in an honest effort to tease out significant findings and assess their meaning. Conclusions will be made based on an analysis of the research collected.

Chapter 7 provides policy recommendations. These recommendations are set in the context of what will be the most efficient and effective policy for national and global security and peace for the 21st Century. Recommendations will correspond to the statements made by Robert Gates to increase resources for development and diplomacy, and match calls by Frank Hoffman to concurrently reduce military spending.55 Given the foundational understanding of the important role worldview and culture play in shaping a society, policy recommendations will target systemic societal changes. Although it is possible for change to take place in a relatively short period of time, most cultural and worldview shifts are generational – therefore, policy recommendations pursue long-term attitudes and awareness. Policy recommendations will be given at the local, state and national level and will include a changing focus on educational material, national holidays, monuments and symbols.
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CHAPTER 1 – WAS IST EIN WELTANSCHAUUNG?

Carl Sagan wrote that the Library of Alexandria housed approximately half a million scrolls.¹ Its librarians sought to obtain a copy of every book in existence, and the burning of this library in antiquity represents one of the greatest literary and intellectual loses of human history. The library must have had collections of books in all of the established disciplines at that time, including philosophy, theology, literature, medicine, geography, mathematics, physics, astronomy, history, biology, the natural sciences and more. Today, there are literally thousands of books written on each of these subjects that could literally fill most libraries around the world.

But the Library at Alexandria would not have possessed any scrolls that focused on Worldview: the concept of “Worldview” is relatively new, having been coined by the German philosopher Emmanuel Kant in 1792.² This concept quickly spread through the work of German academics, first philosophers and theologians, then through a broader intellectual group: “Though German theologians, poets, and philosophers primarily made use of the term during the first two decades of the nineteenth century, by the century’s midpoint it had infiltrated a number of other disciplines, including the work of the historian Ranke, the musician Wagner, the theologian Feebbak, and the physicist Alexander von Humbolt.”³
The word “Worldview” migrated into the English language and was used by such philosophers as William James and J. Martineau. Today, “Worldview” is used casually by many writers and speakers in the United States, and its general use can be described in this manner: “Usually the term is applied to a philosophy affecting the practical (as opposed to purely theoretical) attitudes and beliefs of its adherents.”

We may speak of a “liberal worldview” as opposed to a “conservative worldview,” a “Christian worldview” foiled against a “Muslim worldview,” an “American worldview” verses a “Chinese worldview,” and so forth.

But the concept of Worldview and its deeper implications have not advanced and been developed significantly beyond its roots in the Germany speaking nations and in the philosophical circles from which it was introduced. Although there are now a number of books that can be classified under the title of “Worldview,” that number is still small and increasing only gradually. Further, books and articles that explore the relationship between Worldview and Public Policy are virtually non-existent. A deeper understanding of the concept of Worldview will help bridge this gap between Worldview and Public Policy and illustrate the important association between the two.

The purpose of this chapter is to introduce the concept of Worldview to those for whom it is new, to provide more depth and clarity for those who are acquainted with the concept, and to establish how the possession of a particular worldview can affect personal, communal or national decisions. This chapter will include a description of the word “worldview,” a brief history of the same, a review of the leading articles and books.
that describe Worldview, a description of the building blocks of Worldview and an example from my work experiences of a so-called “Clash of Worldviews.”

**Definition of Worldview**

Philosopher Immanuel Kant coined the term Worldview (*Weltanschauung*) in 1790 in his book *Critique of Judgment*:

> If the human mind is nonetheless to be able even to think the given infinite without contradiction, it must have within itself a power that is supersensible, whose idea of the noumenon cannot be intuited but can yet be regarded as the substrate underlying what is mere appearance, namely our intuition of the world [*Weltanschauung*]. For only by means of this power and its idea do we, in a pure intellectual estimation of magnitude, comprehend the infinite in the world of sense entirely under a concept, even though in a mathematical estimation of magnitude by means of numerical concepts we can never think it in its entirety.\(^6\)

This is the only instance in which Kant used the word, and David Naugle writes: “that for Kant the word *Weltanschauung* means simply the sense perception of the word.”\(^7\) But the use of the word and its definition quickly evolved from its creation by Kant through to its meaning today.

Worldview is a concept, an idea of how individuals, communities and nations view the world around them. A worldview provides the framework in which to perceive reality: it is the existential construct through which humans focus and establish a context to the environment in which they live. Linked to the culture in which one lives, it can be expressed as a philosophy, a cognitive map, image, mindscape, symbolic universe, world hypotheses, assumptive worlds or moral orders, and is derived from the German *Weltanschauung*: *Welt*, German for “World” and *Anschauung* German for “view” or
“outlook.” A worldview is complex and dynamic and may be held by a majority or a minority within a society. The building blocks for a worldview include history, collective memory, religious heritage, symbols, and myths / legends / folktales.

As such, the concept of Worldview is more difficult to capture and measure, as opposed to the hard social sciences that can glean economic data or statistical information. Nevertheless, the concept of Worldview is being studied and described in a small segment of literature, mostly taking place within the disciplines of anthropology, sociology, philosophy and theology.

A “concept is one of the oldest terms in the philosophical vocabulary, and one of the most equivocal. Though a frequent source of confusion and controversy, it remains useful, precisely because of its ambiguity, as a sort of passkey through the labyrinths represented by the theory of meaning, the theory of thinking, and the theory of being.”

Worldview is a concept, but also a series of concepts, as defined by Leo Apostel and his colleagues: in their book, World Views: From Fragmentation to Integration: “A worldview is a coherent collection of concepts and theorems that must allow us to construct a global image of the world, and in this way to understand as many elements of our experience as possible.” They develop this definition further, positing seven components of a worldview, these being:

1. What is the nature of the world? How is it structured and how does it function?
2. Why is our world the way it is, and not different? Why are we the way we are, and not different? What kind of global explanation principles can we put forward?
3. Why do we feel the way we feel in this world, and how do we assess global reality, and the role of our species in it?
4. How are we to act and to create in this world? How, in what different ways, can we influence the world and transform it? What are the general principles by which we should organize our actions?

5. What future is open to us and our species in this world? By what criteria are we to select these possible futures?

6. How are we to construct our image of this world in such a way that we can come up with answers to (1), (2), and (3)?

7. What are some of the partial answers that we can propose to these questions?\(^{10}\)

Jayne Docherty, in her book *Learning Lessons From Waco,\(^{11}\)* reformulates these components of a worldview in this manner:

- What is real or true? (Ontology)
- How is “the real” organized? (Logic)
- What is valuable or important? (Axiology)
- How do we know about what is? (Epistemology)
- How should I or we act? (Ethic)\(^{12}\)

Docherty describes a “clash of worldviews” between members of the FBI and Branch Davidians of David Koresh: this worldview clash led ultimately to the tragic fire in Waco, Texas, wherein over seventy people died, including twenty-three children. She explains that there are challenges to knowing ones or another’s worldview because we can never fully know anyone’s worldview. Worldviews are *lived* rather than articulated principles or formulas. Also worldviews take place in “dialogue” within the context (culture) in which people live. “Her main finding is that the Branch Davidians and federal law enforcement, even while continuing ‘to negotiate,’ were looking at the world in utterly different ways, underwriting too often a ‘negotiation’ that was virtually a dialogue of the deaf, resulting in a deep mutual miscomprehension that carried lethal consequences.”\(^{13}\)
Worldview can be understood as the meaning-making, identity-making, self-perception mechanism that produces culture. In turn, culture supports human understanding of meaning and identity-making in a symbiotic, mutually re-enforcing system. A worldview reflects the culture from which it is found just as culture reveals the worldview of the society in which it is nested in a feedback loop wherein each can be seen as sides of the same coin. Figure 1.1 illustrates the role of worldview in creating a culture just as culture itself informs its worldview.

![Figure 1.1: Diagram of the Relationship Between Culture and Worldview](image)

The publication of *Culture Matters*\(^1^4\) in 2000 and its extensive penetration into a wide ranging arc of academic circles in the decade since highlight an increasing interest into the power and capacity of culture to shape people and nations. As early as 1930 Max Weber argued that culture has a profound economic impact. His work centers on the Protestant Reformation, in general, and Calvinistic theology, in particular, and their role in the development of capitalism.\(^1^5\) In his chapter for the book *Culture Matters*, David Landes begins with these words: “Max Weber was right. If we learn anything from the history of economic development, it is that culture makes almost all of the difference.”\(^1^6\) Douglass North concludes that culture can be considered an important factor for economic development because differences “can be observed from the evidence that the
same formal rules and/or constitutions imposed on different societies produce different outcomes." Further, "Culture plays a powerful role in human life . . . Culture influences the way we view the world and the use we make of it. It shapes our outlook and affections, facilitates our work, conveys our understanding and convictions, variously delights and edifies or troubles and dismay us, and constitutes part of the legacy we will leave for future generations."  

But what is culture, and what is its relationship to worldview? In 1973 anthropologist Clifford Geertz published his important book, *The Interpretation of Culture,* and redefined the concept of culture from a description of the way in which a group of people live, including their artifacts and technology and everything anyone would need to know in order to become an active member of this society, to "a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which people communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward life." Geertz is associated with symbolic anthropology, a field of study that perceives culture as a symbolic structure wherein humans create interpretations of the world – which is worldview. A good example of this is the well-known New Yorker cover/poster of a New Yorker looking west: this illustration provides a caricature of a worldview. This characterization speaks
to a profound truth regarding worldview: where we stand determines what we will see, both literally and figuratively.

Geertz highlighted the important role thought and symbols have within a society. Although he wrote and was concerned about culture, culture’s correlation to worldview make his work relevant here, and he described Worldview in his chapter “World View, and the Analysis of Sacred Symbols” in this way:

A people’s ethos is the tone, character, and quality of their life, its moral and aesthetic style and mood; it is the underlying attitude toward themselves and their world that life reflects. Their world view is their picture of the way things in sheer actuality are, their concept of nature, of self, of society. It contains their most comprehensive ideas of order. Religious believe and ritual confront and mutually confirm one another; the ethos is made intellectually reasonable by being shown to represent a way of life implied by the actual state of affairs of which such a way of life is an authentic expression.  

Figure 1.3 illustrates the important position culture and worldview hold as the encompassing framework in which individuals, relationships and structures are nested. Changing structures (DoD, State Department, USAID and / or other government or non-governmental “structures”) will not be effective unless the culture and its corresponding worldview support such a change. The genius of George Orwell (Animal Farm) and The Who (“Meet the new boss: same as the old boss,” from Won’t Get Fooled Again) is their realization that nothing will change (structures) if nothing changes (culture / worldview).
A worldview, then, working in tandem, in relationship and symbiotically with culture, provides the framework in which to perceive reality: it is the existential construct through which humans focus and establish a context to the environment in which they live. A worldview frames the perception of and for individuals, families, regions and nations and becomes embodied in the DNA of a society. It is unconscious rather than conscious, and shapes how individuals think, organize the world, establish meaning in events and activities. 

**History of the Concept**

David Naugle, chair and professor at the Dallas Baptist University, published *Worldview: History of a Concept* in 2002. In this book he explores the conceptual history of the term “worldview” from the writings of Immanuel Kant forward. He describes how the term was first copied by one of Kant’s students, Johann Gottlieb Fichte, who used the word two years after Kant (1792) in his book *An Attempt at a Critique of All Revelation*: “If we were able to take its principle as a basis for a world view [einer Welt Anschauung] then according to this principle one and the same effect would be cognized as fully necessary – an effect which appears to us in relation to the world of sense as free according to the moral law, and when attributed to the causality or reason, appears in nature as coningent.”

From this point, the use of the word spread through Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von Schelling, who changed the meaning of the word from a mere sensory perception of the world to the cultural patterns imprinted in our brains. Schelling writes: “The intelligence is of two kinds, either blind and unconscious or free and with productive consciousness;
productive unconsciousness in a worldview, with consciousness in the creation of an ideal world.\textsuperscript{26} So Worldview has undergone a shift, from sensory information about the world around us, to “the product of an unconscious intellect. It refers to subterranean impressions about the world conceived by an anesthetized yet functioning mind . . . Thus, from its birth in Kant to its use in Schelling, the term’s primary meaning shifted from the sensory to the intellectual perception of the cosmos.”\textsuperscript{27}

An important German philosopher who used and further developed the concept of Worldview was Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel. Hegel, known for his contribution to philosophy of dialectical idealism, used the word \textit{Weltanschauung} frequently. In an early work (\textit{The Difference Between Fichte’s and Schelling’s System of Philosophy}), he writes: “Reason then united this objective totality with the opposite subjective totality to form the infinite world-intuition [unendlichen \textit{Weltanschauung}] whose expansion has at the same time contracted into the richest and simplest identity.”\textsuperscript{28} Later in his career he writes about a moral view of the world:

Starting with a specific character of this sort, there is formed and established a moral outlook on the world [\textit{moralischche Weltanschauung}] which consists in a process of relation the implicit aspect of morality and the explicit aspect . . . The moral view of the world [Die \textit{moralischche Weltanschauung}], the moral attitudes, consists in the development of the moments which are found present in this relation of such entirely antithetic and confliction presuppositions.\textsuperscript{29}

Later still he discusses the concept of Worldview in his book \textit{The Philosophy of History}. Here Hegel describes how Worldviews becomes embedded in both the individual and collective consciousness. He describes aspects of the Hindu religion, and then posits that this theology “gives a general idea of the Indian view of the Universe [\textit{indischen}}
Vincent McCarthy, reading this and other sections from Hegel, writes: “For Hegel, Weltanschauung means the world-view of a certain nation, in a certain time: a shared view in which the poet participates. Thus a world-view is a general, shared view which one acquires automatically by participation in the times and society which one forms with one’s fellows . . . World-view, à la Hegel, is the understanding from apprehending the unfolding of Spirit in the exterior world.”

Søren Kierkegaard (1813 – 1855), the Danish philosopher, discovered the world Weltanschauung and created a Danish equivalent of it in the word Verdensanskuelse. He used this word, and the word Lebensanschauung (English – lifeview) throughout his work as he “searched for a deep and satisfying view of life that would enable him to become a total human self.”

Friedrich Nietzsche reportedly used the word Weltanschauung fifty times throughout his works. “He can speak of the Hellenic, Dionysian, Christian, Hegelian, and mechanistic views of life . . . Nietzsche believes worldview are cultural entities which people in a given geographical location and historical context are dependent upon, subordinate to, and products of . . . According to Nietzsche, worldviews are nothing but reifications. They are the subjective creations of human knowers in formative social contexts who ascribe their outlook to nature, God, law, or some presumed authority.”

The subject of Worldview continued to be the subject of important intellectuals in the 20th Century, including Karl Jaspers (1883 – 1969) who wrote Psychology of Worldviews in 1919. Jaspers describes the creation of Worldview from two angles: from the subjective (attitudes) and objective sides (world pictures). “Attitudes are the
formal patterns and structures of mental existence by means of which the world is experienced either actively, contemplatively, rationally, sensualistically, ascetically, or in other ways. They are the product of innate ideas or childhood experiences and are subject to psychological analysis. World pictures, on the other hand, are ‘the whole of the objective mental content an individual possesses.’ By means of these basic attitudes, a person encounters the objective world and forms a mental picture of it. The combination of attitudes and world pictures constitutes a worldview.”

Martin Heidegger (1889 – 1976) also wrote about Worldview and was concerned about its place in human activity. In *The Genesis* (1919) he wrote:

Phenomenology is the investigation of life in itself. Despite the appearance of a philosophy of life, it is really the opposite of a worldview. A worldview is an objectification and immobilizing of life at a certain point in the life of a culture. In contrast, phenomenology is never closed off, it is always provisional in its absolute immersion in life as such. In it no theories are in dispute, but only genuine insights verses the un genuine. The genuine ones can be obtained only by an honest and unreserved immersion in life itself in its genuineness, and this is ultimately possible only through the genuineness of a personal life.

What Heidegger is saying is that a worldview is often in opposition to the true, higher purpose of philosophy in that Worldviews are based on cultural patterns and subjective reality. Heidegger understands the role of Worldview, but wants to limit its scope and influence within a society or culture.

Eight years later he was still concerned with Worldview and in *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology* wrote the following:

From the forms and possibilities of world-view thus enumerated it becomes clear that what is meant by this term is not only a conception of the contexture of natural things but at the same time an interpretation of the sense and purpose
of the human Dasein and hence of history. A world-view always includes a
view of life. A world-view grows out of an all-inclusive reflection on the world
and the human Dasein, and this again happens in different ways, explicitly and
consciously in individuals or by appropriating an already prevalent world-view.
We grow up within such a world-view and gradually become accustomed to it.
Our world-view is determined by environment – people, race, class,
developmental stage of culture. Every world-view thus individually formed
arises out of a natural world-view, out of range of conceptions of the world and
determinations of the human Dasein which are at any particular time give more
or less explicitly with each Dasein. We must distinguish the individually
formed world-view from the natural world-view.37

Heidegger is saying that worldviews are not the output or product of thought, but are
created through the process of human experience. They are critically important in order
to understand the human condition, but do not in and of themselves create “truth.”

20th Century philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein (1889 – 1951) also used the word
Weltanschauung, primarily early in his career, to describe an output of culture and one’s
environment. In Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus, he compares how in modernity humans
accepted the worldview of scientific inquiry and naturalism by replacing the old-
fashioned worldview of theology and fatalism:

6.371 The whole modern conception of the world [Weltanschauung] is founded
on the illusion that the so-called laws of nature are the explanations of natural
phenomena.
6.372 Thus people today stop at the laws of nature, treating them as something
inviolable, just as God and Fate were treated in ages past.38

Wittgenstein’s genius and great contribution to philosophy was in his distinction between
language as descriptive and language as formative, that is, the role of language is not
simply to describe the world around us, but language actually creates and forms how we
experience and understand the world. This complex concept is worked out in a series of
multifaceted books, and intersects with Worldview in this passage from *Philosophical Investigations*:

122. A main source of our failure to understand is that we do not command a clear view of our words, – Our Grammar is lacking in this sort of perspicuity. A perspicuous representation produces just that understanding which consists in ‘seeing connexions.’ Hence the importance of finding and inventing intermediate cases.

The concept of a perspicuous representation is of fundamental significance for us. It earmarks the form of account we give, the way we look at things. (Is this a ‘Weltanschauung’?)

By asking, “Is this a Weltanschauung?” Wittgenstein seems to trying to avoid having his system labeled a Worldview because he has already described how previous worldviews (theological, scientific) were not sufficient means through which the truth could be discovered. But, in essence, he has created a Worldview in that “his own system is not simply another way of seeing, but the way of seeing . . . Such an approach to philosophy has not only sparked interest in ordinary language analysis, but has led to a variety of new quasi-philosophical pursuits in areas such as narratives, hermeneutics, semiotics, and rhetoric, each focusing on language and its meaning and use in the context of a form of life and language game.”

Thomas Kuhn’s seminal and controversial book, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962) was an attack on the “traditional understanding of the authority, rationality, and indeed, very nature of modern science.” Kuhn (1922 – 1996) was a professor of linguistics and philosophy at MIT and his work was hailed as “a landmark in intellectual history which has attracted attention far beyond its own immediate field . . . It is written with a combination of depth and clarity that make it an almost unbroken series
of aphorisms . . . Kuhn does not permit truth to be a criterion of scientific theories, he would presumably not claim his own theory to be true. But if causing a revolution is the hallmark of a superior paradigm, this book has been a resounding success.”

Kuhn uses the word “paradigm” instead of Worldview, but in an identical fashion. “Scientific research, indeed the very nature of scientific reason, is revolutionized by the recognition that it is always conducted within the jurisdiction of a paradigm of worldview, for ’to accept a paradigm is to accept a comprehensive scientific, metaphysical, and methodological worldview.’” Edwin Hung writes: “According to Kuhn, paradigms play a decisive role in the practice of science. They determine the relevance of data, the content of observations, the significance of problems, and the acceptance of solutions. No, much more that just these. Paradigms supply values, standards, and methodologies. In brief, each paradigm determines the way science should be practiced: it is a Weltanschauung.”

Further, Hung writes: “Paradigms provide Weltanschauung, worldviews and conceptual frameworks, which, according to Kuhn, are necessary for the pursuit of science, that is, normal science.”

In 1985 a conference was held at Calvin College in Michigan under the theme “Worldview and Social Science.” This summary of that conference was made in the book, *Stained Glass: Worldview and Social Science*:

A study of worldviews can be expected to provide clues to how social theory seeks to come to grips with pluralism. In the first decade of this century, Wilhelm Dilthey described the plight of modernity as a *Streit der Weltanschauung* (a clashing of worldviews). Again, Thomas S. Kuhn gave the notion of worldview a special place in his account of the imponderabilia of scientific revolutions. In the wake of the Kuhnian revolution there seems to be remarkably widespread acknowledgement of the formative influence of worldviews. James Olthuis sums it up in these words: ‘Conflicts in life and
sciences, we are discovering, come down to differences in underlying worldviews.\textsuperscript{46}

To illustrate how differences in worldviews can lead to conflict, consider this description of Weltanschauung from the \textit{Great Soviet Encyclopedia} written in 1977:

In contrast to the bourgeois world view, the communist world view, which summarizes advances in science and social practice, is consistently scientific, internationalists, and humanistic. Its origin coincided with the appearance of the workers’ revolutionary movement. Marxist-Leninist philosophy – dialectical and historical materialism – forms the core of the communist world view. The Marxist-Leninist world view is a powerful tool for the revolutionary transformation of the world. It is one of the decisive forces that organizes people in the struggle for socialism and communism. In the contemporary world there is an acute struggle between two opposing world views – the communist and the bourgeois. The influence of Marxist-Leninism, which triumphs through the strength of truth and the validity of its consistently scientific premises, is growing during this struggle.\textsuperscript{47}

The concept of Worldview has an impressive and significant intellectual history since its inception by Immanuel Kant in 1790, but its place in academic circles and among policy makers is severely limited. Currently, the majority of books dealing with Worldview are primarily relegated to the discipline of theology, in general, and the religious right, in particular, as seen in the following titles of books and articles:


But clearly worldview is more than an important concept limited to and for the religious right. During a speaking tour of the United States in 1962, Julian Huxley predicted that religion and nationalism would cease to exist by the year 2000. This was, hopefully, his worst prediction. As is well know, religion and nationalism have surged in the past decade and have, in some cases, merged to create an “unholy alliance” to justify war, acts of terror or killing “in the name of God.” Nationalism and religion are elements of worldview, and to ignore or dismiss their effect on society would be imprudent. The rise of the religious right within the three Abrahamic faith traditions, as documented by Charles Kimball, When Religion Becomes Evil, and Chris Hedges, American Fascists: The Christian Right and the War on America, for instance, are sobering accounts of the power of religious groups for “meaning making” within cultures.

Most classic public policy textbooks (such as Deborah Stone, Policy Paradox; Eugene Bardach, A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis; Graham Allison and Philip Zelikow, Essence of Decision; John W. Kingdon, Agendas, Alternatives and Public Choices; and Anne Larason Schneider and Helen Ingram, Policy Design for Democracy) offer more practical approaches to public policy decision making: an
appreciation for the role of worldview falls outside the scope of their work. However, worldview is important for policy makers, as noted by Samuel Huntington, who wrote in *The Clash of Civilizations*: "Worldviews and causal theories are indispensable guides to international politics." George Lakoff adds:

One of the things cognitive science teaches us is that when people define their very identity by a worldview, or a narrative, or a mode of thought, they are unlikely to change – for the simple reason that it is physically part of their brain, and so many other aspects of their brain structure would also have to change; that change is unlikely.58

Scott Thomas’s transformative book, *The Global Resurgence of Religion and the Transformation of International Relations*,59 states that the “global resurgence of religion is more wide ranging than a clash of civilizations driven by religious extremism, terrorism, or fundamentalism. This global cultural and religious shifts challenging our interpretation of the modern world – what it means to be modern – as a variety of social and religious groups struggle to find alternative paths to modernity.”60 This is worldview – and these perspectives are manifest through individuals, communities and nations’ actions in the world. Thomas writes:

In other words, religion – rituals, practices, ideas, doctrines, discourses, groups, or institutions, in an empirical sense was a dormant, marginal, or less important part of politics during the 1950s and 1960s – the heyday of the theory of modernization. It is now a more observable part of people’s private and public lives, and so scholars, if often reluctantly, now acknowledge religion to be a global aspect of politics in the late twentieth century.61

**Building Blocks of Worldview**

The building blocks for worldview include history, collective memory, symbols, religion, and myths / legends / folktales. Because every culture, every society and every nation is
comprised of these ingredients, to discover the worldview of any particular culture one must understand these building blocks. While the meaning of these building blocks seem relatively self-evident, a brief description of each will be provided in an effort to clarify their context and contribution to the concept of worldview.

**History**

The phrase, "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it," is from George Santayana and reminds us of the importance of history to our identity. History is the study humanity’s past, the time and development of individual and communal developments, and is a field itself with a long history. Herodotus (c. 484 – 425 BCE) known as the “Father of History,” was also called the “Father of Lies.” These conflicting titles indicate to us an inherent difficulty for the historian who, in addition to providing a narrative context to what has happened, also attempts to interpret and search for causes and effects through historical events. US History, aka American History, is taught as one of the major subjects in elementary, middle and high schools across the United States, and as an academic discipline.

History is taught through a variety of settings and contexts, from family history told at the dinner table, to religious history, national and world history. The sophistication and depth of the history taught depends on the maturity and capacity of the student. Elementary students in the US learn about George Washington and Abraham Lincoln, but an in depth understanding of the economic conditions that contributed to the American colonial insurgency against Great Britain would be inappropriate given the
intellectual capacity of the children. Children in the US are taught about the Boston Tea Party, Nathan Hale, Washington’s crossing of the Delaware and the young army’s struggle at Valley Forge. These facts are taught in a specific, idealized manner within the US – for instance, Lipset reports that Canadians, in general, have a rather unfavorable impression of George Washington and the events of the US Revolutionary War. But in the United States, the veneration afforded to these (Washington, Hale, Boston Tea Party, Valley Forge) create an important initial imprint to which increasingly nuanced layers are added.

It has long been said that history is written by the victors and as such is different from what would have been put down by the defeated. Hence, the perspectives on the so-called Indian Wars given by William Zimmer, a veteran of these wars, and Dee Brown, author of *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee* are at odds with each other. The perspective of the historian flavors the texts themselves: students who read Paul Johnson’s *A History of the American People* and Howard Zinn’s *A People’s History of the United States* will discover that while both begin with Columbus and move through US history with many identical touchstones, the worldview of these authors is reflected in the output of their work and the meaning making for their readers.

**Collective Memory**

“Collective memory” is a concept and meaning making term first expressed by Maurice Halbwahs and used to describe how groups of people have common, shared memories
with other members of the same group. Collective memories serve as shared touchstones that help to create a group identity and can be both positive and glorious, or traumatic and painful. Either way, collective memories bind a group of persons who remember important events in a similar manner. Americans old enough to remember Neil Armstrong’s first steps on the moon can likely tell you exactly where they were when that event took place, or where they were when they heard the news that the US ice hockey team had beaten the Soviet Union during the 1980’s Winter Olympic games (glorious collective memory). In a similar manner, many Americans can tell you the same information when asked about the Challenger explosion, of the tragic attacks of September 11, 2001.

Collective memories can be understood within the context of different geographical regions. For instance, persons who live near Boston hark back to the Revolutionary War and Paul Revere’s Midnight Ride warning, “The British are coming! The British are coming,” even though this event took place 230+ years ago. Atlantans “remember” Sherman’s burning of the city in 1865, while residents of Chicago recall the Great Fire of 1871 that destroyed approximately 1/3 of the city. In San Francisco, the collective memory is of the Great Earthquake of 1906, and it is certain that 100 years from now residents of New Orleans will speak of the devastation wrought by Hurricane Katrina in 2005.

Collective memories are also understood within sub-groups or sub-cultures within a larger context. The Mennonite community, for example, remembers its period of relentless persecution during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Martyr’s Mirror,
published in 1660, describes the persecutions with great details and remains, next to the Bible, as the most important book in meaning-making / identity for most Mennonites today. This collective memory helps shape and defines the identity of the Mennonite people. Likewise, African Americans who are descendants of slavery have different collective memories from European Americans whose ancestors may have been on the other side of the whip and chains. Jews remember centuries of persecution culminating, of course, in the Holocaust of the Third Reich. This history of persecution, without question, influences this group’s worldview, understanding and behavior of Jews within the larger cultural landscape. Likewise, Islamic reality and worldview are influenced by the Crusades that, although they occurred close to 1,000 years ago, are still an important piece of Muslim collective memory ranging from collective trauma (the sacking or Jerusalem during the First Crusade and slaughter of all its inhabitants) to collective glory (the re-taking of Jerusalem under the leadership of Saladin approximately one hundred years later).

Collective memories are often enshrined in local or national monuments: decisions regarding what a nation chooses to memorialize and what it chooses to omit speak loudly in its efforts to create a national identity, a narrative, meaning-making and worldview. Monuments and memorials are prevalent in Washington D.C. and dot the landscape of towns and cities across the nation: these granite, marble and concrete monuments and memorials literally cement and reinforce national and regional identities. These collective memories, passed on from generation to generation and recorded in books and stone remind us of Faulkner’s phrase: “The past is never dead. It’s not even
the past. Collective memories are one of the most powerful influences in a group’s formation of identity.

**Symbols**

Dan Brown, author of five recent novels, among them *The Da Vinci Code, Angels and Demons* and *The Lost Symbol*, has probably done more to underscore the power of symbols than any other author. Although he deals in fiction, his books include a great amount of research and facts surrounding the context of his stories. A symbol is an object, picture, word, group of words or mark that represents something else because of our association to the original item. Religions use symbols, as do nations, to create and reinforce identity and meaning.

The cross / crucifix is the most widely known Christian symbol and represents, Christians believe, the redeeming power of Jesus’ death on the cross and promise of eternal life. Other Christian symbols include a shell, symbolizing baptism, and fish – an early Christian symbol that is also an acrostic in that each letter in the Greek word for fish (Ἰχθύς - ichthus) represents a different word which, when put together, form an early creed (Jesus Christ God’s Son Savior).

Each of the Gospel writers (Matthew, Mark, Luke and John) are identified with their own symbols (winged man, winged lion, ox, eagle, respectively), as are other disciples such as Andrew who is represented by the cross of Andrew, which became an important element of the flags Figure 1.4 St. Andrew’s Flag
Scotland (Figure 1.4) and the Southern Confederacy (Figure 1.5). St. Paul’s symbol is the Bible and sword, whereas St. Peter’s symbol is usually a set of keys, although he is also portrayed as a rooster or upside down cross. Judaism, Islam, Buddhism and other religions use symbols as well to convey meaning and identity.

Anthony Smith has identified the importance of national symbols in his book *National Identity*, *Ethnonationalism in Comparative Perspective*.\(^7^4\) Smith describes the study of national symbols as important because these symbols help establish and form national identity; they “give concrete meaning and visibility to the abstractions of nationalism. The representations and images of the nation exert a profound influence over large numbers of people, exactly because they can be very widely disseminated by the media.”\(^7^5\) The flag is a symbol, as is the national anthem – an anthem itself about a symbol – the flag. In the United States citizens “pledge their allegiance” to a symbol. “The Fourth of July holiday . . . the dollar, the Constitution, the Lincoln Memorial, the Capital and the White House, as well as the leadership cult attached to Washington, Lincoln, F.D. Roosevelt, John F. Kennedy, and Martin Luther King – all of these nation symbols, taken together, have created, however ex post facto, a myth of communal memory.”\(^7^6\)

The ongoing presence of the Confederate Flag (putting aside the confusing and complex history of the Confederate Flag and its different manifestations) speaks to the power of symbols: even today the state flags of Mississippi, Georgia and Tennessee are based on the Confederate Flag, and it was not until the year 2000 that the Confederate
Flag that flew over the State Capitol in South Carolina was moved to a different position.

In the visitor’s museum at Appomattox Courthouse, site where General Robert E. Lee surrendered the Army of Northern Virginia to General Ulysses Grant, a Confederate Flag is on display with these emotional words that help us understand the power of symbols:

“This flag was in the Seven Days; this flag flapped at Chancellorsville; this flag was on the ridge at Gettysburg; this flag went through all of the experiences and all the blood and slaughter of the wilderness and Spotsylvania Court House; this flag was at Ream Station; this flag – my father saw it – came up the hill when the Crater was recovered at the end of July in 1864 – and this flag with the tears of the men who bore it was laid down on the red clay.”

Religion

Religion is one of the most powerful components of any society, and it contributes to culture, meaning making and worldview in a myriad of ways. “The general relationship between religion and culture, independent of conflict analysis, is complex…I assume for the purposes of this book that religious texts, myths, metaphors, laws and values are a subset of all cultural phenomena of a particular civilization.” Religious inputs contribute to personal worldviews and, when shared by others, help create a collective worldview.

There have been many definitions of religion given through the years, from Karl Marx’s “Religion is the opiate of the masses (German - Die Religion ... ist das Opium des Volkes)” to William James, who described religion as "the belief that there is an unseen order, and that our supreme good lies in harmoniously adjusting ourselves thereto." The definition I have found to be extremely instructive, however, is a list of features, or characteristics of religions, as compiled by The Encyclopedia of Philosophy:

1. Belief in supernatural beings (gods).
2. A distinction between sacred and profane objects.
3. Ritual acts focused on sacred objects.
4. A moral code believed to be sanctioned by the gods.
5. Characteristically religious feelings (awe, sense of mystery, sense of guilt, adoration), which tends to be aroused in the presence of sacred objects and during the practice of ritual, and which are connected in idea with the gods.
6. Prayer and other forms of communication with gods.
7. A world view, or a general picture of the world as a whole and the place of the individuals therein. This picture contains some specification of an over-all purpose or point of the world and an indication of how the individuals fit into it.
8. A more or less total organization of one’s life based on the world view.
9. A social group bound together by the above.\textsuperscript{81}

These features, or characteristics, will form the definition from which the concept of religion will be framed for the duration of this dissertation.

Religious worldviews, to be sure, can appear irrational, illogical and unreasonable to those outside of the faith, but it is equally irrational to ignore the power and intensity to which religion can shape identity and worldviews. Although it seems unwise to maintain in the early years of the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century that the world was created in six days, that Noah really existed, built and ark and saved two of each species, and that God parted the Red Sea for Moses, a poll conducted by ABC Prime Time, released on February 16, 2004 indicates that at least 59\% of Americans hold these beliefs.\textsuperscript{82}

Religion has been used by leaders to both promote peace with justice, on the one hand, and violence and war, on the other. R. Scott Appleby labels this bi-polar disorder in this way: “The Ambivalence of the Sacred.”\textsuperscript{83} Ambivalence – the simultaneous presence of two opposing ideas, attitudes or emotions – is present in the Bible and other sacred writings and plain to even casual readers who are convinced cherry picking leaders can provide justification for their activities by finding the appropriate texts. A
prime example of how the Bible can be used by proponents of peace and war can be found in these opposing texts:

He shall judge between the nations,  
and shall arbitrate for many peoples;  
they shall beat their swords into plowshares,  
and their spears into pruning hooks;  
nation shall not lift up sword against nation,  
neither shall they learn war any more. (Isaiah 2:4; Micah 4:3)

Proclaim this among the nations:  
Prepare war,  
stir up the warriors.  
Let all the soldiers draw near,  
let them come up.  
Beat your plowshares into swords,  
and your pruning hooks into spears;  
let the weakling say, “I am a warrior.” (Joel 3:9–10)

The book of Joshua tells the story of the children of Israel’s conquest of the land of Canaan following their sojourn, exodus, and forty year exile in Sinai. It is one of the most violent books of the Bible and includes the enigmatic encounter between Joshua and “the commander of the army of the Lord” — presumably sent to help Joshua in battle, (Joshua 5: 13 – 15) and the equally troubling story of the Sun and Moon standing still (the stopping of time) so that the slaughter of the Amorites could be completed (Joshua 10: 6 – 13). Joshua’s conquest of the land of Canaan has been cited by subsequent generations to justify colonial expansion into regions already inhabited by indigenous civilizations as evidence of “God’s will.” That the Biblical writers see divine approval in Joshua and his army’s conquest and virtual slaughter of the inhabitants is a motif that has been re-enacted in many circumstances and locations and justified by reference to the Book of Joshua.
The combination of religion with political and military power is a potentially dangerous mixture. Political leaders have traditionally sought support from religious institutions and their clergy to provide moral authority for their regimes, especially during times of war. Pervasive across cultures is the belief that God (or the gods) will take our side and bless our war efforts. Described by Walter Wink as the myth of redemptive violence,\textsuperscript{84} it is generally assumed that God will favor us (no matter who we are we will define ourselves as “good” and on God’s side) and defeat “the other” (no matter who they are, we will define them as “evil”). This merging of religion with political and military power can lead to “killing in the name of God,” an oxymoron, at best, and, in reality, a gross distortion of God’s will.

Religion, as a major contributor to the concept of worldview, is grounded in its sacred texts. Currently much of the ideology fueling the “clash of civilizations” between the US and Middle Eastern nations is attributed to clerics and religious based anger and hatred. Pascal’s bitter quip, “Men never do evil so completely and cheerfully as when they do it from religious conviction”\textsuperscript{85} can be supported by reading many passages from the Bible and Qur’ran, the sacred texts of Christianity and Islam, respectively.

Those who deny the religious roots of the US deny its history: “Religion in colonial American life was still central. I would call it the most significant thread in the tapestry of colonial life. Eight out of nine colonial colleges were founded for religious reasons, beginning with Harvard in 1636.”\textsuperscript{86} Further, “On July 2, 1775, the Continental Congress voted, and on July 4 proclaimed the Declaration of Independence of the United States. In that document, Thomas Jefferson twice referred to God in biblical terms, and
before assenting to it, the Congress added two more references. The fifty-six signers were, mostly, Christians; they represented a mostly Christian people; and it was from Christian traditions that they have learned these names.”

The US self-perception as a unique, special and religious nation dates to John Winthrop and the pilgrim’s establishment of the Massachusetts Bay Colony in the 1630s. During his transatlantic trip Winthrop preached to his fellow travelers aboard their ship the Arbella the following words:

> For we must consider that we shall be as a city upon a hill. The eyes of all people are upon us. So that if we shall deal falsely with our God in this work we have undertaken... we shall be made a story and a by-word throughout the world. We shall open the mouths of enemies to speak evil of the ways of God... We shall shame the faces of many of God's worthy servants, and cause their prayers to be turned into curses upon us til we be consumed out of the good land whither we are a-going.

The new settlers saw themselves re-enacting the Biblical drama of Joshua. Having “escaped from Europe,” many pilgrims saw themselves as the spiritual heirs of the children of Israel who were liberated from Egypt and then conquered Israel. It was Alexis de Tocqueville who coined the phrase “American Exceptionalism” to refer to his impression that the young nation (Tocqueville visited the United States in the 1830’s) held a unique spot among nations due to its historic development, self-definition, political and religious institutions. He wrote: “There is no country in the world where the Christian religion retains a greater influence over the souls of men than in America.”

Lipset, 150 years after Tocqueville, wrote that the United States “has been the most religious nation in Christendom. It has exhibited greater acceptance of biblical beliefs
and higher levels of church attendance than anywhere, with the possible exception of a few Catholic countries.  

It is instructive to remember that supporters in the antebellum south justified the institution of slavery by quotations from the Bible, wherein slavery was acknowledged and accepted. Likewise, opponents of same sex marriage and equal rights for gays, lesbians, bi-sexuals and transgender persons again return to the Bible for support of their Worldviews. The role of women within the conservative element of the Abrahamic tradition (Judaism, Christianity and Islam) is contentious – based on the fundamentalists’ reading of sacred texts – developed during an era and within cultures where the worldview did not advocate equality between the sexes.

**Civil Religion**

Jean-Jacques Rousseau first developed the term “civil religion” in *The Social Contract*. His use of the term was to describe the moral and spiritual foundation of a nation or society. Civil religion is a tool of nation building, and included the following tenets:

1. The existence of God
2. Belief in the life to come
3. Acknowledgement that the righteous will be rewarded and the evil punished
4. The exclusion of religious intolerance

One can observe elements of civil religion around the world, from the cultic worship of the Pharaohs of ancient Egypt to the invocation and benediction offered at the inauguration of President Barack Obama. Robert Bellah, in his influential essay *Civil Religion in America*, described the phenomena in this manner: “I would argue that the civil religion at its best is a genuine apprehension of universal and transcendent religious
reality as seen in or, one could almost say, as revealed through the experience of the American people." Rowland Sherrill, a historian of religion, uses this definition of civil religion in the US: “American civil religion is a form of devotion, outlook, and commitment that deeply and widely binds the citizens of the nation together with ideas they possess and express about the sacred nature, the sacred ideals, the sacred character, and sacred meaning of their country." Civil religion, then, is a merging between church and state wherein church and state leaders create a unified national / religious message, blurring the role, beliefs and boundaries of each.

The list of features or characterizations of religions as compiled by *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy* is pertinent in a discussion of the attributes of civil religion in the United States. Most of those elements on that list can be found in American civil religion, from a widely accepted belief in God throughout the general population to ritual acts, sacred objects and locations, sense of awe and reverence, public prayer, specific worldview with an overall-purpose and point of the world in which the US plays a role, and a citizenry that is bound by the above ingredients.

Examples of civil religion within the US include the official motto of the nation, “In God We Trust,” the participation of clergy at public events, the invocation of God by politicians, the reverence in which former national leaders are held (Franklin, Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, etc), the use of religious language and symbols on public buildings, the veneration of fallen soldiers and veterans. War memorials, monuments and plaques universally use terms like “heroic,” “sacrifice,” faithful,” “glory,” and “honor” to describe the persons remembered. Stout describes civil religion with the US in the
following manner: “In fact, American civil religion borrows so heavily from the language and cadences of traditional faiths, many Americans see no conflict or distinction between the two. Many Americans equate dying for their country with dying for their faith. In America’s civil religion, serving country can be coequal with serving God.”  

Bellah describes The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution as “the sacred scriptures and Washington the divinely appointed Moses who led his people out of the hands of tyranny.” Abraham Lincoln’s law partner, William Herndon, wrote:

For fifty years God rolled Abraham Lincoln through his fiery furnace. He did it to try Abraham and to purify him for his purposes. This made Mr. Lincoln humble, tender, forbearing, sympathetic to suffering, kind, sensitive, tolerant; broadening, deepening and widening his whole nature; making him the noblest and loveliest character since Jesus Christ . . . I believe that Lincoln was God’s chosen one.”

Harry Stout describes the Gettysburg Address as America’s Sermon on the Mount, complete with references to the nation’s founding (four score and seven years ago), sacred space (hallowed ground), sacrifice for the greater good (that these dead shall not have died in vain), reference to a higher power (that this nation, under God) and theme of eternity (shall not perish from the face of the earth). Daniel Berrigan has suggested that if American churches want to be honest in what they cherish, the Bibles on the church altar should be taken out and burned and replaced with copies of the Marine Corps Manual, the true inspiration for many Christians in the US.

The role of civil religion, as it both supports and competes with traditional faiths, will be highlighted throughout this dissertation in search for a dominant worldview within the US culture.
Myths / legends / folktales

Myths, legends and folktales are used within a particular culture or nation to help interpret reality and identify the customs and habitual practices, especially as they reflect moral sentiment, that a particular culture or nation of people accept and follow. “I use ‘myth’ in the sense of a story that contains some ultimate and enduring truth, and a way of making sense of amorphous reality, for those who believe in it. Whether myth is believed to be literal history, approximate history, or simply didactic legend, depends on the believer.”

Aesop’s Fables are a prime example of the power of folktales and their role in a society. The fables provide an accessible moral education for children bound in a memorable story, such as the fox and the grapes, the tortoise and the hare and the boy who cried wolf.

US history is filled with myths, legends and folktales – George Washington chopping down the cherry tree and telling his father, “I cannot tell a lie;” Rip van Winkle sleeping through the American Revolution; Paul Bunyan, the giant lumberjack who strides across American folklore, and Horatio Alger’s “Rags to Riches” novels of the 20th Century. “Myths are stories drawn from a society’s history that have acquired through persistent usage the power of symbolizing that society’s ideology and of dramatizing its moral consciousness – with all the complexities and contradictions that consciousness may contain.”

Sometimes myths assist in rewriting narratives that are less than complementary.
Although we have a national narrative of the pilgrims and Native Americans celebrating their first Thanksgiving together after a season of sharing and cooperation, the reality is much less appealing. The story we are told as children of the first Thanksgiving rewrites a complex series of events into an American narrative of virtue – portraying the relationship between the Pilgrims and First Settlers as one dominated by cooperation and generosity. However, this peaceful, idyllic narrative belies a darker reality. The “Indian Wars” continued from the time of the first settlers through the Civil War and beyond and led to the extermination of approximately ten million Native Americans.\textsuperscript{103}

Joseph Campbell described the role and power of myth in \textit{The Hero with a Thousand Faces}, where he wrote:

Throughout the inhabited world, in all times and under every circumstance, the myths of man have flourished; and they have been the living inspiration of whatever else may have appeared out of the activities of the human body and mind. It would not be too much to say that myth is the secret opening through which the inexhaustible energies of the cosmos pour into human cultural manifestations. Religions, philosophies, arts, the social forms of primitive and historic man, prime discoveries in science and technology, the very dreams that blister sleep, boil up from the basic, magic ring of myth.\textsuperscript{104}

It is important to understand these building blocks of Worldview, i.e. history, collective memory, religious heritage, symbols, and myths / legends / folktales if we are to understand Worldview. But having now defined Worldview, provided a brief history of the concept and accompanying historical sources and outlined the building blocks of Worldview, I will now provide a description based on personal experiences of how conflicting and clashing worldview have practical applications in the real world.
A Clash of Worldviews

During the twenty-one years I served as a local pastor/preacher in the United Methodist Church, I worked in three different locations:

1. As an associate pastor in a medium sized suburban community in Fairfield, Connecticut.
2. As a pastor in a small, suburban community in Rowayton, a community that was part of Norwalk, Connecticut.
3. As the senior pastor in a larger sized congregation in a more rural community in New Milford, Connecticut.

In each of these municipalities there were other faith communities ranging from Muslim to Reform and Conservative Judaism to Roman Catholic and all stripes of Protestantism.

I enjoyed most of my colleagues, and served as the clergy association coordinator in each of these locations.

Despite personal warmth and collegiality, however, there were in each of these appointments clergy with whom my Worldview clashed. The clergy with whom I did not see eye-to-eye included ministers from the Southern Baptist Convention, Missouri Lutheran Synod and Assembly of God. The clergy from these three denominations considered themselves evangelical, fundamental and literalist; i.e. they believed that the words of the Bible are literally true and to be understood exactly as written. Because of this conviction, this philosophy, and this mental map – i.e. this Worldview – many of the issues they preached about, taught and supported differed from my preaching, teaching and actions.

We clashed because as a progressive, mainline United Methodist pastor, I did not, and do not today, believe the story of Adam and Eve to be literally true; likewise, I do not
believe that the story of Noah happened as told, nor the account of Jonah and the whale. I do believe these narratives and other Biblical stories have great power and are True in the same way that Shakespeare’s plays capture the essence of human nature – but I do not accept these stories as history: my fundamentalists, literalist colleagues do accept these stories as actual history.

My clergy brothers (all were male, an output of this Worldview) from these fundamental denominations not only accept these Biblical stories as factually accurate, they then base their lives on this reality. According to these clergy leaders, God created the world during a six-day period sometime between 5,700 and 10,000 years ago.¹⁰⁵ My friends are therefore not concerned much with policy issues such as climate change – believing as they do that God created the world in 6 days and that humans lived on the earth simultaneously with dinosaurs – they accepted that God was in charge of the weather and humanity need not be concerned with it. They believe in the words of John: “I am the way, and the truth, and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me.” (John 14:6).¹⁰⁶ Because of this and similar passages about the exclusive pathway to God through Jesus Christ, these fundamentalists are more concerned with the conversion of non-believers and see the mission field as an opportunity to evangelize. They accept as God’s law that homosexuality is an abomination (Leviticus 18:22) and are adamantly
opposed to legislation supporting same sex marriage. Many, believing in the literal words of the Book of Revelation, are convinced that the Anti-Christ is alive today and living in the Middle East and that the Battle of Armageddon will happen during our lifetimes. They tend support military spending and, as described later in the analysis, strongly supported President George W. Bush’s decision to invade Iraq.

I, and the majority of the other clergy in each of the communities where I served as pastor did not agree with these literalists pastors, and hence see the world through an entirely different set of lenses. By not accepting the words of the Bible literally, non-literalists are free to accept the reality of evolution, acknowledge the possibility of global warming and its potential consequences for humanity and are open to the concept of same sex marriage. Many non-fundamental / literal clergy believe there are other religious traditions that lead to God and hence see the mission field as an opportunity to feed, clothe, shelter and heal the world’s least, last and lost and not be as concerned with their religious affiliation.

In addition to these difference, the clergy associations I was privileged to be a member of scheduled regular community services together – for Thanksgiving, Martin Luther King’s birthday and sporadic pulpit exchanges. My fundamentalist, literalist brothers would not participate in such activities knowing that non-Christians were present, participating and sharing equal status. On the night of 9-11-01, when the clergy association of New Milford Connecticut convened a hastily arranged prayer vigil on the town’s green, the fundamentalists were absent because the town’s Rabbi and members of the synagogue were included for the worship service.
These Worldview differences manifest themselves in these and other significant ways, and affect public policy in matters ranging from abortion to stem cell research. Worldview, in essence, makes a difference, and I experienced this difference first hand with my clergy brothers. In reflecting on these differences, we should remember that Christianity in the ante-bellum South was central to many persons. Additionally, these southern Christians were literalists and accepted the Bible literally as written. The Bible, at least tacitly, accepts the practice of slavery. Abraham, the patriarch and father of three great world religions (Judaism, Christianity and Islam\textsuperscript{107}) owned slaves! The literalist Worldview of the southern states allowed for the institution of slavery to exist into the 1860’s and contributed to the Civil War in which 620,000 soldiers were killed.

**Conclusion**

Since its inception in 1790, the concept of Worldview has been described by many of the great philosophers and intellectuals. It is an important component of all individuals, communities and nations and, in tandem with culture, forms the background in which decisions are based. But the concept of Worldview has, in general, been relegated to the philosophers, theologians, anthropologists and sociologists. Reclaiming its essential role in the decision making process for individuals, communities and nations is an important step for policy makers – because understanding the elements of any people’s Worldview will help predict how decisions will be made.
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CHAPTER 2: WORLDVIEW AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO PUBLIC POLICY

In terms of intellectual history, the concept of Worldview is relatively new, having been coined by Immanuel Kant in 1790; the academic discipline of Public Policy, therefore, is very new, having been established in the 1930’s. Public Policy is an interdisciplinary branch of learning that assimilates economics, sociology, political science, history, anthropology, culture, program evaluation and policy analysis to study and inform the process of how decisions that affect communities are prepared and executed. A growing number of books that can be classified as Public Policy are being published each year and its appeal in academia is increasing.

It should come as no surprise then to learn that there exists a scarcity of academic books and articles at the intersection of the concept of “Worldview” and the academic discipline “Public Policy.” Precious few authors have explored the impact a specific worldview can have upon public policy, leaving fertile ground for scholars to cultivate how a Worldview influences decisions and the decision making process on a national, community and even an individual level. Human beings make decisions based on a number of factors, from self-interest to generous acts of philanthropy: from the very practical to intensely religious, from economic to irrational emotions. What is of interest here, however, is how different individuals, communities and nations, under similar
circumstances, make decisions that differ from the decisions other individuals, communities and nations will make. These different decisions, then, must be based on different inputs – i.e. different cultures and Worldviews. Examining the impact a specific Worldview can have on Public Policy, therefore, can open up a whole new way of understanding what can and cannot be accomplished within a particular community or nation given its defining and dominant Worldview.

**What is Public Policy?**

The academic discipline of Public Policy can be found at the nexus of theory and practice – the intersection of scholarly models, concepts and systems and the actual practices, actions and programs of governments in the “real world.” As such, Public Policy is more than just the interdisciplinary study of social sciences, and has been defined as:

A course of action or inaction chosen by public authorities to address a given problem or interrelated set of problems . . . It is a course of action, yes, but action that is anchored in both a set of values regarding appropriate public goals and a set of beliefs about the best way of achieving those goals. The idea of public policy assumes that an issue is no longer a private affair. Policy analysis, Pal says, is the "disciplined application of intellect to public problems." It reduces to one question: what are we going to do about the problem in view?  

The ongoing debates in the United States regarding health care, social security, abortion, same sex marriage and the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan fall under the umbrella of Public Policy, as do the conversations regarding the economy, governmental spending, stimulus packages and job creation. Every public road built, every social security and public assistance check written, every student in public elementary and secondary schools, every building permit and book checked out of a public library reflect decisions that were made through Public Policy. Every person on the planet is affected by Public Policy in that
decisions made by all governments affect their citizens, and decisions made within one nation often have a ripple effect around the globe and affect foreign nations and their people.

Effective Public Policy is seen when the programs developed improve the lives of citizens within the jurisdiction of the policy maker. Unfortunately, policy decisions are often made that improve the condition for some while actually worsening the lives of others. In striking the appropriate balance, policy makers need to take into account stakeholders, constituents, short and long term needs and goals and unintended consequences. Policy decisions can be incremental – moving slowly towards a goal, or monumental – a choice that can literally affect the lives of millions of persons.

In the United States, as in any nation, policy decisions are made within a range of accepted and established norms. US citizens agree, by and large, on the economic foundation and Worldview established by Adam Smith and capitalism vis-à-vis the economic foundation and Worldview established by Karl Marx and communism, even though most have never read either. They disagree, however, on the finer, more nuanced economic principles as advocated on the one hand by John Maynard Keynes, who favors governmental intervention and involvement to balance the business cycles, and Milton Friedman on the other hand who advocates unfettered capitalism thus freeing the markets to self-correct and thrive. US citizens are united around the ideals of democracy, freedom, the separation of powers, rule of law, and basic human rights like “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness,” but divided into political parties dominated by the Republicans and Democrats.
Policy decisions within the US have changed during its 230 years of existence. When the Founding Fathers gathered in Philadelphia and created the US Constitution, it was a product of its time and culture and reflected the Worldview of the men who gathered and produced it. Within the pages of the US Constitution we read that African slaves were to be counted as 3/5ths of a person and slavery was allowed to continue. Women were denied the opportunity to vote. Native Americans, described as “Indians” in the Constitution, were considered to be members of sovereign nations and did not obtain the right to vote until 1924 when Congress passed a law making all Native Americans US Citizens.\(^4\)

But the Founding Fathers were practical men in that they established procedures in which the Constitution could be modified, periodically, as needed. Worldview and culture in the years since the US Constitution was written have indeed changed: during the Civil War Abraham Lincoln “freed” the slaves though the Emancipation Proclamation, and the XIII Amendment to the Constitution abolished slavery.\(^5\) The XIX Amendment, ratified on August 18, 1920, gave women the right to vote.\(^6\) Other significant changes in the US Constitution include Amendments I – X, known as the Bill of Rights,\(^7\) Amendment XVI – allowing Congress to collect income taxes,\(^8\) and Amendment XXVI granting voting rights to US citizens 18 or older.\(^9\)

Public policy that strays too far from the dominant worldview of a society is in peril of failure: from time to time, policy makers at the national, state and local levels have made decisions that strayed too far from the collective Worldview of the people they represented. Prime examples of this include:
Prohibition – Amendment XVIII, officially known as the Volstead Act, was passed on January 16, 1919, and took effect on January 16th, 1920. The US government passed Prohibition, in part, because of pressure from the Temperance Movement, an organization whose leadership was generally composed of “abstinence-minded” church members. But Prohibition did not work. The 1920’s saw the creation of underground operations to supply contraband liquor, from clandestine underground breweries and bootlegging to smuggling and “speakeasies.” The 18th Amendment was repealed on December 5, 1933 when the Twenty-first Amendment to the Constitution was passed. When a culture, guided by a dominant worldview, is in conflict with public policies – those policies are bound to fail. Prohibition, the banning of the sale, manufacture or transportation of alcohol for consumption within the US, was likely to fail because it was not supported by the dominant worldview of the day – i.e., that the consumption of alcohol should be allowed, maybe with some control, but not banned within the society.

Same sex marriage in the State of California: On June 16, 2008 the California State Supreme Court declared that same sex marriages in California in its ruling In re Marriage Cases. Immediately thereafter, however, a ballot initiative was organized to bring the issue before the population at the next election. Known as Proposition 8, the measure added a new provision to the California Constitution that reads: “Only marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California.” (Section 7.5 of Article 1) The majority of the voting population rejected what the courts had deemed appropriate. A similar vote took place in the State of Maine where the legislature passed a law allowing for same-sex marriage in May, 2009, only to be overturned in an election on November 3, 2009.

In 2000 the Board of Education (BOE) Members of the Town of New Milford Connecticut prepared a survey for the public school students on drug, alcohol and sexual practices. The same survey instrument was to be given to students in the 6th, 8th, 10th and 12th grades. The survey was approved at a BOE meeting and
scheduled to be distributed on a Monday in January. The survey included questions regarding the use of drugs and alcohol by students, but it was the sexual section that garnered the most attention. Among questions to be asked were questions about intercourse and oral sex. A week before the surveys were to be given to the students, a secretary who was copying the surveys took one and sent it to the local newspaper. The paper printed the survey. The day the story ran the school’s superintendent’s office was overwhelmed with phone calls and emails. The BOE scheduled an emergency meeting and moved it from their usual location to the high school auditorium. The hue and cry raised was sufficient for the BOE members to withdraw the survey and apologize to the community. Although this is not an example of a law being implemented, it does indicate that the community of New Milford did not support its Board of Education members’ decision to distribute this survey and thus might be considered an initiative that was perceived as over the edge by the typical family in New Milford.

These three examples, from the national, state and local level, illustrate the reality that Public Policy must be made within the bounds of the operational Worldview in that society. When decisions are made contrary to this, policy failure is a distinct possibility.

Biblical scholar Hermann Gunkel coined a phrase a century ago that is germane to this discussion: writing about Biblical forms in his critique of the Old Testament, Gunkel invented the phrase “Sitz im Leben.” Sitz im Leben, literally “sitting in life,” refers to the setting in which Biblical stories took shape and form. Gunkel was interested in determining if a particular passage was used in the Bible as a cultic etiology, or for a liturgy, for morality teaching or for history. The setting of each passage would tell modern scholars about the purpose of that section and help determine the text’s ultimate meaning. For a hundred years seminary students across the world have considered
Hermann Gunkel’s work and learned the phrase *Sitz im Leben* as they discovered exegetical tools to help interpret and understand Biblical texts.

In the same way, the *Sitz im Leben* of any particular Public Policy must reflect the Worldview and culture in which it is located. Laws and policies that do not fit the culture in which they are designed will likely fail. Likewise, laws and policies based on a dominant Worldview are likely to succeed. It is in the policy maker’s best interest, then, to create programs and agendas that not only improve the community in which they are created, but also mirror the dominant Worldview so that acceptance is likely.

Currently, Public Policy in the United States is studied within the overall framework of traditional social sciences, notably political philosophy, economics, anthropology and sociology. As an interdisciplinary field, it draws scholars and professors from these and other fields. Interestingly, few professors at US universities that teach Public Policy have doctorates in Public Policy: at George Mason University’s School of Public Policy, for instance, only five faculty members out of a total of fifty have a Ph.D. in Public Policy. The discipline in which the highest number of faculty have doctorates in is Economics, with eleven, followed by Political Science, with nine, Sociology, at four, Engineering, also four, International Relations, two, Business, two, and Information Technology, two. Other professors at George Mason University’s School of Public Policy have doctorates in subjects ranging from Anthropology and Conflict Resolution to Law and Regional Science.

This academic diversity is reminiscent of the proverbial story told in India of the five blind men who touch an elephant to discover what it is like. One touches the side
and experiences the elephant as a wall; another, the tusk, who thinks the elephant is a long and smooth object; another the tail, one the trunk and finally one at the ear. Following this experience the men gather together and argue about the characteristics of an elephant – each convinced that he is correct.

We all know, of course, that an elephant is not simply one of these components, but the sum of these separate elements. Had the five blind men cooperated, they would have discovered the true essence of the elephant by sharing and comparing notes, rather than blindly sticking to their positions.

In the same way, Public Policy is the sum of different academic components that, when viewed from different perspectives, yield different results. It is the totality of these independent disciplines that creates Public Policy, and the comprehensive inclusion of input and methods from each that creates a balanced system of Public Policy. Only by stepping back and gathering data from the different disciplines can we understand and appreciate the interdisciplinary field of Public Policy.

In order to avoid appearing as one of the blind men examining only a piece of the elephant, I have assembled a thumbnail sketch of four key sub-fields of Public Policy:

1. Political Science.
2. Economics.
4. Anthropology.

In addition to serving as fundamental building blocks of Public Policy, this survey of these fields will help us to understand the Worldview of the authors and scholars who are the leading voices in these fields. Understanding the perspective of these leading social
theorists can help us to appreciate how, when their ideas are incorporated into policy
decisions of governments, acting and spending habits are formed.

Political Philosophy

An important component of public policy is political science, which can trace its roots in
political philosophy and back into the classical era of ancient Greece: Plato (*The
Republic*) and Aristotle (*Politics*) contributed major works to the field. As the Roman
Empire gradually moved towards Christianity as its dominant religion, St. Augustine’s
*City of God* became an important work as it established boundaries between what was
considered sacred and what was considered political, although there was still a great deal
of overlap because of the close relationship between church and state through the period
known as Christendom. Machiavelli, in *The Prince*, offered advice on how to rule: his
name has been linked to those with a cynical, cunning approach to governing – hence one
could say that presidential advisors James Carville and / or Karl Rove offered
Machiavellian advice to Bill Clinton and George W. Bush, respectively.

Thomas Hobbes (*Leviathan* - 1651), John Locke (*Two Treatises of
Governament* – 1689) and Jean – Jacques Rousseau (*Social Contract* - 1762) were three
important philosophers who laid the modern, intellectual foundations for democracy and
republicanism. The three, however, had contrasting perspectives on human nature and
the human condition, (aka “Worldviews”) and as a result developed political philosophies
and systems that varied one from another. For Hobbes, human life without the restraints
of government would lead to a “war of all against all” where individual lives would be
“solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.” He then developed a theory for social, self-interested cooperation. One of Locke’s contributions to political philosophy was his belief that the human mind was a blank slate at birth and that patterns, rules and conventions were created as a result of a person’s environment and circumstances. Like Hobbes, Locke maintained that governments were necessary to protect individual rights, such as his famous phrase “Life, health, Liberty, or Possessions” which Jefferson altered into “Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.” For Rousseau, the social contract should be based on individual rights and powers: “[The social contract] can be reduced to the following terms: Each of us puts his person and all his power in common under the supreme direction of the general will; and in a body we receive each member as an indivisible part of the whole.”

US political philosophy can trace two parallel themes to Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton who favored, respectively, a small central government and a strong central government. Jefferson was an aristocratic farmer in Southern Virginia who owned slaves and thousands of acres. He spent hours in his garden, developed a rotation system, was one of the first to use horizontal or contour plowing, cultivated 170 varieties of fruit and 330 different kinds of vegetables. He once wrote: "No occupation is so delightful to me as the culture of the earth and no culture comparable to that of the garden."

Many of Jefferson's ideas about government, which are the philosophic underpinnings for our country, are based on the interrelationship between the land and the people. He clearly felt that the closer people were to the land, the freer they were to lead more "natural" lives and thus experience more
directly the full possession of their natural unalienable rights. And in the process they might also feel closer to their God, the source of those rights.²⁷

In contrast, Alexander Hamilton favored a strong central government, convinced that this was the best approach to a strong nation. He is well-known for advocating the creation of a monarchy at the Constitutional Convention, and as President George Washington’s Secretary of the Treasury, established many of the practices and policies wherein the new government could collect revenues.²⁸

Two hundred years after Jefferson and Hamilton, John Rawls (A Theory of Justice²⁹ – 1971) and Robert Nozick (Anarchy, State and Utopia³⁰ – 1974) continued this discussion with contemporary political – philosophical books. Rawls presents the case for a balance between the principles of liberty and justice. He writes, “First: each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive scheme of equal basic liberties compatible with a similar scheme of liberties for others,” and “Second: social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both (a) reasonably expected to be to everyone’s advantage, and (b) attached to positions and offices open to all.”³¹ Nozick’s book is in response to Rawls and in opposition in that it argues for a limited state: “An ultraminimal state maintains a monopoly over all use of force except that necessary in immediate self-defense, and so excludes private (or agency) retaliation for wrong and exaction of compensation; but it provides protection and enforcement services only to those who purchase its protection and enforcement policies.”³²

Although they may not acknowledge or even be aware of the context, contemporary politicians have Worldviews that often derive from the political
philosopher’s mentioned. Self-described “Hawks” are likely to be disciples of Hobbes: “Doves,” meanwhile, more likely to favor Rousseau. Small government advocates support the ideals of Jefferson while big government believers are in line with Hamilton. The Worldview of these and other political philosophers are important to understand in that today’s politicians can be associated with these thinkers: this association then allows us to predict and estimate the policy and decision-making process of these individuals.

**Economics**

*An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* is considered the first book on economic development, and its author, Adam Smith, is known as the Father of Economics. Published in 1776, Smith sought to understand and describe why nations experienced contrasting degrees of wealth: England, in particular, and Europe, in general, were wealthier in the day of Adam Smith than other nations or regions of the world. Smith had reports from the Americas, Africa and Asia. For instance, Smith compared the report of Marco Polo’s visits to China towards the end of the 13th Century to contemporary reports that seemed to indicate a lack of economic progress and growth in China over the course of approximately 500 years. Smith wanted to determine what it was that gave each nation its economic advantages or, conversely, its disadvantages.

Smith wrote at the dawn of the Industrial Revolution (1760 – 1830). Although he could not foresee nor predict the explosive growth the Industrial Revolution would bring to Great Britain and other regions of the world, he was able to outline certain themes that are still in use today as tools to describe conditions for or contrary to economic growth. These factors included institutions, incentives, geography and culture.
First and foremost, Smith described an economic viewpoint that he thought accounted for England’s success based on free markets, *laisse – faire* (from the French – literally, “let do,” in economics more like “let alone,” “let pass”), natural advantage and few regulations all governed by an “invisible hand.” 36 Smith’s evaluation led to a philosophy of self-interest, as described:

It is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer, or the baker that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own interest. We address ourselves, not to their humanity but to their self-love, and never talk to them of our own necessities but of their advantages. Nobody but a beggar chooses to depend chiefly upon the benevolence of his fellow-citizens. 37

An alternative economic system to capitalism was introduced and promoted by Karl Marx. Marx was born approximately 100 years after Adam Smith (1818 and 1720, respectively) and wrote at the height of the injustices of the industrial revolution. “Marx did not discover that capitalism is exploitative. It does not require great intellect to see that the capitalists live off other people’s labour.”38 But Marx took this discovery to an entirely new economic level, devising a centrally controlled political and economic structure that came to be known synonymously as Communism and Marxism.

Marx, working with his associate and colleague Friedrich Engels, published *The Communist Manifesto*39 in 1848 and *Capital*40 in 1867. Although the status and acceptance of *Capital* has risen and fallen since its first publication, its place in history can never be denied. Engels wrote: “‘Das Kapital’ is often called, on the Continent, “the Bible of the working class.””41 It is still read by intellectuals across the globe who want to understand the theoretical framework of Marxism and communism. But Marx did less to
define his ideal society than to describe the faults of capitalism. In his foreword to von Mises’s *Liberalism*, Louis Spadro writes: “To accuse Marx of failure to describe the operating details and the implications of a socialist society in *Das Kapital* is indefensible; for that work is exactly what it intended to be: a highly critical examination of the workings of capitalism as Marx conceived the latter to be.”42

Where Smith was interested primarily in describing the conditions that fostered development and economic success, Marx’s *raison d’état* was to document the failure of the capitalistic system for the majority of the population and make the case for an alternative economic and political system, namely, communism. Marx claimed that labor, rather than capital, should be the economic foundation of a society and that the means of production should be owned by the state. That Karl Marx was a brilliant scholar and academic intellect of great ability is undeniable: likewise, his analysis of the conditions of his day and the descriptions of the exploitation workers experiences is indisputable.

But Marx did not live long enough to see, or was the victim of his own confirmation bias to the extent that he missed the significant economic progress being made in England and throughout Western Europe under capitalism. “Marx was famously wrong when he predicted the progressive immiseration of the proletariat. The real wages and living conditions of the working classes improved over the span of the nineteenth century, reducing the squalor that has been captured for posterity by social critics such as Chadwick and Hegel and by writers such as Dickens.”43

What Marx offered was a radical economic option to capitalism, complete with
many of the popular phrases and images associated with communistic ideology: class consciousness, alienation, ideology, exploitation, modes of production, relation of production, commodity fetishism and the materialistic conception of history. Marx worked these ideas powerfully together with the language of unity and struggle, including these two well-known quotes:

“The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Workingmen of all countries, unite!”

The advance of industry, whose involuntary promoter is the bourgeoisie, replaces the isolation of the labourers, due to competition, by their revolutionary combination, due to association. The development of Modern Industry, therefore, cuts from under its feet, the very foundation on which the bourgeoisie produces and appropriates products. What the bourgeoisie therefore, produces, above all, are its own grave-diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable . . . Of all the classes, that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie today, the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class.

Thus, two primary economic systems were created which competed with each other throughout the 20th Century, these being communism and capitalism, which offered conflicting Worldviews of how governments should be involved in economic decisions.

The most significant economic event of the 20th Century was the global depression of the 1930’s that led to significant unemployment, decreases in the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of many nations, and a diminution of the Gross Global Product. The so-called “classical economists” could not account in their models or systems for such a market failure, and were tentative in offering solutions to the financial crisis. Filling this void was British economists John Maynard Keynes, whose classic economic work was titled, *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money.*
Like his predecessors, Adam Smith and Karl Marx, Keynes can best be understood in the context in which he lived. Born on June 5th 1883, Keynes wrote *The General Theory* in response to the Great Depression. Although the concept of a business cycle of economic booms and recessions was well known and written about in economic texts, the Great Depression of the 1930’s challenged all economic theories and offered an opportunity for intellectuals to rethink classical economic thought.

Keynes maintained the trouble that developed nations experienced during the Great Depression was not the economic system itself, but small, technical issues. In a nutshell, Keynes thought that governmental participation, through fiscal and monetary policies, could stimulate and correct market fluctuations in a healthy, productive manner. Classic economic thought, according to Keynes, was more concerned with understanding how the economy worked and defending a *laisse faire*, hands off philosophy. Keynes thought economics should be studied and taught only as the means to improve society and help the economy.

Keynes credits President Roosevelt with increasing demand in the US through fiscal, public works programs (CCC, etc) but also through monetary policies:

We have seen, I think, a signal example of this in the earlier phases of America’s “New Deal”. When President Roosevelt’s substantial loan expenditure began, stocks of all kinds — and particularly of agricultural products — still stood at a very high level. The “New Deal” partly consisted in a strenuous attempt to reduce these stocks — by curtailment of current output and in all sorts of ways. The reduction of stocks to a normal level was a necessary process — a phase which had to be endured. But so long as it lasted, namely, about two years, it constituted a substantial offset to the loan expenditure which was being incurred in other directions. Only when it had been completed was the way prepared for substantial recovery.
Keynes titled chapter ten of *General Theory* “The Marginal Propensity to Consume and the Multiplier.” “The Multiplier” is the concept that the hiring of one person will lead to other jobs because the first person hired will have income to spend on commodities that will create a positive cycle. He wrote that, if, for example, the government employs 100,000 additional men on public works and if the multiplier is 4, this will create an aggregate employment increase of 400,000 persons, barring other adverse reactions on investment in other directions. He continues: “We have seen above that the greater the marginal propensity to consume, the greater the multiplier, and hence the greater the disturbance to employment corresponding to a given change in investment.”

Keynes described the Egyptian pyramids as the world’s first “public works” in that they created jobs and economic opportunities for the citizens. He then describes the building of the cathedrals of the Middle Ages as public works programs as the church was essentially acting as the government. These activities provided wages for workers that were then “multiplied” into the greater community. Keynes argues that any form of public works in times of economic busts would mitigate the cycle by creating more demand and that these state sponsored jobs could be eliminated in boom periods.

Approximately 30 years after the Great Depression and Keynes’ contributions to the world of economics, Milton Friedman wrote his classic work, *Capitalism and Freedom*. The book is bold, brave and brash: plainly written in a direct, straightforward manner, it is a radical work that, if taken literally, would tear apart long established traditions and institutions in the United States. Much like the work of Adam Smith or Karl Marx, Friedman’s *magnum opus* presents an idealist’s vision of what a society can
achieve – it describes and offers prescriptions for a perfect and model state, where everyone lives in harmony and everything is for the best. Written in 1962, Friedman and the book received little attention or thought for ten to fifteen years until they emerged during the mid to late 1970’s at the center of an intellectual and social movement on the Right. It represented a 180° change in direction for Friedman who, in his autobiography, wrote about his economic philosophy during the Great Depression: “How thoroughly Keynesian I was then.”

For Friedman, government can best be described as a necessary evil, the means of organizing a society rather than an end in itself. Friedman’s primary argument is that the role of government must be limited, and that free markets and virtually unfettered capitalism must be allowed to flourish. Government has a role, but that role has boundaries:

First, the scope of government must be limited. Its major function must be to protect our freedom both from the enemies outside our gates and from our fellow-citizens: to preserve law and order, to enforce private contracts, to foster competitive markets. Beyond this major function, government may enable us at times to accomplish jointly what we would find it more difficult or expensive to accomplish severally. However, any such use of government is fraught with danger. We should not and cannot avoid using government in this way. But there should be a clear and large balance of advantages before we do.

Among this list of items Friedman argues should be liberated from governmental control is Social Security, the institution FDR established in the 1930’s to establish retirement benefits for seniors. Writing in 1962, nearly thirty years after the Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance (OASDI) program was established (1935), Friedman wrote:

The "social security" program is one of those things on which the tyranny of the status quo is beginning to work its magic. Despite the controversy that surrounded its inception, it has come to be so much taken for granted that its desirability is hardly questioned any longer. Yet it involves a large-scale
invasion into the personal lives of a large fraction of the nation without, so far as I can see, any justification that is at all persuasive, not only on liberal principles, but on almost any other. I propose to examine the biggest phase of it, that which involves payments to the aged.56

Adam Smith and Karl Marx, John Maynard Keynes and Milton Friedman, then, provide the foundational work and Worldview upon which most contemporary economic and development work is built. Free market, *laisse – faire* capitalism, as presented by Smith, is criticized by Marx, who creates a centrally controlled, economic and political structure known as Marxism or Communism. Keynes, writing during the Great Depression, is a capitalist who argues for governmental intervention to spur the economy during slow or stagnant economic times, while Friedman presents the case for unfettered capitalism, privatization and unregulated free markets.

The dominant Worldview of the United States clearly favors the economic system of Adam Smith against the communistic system outlined by Karl Marx, but the ongoing struggle between the positions of Keynes and Friedman are on display daily in the news as politicians and commentators favor one or the other. Knowing the positions of Keynes and Friedman and their corresponding strengths and weaknesses help policy practitioners view this ongoing debate and struggle about the role of government in economic matters.

**Anthropology**

Anthropology is “the scientific study of the origin and of the physical, social, and cultural development and behavior of man [Latin *anthropologia* : ANTHROPO + LOGY].”57 Modern anthropology can be broken down into four branches, or subsets, these being: 1) Biological anthropology – which studies human evolution, biology, genetics, etc, 2) Cultural anthropology, 3) Archaeology – the study of human material culture through
artifacts, and 4) Anthropological Linguistics – the study of languages. This survey, however, will only concern itself with cultural anthropology – the study of how a particular group of people came to be and the cultures and societies they have built.

Cultural anthropology, like Public Policy, is itself an interdisciplinary field comprised of elements of the following:

Economic and political organization, law and conflict resolution, patterns of consumption and exchange, material culture, technology, infrastructure, gender relations, ethnicity, childrearing and socialization, religion, myth, symbols, worldview, sports, music, nutrition, recreation, games, food, festivals, and language, which is also the object of study in linguistics.”

Cultural anthropology is often defined and conducted through ethnographic research, described as “a cyclical process that provides researchers with a way to examine cultures from the inside out,” states Helen Schwartzman in the conclusion to Ethnography in Organizations. It is “the trademark of cultural anthropology. As a method for grasping ‘the native’s point of view’ it was developed by researchers working mostly outside the United States – in Samoa, Kenya, Bali, Brazil.” Many ethnographic works begin with a brief description of why the researcher was in a special position to observe the culture they were in, i.e.:

- “I was in a unique position to observe the disconnect: When the Berlin Wall fell in 1989, I had already spent six years in Poland as an anthropologist, Fulbright scholar, and freelance journalist. I had a wealth of friends and acquaintances, many of whom were to become leaders in politics, business, and public life.”
- “Soon after I had established myself in Omarkana Trobriand Islands, I began to take part, in a way, in the village life, to look forward to the important or festive events, to take personal interest in the gossip and developments of the village occurrences; to wake up every morning to a new day, presenting itself to me more or less as it does to the natives.”
Researchers who use an ethnographic methodology seek to gain an in-depth understanding of how persons in those different cultures and subcultures think, live and act. The word “ethnography” is derived from the Greek words meaning “writing culture.” Ethnographers attempt to study a culture by “hanging out,” observing and recording the ongoing public and private life of the people.\(^5\) “One of the defining characteristics of ethnographic research is that the investigator goes into the field, instead of bringing the field to the investigator.”\(^6\)

Of course, the definition of where the field is has changed through the decades as cultural anthropology has itself evolved. Laura Nader wrote “Up the Anthropologist” in 1969 in which she challenged anthropologists to look in a different place for their research: “What if, in reinventing anthropology, anthropologists were to study the colonizers, rather than the colonized, the culture of power rather than the culture of the powerless, the culture of affluence rather than the culture of poverty?”\(^7\) While in the 1950’s academics did not consider those who conducted research within the US to be “real anthropologists,”\(^8\) this sentiment has radically changed. Today is it universally recognized that the US, like any other nation, has its own culture – pluralistic, to be sure, but certainly a culture with as many sub-cultures as any other and worthy of being studied by anthropologists.

An important book in the field of ethnography is The Professional Stranger: An Informal Introduction to Ethnography,\(^9\) by Michael Agar, first published in 1980 and revised in 1996. Agar describes the elements of ethnographic research, including the difficulty of defining exactly what it is you are studying:
You ride off to a traditional ceremony in a Ford Bronco with a Pearl Jam tape in the cassette deck. Your local key contact is off giving a shaman workshop in Palm Beach. What in the world are we studying anymore?68

This book is important in that it helps researchers understand their role as researchers within a culture in which they may be members, and the complex, nuanced approach necessary to gather data in an objective, neutral manner.

*Ethnography in Organizations*,69 by Helen Schwartzman, combines qualitative research methodology with institutional theory and moves easily from The Hawthorne Studies to the Pentagon and other organizations. She describes the importance of flexibility and learning as we move forward, being willing to change and adapt to what is being observed as critical components of ethnography: “I my view, the most significant contribution of this project [the Hawthorne Study] is its demonstration of the value of allowing both research questions and methods to evolve and change during the course of an investigation.”70

Alena Ledeneva’s book, *How Russia Really Works*,71 is a cultural analysis of how the Russian economy operates since the end of communism and move towards free markets. Her key data came from sixty-two in-depth interviews across four groups of people (elites, practitioners, those who knew the technical side of know-hows, and journalists) that she coded for use in the book. As such, and having written a previous book (The *Russian Economy of Favours*)72 about how the Russian economy uses the concept of blat (a form of special treatment) for business, she was able to demonstrate what changed and what remained the same in Russia as it moved from a centrally
controlled economy to a private, capitalistic economy (although she is quick to point out that the Soviet Union never really was a successful centrally controlled economy).

*Collision and Collusion,* by Janine Wedel, is a behind-the-scenes look at what happened to the western aid promised and expected to help Eastern Europe transition to free market economies after the collapse of the Soviet Union, a book would not have been possible to write had not Dr. Wedel had first hand experience in the culture and language (s) of Eastern Europe. Only someone with inside information of what was really happening could only have described the phenomenon of the “Marriot Brigade”. The book reminded me of the buildup to war with Iraq during the fall and winter of 2002–03 where “experts” were consulted and told those who asked “exactly what they wanted to hear.”

In addition to these “true” anthropological books there exist what can be described as crossover works, books that deal with topics that bridge disciplines and can be examined from a variety of perspectives. Historian Michael Vlahos’s book *Fighting Identity* is “about how deeply war is intertwined in what it means to be human – in belonging and in collective identity, in the shared identities of society, in the ongoing negotiations that represents relationships between societies everywhere.”

Identity power – as Clausewitz reminds us about geist, or spirit – is the true source of military power. If identity is what moves people, then war is identity’s supreme instrument. People continue to make their identity through war. Hence the shared experience and sacrifice of war is both a story and a celebration; and if war makes identity, then its ritual remembrance afterward is nothing less than a people’s mass. *War is the liturgy of identity.* . . . War may not be a nation’s formalized religion; yet when successful war meets the same needs and offers the same solace as religion, *it is the same thing.* War is a celebration of human belongings.
In a similar manner, New York Times reporter Chris Hedges blurs the lines between journalism and anthropology in his book *War is a Force That Gives Us Meaning*. He writes this about war’s addictive hold on individuals and nations:

I learned early on that war forms its own culture. The rush of battle is a potent and often lethal addiction, for war is a drug, one I ingested for many years. It is peddled by mythmakers—historians, war correspondents, filmmakers, novelists, and the state—all of whom endow it with qualities it often does possess: excitement, exoticism, power, chances to rise above our small stations in life, and a bizarre and fantastic universe that has a grotesque and dark beauty. It dominates culture, distorts memory, corrupts language, and infects everything around it.

Like the power drugs have on an addict, so the making of war creates a constant longing, a craving appetite that needs a fix, Hedges asserts. “The rush of battle is a potent and often lethal addiction, for war is a drug.” Hedges formed these observations as a war correspondent, covering first the conflict in El Salvador, then moving to Jerusalem, Cairo, and later to Sarajevo and Kosovo.

Another historian, who served as a bridge between history and anthropology, was Frederick Jackson Turner (1861 – 1932): his primary work, *The Significance of the Frontier in American History*, has come to be known as the “Turner Thesis.” Turner argued that the true character of America was to be discovered in the frontier, the westward expansion of the nation, from civilization towards the savagery of the wilderness. The frontier was a moving target, of course, beginning with the East Coast and spreading across the Appalachian Mountains into the Great Plains and beyond towards California. He writes: “This perennial rebirth, the fluidity of American life, this expansion westward with its new opportunities, its continuous touch with the simplicity
of primitive society, furnish the forces dominating American character . . . In this advance, the frontier is the outer edge of the wave – the meeting point between savagery and civilization.”

The “frontier” has played an important role in US politics and Worldview, as was seen in John Kennedy’s presidential campaign, “The New Frontier,” and Ronald Reagan’s campaign photo shots on horseback. The frontier image of “rugged individuals” such as Daniel Boone, Davy Crocket, Kit Carson, and Snowshoe Thompson and the frontier justice of locations like the O.K. Corral in Tombstone Arizona are among the cultural characteristics of the US that are distinct from the nation’s European roots.

Picking up on this frontier theme is Richard Slotkin, whose trilogy describes the myth of frontier on American culture. The titles of these three works speak for themselves:

1. Regeneration Through Violence: The mythology of the American frontier, 1600-1860.81
2. The Fatal Environment: The myth of the frontier in the age of industrialization, 1800-1890.82

Slotkin describes his work in this manner:

*Gunfighter Nation* [along with his two previous books] belongs to the field of cultural history, which is concerned with describing the ways in which human cultures develop over time . . . The cultural historian tried to construct a historical account of the development of *meaning* and to show how the activities of symbol-making, interpretation, and imaginative projection continuously interlock with the political and material process of social existence.84
He then describes the concepts of ideology, myth and genre, three components and building blocks of worldview. Without using the term “worldview,” Slotkin covers much of the same material this dissertation will be focusing on – history, collective memory, religious heritage, symbols and myths / legends / folktales, and his three volume study traces the theme of the frontier from the colonial era to the present.

Finally, Patricia Nelson Limerick is another American historian whose work on the American west bridges into the field of anthropology. She is most known for The Legacy of Conquest: The Unbroken Past of the American West, but also authored Something in the Soil: Legacies and Reckonings in the New West. After reviewing some of the bloody history of the Civil War and Indian Wars she concludes:

We live on haunted land, on land that is layers deep in human passion and memory . . . Whether the majority who died at any particular site were Indians or whites, these places literally ground Americans of all back ground in their common history. In truth, the tragedies of the wars are our national joint property, and how we handle that property is one test of our unity or disunity, maturity or immaturity, as a people who wear the label “American.”

Anthropology, “the scientific study of the origin and of the physical, social, and cultural development and behavior of man” shows the output of various Worldviews through history and today. Its inclusion as a building block of Public Policy is considerably different from that offered by political philosophies and economics but, as described above, offers genuine insight into how individuals, communities and nations make decisions. These insights, gleaned from the culture and Worldview of the people studied, can be critical in predicting how governmental leaders will make decisions.
Sociology

The academic discipline of sociology was defined by one of its leading figures, Max Weber, in his essay *The Nature of Social Action*:

[Sociology is] ... the science whose object is to interpret the meaning of social action and thereby give a causal explanation of the way in which the action proceeds and the effects which it produces. By 'action' in this definition is meant the human behaviour when and to the extent that the agent or agents see it as subjectively meaningful ... the meaning to which we refer may be either (a) the meaning actually intended either by an individual agent on a particular historical occasion or by a number of agents on an approximate average in a given set of cases, or (b) the meaning attributed to the agent or agents, as types, in a pure type constructed in the abstract. In neither case is the 'meaning' to be thought of as somehow objectively 'correct' or 'true' by some metaphysical criterion. This is the difference between the empirical sciences of action, such as sociology and history, and any kind of *priori* discipline, such as jurisprudence, logic, ethics, or aesthetics whose aim is to extract from their subject-matter 'correct' or 'valid' meaning.88

Auguste Comte, who wrote *The Course in Positive Philosophy* and *A General View of Positivism*,89 is generally referred to as the “Father of Sociology,” although Èmile Durkheim, Karl Marx and Max Weber are generally considered as the founders of the academic discipline we know today as sociology. Key sociologists whose work will overlap with the scope of this dissertation include Alexis de Tocqueville, Karl Marx (already mentioned), Thorstein Veblin, Max Weber, Robert Bellah, Seymour Martin Lipset, C. Wright Mills and Lawrence Harrison.

As a young man of aristocratic, French roots, Alexis de Tocqueville visited the United States for nine months in 1831 – 1832. Traveling with a companion named Gustave de Beaumont the two toured west as far as Michigan, then traveled down the Mississippi River to New Orleans. But they spent most of their time in New York,
Boston and Philadelphia meeting with national leaders and influential Americans, among them Charles Carroll, the final surviving signer of the Declaration of Independence.  

After returning to France, de Tocqueville wrote *Democracy in America* in which he set down his impression of the social and political institutions of the US. “He was a man of apparent contradictions: an aristocrat with liberal ideals, an agnostic with Christian faith in humanity, and a sociologist with the perspective of a historian. He was, above all, a keen observer of American culture, politics, and society . . . *Democracy in America* remains the best book ever written by a European about the United States.” This book is important because it gives us a glimpse of the US, from an outsider, in its early years. De Tocqueville’s observations, especially in terms of his description of the central place of religion in the new nation, contribute to the historic Worldview of the nation that contributes to a potential dominant Worldview today.

In his book, *Continental Divide: The Values and Institutions of the United States and Canada*, Seymour M. Lipset examines some of the cultural differences between the US and Canada. After establishing working models of the American and Canadian Ideology, Lipset focused his attention on different features of each society, from literature and myths to Law and Deviance, economic behavior, government, war and peace, welfare and politics. He devotes an entire chapter (chapter 5 – The Impact of Religion) to how religion and religious practices differ in these neighboring nations, tracing their origins to the colonial period and the divergent paths each nation has taken.

Furthermore, “Americans are utopian moralists who press hard to institutionalize virtue, to destroy evil people, and to eliminate wicked institutions and practices. They
tend to view social and political dramas as morality plays, as battles between God and the
devil, so that compromise is virtually unthinkable.”⁹⁴ Hence, Americans see themselves
as a light to the nations, a gift from God to model democracy, freedom, liberty and
capitalism to all of the nations of the world. Lipset wrote: “The same Protestant
propensity for moralistic crusades has been expressed in various efforts to reform the rest
of the world by war.”⁹⁵ This “evangelism” of US values onto a global scale is a
peculiarly and curiously American cultural characteristic and helps explain President
Bush’s decision to invade Iraq in the spring of 2003: he wanted to liberate the Iraqi
people from dictatorship and spread democracy to the nations of the Middle East (among
several given reasons).

Lipset compares and contrasts religion in the US with religion in its northern
neighbor, Canada. Canada’s religious experience has been dominated by the Anglican
and Roman Catholic traditions, with a strong ecumenical tradition (the United Church).
The Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches tend to be more hierarchical, top – down
institutions than Protestant denominations, hence creating more loyalty and allegiance
among their memberships. The dominant churches of Canada (Anglican, Roman
Catholic) reflect the “lingering aura”⁹⁶ of the European established churches where the
church and state each supported and endorsed each other in a symbiotic, dependent
manner. Unlike the US, which threw off its colonial power with a violent revolutionary
war, “Canada has been shaped by its gradual, nonviolent separation from Britain and its
need to work out agreements among disparate cultures rather than assimilate them into
one.”⁹⁷
Another major work by Lipset is *American Exceptionalism*. Lipset writes:

When Tocqueville or other “foreign traveler” writers or social scientists have used the term ‘exceptional’ to describe the United States, they have not meant, as some critics of the concept assume, that America is better than other countries or has a superior culture. Rather, they have simply been suggesting that it is qualitatively different, that it is an outlier. Exceptionalism is a double-edged concept. As I shall elaborate, we are the worst as well as the best, depending on which quality is being addressed.

Lipset’s American Exceptionalism covers topics from politics to ideology, to economy, religion and welfare, race and American Intellectuals – all vital components of a dominant Worldview with the US culture.

Robert Bellah is a sociologist who is most well known for his article, “Civil Religion in America.” The concept of “civil religion” began with Rousseau, who described its influence and impact on Europe. One can observe certain elements of civil religion in Europe where, following the Constantinian Shift, the line between church and state was erased and “Christian Empires” ruled. Also known as Christendom, monarchs used the concept of divinity to validate and extend their powers.

Bellah begins his essay “Civil Religion in America” with a review of the religious references in John Kennedy’s inaugural address. Writing in 1966, the image of Kennedy’s life and death was vivid in Bellah’s mind. Bellah moves comfortably between his contemporaries (Kennedy, Johnson) and the “giants” of US history, Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln. He uses multiple quotes from each of these presidents, helping us to understand that the US since Colonial times and still today perceives itself as the new Israel, freed from its European bondage in a way reminiscent of the Children of Israel’s escape from Egypt. To stretch this concept a bit, Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln and the
other Founding Fathers become Biblical-like characters in their elevation to the pantheon of greatness. The concept of “God and Country” is synonymous with America’s civil religion although at odds with the Biblical tradition where the texts and prophets consistently warn against this union and instead offer up a simple choice of “God or Country.” Because religion is one of the building blocks of Worldview, Bellah’s work is important for this analysis that is seeking to determine if a dominant Worldview exists in the US that supports redemptive violence. Equating religion with the state is not new to the United States, but its occurrence within the US is an important component in terms of understanding the dominant Worldview.

Long considered a classic, Mills’ The Power Elite connected the economic, military and political structures of the United States, describing “a triangle structure” within the American society. Although it was Eisenhower who coined the phrase “the military-industrial complex,” it was Mills who gave the intellectual framework to this concept and connected the political sphere to the military and economic alliance. He outlines his theme with this sentence: “Today in America there are several important structural coincidences of interest between these institutional domains, including the development of a permanent war establishment by a privately incorporated economy inside a political vacuum.”

Mills, a sociologist, develops his thesis through an analysis of history, culture, political and economic history. He describes the transformation of the US economy into a permanent war economy by tracing American trends from the US Constitution through his post-World War II, Korean War era using a qualitative analysis of writers and trends.
It is clear that Mills views the merging of political power with the military and economic leaders of the nation as an alarming trend. He writes:

The Constitution of the United States was constructed in fear of a powerful military establishment. The President, a civilian, was declared commander-in-chief of all the armed forces and during a war, of the state militia’s as well. Only Congress could declare war, or vote funds for military use—and for only two years at a time. . . . There was no provision for a flow of advice from military to civilian chiefs. If there were provisions for violence in the constitution, they were reluctant provisions, and the agents of violence were held to a strict instrumental role.104

*Culture Matters*105 is an edited collection of articles by some of the most prominent social scientists of our day, including Francis Fukuyama, Nathan Glazer, Seymour Martin Lipset, Orlando Patterson, Jeffrey Sachs and Richard Shweder. Edited by Lawrence Harrison and Samuel Huntington (who also contribute chapters to the book). The book is an attempt to understand how and why the nations of the world are so disparate at the beginning of the twenty-first century—rich and poor, free and oppressed. It is, essentially, an attempt to discover what separates and distinguishes nations one from another and the impact culture plays in these divergences. Because a worldview is paired with its culture, this is an important book for this research.

Finally, Daniel Rigney’s *The Metaphorical Society An Invitation to Social Theory*106 offers readers an understanding of how metaphors have shaped Western societies. Rigney contends that “social theorists have variously likened societies to organisms and living systems, to machines, battlefields, legal systems, marketplaces, games, theatrical production, and discourses . . . [and] shows how nearly all Western social theories have been inspired by one or more of these metaphors.”107 The book is
helpful in placing a culture’s worldview within the context of its social setting and the metaphors used to define that particular culture.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has provided a discussion of how Worldviews helps shape and determine Public Policy: further, the brief survey of selected social sciences highlights the distinct and different Worldviews embedded within these major social theories. Knowing where someone stands will help determine what that person will see: knowledge of what that person will see will also contribute to determining how that individual will act. Understanding the particular Worldview of an individual, community or nation is therefore important in understanding how and why decisions are made at the individual and communal level.

At this point, readers should have a clear understanding of what Worldviews are, how they affect Public Policy, and why it is important to understand how a dominant Worldview will help shape and determine policy decisions. Next I will define two important concepts of this work, 1) Dominant, and 2) Redemptive Violence so that these two may also be understood for the context of this dissertation.
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CHAPTER 3: DEFINING THE CONCEPTS OF DOMINANT & REDEMPTIVE VIOLENCE

The purpose of this work is to seek evidence that can help determine if there exists a dominant Worldview within the US that supports redemptive violence and hence, an imbalance between the components of 3 – D Security (Defense, Diplomacy and Development) and an imbalance between what the US spends on defense and what the other nations of the world spend.

Before moving forward I would like to provide clarification on how I will use the term “Dominant,” and what the concept of “Redemptive Violence” is. Following this short chapter, the terms “Worldview,” “Public Policy, “Dominant” and “Redemptive Violence” will be used as defined throughout the remainder of this work.

Dominant

This dissertation seeks to identify the existence of a dominant Worldview within the US culture that is manifest through its military output. An important word in this sentence is the word “Dominant.” For the purposes of this work, dominant should not be confused with majority or popular, but as defined both in The American Heritage Dictionary and within genetics:
1. **dominant** (dôm´ə-nənt) *adj.* *Abbr.* dom. 1. Exercising the most influence or control; governing. 2. Pre-eminent in position or prevalence; ascendant. 3. Genetics. Producing the same phenotypic effect whether paired with an identical or a dissimilar gene. Compare *recessive*. 4. Ecology. Designation or pertaining to the species that is most characteristic of a habitat and that may determine the presence and type of other species. [Old French, from Latin *dominâns*, present participle of *dominârs*, to DOMINATE.]

2. Gregor Mendel (1822 – 1884), known as the father of genetics because of his work with the inheritance of specific characteristics in the reproduction of pea plants, noted that when purple colored and white colored pea plants were paired for reproduction, the resulting color was either purple or white but never an intermediate color (such as lavender). He concluded, without the contemporary understanding of DNA and chromosomes, that certain genes are dominant and other recessive. Other experiments, however, provided results where an intermediate effect resulted, defined as codominance.

In 2003 the successful final film adaptation of J. R. R. Tolkien’s *Lord of the Rings, The Return of the King* was released to near universal acclaim. It was only the second movie (after *Titanic*) to gross over $1 billion, and was nominated and won 11 Oscar Awards, including “Best Movie,” “Best Director,” and “Best Musical Score.” There are a total of 24 Oscar Awards, indicating that the movie garnered less than half of the total awards. However, it can be said that *The Lord of the Ring, The Return of the King* dominated the award ceremony because the closest competitors in terms of awards won were *Mystic River* and *Master and Commander*, each film capturing two Oscar awards.³

Likewise, the New York Yankees dominated professional baseball from 1921 – 2003, appearing in 39 World Series and winning 26. The Yankees appeared in 47
percent of the World Series played in those years, and won 32 percent: this compares favorably to the St. Louis Cardinals who had the second most appearances (15) and second most victories (9), during the same time period (1921 – 2003). The Cardinals appeared in 18 percent of the World Series during this time period, and won 11 percent of the World Series during this time period.\footnote{4}

Thus, we can conclude that an entity can dominate a category without necessarily carrying a majority stake. We also know, for instance, that an individual can have four grandparents, all with blond hair and blue eyes, and yet still end up with neither due to the fortunes of chance and the power of a dominant gene that can, at times, appear to be dormant. All humans carry dominant, recessive and codominant genes, multiple strands of DNA that have real and latent potential.

In the same way, all societies carry dominant, recessive and codominant strands – varying Worldviews on a variety of Public Policy issues. US citizens agree, by and large, on the economic writings and “worldview” of Adam Smith and capitalism vis-à-vis Karl Marx and communism, even though most have never read either. They disagree, however, on the finer, more nuanced economic principles as advocated on the one hand by John Maynard Keynes and on the other by Milton Friedman. It could be argued that the dominant economic philosophy in the United States is capitalism, and any proposed increase in government sponsored social programs is met with stiff opposition. An avowed socialist or communist would fare poorly in the US\footnote{5} because these economic worldviews do not match the US culture.
US citizens are also united around the ideals of democracy, freedom, the separation of powers, rule of law, and basic human rights like “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness,” but divided into political parties dominated by the Republicans and Democrats. These differences represent different strands, separate aspects of the US culture and worldview. A candidate who is either a Democrat or Republican may win a particular election, but an avowed monarchist or advocate for dictatorship would not.

Following the election of 2008, the Democratic Party gained control of the White House, the Senate and the House of Representatives – but it is uncertain whether the Democrats obtained a dominant position in the US political arena. The struggle to pass far-reaching, across-the-board health demonstrates that even though the Democratic Party controls the Executive and Legislative Branches of government and made commitments during the 2008 campaign season to pass such legislation demonstrates this lack of dominance. Divisions within the Democratic Party, inherent institutional laws and rules that hinder reform, moderate public support, the power of special interest groups and a unified oppositional party (in this case, the Republican Party) are factors that could be made to illustrate that the Democrats lacked an effectively dominant position, even though they gained control of two of the three branches of the federal government.

“Dominant,’ then, for the purposes of this dissertation, can be defined as holding a pre-eminent position and having the ability to exercise the most influence and control: it does not necessarily reflect the majority opinion, and most likely will reveal the existence of a corresponding recessive strand of Worldview that is in opposition to the dominant
Worldview. If it is determined that a dominant Worldview exists within the US favoring military spending over spending for development and diplomacy, it may also be determined that there is also a recessive Worldview that takes on an opposing perspective.

**Redemptive Violence**

The Harry Potter series, Star Wars trilogy and Lord of the Rings are all modern examples of the ancient archetypal of redemptive violence – where the good, morally virtuous individuals and groups prevail and evil is destroyed. These stories provide a cathartic experience – a spiritual release and purification based on vengeance and retribution. We feel pleasure at the final defeat of Lord Voldemort, brought about through a climatic battle between Harry Potter and his friends who represent “the good” and “He who shall not be named” (Voldemort) and his evil allies. Likewise, when Luke Skywalker and his band of rebel fighters defeat the Evil Empire of Darth Vader, the Emperor and “The Dark Side” after an epic battle in *The Empire Strikes Back*, our sense of moral justice is restored. Finally, Frodo and his companion hobbits, elves, dwarfs, wizards and humans are able to defeat the Dark Lord Sauron through an act of sacrifice by Frodo (destroying The Ring at Mount Doom) and in a grand battle at the Black Gate of Mordor. In all three stories, good triumphs over evil through the power of redemptive violence.

The archetypal literary plot of redemptive violence can be traced back to the first human writings. An early example can be found in the Enûma Elish, the so-called Babylonian Genesis in that it tells a creation myth of Babylon.® Marduk slays his enemies and enslaves their supporters – providing the basic archetypal plot of good
prevailing over evil. The Biblical story of Exodus (Moses verses Pharaoh, the Children of Israel foiled against their Egyptian masters), the Book of Joshua wherein the Children of Israel conquer the inhabitants of the Promised Land, David verses Goliath and other narratives from the Bible tell the same story, as does Homer’s *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, *Beowulf* and hundreds of other narratives. The heroes are endowed with great quantities of heroism and prevail in a “might makes right” moral equation.

For generations, American children have seen this archetypal story told through cartoons. I remember watching Popeye rescue Olive Oyl countless times from the brutal, evil Bluto, one example of this narrative. Initially, of course, the cartoons begin with Bluto beating up Popeye: our “hero” is mercilessly beaten until the spinach is consumed providing Popeye with an energy boost. The spinach enables Popeye to turn the tables and defeat Bluto through the use of the same means Bluto was using against Popeye – brute force, and through the use of this physical force Popeye is able to rescue Olive Oyl. Good prevails over evil in episode after episode providing a subtle message to children. Other examples include Dudley
Do-Right, the dim-witted Canadian Mountie, who seemed perpetually in the process of rescuing Nell from Snidely Whiplash, the representation of evil in this cartoon.

Walter Wink coined this phenomena “The Myth of Redemptive Violence.” He writes: “It enshrines the believe that violence saves, that war brings peace, that might makes right . . . The Myth of Redemptive Violence is the real myth of the modern world. It, and not Judaism or Christianity of Islam, is the dominant religion in our society today.” Wink traces this theme from ancient texts to modern cartoon – and concludes: “The myth of redemptive violence is the simplest, laziest, most exciting, uncomplicated, irrational, and primitive depiction of evil the world has ever known. Furthermore, its orientation toward evil is one into which virtually all modern children (boys especially) are socialized in the process of maturation.” [Italics in original]

Michael Vlahos describes the US perception of redemptive violence in this manner:

America’s Great Wars follow a mythic cycle. The cycle is familiar to all of us, and subconsciously a part of ours:

1. The threat to existence: we are unjustly, barbarously attacked
2. The evil face of the enemy is revealed – what we refused to see
3. The awakening and the Oath
4. The leader comes – he rises to the test
5. The transcendent sacrifice of the pure, the pious, the young
6. The decisive sacrifice of transcendence
7. The enemy is laid low, vanquished or even destroyed forever
8. The reunification – and the deliverance / redemption

Vlahos describes what he considers the three wars wherein American identity (and worldview) was shaped: “Our three great wars – of revolution, civil war, and world war – are a single liturgy twice renewed and reinterpreted. Revolution was our national
realization, our coming into being. Civil was our national redemption. World was to be redemption of humanity, which nearly complete, was then 50 years postponed: to be finally finished (or so it seemed) only after a long Cold War.”

Harry Stout describes redemptive violence, without using those words, in his book *Upon the Altar of Nation*. He writes about the Civil War: “Only as casualties rose to unimaginable levels did it dawn on some people that something mystically religious was taking place, a sort of massive sacrifice on the national altar. The Civil War taught Americans that they really were a Union, and it absolutely required a baptism of blood to unveil transcendent dimension of that union.”

Patricia Nelson Limerick (*The Legacy of Conquest* and *Something in the Soil*) and Richard Slotkin (*Regeneration Through Violence, The Fatal Environment* and *Gunfighter Nation*) describe the myth of western development, Manifest Destiny and the triumph of civilization over the Native Americans in terms that echo the theme of redemptive violence. Limerick writes: “If you place yourself at a distance, there is no clearer fact in American history than the fact of conquest.” When the first European settlers arrived in the 17th Century, North America was inhabited by a Native American population whose numbers have never been accurately known; estimates of this population range from 8 to 100 million. By 1900, the “Indian Wars” had concluded through a total conquest of the continent. Although there are many sub-plots, twists and unintended consequences (the spread of disease like small pox had a devastating impact on the Native Americans and is assumed, for the purposes of this paper, to have been spread via unintentional means)
along the way, the bottom line is that the European settlers took the land from those who were here first through “guns, germs and steel.”

The killing of Native Americans seemed to be part of the divine plan, an re-enactment of the children of Israel taking the land of Israel from its through war, slaughter and “redemptive violence.” The Biblical book of Joshua provided inspiration for some of the early settlers who saw their task as establishing a new Israel on these shores. One of literally hundreds of narratives describing the slaughter of the Native American is this one, from the journal of William Bradford:

Led by several veterans of the Thirty Years’ War in Europe, the Puritans fell upon a Pequot fortress on the Mystic River. After setting the Indians’ wigwams ablaze, the soldiers proceeded to shoot and hack to pieces anyone who attempted to escape the inferno. By the end of the day, approximately four hundred Pequot men, women and children were dead. “It was a fearful sight to see them thus frying in the fire and the streams of blood quenching the same,” Bradford wrote, and horrible was the stink and scent thereof; but victory seemed a sweet sacrifice, and they gave the praise thereof to the God.”

The violence of the frontier, however, is both accepted as redemptive, and evoked in places like Disney World’s Frontierland, populated by mountain men, cowboys, Indians, prospectors, saloon girls, sheriffs and outlaws. Slotkin adds:

Conflict was also a central and peculiar feature of the process . . . Violence is central to both the historical development of the Frontier and its mythic representation. The Anglo – American colonies grew by displacing Amerindian societies and enslaving Africans to advance the fortunes of White colonists. As a result, the ‘savage war’ became a characteristic episode of each phase of westward expansion.

Redemptive violence, the concept that evil can be defeated through violence and war, is an ancient belief that continues to be held by many persons across the planet today.
division of people and nations into good and bad, moral and evil, is primitive, but offers opportunities and excuses to dehumanize and demonize the enemy. Hugh Heclo writes:

Here too there is a dark side. It is one of using religion as a prop for American triumphalism. We can be, and often have been, deceived into thinking American power is an outgrowth of America righteousness. It tempts us with a policy theology of good versus evil, a God-is-on-our-side kind of politics.¹⁹

The concept of redemptive violence and the perception that God is on “our” side is not new, as already established, nor limited to the worldview of citizens of the United States. Here the words of David Hume, writing in 1740:

When our own nation is at war with any other, we detest them under the character of cruel, perfidious, unjust and violent: But always esteem ourselves and allies equitable, moderate, and merciful. If the general of our enemies be successful, ’tis with difficulty we allow him the figure and character of a man. He is a sorcerer: He has communication with daemons; as is reported of Oliver Cromwell, and the Duke of Luxembourg. He is bloody-minded, and takes a pleasure in death and destruction. But if the success be on our side, our commander has all the opposite and good qualities, and is a pattern of virtue, as well as of courage and conduct. His treachery we call policy: His cruelty is an evil inseparable from war. In short, every one of his faults we either endeavor to extenuate, or dignify it with the name of that virtue, which approaches it. It is evident the same method of thinking runs thro’ common life.²⁰

Walter Wink describes a trip he and his wife took to Argentina during the Falklands / Malvinas War in 1982. “With but one exception (the Nobel Peace Laureate Adolfo Pérez Esquivel), all the Christians we interviewed believed that Argentina was fighting a just war to recover ‘its’ islands. Sometimes later we were in England, and without exception, every theologian and ethicist we spoke to believed that England had fought a just war against Argentina to protect ‘its’ islands.”²¹
Although the Cold War came to an end with the peaceful collapse of the Soviet Union, there were many hot wars fought throughout the world that essential fell under the umbrella of conflict between the US and Soviet Union (Korea, Vietnam, to name but two of the most prominent), and the rhetoric between the two nations was hostile. Ronald Reagan first described the Soviet Union as ‘the Evil Empire” at the annual National Association of Evangelicals breakfast on March 8, 1983, saying: “I urge you to beware the temptation of pride - the temptation of blithely declaring yourselves above it all and label both sides equally at fault, to ignore the facts of history and the aggressive impulses of an evil empire, to simply call the arms race a giant misunderstanding and thereby remove yourself from the struggle between right and wrong and good and evil.”

While President George W. Bush described Iran, Iraq and North Korea as the “Axis of Evil,” it is instructive to note that Iranian religious leader Ayatollah Khomeini often referred to the United States as شیطان بزرگ Shaytan-e Bozorg, Persian for “The Great Satan.” The self-identification with good, moral, ethical and righteousness and the “other’ as evil, bad, wicked and wrong is an eternally contemporary process, and therefore allows the elimination of the other for redemptive purposes.

The concept of redemptive violence is to be understood, for the purposes of this dissertation, as a potential ingredient in the construction of a dominant worldview within the US that supports an imbalance of defensive spending as opposed to development and diplomacy.
Conclusion

This section of the dissertation was designed to provide the reader with a better understanding and working definition of concepts and terminology that may be obscure to may policy makers and scholars. An attempt to establish the existence of a dominant worldview that believes in redemptive violence could not be undertaken without an adequate understanding of these concepts: dominant and redemptive violence.

At this point, having established an understanding of Worldview, Public Policy, Dominant and Redemptive Violence, we are ready to move on to the research question, hypothesis and methodology of this work.

1 The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, 390.
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8 Ibid., 53.
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CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH QUESTION, HYPOTHESIS, METHODOLOGY

Secretary of Defense Robert Gates has made the case for “A Balanced Approach” to US national security, noting the need for a more active State Department (diplomacy) and more robust development programs. In describing current conditions around the world, he writes: “Over the long term, the United States cannot kill or capture its way to victory . . . Not every outrage, every act of aggression, or every crisis can or should elicit a U.S. military response.”

He comes to these conclusions after a lifetime of public service, including stints in the US Air Force, Central Intelligence Agency, National Security Council and as the Secretary of Defense, appointed by President George W. Bush in 2006 and continuing under President Barack Obama. Self described as a “Cold War Warrior,” Gates adds: “For just about my entire professional career in government I have generally been known as a hawk on national security. One criticism of me when I was at CIA was that I overestimated threats to the security of our country.”

It is noteworthy, then, to observe Gates, the sitting Secretary of Defense, advocating increased spending for programs outside of the DoD. Gates argues:

In short, based on my experience serving seven presidents, as a former Director of CIA and now as Secretary of Defense, I am here to make the case for strengthening our capacity to use “soft” power and for better integrating it
with “hard” power.\textsuperscript{4}

Gates is describing what is coming to be known as 3 -D Security\textsuperscript{5} (Defense, Development and Diplomacy). Secretary of State Hillary Clinton describes this approach as “Smart Power,” following the definition of Joseph Nye and Suzanne Nossel as the projection of power and influence through means other than military.\textsuperscript{6} Speaking at her confirmation hearing in January 2009 Clinton said: “We must use what has been called smart power: the full range of tools at our disposal – diplomatic, economic, military, political, legal, and cultural – picking the right tool, or combination of tools, for each situation.”\textsuperscript{7}

At the beginning of the 21st Century, however, the US approach to national security via 3 – D Security is unbalanced when considering the financial resources allocated to each. Figure 3.1 summarizes the US Federal Budget FY2007 DoD, State Department (Diplomacy) and development (primarily, but not exclusively, USAID) totals. The chart demonstrates current spending as slices of a pie between defense (blue), Development (red) and Diplomacy (yellow). Clearly, the DoD budget is the dominant recipient of financial resources devoted to 3 – D Security.
David Kilcullen provides another example of the imbalance in 3 – D Security within the United States. He writes:

There are 1.68 million uniformed personnel in the U.S. armed forces. By comparison, taking diplomatic capacity as a surrogate metric for other forms of civilian capacity, the State Department employs about 6,000 foreign service officers, while the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) has about 2,000. In other words, the Department of Defense is about 210 times larger than USAID and State combined, in personnel terms. (In budget terms, the mismatch is far greater, on the order of 350:1.) This represents a substantial asymmetry, particularly when it is realized that the typical size ratio between armed forces and diplomatic / aid agencies for other Western democracies is between 8 and 10:1 (compared to 210:1 in the case of the United States).8

The question I have been wrestling with for many years is why does the US place great resources in the Department of Defense and thereby neglect the budgets and potential of diplomacy and development? Is there something in the US worldview and culture that creates an environment in which this imbalance was created, sustained and now accepted? These, and other questions, have brought me to the research question for this dissertation.

**Research Question**

Is there a dominant worldview at work within the United States culture, expressed by policy makers and elected officials, that accepts a redemptive role of violence and therefore supports an imbalance between the components of 3 – D Security (Defense, Diplomacy and Development), favoring military spending by a factor of 20: 1 over the combined total budgets for diplomacy and development?
Hypothesis

**H1:** A dominant worldview within the US society does exist that supports the belief in redemptive violence, American Exceptionalism and the “City on a hill” civil religion understanding of America’s place in the world as part of God’s plan. George W. Bush expressed this worldview with these words: “Our nation is the greatest force for good in history.”

This worldview permeates US society and will ultimately not allow 3 – D Security to be successful. Without an altering of the dominant worldview and process of meaning-making for a majority of US citizens, 3 – D Security will be seen as an ineffective policy and will not be successfully funded or implemented. Spending at the DoD will continue to grow in proportion to security risks around the world.

**H1:O:** There is no dominant worldview in operation within the US, and 3 – D Security, given a proper amount of time and practice, will be successful.

Methodology

The following analysis employs a mixed methodology known as a concurrent triangulation strategy for obtaining data, a hybrid of quantitative and qualitative research appropriate for ascertaining the potential existence of a dominant worldview within a social order, i.e. the United States. “The concept of mixing different methods probably originated in 1959, when Campbell and Fiske used multiple methods to study validity of psychological traits. They encouraged others to employ their ‘multimethod matrix’ to
examine multiple approaches to data collection in a study.”10 The mixed methodological approach allows this study to address the research question and hypothesis from several different angles and “capture the best of both quantitative and qualitative approaches.”11 has been chosen.

Qualitative and quantitative research are methodologies that can be seen as competitors, opposing each other and offering conflicting techniques for knowledge construction, or as teammates, colleagues whose contrasting modes of gathering data can be perceived as complimentary. The approach taken in this dissertation is that qualitative and quantitative methodologies will be considered as colleagues, coworkers acting in concert with each other to tease out a theoretical dominant worldview.

Quantitative research is often linked with positivism, the philosophical concept coined by Henri, comte de Saint-Simon, adopted and widely disseminated by Auguste Comte, to designate the school of epistemologically that maintains the only things which can be known can be empirically verifiable.12 For the positivist, metaphysical speculation is to be avoided. This perspective came to dominate the social sciences at the end of the 19th and early decades of the 20th Century. Positivism postulates, “the social world, similar to the natural world, is governed by rules which result in patterns. Accordingly, causal relationships between variables exist and can even be identified, proven, and explained. Thus, patterned social reality is predictable and can potentially be controlled.”13

An alternative approach to positivism emerged within the social sciences and is known as the hermeneutic tradition: hermeneutics is a method of data gathering that can
be considered “post-positivism.” The hermeneutic approach differs from the positivist in its conception of epistemology: knowledge of the social order is not to be understood solely as something to be discovered and measured, “but rather it is to be relational and subjective, produced during the research process. The researcher is not assumed to be value-neutral and ‘objective’ but rather an active participant, along with the research subjects, in the building of descriptive, exploratory, and explanatory knowledge.” A danger for the researcher who uses a hermeneutic, post-positivism approach is that their research will be dismissed or devalued by those who insist on quantitative research.

A concurrent triangulation approach has been selected as the mixed methodology because it offers two means to “confirm, cross-validate, or corroborate findings within a single study . . . This model generally uses separate quantitative and qualitative methods as a means to offset the weakness inherent within one method with the strengths of the other method.” Integration of the results from the two methods will occur in the interpretation and analysis phase of this dissertation, chapter 4. Data collected from quantitative research were obtained during the same period as data collected from qualitative research: it was my discipline to conduct, transcribe and assess interviews and other ethnographic research in the morning, make phone calls to libraries and churches in the afternoon, read in the evenings and visit sites of interest on weekends, although this routine varied somewhat from day to day or week to week.

The mixed methodological approach of this dissertation will provide a balanced approach and means to access different sets of knowledge. Close-ended quantitative data has been collected to provide detailed information about measurable factors that
contribute to a worldview: this information has been used in conjunction with open-ended qualitative data to generalize the findings for an entire society. This type of approach is being used because this research is exploratory: the topic of a dominant worldview as a contributing factor to worldview is new, and existing theories have not been applied to this research.

**Quantitative Research**

“Quantitative research is often privileged as ‘hard’ science. A quantitative researcher relies on number, rates, and percentages, typically presented in a table, grid, or chart in order to communicate meaning.”\(^1\) This dissertation will provide quantitative data consisting of:

1) The percentage of towns and cities within five regionally and politically diverse states that have war memorial, monuments or plaques.
2) The percentage of towns and cities within five regionally and politically diverse states that have peace memorial, monuments or plaques.
3) The total number of war and peace monuments within the US Capital, Washington, District of Columbia.
4) The total number and percentage of all the towns and cities of these same states that celebrate the Martin Luther King, Jr. holiday, Memorial Day, July 4\(^{th}\) or Veteran’s Day with parades, fireworks, ceremonies or other civil events to which the public is invited.
5) The number and percentage of United Methodist Churches, located within a district encompassed in the same five states, which display a United States flag on their property and the flag’s location.
6) A coded analysis of the preambles of all of the US states looking for key words or phrases used to promote civil religion, redemptive violence or American Exceptionalism.
7) A simple counting process of the names of certain historic figures (Nathan Hale, George Washington, Robert E. Lee, Ulysses Grant, Abraham Lincoln, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Dwight David Eisenhower, Jesse Lee, Alfred Henry Love, Dorothy Day, Jeannette Rankin, Martin Luther King, Jr., Daniel Berrigan and Jody Williams) within state approved US history books used at the elementary, middle and high school public schools in the US.
Data obtained from this quantitative research will be compiled in both tables and charts. It will be used to provide tangible, measurable, numerical statistics that offer evidence for and against the hypothesis of this dissertation. This information will be merged with data gleaned from qualitative research in the analysis section (chapter 4) and used as the basis for tentative conclusions and policy recommendations.

**Qualitative Research**

Data has also been collected from a qualitative approach that is designed to understand, from a hermeneutic perspective, a social reality that is relational and “soft,” accessed through separate techniques:

Qualitative research is an exciting interdisciplinary landscape rich with perspectives on knowledge construction and enabled by a multitude of techniques available for generating knowledge. When we say that the craft of qualitative research involved a holistic approach, we mean that the practice of qualitative research is reflexive and process driven, ultimately producing culturally situated and theory-enmeshed knowledge through an ongoing interplay between theory and methods, researcher and researched.\[^19\] [Italics in original, bold added]

The qualitative data gathering process has employed the following methods: a study of the academic, scholarly literature (books, journal articles) pertaining to the military-industrial complex; content analysis of non-academic literature (newspapers, brochures, blogs, tweets); targeted, semi-structured interviews; and ethnographic research at historic national parks, war memorials, parades and special occasions.

Content analysis is a research methodology that can be used in either quantitative or qualitative research.\[^20\] Written texts, in a variety of forms, provide source material for the researcher depending on what information is being gathered. Worldview, as defined
earlier in this dissertation, is derived from a number of factors including history, collective memory, symbols, religion, and myths / legends / folktales. Thus, an analysis of any written material in any of these areas would constitute content analysis. “Texts, then, are [to be] defined as being the semiotic manifestation of material social process.”

This dissertation will employ the method of content analysis for the study of both academic, scholarly literature and non-academic literature.

1) Targeted, semi-structured interviews were collected from fifteen individuals. Persons interviewed were selected from a broad cross section of the US public regarding thoughts and opinions of the US and its role in the world. Interviews were taped and thereafter transcribed into Microsoft Word documents: these documents were then assessed and coded to determine patterns, themes, relationships or other pertinent information for this dissertation. The research instrument used for these interviews may be found in Appendix A. The interviews took a semi-structured approach in that I developed a list of questions from which I began and followed for each interview. Subsequent and follow-up questions developed based on the responses given to the prepared questions. I used a snowball approach of questioning, seeking more in depth responses based on statements provided by the person being interviewed.

2) An examination of the “standards” or “frameworks” established by the state boards of education within the five selected states (Arizona, Connecticut, Missouri, Oregon and Virginia). This section has been placed under the qualitative research because it is difficult to count, measure or quantity these standards in a systematic manner: however, the standards do present an opportunity to discover what educational leaders at the state level believe is important to transmit to the next generation.

3) Ethnographic research. A third source of data was obtained through ethnographic fieldwork determined to observe and study US norms and mores to provide evidence for or against the hypothesis of this dissertation. I traveled to eight Revolutionary
War and 12 Civil War battle sites to obtain data for how the US preserves, maintains and presents its history. Additionally, I traveled to numerous war memorials or monuments located throughout the US, beginning in Washington, District of Columbia, and scattered up and down the East Coast where wars were waged between the Native Americans and settlers, between American patriots and the British army (Revolutionary War), between US soldiers and the British Army (War of 1812), and between Confederate and Union soldiers (Civil War). Data obtained was through participation of park ranger tours, video presentations, conversations with other visitors and personal viewing of the “valued” artifacts in their associated exhibits and museums around the nation. In addition to the above mentioned battle sites, I also made six trips to Arlington National Cemetery, including a special trip on Memorial Day and attended a military funeral held in Arlington. Ethnographic research was also conducted at the site of peace memorial, monuments and plaques. Data was obtained through the same process used above.

The ethnographic research also included a content analysis of non-academic literature (newspapers, movies, brochures, blogs, tweets). Content analysis has been described as an effort to understand, as Harold Lasswell put it, “Who says what, to whom, why, to what extent and with what effect?” Ole Holsti defines content analysis as “any technique for making inferences by objectively and systematically identifying specified characteristics of messages.” Culture and worldview are determined from a number of factors not considered academic sources; for example, Jon Stewart may very well have a more profound impact on the US public than noted philosopher, political economist and author Francis Fukuyama, and Disney movies could shape US worldview more than State of the Union addresses.

**Gathering Data Process**

The process used to gather data for two of the quantitative portions of this dissertation (the total number and percentage of war memorials, monuments or plaques within five
regionally diverse states within the US and the total and percentage of peace memorial within the same states) changed in two significant ways during the research stage of the work. The original process, as well as the new procedures, will be explained.

After choosing five states from different regions of the nation (New England, Colonial South, Midwest, Northwest and Southwest) that also reflected different political perspectives (two blue states, two red states, one purple state), I began my data gathering with the State of Connecticut, a state I am familiar with having lived there. Initially, I proceeded by making phone calls to the office of the town clerk, who I assumed knew the answers to my three questions: 1) Does your town / city have any war memorials / monuments / plaques, and if so, what wars do they honor? 2) Does your town celebrate with parades, fireworks, ceremonies or other civic events, the patriotic holidays of Memorial Day, July 4th, or Veteran’s Day? 3) Does your town / city have any peace memorials / monuments / plaques, and if so, what or who do they honor?

My research method changed initially after about 20 phone calls to the town clerk’s office. Approximately 40 percent (maybe eight out of the first twenty I called) of the town clerks could answer my questions, but if they could not, they would not offer to follow up and often referred me to the public library. I soon realized that although the percentage of public librarians who knew answers to these questions was about the same or even a little lower than the town clerks, in most cases the librarians were willing to conduct research and get the information to me later, either with a return phone call, email, or an arranged time for me to return their call. From that point forward, I have begun my research with phone calls to the local public library.
The second significant change took place after contacting 50 town clerks or librarians in Connecticut. I discovered a degree of hostility and opposition from approximately 30 percent of the librarians when I got to my third question inquiring about peace memorials / monuments / plaques. This peculiar reaction, I soon realized, was providing ethnographic data in and of itself: roughly one third of the librarians contacted were defensive regarding the number of war memorials and the way Memorial Day, July 4th and Veteran’s Day were being celebrated in their municipalities when they also realized I was looking for data regarding the way peace was remembered in their towns / cities. This defensive, sometimes hostile behavior, prevented the dissemination of much anecdotal data related to the war memorials / monuments / plaques. I found that the combination of questions upset a high enough percentage of the librarians that I was not able to access the information I sought.

Based on this experience and the information I was receiving, I decided to change the approach. To begin with, it was becoming obvious that virtually every town and city in Connecticut had war memorials, monuments or plaques, sometimes in great abundance: further, almost no town or city in Connecticut had peace memorials, monuments or plaques. Concurrent to phoning the libraries, I also sought the presence of war or peace memorials, monuments and plaques in various towns via the Internet. I discovered the existence of four peace memorials within Connecticut via the Internet and confirmed their presence through phone calls to the town clerk’s office of these municipalities. I decided, therefore, to abandon my question to librarians regarding the existence of peace memorials, monuments or plaques within their town or city, and focus
instead on those devoted to war, and to the civil celebration of the Memorial Day, July 4th and Veteran’s Day because then librarians were extremely forthcoming regarding the war memorials, monuments and plaques; the anecdotal information they provided was of high value in determining a dominant worldview. Data obtained regarding the existence of peace memorials, monuments and plaques would be re-routed to research online.

This change of research methods immediately bore results. In case after case, town and cities alike, I received an enthusiastic response from librarians determined to provide me with the information I sought. When I conceived this work, I assumed that the information I would obtain would be used as quantitative data for the dissertation – providing me with the total number of towns and cities that had Civil War or World War II memorials, for instance, of the percentage of municipalities that celebrated Memorial Day with public events. What I received, however, was information that will also be used in the qualitative, ethnographic section of the analysis – local traditions and customs that are an essential component of the US culture, meaning and identity making, and contributors to worldview.

The possibility of missing peace memorials, monuments and plaques seemed a possibility by limiting my research to the Internet. While it was and is clear to me that there are few peace memorials, monuments or plaques in the United States, it is also a reality that the Internet is fallible and incomplete. To mitigate against this shortcoming, I devised a trouble-shooting approach: the Commonwealth of Massachusetts lies just to the North of Connecticut. It is a bigger state and has a larger population, but a similar history, culture and perspective, to Connecticut. Beginning with the town of Abington, I
called 50 libraries in alphabetical order in Massachusetts asking only a single question: 
does your town or city have any peace memorials, monuments or plaques. The great 
majority of answers to this question were “no.” Only in two of 50 towns were peace 
monuments present and identified by the librarian. Both of these peace memorials had 
already been found on line. This helped confirm my intuition that 1) there are few peace 
memorials, monuments or plaques in towns and cities (at least in New England), and 2) 
the existing ones can be found on line.

I also used phone calls to obtain data regarding the existence and placement of US 
flags on United Methodist Church property. The United Methodist Church has often been 
perceived as the denomination that is most representative of the United States. The 
church was officially established in 1784, and its growth followed that of the US. 
Methodist pastors, known as circuit riders, were on the heels of the earliest settlers as the 
nation expanded westward. Today, the church likes to boast that it has more churches 
than there are post offices, and that there is a United Methodist Church in virtually every 
county in United States.

Today’s membership of the denomination stands at 8.9 million. There are 
approximately 35,000 local churches spread across the nation, divided into 72 
conferences. A bishop leads each conference of the United Methodist Church, and total 
church membership within these conferences averages 500 churches. Conferences are 
divided into districts that can have from 30 – 100 churches depending on geography and 
resources.
Quantitative data collected for the purpose of providing evidence for or against the presence of a civil religion (as a building block of worldview) has been undertaken in districts within the five regionally diverse states. The districts chosen within these states have a range of 42 to 80 churches and total 290 churches surveyed. I called each of these churches and asked two questions: 1) Does your church display a US flag on its property, and 2) If yes, where is it displayed?

**Potential Pitfalls and Challenges of this Methodology**

While this analysis seeks to discover and verify the existence of a dominant worldview at work within the US culture regarding the resources allocated to the military in relation to funding for development and diplomacy, it is also obvious that individuals have their own worldviews based on personal beliefs, experiences and context. I have a worldview that could influence these findings through personal confirmation bias: in other words, I may look and accept evidence and data to support my hypothesis rather than allowing the data to sort itself objectively in a neutral manner.

Thomas Kuhn described the phenomena of bias in his classic book, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Kuhn describes individuals who become so locked into their paradigms that reality is missed. Kuhn argued that individuals create paradigms (or worldviews) from which they perceive reality. Even scientists were found to unconsciously reject data that did not fit their models.

However, in the post-positivist, hermeneutical approach also used within this dissertation, the reflexive questioning of my role in this process is perceived as an
important and essential one. Sandra Harding argues for a rigorous application of neutrality, meaning “that when we select our topic, create our initial research questions, construct our design, and move through data collection, analysis, and representation, we must not disavow the subjectivity (emotions, politics, and standpoint) that we each bring to bear on our research, but rather own it, disclose it, and critically engage it.”

Being aware of who I am, what I believe and my personal worldview (as described in the introduction) is a starting point for reflexive objectivity, but not a total cure.

A second challenge of this dissertation comes within the analysis section of this paper in terms of blending the quantitative and qualitative data in a meaningful and objective manner. The sheer volume of data collected alone provides a potential danger. Entire books have been devoted to each of the memorials on the Washington Mall (i.e. the Lincoln Memorial, Washington and Jefferson Monuments, World War II, Vietnam, Korea, etc). There are numerous authors who critique the military – industrial complex and offer a variety of explanations and factors that contribute to its existence. Likewise, there is a tremendous amount of literature regarding the nature of war, its origins, its role in history and civilization. Finding the right data to present has been a difficult process, fraught with complexity.

There is also the possibility that I have incorrect or incomplete data. As already mentioned, I am relying on the Internet to provide information on the peace memorials, monuments or plaques across the five selected states. There could (and probably are) be more. Additionally, there are likely war memorials, monuments or plaques that have also been underreported. I am relying on the knowledge and research of approximately 900
librarians across the nation. Many times, the initial response of a librarian to questions about war memorials, monuments or plaques was “no,” followed later with a comment like, “I forgot – we do have a World War II memorial in front of the Town Hall.” I tried not to accept an answer of “no” easily: if the first, quick response of a librarian was “no,” I moved on to the question regarding civil celebrations of Memorial Day, July 4 and Veteran’s Day, and then returned to the question of memorial, monuments and plaques. This gave librarians a second opportunity to reflect, check with another librarian or source, etc. I believe, therefore, that the data is relatively close to complete and accurate, at least to the extent of the method used. To the best of my ability, I accurately recorded the information received from the librarians and Internet.

If, however, data is missing, I believe the numbers are small and, for the most part, inconsequential to this work. There is no reason to believe that a librarian would intentionally over report, i.e. indicate that there existed a war memorial, monument or plaque within their town or city that did not exist: far more likely is the possibility that the librarians failed to identify these artifacts. If an underreporting of the war memorials, monument and plaques did take place, their inclusion within my data would increase the total numbers and percentage of towns and cities that have them: if peace memorials, monuments and plaques are not accounted for, I assume this number is small and their impact negligible.

I have fewer doubts regarding the data on the presence of US flags in United Methodist Churches in the targeted districts in these five states because I spoke to the church secretary or pastor in almost all of these churches. In a few cases, the secretary
was uncertain – but in those cases either asked another office worker or walked around the church and got back to me.

A Visual Representation of the Methodology used within this Dissertation
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Rationale for National and Regional Site Selection

The capital of the United States, Washington, District of Columbia, two US National Parks (Valley Forge and Gettysburg) and five states (Arizona, Connecticut, Missouri, Oregon and Virginia) have been chosen for special attention in the research of this dissertation. The capital and national parks are important national heritage sites: the five states chosen have been selected to create a regional balance for data collection. The existence of a dominant worldview must cut across state and geographical boundaries – and these states provide valuable information from New England (Connecticut), the South (Virginia), Midwest (Missouri), Southwest (Arizona) and Northwest (Missouri). The states chosen also are identified as classified in this manner: two red states (Missouri, Arizona), two blue states (Connecticut and Oregon) and one purple state (Virginia).
Washington, District of Columbia

The capital city of the United States is Washington, District of Columbia. Founded on July 16, 1790, the creation of the nation’s capital is outlined in the US Constitution, Article 1, Section 8 [17] that provides Congress with the authority “To exercise Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States and the acceptance of Congress, become the State of Government of the United States.” Finding a location that the states could all agree on was difficult: after much debate and discussion, a compromise was struck with George
Washington ultimately given the task of choosing a site. The area chosen, a ten-mile by ten-mile square of relatively undeveloped land ceded by Virginia and Maryland, provided a *tabula rasa* for which a new city could be designed and developed. Two hundred and twenty years later, Washington, District of Columbia, is the grand, impressive city its visionary planners sought. As such, it provides a venue of meaning making and national identity for its citizens and for visitors from around the globe.

The assignment to design the new city was given to Pierre L’Enfant, a French army engineer who had served in the American Revolutionary War. L’Enfant’s visionary brilliance was that he planned the capital not for a nation of 13 states and a total population of 3 million – which were the national statistics in 1790, but for a nation of 50 states and a potential of 500,000,000 people. The city’s majestic design was fitting for what George Washington himself described as “the Emporium of the West,” or its description as the “city of magnificent distances.”

“The Mall, which extends from the Capital to the Lincoln Memorial, was intended to be one broad, tree-lined avenue, in the manner of the Champs-Élysées in Paris . . . At the point where the north – south axis of the White House meets the east – west axis of the Capital, an equestrian statue of George Washington was planned. This spot, slightly relocated because of soft subsoil and subterranean streams, is now the site of the Washington Monument.”

Interestingly, and perhaps coincidently, the hill on which the US Capital was to be built had been named New Troy, and the area just down included a farm of 400 acres owned by Francis Pope who had named his farm Rome and the small river that flowed through it the Tiber. David Ovason suggests that Pope might have named the area
Rome and the river Tiber as a sly joke on his name, and indicates that Washington’s probably knew that sections within the area he had selected for the new capital bore the names of the ancient capital cities Troy and Rome: whether this had any effect on his decision is, however, speculation.\textsuperscript{33}

The design and construction of the capital city was intended to help create a nation, a nation defined by Smith as “a named human population sharing an historic territory, common myths and historical memories; a mass, public culture; a common economy; and common legal rights and duties for all members.”\textsuperscript{34} Nihal Perera writes:

The building of a new capital is neither a politically neutral process nor a socially isolated project. It involves the state, the government, and various subject populations; and such projects are connected to larger, international and global pressures as well as the immediate needs and aspirations of the power holders and various citizen groups. While representing the nation, national symbols also condition it. Hence, both social space and cultural politics are central to the building of a new capital.\textsuperscript{35}

Today, Washington, D. C. is filled with monuments and memorials, from the Lincoln Memorial at the western end of the mall to the stunning equestrian statue and monument of General Grant at the foot of the US Capital. Most visitors are familiar with the Vietnam War Memorial, the Korean War Memorial, the Memorial for World War II, but spread across the city are another twenty-five Civil War memorial alone – stone and granite monuments to General George Gordon Meade, Winfield Scott Hancock, Admiral David Farragut, General John Logan, General George Thomas, General William Tecumseh Sherman, etc. etc. Although there are a few peace memorials mixed in, their size, scope, placement and relatively small total conveys a message about the value of war and peace in the US worldview. “Made of imperishable stone or metal, and erected
prominently in shared civil space – parks, town squares, public buildings – public monuments were meant to be a genuine testimonial of the people’s memory, an eternal repository of what they held most dear.”36

Washington, District of Columbia, both influences, legislates and produces the American culture and worldview, and is a product of the same. The national capital reflects the image the nation wants to project – it is the outward expression of US values and mores. Its inclusion for this dissertation is important as the national capital and the nucleus of national identity-making.

Valley Forge

I traveled to eight Revolutionary War historic sites in order to better understand this war’s contribution and impact on the US worldview and culture, but have decided to limit my observations and findings within the pages of this dissertation to Valley Forge, the location of the winter quarters of George Washington and his troops during the winter of 1777 – 8. During the Revolutionary War Washington set up winter quarters five times, including two separate winters at Morristown, New Jersey, where the fiercest winter of the Revolutionary War was experienced in 1779 – 1780.37 Contrary to popular opinion, the winter of 1777 – 8 in which the Continental Army camped a Valley Forge was relatively mild: army records indicate that two thirds of the men who died did so in the warmer months of March, April and May, from a combination of disease (influenza, typhus, typhoid and dysentery).38 But it is at Valley Forge where the US memory making of the Revolutionary War is at its strongest and why this site is included for this dissertation.
Gettysburg

I visited a dozen Civil War battle sites for this dissertation, from Antietam, Maryland, to Atlanta, Georgia. In between were trips to Appomattox Court House, Chancellorsville, Cold Harbor, Fredericksburg, Harper’s Ferry, Manassas, Petersburg, Richmond and Spotsylvania. But the most “impressive” Civil War battlefield is to be found at Gettysburg, the location of a pivotal three-day confrontation between the Confederate and Union forces. A total of 51,000 soldiers were killed, wounded or missing after the battle and the town destroyed. Five months later, President Abraham Lincoln traveled to Gettysburg and delivered the Gettysburg Address, a speech I, like millions of other US students, memorized in elementary school. The meaning making impact of this battlefield can be seen in the approximately 1,300 monuments or memorials built throughout the park in the years after the war that honored the soldier’s bravery, courage and sacrifice, and bear witness to the “hallowed ground” of US history.

Arizona

Arizona became the 48th state to join the union on February 14, 1912. It was the final contiguous state to join the Union, and the sixth largest state at 114,000 miles. Arizona has a relatively small population of 6.5 million persons, is located in the US Southwest, and bordered by Utah (North), New Mexico (East), Mexico (South), California and Nevada (West). Its capital is Phoenix, and it is known as “the Grand Canyon State.”

Arizona is considered a red state, having voted for the Republican candidate for president in every election since 1952 with the one exception of 1996. At the time of
this writing (2009), it has a Republican Governor (Jan Brewer), two Republican Senators (John McCain and Jon Kyl), three Republican Representatives (Trent Franks, John Shadegg and Jeffrey Flake) and five Democratic Representatives (Ann Kirkpatrick, Edward Pastor, Harry Mitchell, Raul Grijalva and Gabrielle Giffords). Arizona has 94 towns and cities from which data was obtained for this dissertation.41

Connecticut

Connecticut is one of the original 13 colonies one of six New England states. It is the third smallest of the states at 12,997 square miles, and has a population of 3.5 million. It is bordered by Massachusetts (North), Rhode Island (East), the Long Island Sound (Atlantic Ocean – South) and New York (East). Connecticut hosted several significant battles during the Revolutionary War and War of 1812, and its nickname is the Constitution State. Its capital is Hartford.43

Connecticut is considered a blue state, having voted for Democratic candidates for President in every election since 1992.44 At the time of this writing (2009), it has a Republican Governor (Jodi Rell), a Democratic and (Christopher Dodd), an Independent senator (Joseph Lieberman) and five Democratic Representatives (John Larson, Joseph Courtney, Rosa DeLauro, Jim Himes, and Chris Murphy). Connecticut has 169 towns and cities from which data for this dissertation was obtained.45

Missouri

Missouri, located near the geographical center of the coterminous United States, was the 24th nation to join the Union on August 10, 1821. It is the 21st largest state at 69,709
square miles, and its population is 5.9 million. It is bordered by Iowa (North), Illinois, Kentucky and Tennessee (across the Mississippi to the East), Arkansas (South) and Oklahoma, Kansas and Nebraska (West). Its nickname is the “Show Me State,” and its capital is Jefferson City.

Missouri is considered a Red State, having voted for the Republicans candidate for President in every election since 1980 with the exception of 1992 and 1996 when the state went for Bill Clinton. At the time of this writing (2009), Missouri’s governor is Democrat Jay Nixon: the state has a Republican Senator (Christopher Bond), a Democratic Senator (Claire McCaskill), five Republican Members of Congress (Todd Akin, Sam Graves, Roy Blunt, Jo Ann Emerson and Blaine Luetkemeyer) and four Democratic Members of Congress (William Lacy Clay, Jr., Russ Carnahan, Ike Skelton and Emanuel Cleaver, II). Missouri has 270 towns and cities from which this dissertation will obtain data.

Oregon

Oregon was the 33rd state to join the Union on February 14, 1859. It is the 9th largest state at 97,073 square miles, and has a population of 3.8 million. It is bordered by Washington (North), Idaho (East), Nevada and California (South) and the Pacific Ocean (West). Oregon’s nickname is “The Beaver State” which it derived from the beaver pelts it harvested in the early 19th Century, and its capital is Salem.

Oregon is considered a blue state, having voted for Democratic candidates for President in every election since 1988. At the time of this writing (2009), Oregon’s governor is Democrat Ted Kulongoski: the state has two Democratic Senators (Ron
Wyden Jeff Merkley), four Democratic Members of Congress (David Wu, Earl Blumenauer, Peter DeFazio and Kurt Schrader) and one Republican Members of Congress (Greg Walden). Oregon has 155 towns and cities from which this dissertation will obtain data.

Virginia

Virginia was one of the original 13 colonies and has had continuous European settlers from the settling of Jamestown in 1607. It is the 35th largest state with 40,767 square miles, and has a population of 7.7 million. It is bordered by Maryland (Northeast), North Carolina and Tennessee (South), Kentucky (West) and West Virginia (Northwest). Its capital is Richmond, and it nickname is “The Old Dominion.”

Virginia is considered a purple state, having voted for the Republican Candidate for President in every election from 1968 to 2004, but switching to Barack Obama in 2008. At the time of this writing (2009), Virginia’s governor is Democrat Timothy Kaine: the state has two Democratic Senators (Jim Webb and Mark Warner), six Democratic Members of Congress (Robert Scott, Thomas Perriello, James Moran, Frederick Boucher and Gerald Connolly) and five Republican Members of Congress (Rob Wittman, James Forbes, Robert Goodlatte, Eric Cantor and Frank Wolf). Virginia has 223 towns and cities from which this dissertation will obtain data.

Total population of these five states is 27.4 million persons, approximately 9 percent of the US population of 310 million persons. The states also have a total of 911 towns and cities, with over a 90 percent reporting rate in each. This data, carefully
recorded in Microsoft Excel spreadsheets, will provide important quantitative data as evidence of the existence of a possible worldview within the US.

**Conclusion**

This chapter of the dissertation has provided the research question, a hypothesis and alternative hypothesis, and methodology to be employed. The methodology section indicates potential concerns regarding the collection of data and its interpretation, and the effort being maintained to mitigate the impact of these challenges.

Having laid the ground work for what has been studied and how this study was be conducted and data obtained, we are now ready to proceed with the dissemination and interpretation of the data, which will take place in the next chapter.
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CHAPTER 5 – DISSERTATION DATA

Data has been obtained from both quantitative and qualitative methods. The data gathered will be assembled within this chapter in a systematic manner, beginning with the quantitative information, followed by the qualitative. Explanatory information will also be provided so that the research can be understood in relation to both why it was gathered and its possible usefulness in determining a dominant worldview within the United States.

As noted in the previous chapter, five states were chosen from which data was obtained: these five states provide sampling data for the entire United States. The states are regionally and politically diverse and contain 27.4 million persons, approximately 9 percent of the US population of 310 million persons. Additional information was collected from the nation’s capital, Washington, District of Columbia. Data from Washington, D.C will be presented separate from the state totals.

It should be remembered that Virginia and Connecticut, original colonies of Great Britain and among the first 13 states to join the union, have different histories and relationships to the United States than, for example, Missouri, Oregon and Arizona, states that joined the Union later. Therefore, it should not be surprising to find few Revolutionary War memorials, monument or plagues in Missouri or Oregon, for instance,
because they were not states and did not participate in these wars: the same thing can be said of Arizona for the Civil War. In attempting to identify a dominant worldview within the United States, however, it is the overall presence of war memorials, monuments and plaques within towns and cities across the United States, in relation to peace memorials, monuments and plaques that is a key to ascertaining what are the important events that are used for meaning making and important to a US national collective memory. The important information is this: what do these marble, brick, concrete and granite markers immortalize?

**Quantitative**

**War memorials, monuments and plaques**

Data will be presented first regarding the presence of war memorials, monument and plaques within towns and cities of the five selected states. A section will follow this information on peace memorials, monuments and plaques. Each dataset is accompanied by a narrative description designed to highlight significant data and provide clarification.

This section is preceded by a brief summary of the history of wars and conflicts from the five states.

**Arizona**

Arizona has 94 towns and cities and a total population of 6.5 million persons. Because Arizona did not become a state until 1912, it was not directly involved in the American Revolutionary War, nor War of 1812, Mexican–American, Civil War or Spanish-American Wars, although a small number of soldiers from the territory of Arizona did
fight in the Civil and Spanish-American Wars. Its first settler inhabitants included Hualapai, Navajo, Apache and Anasazi. A Spanish period of occupation began 1539 and continued until 1821 when Mexico gained independence from Spain. Arizona was ceded to the US from Mexico in 1848 as part of New Mexico. The worst fighting between Native Americans and European settlers took place during the Pueblo Revolt of 1680 - 1692, when the Pueblo Indians overthrew the Spanish and lived independently for a dozen years. The Navajo Conflicts consisted of persistent fighting between the Navajo and US Army and occurred from 1849 – 1863 when the remaining Navajo were forcefully removed from the area and re-located to reservations. Apache attacks under leaders such as Geronimo, Cochise and Victorio harassed settlements until 1900, with no major battles or battle sites. Citizens from Arizona fought in all of the 20th Century US wars beginning with World War I. Data was collected from 86 of the 94 towns and cities, representing 91.5 percent reporting.

**Connecticut**

Connecticut has 169 towns and cities and a total population of 3.5 million persons. One of the original 13 colonies, battles were fought within the state’s boundaries between the European settlers and Native Americans, the most well-known named the Pequot War (1637); battles were also fought on Connecticut soil during the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812. Connecticut soldiers played an important role in the Civil War, and the New England Civil War Museum is located in Rockville-Vernon Connecticut. Soldiers from Connecticut fought in all other wars the US was involved in, from the French and
Indian Wars through the current wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. Data was collected from 160 of the 169 towns and cities, representing 94.7 percent reporting.

**Missouri**

Missouri has 270 towns and cities and a total population of 5.9 million persons. The Native American population of Missouri included the Caddo, Dakota, Delaware, Missouri, Omaha and Shawnee tribes. Spanish explorers were the first Europeans to enter Missouri, followed by French and British. The Seven Years War, aka the French and Indian War, was fought primarily to settle ownership of this particular region. The United States obtained Missouri as part of the Louisiana Purchase from France in 1803, and Missouri entered the union in 1821 as a slave state under the terms of the Missouri Compromise. The state was officially neutral during the Civil War, and loyalties among its population were split. Fighting took place in Missouri between factions that favored both sides, “but those in the Union army outnumbered those in the Confederate army by nearly 4 to 1.”¹ Missouri sent troops to all of the wars the US has fought in since the Mexican – American War. Data was collected from 247 of the 270 towns and cities, representing 91.5 percent reporting.

**Oregon**

Oregon has 155 towns and cities and a total population of 3.8 million persons. Oregon joined the Union in 1859 and officially was a Union state, although it had Confederate sympathizers. The worst fighting occurring on Oregon’s soil between Native Americans and settlers is known as the Rogue River War, fought in 1855 – 6, after the discovery of
gold. First settlers who survived were forced onto reservations. In 1872–3 the Modoc War took place between US soldiers and Native Americans in Northern California and Southern Oregon. Eventually, the US forces prevailed. No other major battles were fought on Oregon soil, and the state has provided soldiers for every war since the Civil War. Data was collected from 144 of the 155 towns and cities, representing 93 percent reporting.

**Virginia**

Virginia has 214 towns and cities and a total population of 7.7 million persons. One of the original 13 colonies, battles were fought within the state’s boundaries between the European settlers and Native Americans, the most well-known between the Powhatan Confederacy and British colonial settlers (1622 - 1644); battles were also fought on Virginia’s soil during the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812. During the 1860’s, “Virginia became the major battleground of the Civil War. The bitterest and bloodiest fighting in the history of the Western Hemisphere took place in a narrow band of land extending from Manassas to Petersburg.” Soldiers from Virginia fought in all other wars the US was involved in, from the French and Indian Wars through the current wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. Data was collected from 204 of the 223 towns and cities, representing 91.5 percent reporting.

The first table represents the percentage of towns and cities from the selected states that have public war memorials, monuments or plaques, from these different wars; Revolutionary War, Civil War, World War I, World War II, Korea and Vietnam. Data from Korea and Vietnam was not collected from Connecticut or Virginia.
Table 1: War Memorials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Rev. War</th>
<th>Civil War</th>
<th>WW I</th>
<th>WW II</th>
<th>Korea</th>
<th>Vietnam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>2 %</td>
<td>7.25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>88.75 %</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>2.5 %</td>
<td>35.8 %</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>.6 %</td>
<td>3.75 %</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>50 %</td>
<td>84 %</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data collected and presented in Table 1 indicates a high percentage of Revolutionary War memorials, monuments and plaques in the two states directly affected by that war, Connecticut (62.5 percent) and Virginia (50 percent). Likewise, these two states’ participation in the Civil War was important for collective memory and meaning making as residents constructed many memorials and monuments honoring those who fought in that conflict: Connecticut, 88.75 percent, Virginia, 84 percent. With the exception of Missouri, over 50 percent of all of the towns and cities of these five states had World War I memorials, monuments or plaques, and World War II was remembered in over 50 percent in all five states. Data from the Korean and Vietnam War was not collected in Connecticut or Virginia, with the other states running from a high of 80 percent in Arizona (Vietnam) to a low of 35 percent in Missouri for the Korean War.

The information captured within Table 1 shows only part of the story. Data was not collected from any of the five chosen state regarding memorials, monuments or plaques to the terrorist’s attacks of 9/11/01, or to the Wars in Afghanistan or Iraq, even though many librarians offered such information. Likewise, I did not record information regarding the French and Indian War, the War of 1812, Mexican – American War,
Spanish – American War or other less “significant wars.” Towns and cities throughout the five chosen states have constructed memorials, monuments or plaques to such wars as Desert Storm, Afghanistan and Iraq, and the tragic, terrorist’s attacks of September 11. Some towns or cities, like Hartford, Connecticut, have multiple memorials, monuments or plaques for various wars: Hartford has 24 separate war markers, including eight honoring soldiers from the Revolutionary War and twelve from the Civil War.³

An extreme, although not unique, example of a town that honors veterans from all of its wars is New Fairfield, Connecticut: the following describes their Veteran’s Memorial:

Four stone benches, two on the North side and two on the South side, give visitors a place to sit, think and reflect while visiting the Monument. 12 Bronze markers, one for each war or conflict, are situated around the perimeter of the main area. There is a marker for each war or conflict; French and Indian War, Revolutionary War, War of 1812, Civil War, Mexican War, Spanish American War, World War I, World War II, Korea, Vietnam, Persian Gulf War, and All Other Conflicts.⁴

In addition to the war memorials, monuments and plaques identified in Table 1 for Virginia, it should also be noted that Virginia hosts the Arlington National Cemetery, the Iwo Jima and Air Force Memorials, and the Pentagon Memorial to the 9-11 attacks. The town of Bedford, Virginia, had a higher percentage of soldiers killed on D-Day than any other municipality in the US:⁵ on June 6 2001 President George W. Bush dedicated the newly constructed, $25 million National D-Day Memorial, honoring the US invasion of France that began on June 6, 1944. Richmond is the home of the Virginia War Memorial, a $15 million memorial and museum that lists all of the names of Virginian citizens who have been killed in US wars since World War I.
In addition to the war memorials, monument and plaques summarized in Table 1, The National World War I museum is located in Kansas City, Missouri. Its website indicates that a community-based fundraising effort raised over $2.5 million in ten days – a testimony to the importance and meaning making of that war experience. The museum’s mission statement reads:

The National World War I Museum at Liberty Memorial inspires thought, dialogue, and learning to make the experiences of the World War I era meaningful and relevant for present and future generations. The Museum fulfills its mission by:

- Maintaining the Liberty Memorial as a beacon of freedom and a symbol of the courage, patriotism, sacrifice, and honor of all who served in World War I.
- Interpreting the history of World War I to encourage public involvement and informed decision-making.
- Providing exhibitions and educational programs that engage diverse audiences
- Collecting and preserving historical materials with the highest professional standards.6

In addition to the war memorials, monuments and plaques listed in Table 1 for Oregon, a statewide Fallen Heroes Memorial has been constructed in Central Point, Oregon. The sentiment behind the memorial is expressed in this manner:

To memorialize and Honor All Of Oregon's Fallen Heroes from 1859 to the present Afghanistan & Iraq Wars.
Thank you to all whose generous support will make it possible to honor Oregon's veterans.
God bless you all and thank you for your courage, dedication, and commitment.7

U.S. Senator Gordon Smith spoke at the ground-breaking ceremony of the memorial, and said: “Those who have fallen while in the military have made the ultimate sacrifice for "America's interests, America's people, America's allies and America's values.”8
Despite the fact that Arizona did not become a state until 1912, I have identified eight Civil War monuments within the state indicating the importance of the Civil War in the collective memory of the US: “On the whole, these monuments reflect how Arizonans have remembered and constructed their Civil War past, even to the point of exaggerating its importance. After all, these monuments reflect the transplanted identities and eastern ties of many of today’s Arizonans.”

The process that takes place from the conception of a memorial, monument or plaque through its site selection, funding, construction and dedication is complex and often takes years to accomplish. Once the marker itself is finally complete, a dedication ceremony follows. The dedication events by and large follow the same format: welcome, opening prayer, acknowledgement of those responsible for the marker (including major donors, the artists, and politicians who steered the project through bureaucratic red tape) remarks by veterans who participated in the conflict and by active military officers, a speech or words by public officials, formal dedication of the memorial, monument or plaque, and closing prayers.

Typical of the dedications I have read was one that took place at the dedication of a Civil War Monument in Prospect, Connecticut:

The monument was erected in the fall of 1906, too late in the season for ceremonial dedication exercises. At the official unveiling on May 30, 1907, the Wadhams Post, No. 49, Grand Army of the Republic, of Waterbury and the Isbell Post from Naugatuck, headed by the Naugatuck Fife and Drum Corps, played important roles. The Cheshire Band was on hand and Company C, Boys Brigade, St. Paul's Church, was in the line of march.

Principal orator was the Reverend Sherrod Soule of Naugatuck, who discussed states rights and slavery, in which respects his remarks were usual for such ceremonies, and exhorted his audience with the words, "May this monument be
an inspiration to you who abide here and your children and your children's
children and the generations unborn," which was a conventional sentiment for
orators on such occasions.10

**Peace Memorials, monuments and plaques**

There are very few peace memorials, monuments or plaques within the five selected
states, especially in comparison to the number, size and prominence of the war
memorials, monuments and plaques found within the same five states. Table 3 provides
the percentage of towns and cities within these states that have peace memorials,
monuments and plaques. Because the numbers are so small, the list of these memorials,
monuments and plaques are also included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th># of Towns &amp; Cities</th>
<th># of Peace objects</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.25 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 18 peace memorials, monuments or plaques were discovered within the five
selected states, less than the total number of war memorials, monuments and plaques
identified in Hartford, Connecticut. The peace memorials, monuments and plaques found
within these states are:

**Arizona**

1. Gordon Hirabayashi Recreation Site, Coronado National Forest. Used in 1937 as
   a prison camp, it was used during WW II for Japanese Americans protesting
   relocation and some conscientious objectors.
2. Peace Wall, Castle Rock, Brisbee, Arizona. Castle Rock is an imposing hunk of rock on the side of Tombstone Canyon in Bisbee, Arizona. British-born artist Rose Johnson was commissioned by the city of Bisbee to paint a mural dedicated to world peace on a concrete wall that abuts Castle Rock."

3. Wesley Bolin Memorial Plaza, Phoenix, Arizona. Site of 27 memorials dedicated to a variety of causes, including war and peace.

4. Amitabha Stupa and Peace Park, Sedona, Arizona

Connecticut


2. Angel of Peace, New Haven. Also known as the soldiers and sailors monument, the monument consists of a square pedestal and a vertical granite shaft, culminating with the 11-foot, 5,000-pound bronze Angel of Peace at the top. The faces of the pedestal feature bronze bas-relief sculptures depicting scenes from the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the Civil War, respectively. On the four corners of the pedestal sit four different bronze ladies: Patriotism, Victory, Prosperity, and History."

Missouri


2. Peace and Vigilance sculpture, Old Post Office, St. Louis.

3. Peace Park, University of Missouri. Named after the shootings took place at Kent State University in 1970.


Oregon

1. Monument to Ranald MacDonald, Astoria, Oregon. First American to teach English to the Japanese.

2. Peace plaza, Salem, Oregon.

3. Sapporo Bell, Portland, Oregon. Given in 1990 in commemoration of 30 years of sister-city relations from their sister city in South Korea.

4. Portland Peace Memorial Park, Orchestrated by the Oregon chapter of Veterans for Peace. ...thought to be the largest memorial to the idea of peace in America.
Virginia

1. Light of Truth Universal Shrine, Yogaville, Virginia.
2. Peacemakers Monument, Winchester, VA. Commemorating the handshake between President Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev on December 7, 1987. Matched by an identical monument in Moscow.
3. Garden for Peace, Charlottesville Historical Society Garden, Charlottesville, VA.
4. McClean House, Appomattox Court House, Appomattox County, VA. Site of the surrender and peace agreement between Generals Grant and Lee, April 9, 1865.
5. Bust of Martin Luther King, Jr., in Hopewell, VA, where King spoke these words in 1962: “Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.”

Washington, District of Columbia

Washington, District of Columbia, is both the nation’s capital and a large, metropolitan city. Its importance as a meaning and identity making location has already been established: however, because it is a city as opposed to a state, its data should be assessed separately.

I have identified a total of 49 monuments or memorials dedicated to generals, soldiers, armies, or other symbols related to war, and a total of eleven monuments or memorials dedicated to peace. In addition to a disparity between the total number of memorials, monuments and plaques devoted to war and peace, respectively, the size, scope and prominence of each should also be taken into account. For example, “The Grant Memorial is one of the largest, most important sculptures in the capital. The central figure, an equestrian statue of General Ulysses S. Grant, towers 40 feet above the 252-foot-long and 71-foot-wide marble platform . . . Located at the foot of Capital Hill, in Union Square, the Grant Memorial is also one of the city’s most prominently placed monuments . . . The monument preeminent placement was intended to enshrine the Civil
War for all time.” A second example is the World War II Memorial, a 7.4 acre memorial ringed by 57 17-foot tall pillars and anchored by two forty feet tall arches on either end: the memorial cost $197 million and is located between the Washington Monument and Lincoln Memorial.

Contrasting these large, prominently placed memorials are two peace memorials: the first, a 2’ by 3’ plaque affixed to the outside of the Willard Hotel identifying the site as the location of the failed peace conference of 1861, an attempt to avoid the confrontation soon to develop. When I went to observe the plaque I queried two bell hops, three workers at the front desk and the concierge who did not know of the plaques existence. Likewise, the site of Martin Luther King Jr.’s “I Have A Dream Speech” on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial is identified only by a few words inscribed into the marble stone where he stood. I have observed many visitors who walk right over or by the inscription and fail to notice its presence.

The war memorials, monument and plaques found within Washington, District of Columbia, are listed below along with where they are located, followed by the peace memorials, monuments and plaques:

**War:**

2. Baron von Steuben – Revolutionary War leader, trainer of the army at Valley Forge; Lafayette Park, H Street & 16th.
4. John Barry – Revolutionary soldier, known as the “Father of the US Navy.” I Street & 14th.

6. Daughters of the American Revolution Statue, C Street and 18th.


12. Nathanael Greene, Revolutionary War General, Capitol Hill, Maryland Avenue & 3rd.

13. Andrew Jackson, General War of 1812, as portrayed in battle at the battle of New Orleans, Lafayette Park, Pennsylvania Ave. & 16th.

14. Ulysses S. Grant, Civil War General, Capitol Hill, West Mall & 1st.

15. Winfield Scott – Military Leader, Scott Circle, Massachusetts Ave. & 16th.


17. Albert Pike – brigadier general in the Confederate Army during the Civil War -- making him the only Confederate officer to be honored with a statue in Washington DC.


19. Admiral David Farragut – Civil War, Farragut Square, Connecticut Ave. & 17th.


23. Benjamin Franklin Stephenson and the Grand Army of the Republic Memorial, 7th Street between Pennsylvania and Indiana Ave, S.W.

24. Winfield Scott Hancock, Civil War General, Market Square, Pennsylvania Ave. & 7th.

25. John Ericsson, Civil War Army engineer, designed and builder of the Monitor, West Potomac Park Independence Avenue & Ohio Drive.


28. John A. Rawlins, Civil War General, Rawlings Park, 18th and E Street, S.W.

29. Philip Sheridan – Civil War General, Circle Massachusetts Ave. & 23rd

30. Civil War Sailors, Capitol Hill, Pennsylvania Ave. & 1st. Also known as the Navy Memorial, its inscription reads, “In Memory of the Officers, Seamen, and Marines of the United States Navy Who Fell in Defense of the Union and Liberty of Their Country, 1861 – 1865.” As such, it is considered a memorial to Civil War Sailors: however, it is also known as the Peace Monument – standing on the pedestal is an allegorical representation of America as a woman crying on the shoulder of another woman representing History with the words, “They died that their country might live.”

31. Lincoln Under Fire Monument, dedicated to Lincoln’s trip to Fort Stevens for a better look at the battle, Georgia Ave. & 13th Street, N.W.

32. African-American Civil War Memorial, Shaw, U & 11th.


34. 25th New York Volunteers Monument, 6625 Georgia Ave, N.W.

35. Arsenal monument, E Street, S.E.

36. Pension building, designed as a tribute to the Civil War Veterans and from which pensions to these men would be disbursed, Judiciary Square, F Street between 4th and 5th, S.W.

37. DC World War I Memorial, Potomac Park, Independence Avenue & Ohio Drive.
39. First Division of the Army, created during World War 1 and active in every war since, White House, State Place & 17th.
40. Second Division – Ellipse - Constitution Avenue & 17th; to honor members of the 2nd Division who died in WW II, Korea and Vietnam.
41. First Division of the Army, created during World War 1 and active in every war since, White House, State Place & 17th.
42. Lone Sailor, US Navy Memorial, Market Square, Pennsylvania Ave. & 8th
43. Roman Centurion, Union Station, Massachusetts Ave. & 1st.
44. World War II Memorial, mall, Constitution Ave & 17th.
47. Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall Potomac Park Constitution Ave. & 23rd.
48. Veterans of Foreign Wars Tribute, Maryland Ave, Constitution Avenue, and 2nd Street.
49. Three Servicemen, Potomac Park, Constitution Ave. & 23rd

Peace Monuments, Memorials, Plaques

2. Naval Peace Monument; identified above under #30, Capitol Hill, Pennsylvania Ave. & 1st.
3. Inscription, steps of the Lincoln Memorial where Martin Luther King Jr. delivered his “I Have A Dream Speech,” August 28, 1963.
4. Peace Conference Plaque, Willard Hotel, Pennsylvania Ave. at 15th Street. From February 4 to 27 delegates from 21 of the then 34 states met in a failed attempt to avert the Civil War.
5. Statue of Jennette Rankin, US Capital, Statuary Hall. Representative Rankin is the only US Congress person who voted “no” against the US decisions to enter
WW I and WW II.

6. Friendship Gate, Chinatown, H Street and 7th. A gift of Beijing, China, to its sister city Washington, D.C.

7. First International Peace Garden, by the Tidal Basin.

8. Guns to Plowshares, Judiciary Square Metro Station. 20’ plowshare created from 3,000 handguns donated by the Washington Metro Police Department.


10. Headquarters, US Institute of Peace: currently under construction at Constitution Ave. and 23rd Street, NW.


Celebration of MLK Birthday, Memorial Day, July 4 and Veteran’s Day

The third table presented represents the percentage of towns and cities from the five selected states that celebrate Martin Luther King’s birthday, Memorial Day, July 4th, or Veteran’s Day with public, civil events. I defined “civil celebration” to the librarians as an event planned by the municipality or other civic organization that was publicized and open to the public: for King remembrances, some communities held a community wide service within a church co-sponsored by other religious organizations where town officials were present and often spoke: for Memorial Day this often took the form of a parade or public ceremony at a local monument. July 4th included firework displays, town wide picnics, parades and public ceremonies. Veteran’s Day often include visits by veterans to the public schools in the days before or after the holiday to describe their war experiences and understanding of Veteran’s Day. Other communities recognized
Veteran’s Day with VFW or American Legion organizations gathering at a public event and remembering those who served – open to the public, and often including local clergy, politicians and leaders.

**Table 3: Celebrations of Selected National Holidays**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>ML King</th>
<th>Memorial Day</th>
<th>July 4</th>
<th>Veteran’s Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>2.5 %</td>
<td>64.75 %</td>
<td>70 %</td>
<td>81.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>21 %</td>
<td>98 %</td>
<td>45 %</td>
<td>84 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>16 %</td>
<td>60.5 %</td>
<td>58 %</td>
<td>59 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>7.5 %</td>
<td>77.5 %</td>
<td>89.5 %</td>
<td>87.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>86 %</td>
<td>85 %</td>
<td>83 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 indicates that the percentage of towns and cities from these five states that observe the birthday of Martin Luther King Jr. is lower than the percentage of towns and cities from the same states that observe Memorial Day, July 4 or Veteran’s Day. The celebration of Memorial Day is highest in Connecticut, with 98 percent of the towns and cities polled responding an observance of Memorial Day, of which over 95 percent of the towns hold parades.

Interesting anecdotal information obtained from the research process includes these noted celebrations:

1. Essex, Connecticut, hosts a unique celebration and parade the second weekend of Mary to remember the “Burning of the Ships:” according to First Selectman Philip Miller, the parade and special events recall Essex’s worst day in history, the attack of the British during the War of 1812 in which over $200,000 worth of newly constructed and being constructed ships were burned by the British.  
2. In Lebanon, Connecticut, volunteers collect American flags throughout the year that have been soiled, ripped or otherwise damaged. Following the Veteran’s
Day Parade, the flags are collectively burned, the proper way of destroying damaged flags.\textsuperscript{13}

3. In Fredericksburg, Virginia, on the night before Memorial Day visitors come by the thousands to the terraced National Cemetery where more than 15,000 Union soldiers were laid to rest after the Civil War. Boy Scouts set up luminaries at each of the graves. National Park Service historians and volunteers talk about the Battle of Fredericksburg and the men who fought and died. On Memorial Day itself, there are several ceremonies at historic cemeteries: At the Masonic Cemetery, a ceremony honors Revolutionary War and Civil War veterans buried there. The Ladies’ Memorial Association of Fredericksburg holds an elaborate ceremony at the Confederate Cemetery. A program at the National Cemetery honors American soldiers who have died in service to their country. Various veterans’ groups now hold a Memorial Day ceremony at the Fredericksburg Area War Memorial.

United States Flags in United Methodist Churches

Table 4 shows the percentage of United Methodist Churches that display the United States flag on their property, and if they do, if the flag is displayed within the sanctuary.

The United Methodist Church is the largest mainline Protestant Denomination at 8.9 million members. There are a total of 35,000 United Methodist Churches divided into 72 regional conferences. Conferences, in turn, are divided into districts: the number of districts within a conference varies from five to twelve. Districts may have as few as 40 churches, or as many as 90.

Research for this dissertation was conducted through phone calls to every United Methodist Church in five districts located within the five selected states. The districts are identified by both the name of the district and the conference in which it is located.
Churches that did not meet for worship in their own space, i.e. churches meeting in schools of other public spaces, were not included in the percentage totals because it was determined these congregations did not control decisions regarding furnishings of their space.

- The Central East District (Arizona) has 41 churches of which data from 37 was received.
- The Connecticut District has 77 churches of which data from 73 was received.
- The Mid-State District (Missouri) has 80 churches of which data was received from 72.
- The Western District (Oregon) has 42 churches of which data from 40 was received.
- The Alexandria District (Virginia) has 55 churches of which data from 52 was received.

Total number of churches within these five districts totals 295 churches from which data was received from 274 churches representing 92.9 percent of the churches within these districts.

The purpose of this research is to identify a potential link between church and state within the US culture and society that then is reflected and echoed through US worldview. Religion is an important building block of worldview, and the US flag is an important symbol of the United States. Additionally, the concept of redemptive violence is often fitted into the religious context of right verses wrong, light verses darkness, good verses evil. The presence of any object or symbol in a sacred space implies a link leads to a transference of the sacred to that object or symbol. Having a flag in the worship location, in other words, can be perceived as providing a divine blessing on that flag and the nation it represents.
### Table 4: United Methodist Churches Displaying Flags

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District, Conference</th>
<th>% of churches w/ flags</th>
<th>Flag located in sanctuary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central East District, Desert Southwest (AZ)</td>
<td>92 %</td>
<td>88 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut District, New York</td>
<td>95 %</td>
<td>90 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid – State District, Missouri Conference</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>93 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid – State District, Oregon – Idaho</td>
<td>91 %</td>
<td>84 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria District, Virginia Conference</td>
<td>96 %</td>
<td>92 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My research shows that, across all five targeted districts, at least 91 percent of the churches display flags on their premises: further, at least 84 percent of the churches within these districts display the US flag within the sanctuary, or place of worship.

At least one church goes further than displaying the US flag within its sanctuary. At the Camdenton United Methodist Church in Camdenton, Missouri, flags from the US military services are also displayed during worship services for a few selected Sundays each year, including Memorial Day weekend and the Sundays closest to July 4th and Veteran’s Day. The church owns flags of the US Marine Corps, US Navy, US Army, US Air Force, and US Coast Guard, and displays them from columns located in the sanctuary on these indicated dates.

**Coded Analysis of State Preambles**

The Constitution of the United States was created by the Constitutional Convention that met in Philadelphia from May 25 through September 17, 1787. The constitution is the
supreme law of the United States, and provides the foundation for the nation. It begins with the Preamble, a well-crafted sentence designed to introduce the Constitution to its readers. Its words are well known to many Americans:

We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.¹⁵

In the same manner, individual states within the United States have state constitutions in which the laws of that state are established. Forty-five of the fifty US states have preambles.

In searching for a potentially dominant worldview within the United States people in regards to redemptive violence and defense spending, I have performed a full text-coding word search of these forty-five preambles, with the following results:

- All of the 45 preambles mention the word “God” or a synonym for God (Creator, Almighty, Supreme Ruler of the Universe, Divine) to a) express gratitude to God or b) invoke divine blessings on their state’s constitution, or c) both.
- 26 of the preambles, representing 57.8 percent, use the phrase “Grateful to Almighty God.”
- Another 4 of the preambles, representing 8.9 percent, use the phrase “Grateful to God.” Together, these two phrases, “Grateful to Almighty God” or “Grateful to God” appear in 66.6 percent of the 45 state’s preambles.
- 34 of the preambles, representing 75.6 percent, use the word “ordain” within their preambles.

The presence of sacred words (God, Creator, Divine, Almighty) may suggest a strong civil religion at work within these state constitutions and their authors. The state constitutions are the foundation, the base upon which state laws are constructed. The
placement of God at this important location is a likely indication “of deep-seated values and commitments that are not made explicit in the course of everyday life.”16 Further, the use of the word “ordain” in two-thirds of these state preambles (and the Preamble to the US Constitution) is interesting. To note, The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language defines “ordain” in the following manner:

**Ordain** 1. **a.** To invest with ministerial or priestly authority; confer holy orders upon. **b.** To authorize as a rabbi. 2. **a.** To order by virtue of superior authority. B. To decree as part of the order of nature or of the universe: “From this hour I ordain myself loos’d of limits and imaginary lines.” (Walt Whitman). 3. To prearrange unalterable; predestine: by fate ordained. [Middle English ordeinen, from Norman French ordeiner, from Late Latin õrdinâre, from Latin, to arrange in order, from õrdô (stem õrdin-), order.17

Other key words that occur frequently within the state preambles are “Liberty” or “Liberties,” mentioned 29 times (64.4 percent), “Blessing,” mentioned 28 times (62.2 percent) and “Freedom,” mentioned 11 times (24.4 percent). Full text of the Preambles to US State Constitutions is found in Appendix B.

**Content Analysis of State Approved US History Books: A Counting Matrix**

State Boards of Education are given the responsibility of establishing regulations and standards for curriculum development and textbook selection. Local board of education officials, working with school administrators, use these standards and approved list of textbooks to make decisions regarding what books will be used within their jurisdiction. Local school districts can make different choices from each other, but all under a greater umbrella of accepted standards and frameworks.
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The State Board of Education standards and frameworks for the five states chosen vary one from another in relation to US History and how it is to be taught in their state, but the variations are minor and often related to how regional and state histories are taught, and the grade level in which different social studies topics, such as world history, US history, and government, are taught. There is a great deal of uniformity in terms of standards, frameworks and approved textbooks. The approved textbook list for US History books for the Commonwealth of Virginia can be found in Appendix C.

There are four primary book publishers of US history textbooks in the United States, these being 1) Pearson / Prentice Hall / Scott Foresman, 2) Glencoe / McGraw Hill, 3) Harcourt Education, and 4) McDougall Littell / Houghton Miflin. Through the Board of Education of Fairfax, Virginia,\(^\text{18}\) and the Washington Research Library Consortium,\(^\text{19}\) I have had the opportunity to review all of the US History textbooks available from these four publishers. In addition, I have also been able to access school textbooks from the Oxford University Press, a fifth publisher with a smaller market but also approved for use within the five states, and William Bennett’s two volume series, *America: The Last Best Hope*. I have scanned the table of contents of all of these books and read quickly through their pages: the various textbooks are all similar in content, subject matter and perspective.

In an attempt to discern an unbiased method for determining whether a dominant worldview exists within the US that supports redemptive violence and an imbalance between military, development and diplomacy, I have settled on two approaches. The first is quantitative, the second qualitative. For my quantitative methodology, I have
selected textbooks from the major textbook publishers and that meet the state standards
and frameworks. US History is first taught in upper elementary school grades, returned
to again in Middle School, and taught with more sophistication and complexity in high
school. For the purposes of this research, I have decided to concentrate on Middle
School and High School, and have selected textbooks from these grade levels to search
the index tables for a dozen names of men and women associated with war-making
activities, or peace-making activities. The twelve persons are:

1. Nathan Hale: US Spy, Revolutionary War. Hale, from Connecticut, was captured
by the British in 1776 and killed as a spy after some documents were found in his shoe.
It is believed that he spoke the following words before being hanged: “I only regret
that I have but one life to lose for my country.”
2. George Washington: served as the commander of the continental army during the
Revolutionary War and served two terms as the first president of the United States.
3. Robert E. Lee: career US military soldier, most well known for commanding the
Confederate Army of Virginia during the Civil War.
4. Ulysses Grant: General of the Union Army during the Civil War and the 18th
president of the United States.
5. Abraham Lincoln: 16th president of the United States – led the nation through the
Civil War.
6. Dwight David Eisenhower: A Five-star general of the US army during World War II
and 34th President of the US.
7. Jesse Lee: Preacher, author and early leader of the Methodist Church – a
conscientious objector (CO) during the Revolutionary War.
8. Alfred Henry Love: A wool merchant and pacifist, became a conscientious objector
(CO) during the Civil War, later founder of the Universal Peace Union.
9. Dorothy Day: Journalist, activist, pacifist and co-founder of The Catholic Worker.
10. Jeannette Rankin: The first woman elected to the House of Representatives
(Montana), she voted against the US entry into both WW I and WW II. She was the
only member of Congress to vote against the US decision for World War II.
11. Martin Luther King, Jr.: Preacher, activist, civil rights leader, proponent of non-
violent resistance.
12. Daniel Berrigan: Priest, writer, activist and pacifist. Berrigan and his brother Philip
were well-known protestors against the War in Vietnam.

The Middle School textbooks I have chosen are each part of a two-year set that take 6th
and 7th graders through US history beginnings to the 21st Century. They are:

1. *American Journey*, published by Glencoe / Mcgraw Hill. The first volume is designed for Grade 6 and is subtitled “Early Years,” the second volume is designed for Grade 7 and is titled “Modern Times.”

2. *US History*, published by Holt McDougal. The first volume is designed for 6th Grade and is titled “Beginnings to 1877,” the second volume is designed for Grade 7 and is titled “Civil War to the Present.”

For High School textbooks, I have chosen five different publishers whose US History books cover US History:


6. *Contemporary’s American History I; Before Civil War* and *Contemporary’s American History II; After Civil War*.

7. *America: The Last Best Hope, Volume I and Volume II.*

| Table 5: Select Names in Approved US History Books |
|------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|                | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| N. Hale         | √ | √ | √ | X | X | X | √ |
| G. Washington   | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ |
| R. E. Lee       | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ |
| U. Grant        | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ |
| A. Lincoln      | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ |
| D. Eisenhower   | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ |
| J. Lee          | X  | X  | X  | X | X | X | X |
| A. Love         | X  | X  | X  | X | X | X | X |
| D. Day          | X  | X  | X  | X | X | X | X |
| J. Rankin       | √  | √  | X  | X | √ | X | √ |
| M. L. King, Jr. | √  | √  | √  | √ | √ | √ | √ |
| D. Berrigan     | X  | X  | X  | X | X | X | X |

The results of this exercise should come as no surprise to anyone familiar with US history. In a circular, self-re-enforcing manner, the well-known and famous names are
taught and remembered and the less celebrated and renowned names fade to history. Most Americans know the name of Robert E. Lee, but few know the name of Jesse Lee: most know Abraham Lincoln, but few know Alfred Henry, and know little of Dorothy Day, Jeanette Rankin or Daniel Berrigan. But each person lived full and prominent lives. Jesse Lee, for example, born and raised in Virginia, was the first Methodist preacher appointed to New England and founded churches in Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Vermont and Maine. He wrote a History of Methodism, an important source book for Methodist scholars, and served two terms as chaplain to the US House of Representatives and a term as the chaplain for the US Senate. If the US culture and worldview honored and appreciated peacemakers, it is possible that these names, like those associated with US wars, would be remembered, honored and cherished.

A word should also be included on the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Dr. King’s name appears in all of the selected US History textbooks, and the description of his work always spans several pages; sometimes entire chapters are devoted to the Civil Rights movement and King’s leadership and involvement. But King is remembered more in these textbooks as a Civil Rights leader who used non-violent resistance than as a pacifist. His opposition to the War in Vietnam, for instance, is not mentioned in five of the seven textbooks chosen for analysis.
Qualitative Data

Data was collected for this dissertation using a concurrent triangulation strategy, a post-positivist methodological approach that combines quantitative and qualitative approaches. From January through November 2009 data was collected through a variety of means, including phone calls, Internet research, academic and non-academic reading, ethnographic data collection at US National sites and targeted interviews. In this section, data collected from qualitative approaches will be described.

Targeted, Semi-Structured Interviews

The first means of collecting data qualitatively was through targeted, semi-structured interviews. 15 interviews were conducted from June through November 2009 in an attempt to discern the personal worldview of these individuals in assessing whether a dominant worldview within the population of the US society existed. The persons interviewed were selected because of their relationship to the US military – industrial – political complex as soldiers, contractors, professors, pastors, aid workers, pacifists and students. Categories of persons interviewed were:

1. A pacifist, author and professor at a US university.
2. A professor and author of conflict resolution at a US university.
3. A political scientist, professor, author.
4. A military advisor to General Petraeus.
5. A civilian employee working at the Pentagon.
6. A retired colonel from the US Army now working in the defense industry.
7. An active Marine Major.
10. An Iraqi citizen studying in the US.
11. A United Methodist pastor working at the national headquarters of Church and Society.
12. An executive at the United States Institute for Peace.
13. A junior officer at USAID.
14. A well-known news correspondent with CNN.
15. A retired four-star general.

The information collected from this interview process has provided a degree of depth and confirmation of data collected through other methodological approaches. Those interviewed ranged from a retired 4–Star General to a stay at home mother of two: interviewees included a United Methodist pastor and two students. No two persons answered the questions presented in exactly the same manner, demonstrating individual characteristics, preferences, opinions and worldviews. However, individuals did make interesting and revealing comments that bespeak a wider context and worldview. Additionally, patterns began to emerge and take shape from the individuals that would allow me to place them into certain “groups,” i.e. a military mindset as opposed to a more peace-seeking, negotiation, diplomacy-first mindset.

The interview instrument is to be found in Appendix A. I began with a general, introduction to my research topic and purpose of the interview. My initial question was always a background questions – something to the effect of “can you tell me how you got into this line of work?” designed to provide a context for my research and to help ease into the interview. The background question was followed by inquiries about
personal tastes in movies, books and music – because worldview both creates culture and is a reflection of culture. These questions were followed by more targeted questions concerning the US, 3 – D Security, the use of war, violence and torture.

All persons interviewed agree to be taped for my research, and all agreed that I could quote them by name if I deemed it necessary for my finished work. Everyone seemed comfortable, relaxed and willing. Six persons chose to stop the tape recorder at certain times to speak off the record: the other interviews proceeded uninterrupted. Favorite movies ranged from *Chariots of Fire* to *High Noon*. Favorite authors ran from Mark Twain to Thomas Friedman. Musical tastes were eclectic.

The most common response to what people liked most about the United States was the nation’s freedom (12 persons answered in this manner in one form or another). Things disliked about the US were similar, i.e. citizens of the US have too much freedom – the society is too open, too unguarded, and too permissive. Another source of dislike was the current political animosity and lack of political dialogue. One participant described the political climate in Washington, D. C. as a violation of reason.

Ten of fifteen had never heard of the phrase “3 – D Security.” When I explained the meaning most expressed their opinion that this represented a good approach to US foreign policy and security. Several military persons said it reminded them of D.I.M. E., for Diplomatic, Intelligence, Military and Economic.

Six persons interviewed, representing 40 percent of the total, were persons with or connected intimately to, military careers or work. Although they answered questions differently regarding cultural preferences (movies, books, music), 5 of the 6 (83
percent) agreed that war and violence could be used as a means to establish peace and justice. Said one person interviewed, who it can be said represented this group: “There is evil in the world, and the only way to confront this evil is to destroy it. Yes, I firmly believe in the ability of war and violence to create just, peaceful societies and nations.” Among the other nine persons interviewed, a small majority (five – 55 percent) also believed that war and violence were sometimes necessary to achieve peace and justice. Although this sampling size is relatively small and should not be extrapolated to the entire US population, it is consistent with other data indicating the willingness to use war and violence as a means of peacebuilding.

The self-described pacifist and conflict resolution professor did not believe that war and violence were sometimes necessary to achieve peace and justice: they were joined by three others, including two military career persons who said that in today’s world, war and violence simply seem to be creating more anger and resentment, fodder for more war and violence.

An important comment was made by one participant who observed that Americans, on the whole, reflect more the worldview of Hobbes than Locke, as opposed to Locke, whose worldview is more dominant in Europe. When pressed to provide insight to the causes of this distinction between these two cultures he quickly provided three factors: 1) colonization, 2) immigration and 3) a frontier mentality. Citizens of the US, he maintained (for the most part with a large group of exceptions), agree with Hobbes that without governmental security, human life would be “solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.” Interviewee paraphrased Hobbesian quote, remembering the words
“brutish” and “short.”)

Most agreed that torture was performed against detainees from the War on Terror by the United States since the attacks of 9 – 11 – 01. I received a very mixed reaction from those interviewed on this topic, including the following:

- Marine Major: “I am trained to kill the enemy. I believe the worst form of torture is to kill another person, and yet I, and the members of the US military, are trained and prepared to do just that. So to torture an enemy combatant is less offensive, less permanent than killing. Yes, I believe in torture if the person held has information that can help save American lives.”
- Retired Colonel, now working in the defense industry: “Torture is never acceptable.”
- Civilian Pentagon employee: “I just don’t know. I think I tend to avoid the subject and don’t want to think about it.”
- Retired 4-Star General: “I refuse to judge those who performed waterboarding on detainees. I think that a degree of enhanced interrogation is acceptable within the context of who is being interrogated – for instance, techniques used on a 10 year old civilian girl would seem shocking, but the same techniques used on a person responsible for the death of 3,000 persons is not shocking at all. That person has given up their right to freedom, and so techniques can be applied to obtain information. However, I do not believe in the efficacy of torture – I do believe credible information can be obtained from other methods.”
- CNN political commentator: “I do not believe that torture is acceptable in any manner. It does not give credible information. I have not considered the moral implications and do not need to because I don’t believe it is effective.”
- Military advisor to David Petraeus: “Torture is morally wrong. When we start torturing detainees, we lose the moral high ground and are no longer ethically superior to those we are fighting against. The US stands for something in the world and when that is lost, the US international image is tainted.”
The interview subjects displayed a wide-range of answers to the prepared and follow up questions, and their answers were consistent with the hypothesis that there does exist a dominant and recessive worldview within the US culture in terms of redemptive violence and an imbalance towards military spending in relation to development and diplomacy. This assessment was made by determining that a majority seemed to support, more or less, the current status of the US as a unipolar power and its role as the world’s light on a hill, last best hope, defender of freedom, liberty and democracy, while a minority would favor a total re-structuring of the US and world around a more consensual, cooperative approach. Opinions expressed by individuals that will be used in Chapter 4, “Analysis and Tentative Conclusions,” will be paired with polling data to demonstrate national support for such perspectives.

An Analysis of the Standards and Frameworks for US History

The States of Arizona, Connecticut, Missouri, Oregon and Virginia have statewide administrators charged with the task of ensuring that certain standards are met for students for different subjects and at different educational levels. These states all set standards, or frameworks, for which students must be taught. In addition, these statewide officials sometimes prepare lists of acceptable books for districts to use.

Local school districts are charged with the task of determining what the best textbooks are in order to meet these standards. The Fairfax County School District, for example, assembles a committee of teachers, administers and community members under the guidance of the Social Studies Coordinator for the district. This committee reviews
the state standards and approved textbooks, followed by a recommendation to the school board for which texts the district should purchase. This process provides both statewide standards and local control.

I have accessed the statewide standards for the five sample states in all subject matters and for all grade levels and for the purpose of this dissertation have isolated the social studies / US History component for Grade 5. Grade 5 seems to be the common start ground for teaching US History, at least in these five states: I have selected Grade 5 because it is the first level in which information deemed important is systematically taught to US school children.

The survey results provide data that shows a great deal of overlapping standards and benchmarks from state to state. Although there is variety (Virginia, for example, is the only state that lists the name of Andrew “Stonewall” Jackson for 5th grade standards), there is much more continuity.

The standards for US History from these five states for grade 5 are presented in five parallel columns in which information can be seen and read in conjunction with the other states. The State of Oregon has the longest list of standards and therefore runs past the other four states.

The survey indicate that each state requires the teaching of the same basic material: beginning with the era of exploration, state standards describe early settlements, the French and Indian War, and events leading up to the US Revolutionary War. The standards move from war to war, emphasizing the contributing factor leading up to each war and after effects of these wars. Names to be learned include Benjamin Franklin,
Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, Patrick Henry, Abraham Lincoln, Robert E. Lee, Ulysses Grant, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Dwight Eisenhower. Survey results are found in Appendix D.

**Ethnographic**

Ethnographic research is designed to obtain an in-depth understanding of how individuals within a culture live and make sense of the world around them, i.e. it studies the culture and its worldview. One tool of ethnography is *participant observation*, which requires the researcher to make extensive visits or live within the culture he or she wants to study.\(^3^0\) For the past 18 months I have consciously perceived myself as a participant observer of the US culture. I have gathered a great amount of data during the past 18 months that came from deliberate, intentionally planned visits on significant dates and/or to important touchstones of US culture. In addition, I have gathered data about the US culture and worldview by watching TV, watching my son and his friends play X-Box 360, attending sporting events and being aware of the society in which I live. Although this data cannot be placed neatly in tables and charts it provides, in essence, an important and alternative means from quantitative data of assessing a culture and its corresponding worldview. Clifford Geertz writes: “Understanding a people’s culture exposes their normalness without reducing their particularity. It renders them accessible: setting them in the frame of their own banalities, it dissolves their opacity.”\(^3^1\)

Notebook in hand, “professional stranger” attitude in mind, I set out to observe the culture in which I have lived for most of my 50 years. But under a different title, I have been a student of the US for the past twenty-five years. As an ordained pastor, I
learned long ago that I wanted to be a “seer,” an observer of what was taking place in the world around me, so that I could be a “sayer,” a preacher who could share these observations with a larger audience. I have been a student of the United States – seeking clues to understand this unique nation and its eclectic, complex, contradictory and confusing people – for the past twenty-five years.

During the past eighteen months I have strategically plotted trips to important national sites from Boston, Massachusetts to Richmond, Virginia. These locations were selected because of their important place in US history, culture and worldview. Sites visited include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Mystic, Connecticut – site of a slaughter of Native Americans during the Pequot War (May 26, 1637) that essentially broke the Pequot Nation.
- Great Barrington, Massachusetts – site of the first armed resistance to the British that would lead to the US Revolution. Marking the spot is a blue dolomite stone inscribed with the following words: "Near this spot stood the first court house of Berkshire County, erected in 1764. Here, August 16, 1774, occurred the first open resistance to British rule in America."
- Bunker Hill, Massachusetts – site of the first major conflict between the British and Patriot forces on June 17, 1775. A monument has been erected there and stands 221 feet tall: I climbed its 294 steps to get a better understanding of the terrain and battlefield, now virtually overrun by development. Now part of the Boston National Historic Park.
- Ridgefield, Connecticut, site of the Battle of Ridgefield (April 25, 1777) – a small but important victory for the Patriots over the British during the Revolutionary War in that it deterred any future British forays into Connecticut’s interior.
- Yorktown Battlefield, Colonial National Historic Park.
- Tomb of Ulysses Grant, National Memorial, New York City.
- Valley Forge National Historic Park, Pennsylvania.
- Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine, Baltimore Harbor. This is the location of the famous flag’s survival through a 25 hour British bombardment that inspired Francis Scott Key’s poem, “The Defence of Fort McHenry,” which was published in the Patriot on September 20, 1814. The poem, later set to music, became known as “The Star Spangled Banner” and was adopted as the national anthem by an executive order from President Wilson in 1916, followed by a more inclusive Congressional resolution in 1931.32
- Antietam National Battlefield, Maryland: the bloodiest one-day battle of the
American Civil War and location of General Lee’s first Northern campaigns.

- Manassas National Park – site of Manassas I, the first major battle of the Civil War, and Manassas II, a second major battle fought at the same site a year later.
- Harper’s Ferry, Fredericksburg, Spotsylvania, Chancellorsville, and Cold Harbor: sites of important Civil War battles.
- Gettysburg National Military Park. Location of an important 3-day battle between Union and Confederate forces, July 1 – 3, 1863, and place where Abraham Lincoln delivered the Gettysburg Address less than six months later.
- Richmond, Virginia. Capital of the Confederacy and focus of much of the Civil War’s Eastern campaigns.
- Appomattox Courthouse National historic Park – location where Generals Grant and Lee met to discuss Lee’s surrender, an important step for the conclusion of the Civil War.
- Arlington National Cemetery.
- The Pentagon.
- The major war memorials and monuments of Washington, District of Columbia, including John Paul Jones, George Washington, Generals Grant, Sherman, Scott, Meade, Rawlings, Pershing, World War II, Korea, and Vietnam.
- Most of the peace memorials mentioned earlier within this chapter, including the Statue of Peace, East front portico, US Capital; Naval Peace Monument; Inscription, steps of the Lincoln Memorial where Martin Luther King Jr. delivered his “I Have A Dream Speech;” Peace Conference Plaque, Willard Hotel; First International Peace Garden, by the Tidal Basin; Mohandas K. Gandhi, Dupont Circle; Headquarters, US Institute of Peace; and Japanese Stone Lantern, The Tidal Basin.
- The United Nations Headquarters, New York City.

In addition to visiting these important locations, I was also able to visit “The Star Spangled Banner’s” new home at the Smithsonian National Museum of American History where it is displayed prominently in an environmentally controlled chamber and considered a “National Treasure.” I attended President Barack Obama’s Inauguration, and was present at Arlington National Cemetery five months later on Memorial Day when President Obama participated in the ceremonies held on that special day.
I attended a funeral at Arlington National Cemetery, was present at the retirement ceremony of a Colonel from the US Army, and present at the halftime of a George Mason basketball game on February 14th against Northeastern University when General Golden inducted 40 young men and women into the US Army. I attended the 4th of July parade in Fairfax City, and the fireworks later that night sitting next to the Washington Monument. I watched on television as General Petraeus flipped the coin to determine which team would initially obtain possession of the ball at the 2009 Super Bowl, preceded by a pre-game flyover provided by the Air Force Thunderbird’s Aerial Demonstration Squadron and followed by an all-service US Special Operations Command color guard who presented the nation’s colors for the National Anthem. I also watched the pre-game ceremonies for Game 1 of the 2009 World Series in which a wounded Iraqi Veteran threw out the first pitch, framed by a US flag the size of the outfield. A separate Iraqi veteran sang the national anthem and the concluding notes were timed perfectly with another flyover from the Air Force Thunderbird’s Aerial Demonstration Squadron.

Unlike quantitative data, the dissemination of ethnographic data often takes place through narrative, story-telling descriptions. Among the many stories to be told are observations from my visits to several of the above-mentioned locations. Visitors to Valley Forge can walk around the site where George Washington and the Continental Army spent the winter of 1778 – 9. Valley Forge has a special place in the hearts of most Americans: it is perceived as the crucible through which the army was tried, tested and toughened. Its emergence from that winter is understood as a turning
point in the creation of a disciplined fighting force that was able to force the British from the field on June 28th, 1778 at the Battle of Monmouth, New Jersey.

One of the important symbols at Valley Forge is the National Memorial Arch, a 60-foot high, 49-foot long and 18 foot wide granite Arch designed as a simple version of the triumphant arch of Titus. Titus’s triumphant arch is located in Rome and celebrates the capture of Jerusalem by Emperor Titus in 70 C.E. Inscribed near the top of the arch are these words, taken from the Bible: “They shall hunger no more, Neither Thirst any more.” (Revelations 7:16)

Down the road from the arch can be found the Washington Chapel, dedicated to Commander of the Army George Washington. I was struck by two images:

1. Located on a ledge halfway up the exterior wall of the building is a statue of General Washington. I have visited, literally, hundreds of cathedrals, churches and chapels across the United States, Europe and Africa and have never seen anything like this. Typically, statues on the outside of Christian places of worship are reserved for representations of Jesus, the disciples, Biblical characters, or other significant religious figures. Here, George Washington is elevated to a sacred location.

2. Inside the bell tower is a beautiful stain glass window featuring a kneeling George Washington in the center. Behind Washington is Jesus who appears to be holding a
shield painted red, white and blue. In the four corners of the window are the Gospel writers – Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. The stain glass window suggests an exalted status, heavenly for Washington – surrounded by Jesus and the four evangelists. A picture of the window can be found in Appendix E.

These images at the Washington Chapel in Valley Forge are similar to the painting in the interior of the dome of the US Capital. Known as *The Apotheosis of George Washington* and painted by Vatican trained artist Constantino Brumidi in 1865, it depicts the elevation of George Washington to the status of a God (apotheosis – “Exaltation to divine rank or stature; deification”36). The central panel of Washington’s transformation depicts Washington, two female angelic images representing Liberty and Victory, and thirteen other female angelic figures representing the 13 original colonies and states: this central painting is surrounded by six groups of figures representing 1) War, 2) Science, 3) Marine, 4) Commerce, 5) Mechanics, and 6) Agriculture. An image of the painting can be found in Appendix F.

It is hard to imagine many contemporary citizens of the US who believe that George Washington was literally transformed into a god: likewise, it is doubtful that the architects, planners, artists and builders of the Washington Chapel and US Capitol thought of Washington as a real deity. But this misses the point: the elevation of Washington to this exalted status bespeaks a deliberate campaign of nation building – the creation of a pantheon of Founding Fathers help shape the new nation and gave it a nucleus from which to build upon. Francis Furstenberg’s *In the Name of the Father*37 describes the deliberate attempt to create a national spirit, aka collective memory, or what
Lincoln described as ”the mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature.”

Like Biblical stories, creation myths, folktales or fables, the stories about George Washington play an important role in US collective memory: they tell Americans that the founding father of their nation was a great man. These stories of Washington – 1) throwing a silver dollar across the Potomac, 2) chopping down a cherry tree and refusing to lie to his father, and 3) sketching the outline of a US flag on a piece of paper and giving it to Betsy Ross, were created to enhance the mythic qualities of Washington – the silver dollar to demonstrate his great strength, the cheery tree to demonstrate both his “inability to lie” and, appropriately, a touch of independence and rebellion, the flag story to connect Washington to this great symbol, the flag of the United States.

During a visit to Gettysburg, I stood on Seminary Hill and looked across the valley towards Cemetery Ridge where the Union troops, hunkered down behind a stone wall, rocks, trees and quickly dug entrenchments, prepared for the Confederate attack known as Pickett’s Charge. The Union lines held, the Confederates retreated, and most saw this as the symbolic turning point of the Civil War.

Abraham Lincoln was invited to speak at the dedication of the National Cemetery at Gettysburg, and event scheduled for November 19, 1863. His brilliant, two minute speech included the following words: “But, in a larger sense, we can not dedicate . . . we can not consecrate . . . we can not hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead,
who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract.”

It is now an accepted truth that the land of Gettysburg is “hallowed,” “consecrated” ground. It is deemed holy, set aside from sacred, because of the sacrifice these men from the North and South made for their country. But might not it also be pointed out that men went to Gettysburg to kill, to wage war and destroy the other? Gettysburg also represents the unleashed fury, the savage, violent beast of humanity, from the firing of cannons designed to maim, destroy, decapitate and annihilate the enemy, to rifles, bayonets and swords – all instruments of death and destruction. If Gettysburg represents hallowed ground, it also represents evil ground, cursed for the immorality set loose there.

The National Parks Service estimates that 1,300 monuments and memorials have been erected at Gettysburg, many placed in the location where the event identified on the monument took place (i.e. death of a soldier, advance of a battalion, successful defense, etc). Gettysburg demonstrates meaning making at it’s finest: Confederate, as well as Union Monuments, are plentiful. Visitors (approximately 2 million per year) pay homage to the great battle waged there and reflect on its meaning for themselves and their nation.

Construction on the Lincoln Memorial began on February 12, 1914, 49 years after the death of the president, and dedicated eight years later on May 30, 1922. “‘The monument is neither palace nor temple nor tomb,’ wrote Helen Nicolay (daughter of Abraham Lincoln’s secretary John Nicolay) of the Lincoln Memorial.” Clearly not a palace or a tomb (Lincoln is buried in Springfield, Illinois), inscribed into the monument just over Lincoln’s statue are these words:
IN THIS TEMPLE
AS IN THE HEARST OF THE PEOPLE
FOR WHOM HE SAVED THE UNION
THE MEMORY OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN
IS ENSHRINED FOREVER

There are no scheduled worship services that take place within the Lincoln Memorial, but in many respects it is a temple to the US civil religion, and the statue of Lincoln and memorial itself are, “in many ways, a direct copy of the Statue of Zeus which stood in the Temple of Zeus in Olympia, Greece, from 432 B.E. to sometime in the fifth century, A.D.” The memorial, located at the Western most location on the mall, is close to the Arlington home of Robert E. Lee, thus bringing the two together as the war preserved the union. Lincoln, facing East, looks across the mall to the Capitol building, two miles away, and the Statue of Ulysses Grant at the base of the Capitol. “Thus perceptually the two ends of the National Mall come together in a determined glance between Lincoln and Grant.”

Soon after Lincoln’s death the fallen president was portrayed as the ultimate martyr, the supreme sacrifice necessary to “bind up the nation’s wounds.”

Figure 5.2
Resurrection of Abraham Lincoln
Like Washington, a painting of Lincoln’s resurrection was created and issued in commemorative prints across the nation. This print shows the image of Lincoln rising Christ-like from the grave and being escorted to heaven by two angels.

The decision to use the word “Temple,” the apotheosis of Lincoln, the sacred ground of Gettysburg and other war sites do not occur randomly: they are the outputs of a culturally determined outlook linking important civil events and people to religious experiences. This blurring of the lines between church and state is seen in countless memorials, shrines and plaques often accompanied by the word “shrine.” For instance the Virginia War Memorial, located in Richmond, Virginia, is described on its web site in this manner:

Walk inside the Virginia War Memorial and you enter hallowed ground. For here on its soaring glass and marble walls are the names of more than 11,600 Virginia heroes who gave their lives to keep our country free. Engraved on its stone and glass walls, the Shrine of Memory originally had the names of Virginians who died as a result of hostile action in World War II and Korea. An addition was dedicated in 1981 to honor those killed in the Vietnam War, and in 1996 the names of those killed in the Persian Gulf were added. There are a total of 11,634 names: WWII 9,398; Korea 850; Vietnam 1,379; and the Persian Gulf 7.45

Plans are already underway at the Virginia War Memorial for the inclusion of names killed in the Wars in Afghanistan and Iraq.
I was able to visit both Fort McHenry, in the Baltimore Harbor, and the flag that flew over Fort McHenry on the night of September 13, 1814. The fort withstood a 25-hour period of bombardment and inspired Francis Scott Key, an American guest of the British on board their ship HMS Tonnant, to write a poem titled “The Defence of Fort McHenry,” which was published in the Patriot on September 20, 1814. The poem, later set to music, became known as “The Star Spangled Banner” and was adopted as the national anthem by an executive order from President Wilson in 1916, followed by a more inclusive Congressional resolution in 1931.

The flag that inspired Keyes is now considered a “National Treasure”: it is displayed prominently in an environmentally controlled chamber in the Smithsonian National Museum of American History. The flag was not always so treated: for years, the family of Major Armistead, commander of the fort, owned it, and kept it in their attic. The flag was displayed from time to time, hung from windows for the 4th of July or other special occasions, then returned to the attic. The family even cut pieces of the flag and gave them as souvenirs to family and friends, including one of the stars. Some of the cut
pieces have been returned to the museum and are now displayed close by this important artifact. The star is still missing.

I attended a funeral at the Arlington National Cemetery where a flag draped coffin was pulled through the cemetery on a horse led caisson. After the priest completed the Service of Committal, a ceremonial, 21 – shot salute was made, followed by taps and the folding of the flag – a solemn ceremony that took six Marines over three minutes. The flag was presented to the widow by the commanding officer who spoke these words: “On behalf of the President of the United States, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and a grateful nation, please accept this flag as a symbol of our appreciation for your husband’s honorable and faithful service to Country and Corps.” The officer then presented the widow with a small container and said: “We also ask you to please accept these ceremonial shell casings that were fired in his honor. May God provide you with comfort, and may heaven continue to smile on each and every one of you.” At that point in the service, the commanding officer and his six guards marched off and the family was invited to depart.

The United States is a nation whose national anthem is about its flag. US citizens pledge allegiance to the flag, and it is interesting to note, “the original flag-salute ceremony proceeded as follows. Those participating stood facing the flag and recited the following pledge: ‘I pledge allegiance to my flag and the Republic for which it stands, one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.’ At the words ‘to my flag,’ the right hand was extended, palm up and slightly raised, toward the flag. This position was held till the end of the pledge, after which the arm was dropped to the side.”48
pledge as we know it was revised and amended through the National Flag Conferences of 1923 and 1924, when the words were changed to, “I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the republic, for which it stand, one nation, with liberty and justice for all.” The words “Under God, indivisible” were added in 1954. “The similarity of the ‘stiff-arm’ form of the salute to the hated Nazi salute led Congress in 1942 to provide that the salute should be rendered by placing the right hand over the heart.”

I had the opportunity to attend both the inauguration of President Barack Obama on January 20, 2009, and the Memorial Day Events at Arlington National Cemetery on May 25, 2009. These two events are important national ceremonies – filled with symbolism, rites and rituals that have taken place repeatedly in the nation’s history. I was struck by how these order of events resembled a Christian worship service, with a mixture of prayer, music and sermon / speech. This is the Order of Events for President Obama’s Inauguration Day, contrasted with corresponding components of a Christian worship service taken from the United Methodist Book of Worship:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidential Inauguration Service</th>
<th>Christian Worship Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Musical Selections</strong></td>
<td><strong>Prelude, musical selection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The United States Marine Band</td>
<td>Usually performed by the organist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Musical Selections</strong></td>
<td><strong>Choral Introit</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The San Francisco Boys Chorus and</td>
<td>Sung by members of the choir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the San Francisco Girls Chorus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Call to Order and Welcoming Remarks</strong></td>
<td><strong>Call to Worship and Welcome</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Honorable Dianne Feinstein</td>
<td>Usually performed by the pastor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Invocation**
Dr. Rick Warren
Saddleback Church, Lake Forest, CA

**Opening Hymn**
Led by the pastor or church member

**Musical Selection**
Aretha Franklin

**Seasonally appropriate music to start the worship service**

**Musical Selection, Anthem**
John Williams, Composer/arranger:
  - Itzhak Perlman, Violin
  - Yo-Yo Ma, Cello
  - Gabriela Montero, Piano
  - Anthony McGill, Clarinet

**Other Sacred Rituals**

**Oath of Office Administered to Vice President-elect Joseph R. Biden, Jr.**
By Associate Justice of the Supreme Court
The Honorable John Paul Stevens

**Affirmation of Faith**

**Oath of Office Administered to President-elect Barack H. Obama**
By the Chief Justice of the United States
The Honorable John G. Roberts, Jr.

**Sermon**
The President of the United States
The Honorable Barack H. Obama

**Response to the Message**
Elizabeth Alexander

**Benediction**
The Reverend Dr. Joseph E. Lowery

**Members of the Congregation**

**Benediction**
Local Pastor
The mixture of church and state within the US is curious – especially in light of the First Amendment of the US Constitution:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.\textsuperscript{50}

Congress has made no laws respecting an establishment of religion, but the US is still largely a religious nation, and this religious inclination finds its ways into the public arena in many obvious and subtle ways. The connection between US nationalism, patriotism and love of country and religion – through symbols, public prayer, quoting of scriptures, and direct reference to the divine presents an opportunity for Americans to perceive their nation as a specially blessed nation by God and therefore enables these citizens to frame America’s actions as part of the divine plan for the universe.

Another setting in which I have performed ethnographic research is within my home: it is hard for me not to notice my son’s passion for playing war games on his X–Box 360. As an interested researcher, I went on line to see what titles Microsoft is preparing to release. The upcoming games list, as of November 1, 2009, consists of these games:

- Lego Indiana Jones 2: The Adventure Continues
- Call of Duty: Modern Warfare 2
- Dragon Ball: Raging Blast
- Tony Hawk: Ride
- Assassin’s Creed II
- Left 4 Dead 2
- Rogue Warrior
- The Saboteur
- Darksiders
- Army of Two: The 40\textsuperscript{th} Day
Without knowing much about these games it is obvious that the military – war – violent games dominate the list. The game “Halo” is marketed with accessories – combat helmets, simulated guns, vests, goggles, etc. Participants resemble real US warriors engaged for battle.

I wonder, and am concerned, what effect these games have on America’s children. Endless hours of video killing is eerily similar to the technological “advances” now being used through drone warfare and guided, “smart bombs” that can be operated thousands of miles from the actual killing. P. W. Singer provides a glimpse of not only future warfare but warfare as it is being conducted today in his new book *Wired For War: The Robotics Revolution and Conflict in the 21st Century*.52

Children’s exposure to the theme of redemptive violence, warfare and violence is, of course, not new. The toy, G. I. Joe, by Hasbro, celebrated its 45 birthday in 2009 and is a line of military – themed action figures. I had toy soldiers as a child and played combat games in my backyard with my siblings and neighbors. Children’s movies –
from *The Wizard of Oz* through *Swiss Family Robinson*, *Peter Pan* and *The Lion King* are movies about redemptive violence, the good overcoming evil through fighting for what is right. Adult movies, from *High Noon* through *Dirty Harry* to *Inglorious Bastard* convey this same message: the good will be vindicated as the evil is destroyed through the application of violence.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has been devoted to the dissemination of data – the reporting of what I have discovered during the past eighteen months. The information was reported in two categories – quantitative, followed by qualitative.

Quantitative data included 1) the research results of the presence of war memorials, monuments and plaques within five purposefully selected states that demonstrate regional and political diversity, 2) the presence of peace memorials, monuments and plaques within the same five states, 3) the presence of war and peace memorials, monuments and plaques within the nation’s capital, Washington, District of Columbia, 4) the celebration of four national holidays within the towns and cities of these same five states, 5) the presence of US flags within United Methodist Churches in these same states, 6) a full text-coding word search of the 45 state preambles and 7) a content analysis of state approved US History books searching for 12 specific names.

Qualitative data included a summary of the 15 interviews I conducted during the later half of 2009, a survey of the standards and frameworks for US History books in the selected five states, and ethnographic information gleaned from observational fieldwork.
Data obtained from the quantitative and qualitative methods will be used to support and confirm each other in seeking to determine if evidence exists for and against the existence of a dominant worldview within the United States. This data provides the base from which an analysis can be conducted and tentative conclusions drawn, which will be the subject matter of Chapter 5.
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CHAPTER 6: ANALYSIS AND SUGGESTED FINDINGS BASED ON THE RESEARCH

It could be argued that the substantial presence of large war memorials, monuments and plaques, located in central, highly visible locations in the nation’s capital, and in the majority of towns and cities across the Untied States does not prove the existence of a dominant worldview that supports redemptive violence. Nor does it, by itself, provide a rationale for the imbalance in US funding for the components of 3 – D Security (Defense, Development and Diplomacy) favoring defense. It is true that many of these memorials, monuments and plaques were constructed and dedicated generations ago and the leaders or events honored through these marble, granite and concrete markers are long since dead, buried and often forgotten.

Likewise, it could be argued that the parades, fireworks and ceremonies for Memorial Day, July 4th and Veteran’s Day do not prove the existence of a dominant worldview within the US regarding redemptive violence and the imbalance in US spending priorities. While it is true that there are few peace memorials, monuments and plaques within the towns and cities of the United States and that the percentage of towns and cities that celebrate Martin Luther King’s birthday is small compared to the number and extent of the celebrations of Memorial Day, July 4 and Veteran’s Day, this can be seen as independent of any overarching perspective or worldview.
The same can be said for the quantitative and qualitative data that indicate a preferential treatment for war and war leaders as opposed to periods of peace and peacemakers in state approved history textbooks. School boards and districts choose textbooks that teach important US events and people: the case can be made that Nathan Hale is more important to the history of the United States than Jesse Lee: the same can be said of Ulysses Grant and Alfred Henry Love.

The presence of US flags in places of worship and the evidence pointing to the existence of a strong civil religion within the United States can be dismissed as irrelevant to any unified worldview or policy input: in the same manner, the use of a divine term for God found within all of the preambles to state’s constitutions can be described as unimportant for policy makers.

But the evidence presented, combined with an understanding of the concept of worldview, implies otherwise.

The data suggest that there is a dominant worldview within the United States – a worldview that believes in redemptive violence and thus supports the current imbalance between federal appropriations for defense, diplomacy and development. The key to this assessment lies in the subtle, hidden, unconscious meaning-making power of rituals, symbols, narratives and history in the construction of worldview. If scholars agree on the definition of worldview and the accepted understanding of how it is created and perpetuated, then we must treat seriously the elements that create a worldview of redemptive violence and its quid quo pro policy implications. Building blocks for worldview include history, collective memory, religious heritage, symbols and myths /
legends / folktales: in the US, these building blocks work in concert with each other contributing to this dominant worldview.

This dominant worldview, broadly speaking, maintains that the United States does represent “the last best hope” for the world and perceives the US metaphorically as a “light on the hill.” The work and influence of international organizations such as the UN are supported under this broad worldview only when the UN efforts seem to dovetail with the interests of the US, and unilateralism is seen as a viable option. Peace, democracy, freedom and justice can be achieved through the use of violence and war as evidenced through the positive outcomes from the US Revolutionary War, the Civil War and World War II. In metaphysical or theological terminology, the US is identified with what is morally good, right and just (Godliness); enemies of the United States are deemed wicked, immoral and unjust (evil).

A second tentative conclusion drawn from the research is that a recessive worldview also exists with the US that is counter to the dominant worldview: this recessive worldview favors more peaceful means of solving international conflict and sees peace as the means and the ends. It is cooperative in nature and supports multilateralism. It is more nuanced than the dominant worldview, understanding that the US itself is far from perfect and has made significant mistakes in its past (slavery, treatment of the Native Americans, women’s rights, Vietnam). It is reflective and recognizes that past failures can provide warnings and clues for the future and seeks common ground to solve pressing international crises. Like the dominant worldview, the
history of this minority gene can be traced to the origins of the nation and it waxes and wanes in different eras.

The purpose of this chapter is to analyze the data presented in Chapter 4 and provide evidence that supports the tentative conclusion outlined above about the existence of a dominant and recessive worldview within the US culture.

**Presence of Peace and War Memorials, Monuments and Plaques**

Research from the five selected states regarding the presence of war related memorials, monuments and plaques can be summarized in this manner: I was able to access information from 841 (out of a total of 911) towns and cities within five states (Arizona, Connecticut, Missouri, Oregon and Virginia) representing a reporting rate of 92.3 percent. Of the municipalities reporting, 601, or 71.46 percent of these towns and cities, have at least one war memorial, monument or plaque. This is in contrast to the 18 peace memorials, monuments or plaques discovered within the same five states, representing 2 percent of the towns and cities with markers devoted to peace.

This imbalance is striking. What makes this discrepancy even more lopsided and noteworthy is the fact that a great majority of the towns and cities with war memorials, monuments or plaques have more than one: some, as mentioned earlier, like Hartford, Connecticut, has twenty-four war memorials and monuments; many towns and cities are currently constructing more. Although totals were not collected in any state for markers remembering the victims of 9-11-01 or for the soldiers killed in the ongoing wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, information volunteered from the sources indicates that
approximately 25 percent of the towns and cities within these five states have already constructed or are in the process of planning memorials for these events.

It is clear to me, on the basis of this research, that the State of Connecticut, for example, has well over 1000 war memorials, monument and plaques. This is in marked contrast to the two peace memorials found in the state, presenting a ratio of 500 to one.

The presence of these war markers, compared to the glaring absence of peace markers, reveals what this society, or any society with this imbalance, honors and values. Monuments help to foster worldview: they support the remembrance of a particular historic event. The markers are usually blessed by religious leaders at the time of their dedication and through inscriptions on them, and are important symbols for those who pass by. “Public monuments are the most conservative of commemorative forms precisely because they are meant to last, unchanged, forever . . . Made of imperishable stone or metal, and erected prominently in shared civic spaces – parks, town squares, public buildings – public monuments were meant to be a genuine testimonial of the people’s memory, an eternal repository for what they held most dear.”

I remember as a child playing hide and seek around the war memorial located in my home town: my children climbed on the tank parked on the town green in New Milford, Connecticut, as they grew up. In Westport, Connecticut, two cannons were set up as war monuments,
marking the location of the British invasion of April 1777. A librarian in Westport told me that since they were put up in 1903, nearly every child in Westport has sat upon them.

These war memorials, monuments and plaques contribute to the making of a worldview: citizens of the US are taught, directly and indirectly, consciously and unconsciously, that these markers honor important persons and significant events. Many of us drive or walk past a war memorial every day, and those who participate in Memorial Day, 4th of July or Veteran’s Day ceremonies often gather at the town’s monuments to pay tribute to those who have participated in these wars.

These markers remind us, “We call on the warrior to exemplify the qualities necessary to prosecute war – courage, loyalty, and self-sacrifice. The soldier, neglected, even shunned during peacetime, is suddenly held up as the exemplar or our highest ideals, the savior of the state.” In direct and subliminal ways, the prolific presence of these war memorials, monuments and plaques is like the air around us: we take its presence for granted, but it surrounds us, informs our lives, and is a building block of our collective worldview.

**Celebration of Martin Luther King’s Birthday, Memorial Day, July 4th and Veteran’s Day**

Of the same 841 towns in which data was collected, the following totals are presented in regard to the celebration of Martin Luther King’s birthday (January), Memorial Day (May), 4th of July and Veteran’s Day (November):

- Martin Luther King’s birthday is celebrated in 145 towns and cities representing 17.24 percent.
- Memorial Day is celebrated in 669 towns and cities representing 79.55 percent.
- July 4th is celebrated in 580 towns and cities representing 68.96 percent.
- Veteran’s Day is celebrated in 647 towns and cities representing 76.92 percent.

Once again, a distortion is present within these states in terms of the civic celebrations of these four holidays. Although it was outside the scope of this research, I discovered that a majority of the King celebrations were in towns and cities with a large African–American population. Memorial Day, July 4th and Veteran’s Day, by contrast, were celebrated in the great majority of these towns and cities across these five states.

As a Christian pastor, I am well aware of the significance and impact on the human psyche of rituals ceremonies, and sacraments. Most Christians know the story of Christmas and Easter, but churches re-tell these stories annually through word, music, pageants, and dramas that re-enforce the message. In addition to these major Christian holidays, in the churches where I served as pastor, I placed a particular emphasis on two dates important to me: 1) World Communion Sunday, the first Sunday in October wherein all Christian Churches are encouraged to share the sacrament in a spirit of cooperation and unity, and 2) Maundy Thursday – the night Jesus washed his disciples feet, commanded them to love one other, and shared the Last Supper, thus instituting the sacrament of the Eucharist. Through the dozen years that I stressed these two special events in the last church I served, I observed a corresponding increase in attendance and participation by members of the congregation at these two worship services: what I highlighted became more important to others within my congregation.
In the same manner, when a town chooses to celebrate Memorial Day, July 4th or Veteran’s Day with specially planned events, it creates special significance and communicates to the public that these dates matter: that there is special significance to these days in respect to other days. The honoring of Memorial Day and Veteran’s Day, in particular, are holidays designed as a tribute to the men and women who were either killed in wars (Memorial Day) or veterans of the US military (Veteran’s Day). The fact that civic events, focusing on military service, are planned in a majority of municipalities across the United States shows what the US culture and worldview honors and respects. The smaller number of towns and cities that mark Dr. King’s birthday implies that this event is of lesser importance to the citizens of the US. The total absence of a day to celebrate and remember international peace and conflict resolution is also telling in that what is ignored tells us what is not important to a nation’s sense of identity.

**US Flags within United Methodist Churches**

Five districts from within these five states were selected from the United Methodist Church to determine whether a US flag was displayed on church property and, if the answer was yes, where it was displayed. These districts contain a total of 295 churches of which information was obtained from 274, a reporting rate of 92.9 percent. 258 of these churches (94 percent) reported that they had a flag on their property, and 245 (89.4 percent) indicated that the flag was displayed in their sanctuaries.

In 2007 the Rev. Clayton Childers, a staff person at the national headquarters of the United Methodist Church (General Board of Church and Society), wrote an essay
titled “Do United Methodists Believe the Flag of the United States is Appropriate for Worship?” His five-page article was well researched and included historic practices and contemporary perspectives. He concluded that the placement of a flag in a location of worship was inappropriate because of its implied nationalism and potential link between church and state.

Among other arguments that Rev. Childers made was this:

\[ e) \textbf{The presence of a national flag in worship can imply endorsement} \textbf{ of national policies that often run counter to the teachings of Jesus Christ and our Christian faith. (One need only recall the way the Swastika Flag was displayed prominently in German churches during the Nazi era). It is much better for the church to maintain a position of healthy distance from the state where it can see clearly and maintain a tempered perspective. Martin Luther King Jr. believed that the church should neither dominate the state nor be dominated by the state but should be the conscience of the state.}^{4} \]

Conservative elements within the United Methodist Church seized on this article and initiated a nation-wide campaign to force the resignation or firing of Rev. Childers from his position, stressing his comparison of the US flag to the German Swastika. The campaign to remove Rev. Childers from his job did not generate enough support to force him from his job, but it was a sign of the tremendous emotion this issue generates.

Barely four months later, however, Rev. Childers found himself with a group of United Methodist Men at a breakfast meeting where his article had been distributed. Considerable discussion ensued, summed up by one participant who said: “I believe that God gave the American flag to the United States.” Rev. Childers thought that this statement seemed to represent the opinion of about 80 percent of the men gathered.$^{5}$
While it would be easy to dismiss such comments as irrational, we need to remember that it is never rational to disregard the comments of the irrational.

The flag of the United States is an important symbol for the nation and its people. Dating back to the early years of the US Revolution, it is an icon with incredible power. “Rallying around the flag,” also known as “Flagmania,” or “the Cult of the Flag,” is nothing neither new nor unique to the United States. The children’s game “Capture the Flag” is based upon the real wartime efforts to both capture the enemy’s flags and defend your own. Inside the Chapel located directly behind Napoleon’s Tomb at the Hôtel des Invalides, flags captured by Napoleon’s troops throughout his campaigns are displayed hanging near the ceiling. Leo Tolstoy, among others, described the importance of fighting for and defending regimental and national standards in his epic novel, War and Peace.

In 1861 Edward Everett, the president of Harvard, spoke these words: “Why is it that the flag of the country, always honored, always beloved, is now at once worshipped, I may say, with passionate homage of this whole people? Why does it float, as never before, not merely from arsenal and masthead, but from tower and steeple, from the
public edifices, the temples of science, the private dwellings, in magnificent display of miniature presentiment.”

The answer, provided by Everett himself, was this: the onset of the Civil War. “A nation festooned with flags is a nation at war. On both sides, flags assumed a transcendent significance as symbols of their respective nation’s sacred importance . . . In the South, ordinary Confederates were the most committed to unfurling banners, first the Stars and Bars, and soon thereafter the aptly named Southern Cross, which became the readily identified icon of the Confederacy and, later, the Lost Cause. On both sides, verse would soon fuse with symbol and produce hundreds of songs directed primarily to the national flag. If West Point became the seminary of America’s national religion, then flags would serve as its religion’s totem.”

The presence of flags within the sanctuaries of 89.4 percent of the United Methodist Churches contacted through this research is an important indicator of the ongoing link between church and state within the United States and evidence of the existence of a strong civil religion. Objects located in sanctuaries – such as the cross, altar table, baptismal font, communion elements, Holy Scriptures, pulpit and lectern – are all powerful symbols that convey messages about the religion and its worldview. The inclusion of the US flags in the sanctuary provides the flag with religious significance, a linking of church and state and an association of the policies of the US with Christianity.

**State Preambles**
Forty-five of the fifty United States’ state constitutions have preambles: of these, 100 percent mention the word “God” or an alternative term (Creator, Almighty, Supreme Ruler of the Universe, Divine Author, etc) within these preambles. 26, over half, use the same phrase: “Grateful to Almighty God.” Another four use the phrase, “Grateful to God,” omitting the word “Almighty.” The inclusion of references to God within state preambles is interesting in that an intentional link is created from the state’s perspective to religion. When governmental organizations, such as individual states, create the structure and basis for state laws, as they do in their state constitutions, the invoking of God’s name is an expression of the framers belief that God has, in the past, and will, in the future, bless their state and its activities. This is another instance of civil religion and the favored status the US perceives it enjoys in God’s eyes.

**US History Textbooks**

The US History officially approved for the State of Virginia is similar, if not identical, to the textbooks being used in the other four states used in this dissertation; all include information about George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Robert E. Lee, Ulysses Grant and Dwight Eisenhower. Four out of the seven books examined also include information about Nathan Hale.

The names of Jesse Lee, Alfred Henry Love, Dorothy Day and Daniel Berrigan are absent from all of these textbooks. Jeannette Rankin’s name appears in four of the seven, and Martin Luther King’s name is in all of the textbooks.
Reading through the standards and frameworks developed by the State Board of Education for each of these five states is similar to reading a Sparks Notes outline of US History: US history moves from a snapshot of Native American life, through the Age of Discovery, Colonization, French and Indian War, Revolutionary War, Mexican – American War, Civil War, Spanish – American War, World War I and II, Cold War, Korean and Vietnam War. Important names are the names of military men and national leaders during these times of war. The frameworks establish what should be taught at different grade levels and are followed by state sponsored tests to determine if the students learned the required information.

The transformation of information to the next generation is one of the most important functions of a society and, in turn, demonstrates what is deemed important to that society. History is one of the most powerful building blocks of worldview, and the perspective, bias and conclusions drawn by historians have an impact on the students. It is theoretically possible to imagine life in the so-called Alternative Universe Robert Gates suggested that might exist: in this altered universe it is possible that reality might be perceived in a different manner. In this alternative universe, men and women who were the peacemaker and peace builders could be honored and appreciated, while those whose lives involved death and destruction would be limited to minor roles.

The theoretical construction of this alternative universe makes this point: men and women who have resisted war efforts, who are or have been conscientious objectors, pacifists and antiwar patriots who believe the best path forward for the United States historically or today is through conflict resolution, diplomacy and dialogue could be held
in a higher place and esteem than those who chose pathways leading to war. But in a society where the dominant worldview supports redemptive violence, the scenario of valuing peace persons seems less likely.

**Characteristics of the Dominant Worldview**

The proposed dominant worldview within the US culture is perhaps best summarized by General George C. Marshall, who said: “We are determined that before the sun sets on this terrible struggle our flag will be recognized throughout the world as a symbol of freedom on the one hand and of overwhelming force on the other.”

It would be difficult to determine whether the US flag was recognized throughout the world in the years following World War II as a symbol of freedom. Certainly, many in France, the Philippines and other nations did see the US as liberators and gained a deeper appreciation of the role the US played in overthrowing Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan. A few years after the war the Marshall Plan was implemented as an unprecedented strategy that combined altruism with enlightened self-interest: by providing resources to rebuild Europe (and Japan), the US reduced the likelihood of future conflict and created unparalleled good will and international acclaim. “Aid was invented to rebuild Europe after the Second World War. It worked.” Over a four-year period (1948 – 1952), approximately $13 billion in aid was sent to the people of Western Europe. Further, the United Nations was established, on US soil, and the citizens of the US, believing they had won peace through war, saw themselves as the defenders of freedom and democracy against the communism of the Soviet Union.
Marshall’s prediction regarding overwhelming force is easier to confirm. The US did emerge from World War II as a nation with overwhelming force: at the end of the war the US had 12 million persons in military uniform and was the only nation capable of creating a nuclear bomb. Although the US got a late start mobilizing the military – industrial complex, Robert Higgs writes:

From 1942 to 1944, war production increased rapidly. Although there is no defensible way to place a value on the outpouring of munitions, its physical dimensions are awesome. From mid – 1940 to mid-1945, munitions makers produced 86,338 tanks; 297,000 airplanes; 17,400,000 rifles, carbines, and side arms; 315,000 pieces of field artillery and mortars; 4,200,000 tons of artillery shells; 41,400,000,000 rounds of small arms ammunition; 64,500 landing vessels; 6,500 other navy ships; 5,400 cargo ships and transports, and vast amounts of other munitions.13

Although challenged during the Cold War by the Soviet Union, the military strength of the US was never equaled. While it is true that the Soviet Union developed and deployed a sufficient number of nuclear weapons to destroy the United States, the so-called “Bomber Gap” and “Missile Gaps” of the 1950’s (the perceived disparity between the number of weapons the Soviet Union had in terms of what the US possessed) only existed in the exaggerated estimates of the Soviet power as reported in the Gaither Committee (1957) and public fears and were soon proven incorrect and even intentionally distorted.14

Today, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the dominance of the US military prowess is unchallenged: one example of this unprecedented power comes from Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, who says: “As much as the U.S. Navy has shrunk since the end of the Cold War, for example, in terms of tonnage, its battle fleet is still
larger than the next 13 navies combined — and 11 of those 13 navies are U.S. allies or partners.”

This military prowess is accompanied by great temptations. “With great power comes great responsibility” is the Spiderman comic book’s version of an issue that can be traced as far back as Socrates’ “rule worthy of might.” Unparalleled military power tempts any nation to make decisions it otherwise might avoid and presents a potential danger, as spoken by Lord Acton: “Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely. Great men are almost always bad men.”

An example of this dilemma is found in the writings of Ulysses Grant who, reflecting back years later in his memoirs, wrote of the Mexican – American War:

For myself, I was bitterly opposed to the measure, and to this day regard the war, which resulted, as one of the most unjust ever waged by a stronger against a weaker nation. It was an instance of a republic following the bad example of European monarchies, in not considering justice in their desire to acquire additional territory. But I believed my duty to the flag surpassed my personal opinion, and I accepted my commission.

What this tells us is that Grant believed that the war was unjust – the temptation of hostile territorial acquisition by “a stronger nation against a weaker nation,” but Grant accepted the commission never-the-less and served under Generals Zachary Taylor and Winfield Scott.

Grant’s decision is illustrative of Reinhold Niebuhr’s *Moral Man and Immoral Society.* Grant, the individual, knew the difference between right and wrong: Grant, the soldier, participated in what he believed was an immoral war. The knowledge that soldiers will fight even when they believe the consequences are unjust is not new or
surprising. Soldiers are trained to follow orders, as Tennyson’s poem *Charge of the Light Brigade* reveals.

But what are equally troubling are the decisions of national leaders to wage wars and couch them in moralistic terms. Theologian William Sloan Coffin describes this phenomenon in this manner: “All nations make decisions based on self-interests and then defend them in the name of morality.”

The efforts to link US nationalism with civil religion provides civilians and soldiers alike with the moral justification necessary to engage in wars without question. Terms like “service” and “sacrifice” are widespread in the military vocabulary, and parallel to religious language: soldiers serve their nation just as clergy and members of religious organizations serve God; soldiers sacrifice for their nation just as clergy members of religious organizations sacrifice for God.

I viewed a new Navy recruitment video that demonstrates the relationship between military service and service to God in a striking manner. Accompanied by soaring music, moving video footage and a dramatic, bass voice, the commercial uses language and images of religion to enlist newcomers. Titled, “The Calling,” persons familiar with theological language in which ordained individuals speak of “God’s Call,” the words of the commercial are as follows:

The call to serve - it has no sound yet I have heard it in the whispered retelling of honorable sacrifices made by those who have served before me. The call to serve has no form yet I have clearly seen it in the eyes of men and women infinitely more courageous and more driven than most. The call to serve has no weight yet I have held it in my hands. I will commit to carry it close to my heart until my country is safe and the anguish of those less fortunate has been soothed. The call to serve is at once invisible and always present: and for those who choose to answer the call for their country, for their fellow man, for themselves: It is the most powerful force on earth: America’s Navy, a global force for good.
“The Call to Serve,” repeated four times in this 60 second commercial, echoes theological language, as seen in the Christian book *Called to Serve: A Guidebook for Altar Servers,* a recruitment video to the priesthood of the Roman Catholic Church, uncounted sermon titles from clergy of all denominations, and the old Christian hymn, “Called to Serve;”

```
Called to serve Him, heav'nly King of glory,
Chosen e'er to witness for his name,
Far and wide we tell the Father's story,
Far and wide his love proclaim.

Called to know the richness of his blessing--
Sons and daughters, children of a King--
Glad of heart, his holy name confessing,
Praises unto him we bring.

Onward, ever onward, as we glory in his name;...
God our strength will be; press forward ever,
Called to serve our King.
```

The convergence of religion with political and military leadership leading to war is as old as history itself, and told countless times in human history. It can be traced within the Judeo-Christian heritage as far back as 3,000 years ago to the Biblical David who, as king, was the *de facto* political, religious *and* military leader of Israel. That religion can be used for both peace with justice or violence and war purposes has been well established by history and summarized by R. Scott Appleby with these words: *The Ambivalence of the Sacred.* Ambivalence – the simultaneous presence of two opposing ideas, attitudes or emotions – is present in the Bible and other sacred writings and plain to even casual readers who are convinced cherry picking leaders can provide justification for their activities by finding the appropriate texts.
Since the time of its founding, the United States has seen itself as a religious nation (mentioned earlier in quotes by Alexis de Tocqueville and S. Martin Lipset); a Gallup survey in 2007 indicates that approximately 90 percent of American “believe in God or a universal spirit.” The religion Americans believe in is primarily Christian: a Pew Forum poll, also conducted in 2007, indicates that 78.4 percent of the American population is Christian.

Christianity presents a mixed message in relation to “redemptive violence.” Theologian Robert McAfee Brown wrote: "Nothing in Jesus' life or teaching can be twisted in support of killing or warfare," while Harvey Cox adds: "A church that is not able to take a firm stand against war is not a church which deserves to be believed." During the church’s first three centuries, Christians were pacifists and refused to serve within the Roman Army.

But these sentiments and theology changed dramatically during the so-called “Constantinian shift,” the political and theological alteration brought about by Constantine’s “conversion” to Christianity, presumably on the eve of the Battle for the Milivian Bridge in 312 CE. The shift is perhaps no more pronounced than in respect to military service: “The practice of early Christianity was so far reversed by the early fifth century that under Theodosius II those polluted by pagan rites were excluded from the army – only Christians could serve. Most surprising is the bearing of arms on occasion even by the clergy.”

Constantine conquered and gained control of the Roman Empire by means of conquest and the sword. His conversion to Christianity and the union of the church and
state brought about a profound shift in the way the church operated. No longer was the church’s primary concern of building God’s kingdom on earth through the tools of love, grace, mercy, and peace; instead, church and state leaders worked to build earthly kingdoms, using the tools of armies, warfare, violence, and aggression. This was a paradigm shift that transformed the cross of Jesus Christ from a symbol of selfless sacrifice and radical love into an offensive sword of power and force. The church moved from being a religion of the meek to being a religion of the mighty.

Henry Thompson writes: “It has even been suggested that Christianity has started or fomented more war than any group in history. Ferguson notes that while Christianity is one of the most pacifist of he religions in origin, it has a record of military activity second to none. It has an appalling record of bloodshed as the religion of the militant nationalism of Europe.” Kings, self-proclaimed divinely appointed to reign, were the epitome of civil religion as their interests were seen parallel to those of God. It is this Christianity that was initially exported to North America, and what has developed and matured through the years.

A dominant worldview is composed from the elements of religious heritage, history, collective memory, symbols and myths, legends and folktales. Within the US, data presented seem to suggest a dominant worldview that favors redemptive violence and thus supports great military spending. Michael Hayden, retired four-star general and former director of the CIA, expressed this worldview to me in this manner: “The US worldview is Hobbesian. It has achieved this worldview through colonialization,
immigration and its frontier mentality.” It is also expressed in the words of George W. Bush whose quote provides a summary of the ultimate form of this worldview:

We will export death and violence to the four corners of the earth in defense of this great nation.\textsuperscript{33}

**Recessive Worldview**

There is also evidence that a recessive worldview exists within the United States, a worldview that is, in essence, the anti-thesis of the dominant worldview in terms of redemptive violence. It is a worldview that argues peace is the means as well as the ends: *Peace is the Way.*\textsuperscript{34} This worldview does not believe in redemptive violence, but in the value of peaceful coexistence, cooperation, communication and conflict resolution. It does not believe that evil exists “out there” to be crushed, but, as Solzhenitsyn writes, within each and every person:

If only it were all so simple! If only there were evil people somewhere, insidiously committing evil deeds, and it were necessary only to separate them from the rest of us and destroy them. But the line dividing good and evil cuts through the heart of every human being. And who is willing to destroy a piece of his own heart?

During the life of any heart this line keeps changing place; sometimes it is squeezed one way by exuberant evil and sometimes it shifts to allow enough space for good to flourish. One and the same human being is, at various stages, under various circumstances, a totally different human being. At times he is close to being a devil, at times to sainthood. But his name doesn’t change, and to that name we ascribe the whole lot, good and evil.\textsuperscript{35}

This recessive worldview can also be traced to the nation’s earliest settlers and has been manifest through the writings and work of different individuals and groups through the centuries. David Fischer, in *Albion’s Seed: Four British Folkways in America,*\textsuperscript{36} describes four separate waves of immigration from Great Britain to the New World that
took place between 1629 and 1775, one of which (the third) is most responsible for this recessive worldview. In summary, Fischer’s four migration waves are:  

1. The exodus of Puritans from the east of England to Massachusetts from 1629 – 1640. This is the group summarized by John Winthrop’s “city on a hill” metaphor, a group that saw itself re-enacting the Conquest of the Promised Land by the children of Israel. After killing Native Americans, the Pilgrims would gather for worship and give thanks to God for their military victories – an example of the concept of redemptive violence.

2. The migration of a small Royalist elite and large numbers of indentured servants from the south of England to Virginia (ca. 1642 – 75). This is the migration wave that led to leaders like George Washington, George Mason, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison and James Monroe. Like the Pilgrim immigrants further North, this group also clashed violently with the Native Americans and contributed intellectually and with military manpower to the US Revolution.

3. The third migration was a movement from the North Midlands of England and Wales to the Delaware Valley (ca. 1675 – 1725). This is the Friend’s Migration, the Quakers and Mennonites, led by William Penn, who brought with them the theories of pacifism and cooperation. They were greatly influenced by the writing of George Fox and the concept that an Inner Light dwelled in all persons. It is this group that has expressed the recessive worldview gene against militarism and redemptive violence: its strand is still alive today.

4. The fourth group was English-speaking people from the borders of North Britain and Northern Ireland to the Appalachian backcountry from approximately 1718 – 1775. Fischer describes how these Northern British immigrants who came to live in the backcountry were heartily disliked by all three other groups who considered them savages and barbarians. “A Pennsylvania Quaker called them Goths and Vandals.”

This recessive worldview was expressed in the writings of David Henry Thoreau who, living during the Mexican – American War, wrote *Civil Disobedience* in which he described the obligations of moral men to disobey their governments when their governments acted immorally. Thoreau established the concept of being a citizen of not just one nation, but becoming a citizen of the whole world and thus not as partisan and parochial in his loyalties and approach.

Between the World Wars this recessive gene merged with a strong belief in isolationism that created great anti-war sentiment. Brigadier General Smedley Butler, at
the time the most decorated soldier in US history, captured this mood in his book, *War is a Racket:* the short book itself has become a classic antiwar text. Butler writes: “I spent 33 years in the Marines, most of my time begin a high-class muscle man for big business, for Wall Street and the bankers. In short, I was a racketeer for Capitalism.”

Strong representatives for this worldview included Jeannette Rankin, who voted against the US involvement in World War I and World War II, Dorothy Day, Thomas Merton and Daniel Berrigan. Theologian Walter Wink is critical of the concept of redemptive violence, labeling it “the myth of redemptive violence.”

This recessive gene can be traced within the same constructs, or building blocks, that create worldview – in the history, collective memories, religious heritage, symbols and myths, legends and folktales that present paint a tapestry of an alternative to the world of war and violence, conflict and competition. It is experienced in traditional peace denominations (i.e., the Quakers, Mennonites, and Brethren), and in the few peace memorials, monuments and plaques. It can be experienced through alternative educational curriculum, such as the Paul D. Coverdell World Wise Schools program Voices from the Field, a Peace Corp Connection and Curriculum. It can be seen in the high hopes the citizens of the US felt at the creation of the United Nations in 1946, bringing to reality the hopes of the late President Roosevelt who had said during his fourth inaugural address: “We have learned that we cannot live alone, at peace; that our own well-being is dependent upon the well-being of other nations, far away . . . . We have learned the simple truth, as Emerson said, that ‘the only way to have a friend is to be one.’”
Conclusion

This dissertation has sought evidence to answer the question, is there a dominant worldview at work within the United States culture, expressed by policy makers and elected officials that accepts a redemptive role of violence and therefore supports an imbalance between the components of 3 – D Security. Evidence was presented that suggests such a worldview exists. An unanticipated result of this research was evidence collected that also reflects a recessive gene, a worldview within the US that does not support redemptive violence but seeks a more peaceful, cooperative, conflict resolution path. The two worldviews compete with each other to determine public policy decisions for domestic and foreign policy.

These conclusions are made under the context of what defines a worldview, and its role in a society. Policy makers looking to change public policy decisions must be aware of the worldview in which they operate. Fundamental changes to policies that do not reflect the dominant worldview will most likely be met with significant opposition, including blocking strategies, sabotaging behavior, legislative stalling, protests, shifts in voter support and public campaigns staged by special interests. Proposed changes that undercut any person or group of persons’ worldview are perceived as threatening to those who hold that worldview: when that worldview is dominant, adjustments to policies nested within this worldview are likely to fail.

The next chapter, Policy Recommendations, will be made in the context of understanding worldview and the process of shifting perspectives, a course of action that is often generational.
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CHAPTER 7: POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

It is the premise of this dissertation that worldview and culture are the determinants of public policy – that is, policy will not change unless the worldview and culture in which it is set changes. Different cultures, with different worldviews, will therefore have diverse policies and dissimilar forms of government. What may work in Canada, for instance, because of differences in culture and worldview from the United States, may not work in the US because it will be rejected by the public.¹

Public policy is not made in a vacuum, but in the context of culture and worldview. When we look back through history, events seem preordained, as if the decisions made and actions taken were inevitable. But this is not true: human beings, communities and nations are in charge of their own destinies and are free to make choices based on the information available to them at the time decisions need to be made. This is true for any decision the US or I will make today or tomorrow, and it is true for decisions the leaders of the United States and I made yesterday, last year, or any decisions made in the years before that. Helena Norberg-Hodge reminds us that human beings have options, choices, freewill: “There is more than one path into the future.”²

The decision to define the tragic attacks of 9-11-01 as an act of war rather than a crime against humanity has had immense consequences and is a clear example of an
output of the dominant worldview. The United States government, led by the Bush Administration, could have declared the 9-11 attacks a brutal crime against humanity, an unwarranted, unprovoked assault against innocent victims. The attack and attackers could have been treated like the Oklahoma City bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building on April 19 1995, in which 168 persons were killed and another 680 injured: three this unwarranted, unprovoked assault against innocent victims was treated as a criminal activity. As such, the FBI, local and state police departments, federal officials and the US court system were used to solve the crime and punish the offenders.

In much the same way, the attackers of 9-11 could have been pursued via international police forces and courts. This would have brought into action such organizations as the United Nations, Interpol, the International Court of Justice and newly organized International Criminal Court. This course of action could have been pursued had the United States operated within a dominant worldview that supported international cooperation, peaceful conflict resolution, cooperation and collaboration.

Instead, the leaders of the United States declared that the nation was under attack and thereafter declared a “War on Terror,” an ambiguous, indefinite and confusing phrase that is difficult to frame and understand. This decision has ushered in an era of preemptive and preventative war as the United States and some allies have invaded and remain fighting in Afghanistan and Iraq. “The decision to define the challenges facing the United States as war rather than as criminal terrorism had fateful consequences. It elevated the status of the attackers from that of vicious criminals to warriors against the United States.” I would maintain that this decision was made within the context of the
worldview that supports aggressive, combative, retaliatory actions whose existence has been suggested by the preceding research.

Many have argued that the phrase “War on Terror” is inappropriate: war must by definition be waged against another nation – not against a terrorist network. George Lakoff argues: “Literal—not metaphorical—wars are conducted against armies of other nations. They end when the armies are defeated militarily and a peace treaty is signed. Terror is an emotional state. It is in us. It is not an army. And you can’t defeat it militarily and you can’t sign a peace treaty with it.”

Francis Fukuyama, a self-described neoconservative in the 1990’s, said: “The term 'war on terrorism' is a misnomer, resulting in distorted ideas of the main threat facing Americans today. Terrorism is only a means to an end; in this respect, a 'war on terror' makes no more sense than a war on submarines.”

But the “War on Terror” was declared and invasion plans for Afghanistan and Iraq executed. To date, 4,680 American soldiers, marines, sailors and airmen have been killed in the War in Iraq and another 920 killed in Afghanistan totaling 5,600 lives – almost two times the official death total of the 9-11 attacks of 2,819; furthermore, the number of soldiers killed in Iraq and Afghanistan is still rising. A Congressional Research Report from March 2009 indicates that the number of wounded US military personnel in these conflicts is 33,856 and also growing. The number of civilian and military deaths of Afghans and Iraqis will never be known. In addition to those killed or injured, the financial cost of the wars is staggering: Joseph Stiglitz and Linda Bilmes’s estimate that the War in Iraq’s long term cost will be $3 trillion was made in February 2008 and was based solely on the cost of the war in Iraq; the short and long-term costs in
Iraq have continued to grow since their book was completed and the short and long-term costs in Afghanistan have yet to be calculated.9

The decision to declare a “War on Terror” and respond with two invasions was predictable given the evidence for a dominant worldview within the United States that believes in redemptive violence, the moral authority of the US and the use of war to solve international situations. The US leaders responded to the attacks, as expected, with warfare – and these wars, at least initially, were supported by the general public, including a super majority of 87 percent of the Christian Right who supported President Bush’s decision to go to war in Iraq.10 The Christian Right’s belief in redemptive violence, literal reading of the Bible, association of the US with God and morality and the nations of Afghanistan and Iraq with evil is an output of the dominant worldview postulated within this dissertation.

Taking another path or choosing an alternative approach to war and violence might not have been possible given the prevailing public opinion that existed within the US during the months after the attacks. The nation, with extensive evidence supporting the existence of a dominant worldview that believes in redemptive violence, was also collectively working its way through the five stages of grief proposed first by Elizabeth Kübler-Ross – these being denial, anger, bargaining, depression, and acceptance.11 The stages, not always sequential and often re-visited over time, include anger – a dangerous ingredient in determining public policies. After the initial shock, many Americans became angry, and one expression of this anger was through acts of revenge against those responsible for the attacks.12
Peacebuilding is a process that must be waged with as much energy as the making of war. It is not easy, and the cycle of violence much easier to fall into. Nancy Good Sider writes: “Peacebuilders make peace everyday with the picture of dead bodies before their eyes and the sound of bombing in their ears. In order to transform conflict in these situations, the peacebuilder must first address the rage, anger, outrage and denial that results from this trauma.” Trauma healing for the citizens of the United States was never addressed on a national level, and the appropriate emotions of rage, anger, outrage and denial were not expressed through positive, constructive means of healing, but through the dominant worldview of redemptive violence. The reciprocal choice by the United States of war, pre-emptive and preventive attacks, “shock and awe” leads to a conflict trap wherein participants continue to fight and kill in response to the attacks perpetuated upon them, ala the Hatfield / McCoy feud (See figure 6:1). “The inner circle may be towards a natural, instinctive
revenge journey and the outer circle would describe how to reconcile trauma-based conflict.”

Meanwhile, a study released online by the American Journal of Public Health “estimates that 45,000 deaths per year are associated with the lack of health insurance. If a person is uninsured, ‘it means you’re at mortal risk,’ said one of the authors, Dr. David Himmelstein, an associate professor of medicine at Harvard Medical School.” If this total is correct, it means that approximately 15 times more people die each year in the US from a lack of health care than were killed in the attacks of 9-11. How the United States, or any nation, uses its resources – how it prioritizes its commitments, is telling for what it values and what it does not value. The money spent on the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq could have been used to provide health care for all Americans; the money spent on the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq could have been used to soften the great recession by offering more federal programs, stimulus packages, etc. These decisions are based on the dominant worldview – the operational framework under which individuals and nations make decisions.

Public policy that strays too far from the dominant worldview of a society is in peril of failure; the most obvious example of this took place in the 1920’s when the United States passed the 18th Amendment. This amendment was ratified on January 16, 1919, and took effect on January 16th, 1920. Officially named the Volstead Act, it is commonly known as Prohibition. The US government passed Prohibition, in part, because of pressure from the Temperance Movement, an organization whose leadership was generally composed of “abstinence-minded” church members.
But Prohibition did not work. The 1920’s saw the creation of underground operations to supply contraband liquor, from clandestine underground breweries and bootlegging to smuggling and “speakeasies.” The 18th Amendment was repealed on December 5, 1933 when the Twenty-first Amendment to the Constitution was passed.\textsuperscript{18} When a culture, guided by a dominant worldview, is in conflict with public policies – those policies are bound to fail. Prohibition, the banning of the sale, manufacture or transportation of alcohol for consumption within the US, was likely to fail because it was not supported by the dominant worldview of the day – i.e., that the consumption of alcohol should be allowed within the society.

In the same manner, a decision by leaders of the US to declare the attacks of 9-11 a crime against humanity and to therefore use international police organizations and courts to bring the perpetrators to justice instead of using the Department of Defense and full resources of the Pentagon was unlikely to garner much public support. The factors that contribute to the making of a dominant worldview, such as the presence of war memorials, monuments and plaques in towns and cities across the United States and the corresponding lack of peace memorials, monuments and plaques within the same locations, the number of towns and cities that celebrate Memorial Day, July 4\textsuperscript{th} and Veteran’s Day in contrast to the number that celebrate Martin Luther King’s birthday, the so-called “cult of the flag” and presence of flags within United Methodist Church sanctuaries, the use of God’s name in the preambles of state constitutions and the concentration in US History books on generals and national leaders during times of war are the factors that contributed to the decision to go to war after the attacks of 9-11. That
the administration would use diplomacy, conflict resolution and negotiation as the means to proceed was unlikely to be supported by the public given the culture in which these options could have been made.

As mentioned in the introduction, Adrian Lewis argues, “the United States became a ‘superpower’ through war, and has retained that status because of war.” Most Americans would be surprised to learn the total number of wars and military conflicts the US has engaged in since its Constitution was adopted toward the end of the 18th Century. Richard Grimmett, a specialist in National Defense, Foreign Affairs, Defense and Trade Division, published a report for the Congressional Research Service in 1999 titled “Instances of Use of United States Armed Forces Abroad, 1789 – 1999.” The report lists 277 occasions where the US has used its armed forces abroad in situations of military conflict or potential conflict. Although Grimmett is careful to remind readers that these conflicts vary in size, scope and duration, it is of interest to note that of the 277 events listed, only eleven times did the US declare war, less than 4 percent of the time.

An alternative approach to war, conflict and competition would be cooperation, collaboration and coordination. Heraclites, the pre-Socratic Greek philosopher, who said, “War is the father and king of all things,” was countered twenty-five hundred years later by the economist Ludwig von Mises, who wrote:

It starts from the premise that not war, but peace, is the father of all things. What alone enables mankind to advance and distinguished man from the animals is social cooperation. It is labor alone that is productive: it creates wealth and therewith lays the outward foundations for the inward flowering of man. War only destroys: it cannot create. War, carnage, destruction, and devastation we have in common with the predatory beasts of the jungle; constructive labor is our distinctively human characteristic. [Italics added]
Human history can be described as an epic quest for survival – individuals and communities searching for the resources to ward off death from hunger, disease, exposure or injury. Military students and scholars love to quote Carl von Clausewitz, the Prussian soldier, scholar and author of *On War.* One of the most frequently quoted phrase of Clausewitz is this: the “first and the most decisive act of judgment which a statesman and commander performs is that of correctly recognizing in this respect the kind of war he is undertaking . . .” From an existential perspective, humanity is fighting a collective battle against pestilence, war, famine, and death, the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse. Current pestilence includes (HIV/AIDS, malaria, Chagas, Yellow Fever, Dengue Fever, Cholera, Typhoid Fever, Schistosomiasis and Rabies), famine, environmental degradation / global warming and the inequality of access to resources.

Seen from this perspective, differences in human communities – such as nationalism, religion, forms of government, economic structure or race are insignificant. Freud referred to this as “The narcissism of minor differences.” The economic cost of war contributes to an endless cycle: in the competition for scarce resources, money spent for the equipment, training and personnel to wage war is money not being spent cooperatively to provide basic human needs – food, potable water, shelter, health care and education.

To deal with these issues, a new approach is necessary. Albert Einstein wrote: “The world we have made, as a result of the level of thinking we have done thus far, creates problems we cannot solve at the same level at which we created them.” It is the recommendation here that a new worldview must be fostered within the United States in
order to address the challenges of the present and future: a continuation of the current worldview can lead toward Einstein’s apocalyptic prediction: “I do not know how the Third World War will be fought, but I can tell you what they will use in the Fourth – rocks!”

The alternative worldview would include a greater appreciation for and respect for multilateralism and multi-national organizations such as the United Nations. President Franklin D. Roosevelt coined the name “United Nations” during the Second World War in 1942. It officially came into existence, replacing the League of Nations, on October 24 1945 with 51 original member states. Today, the United Nations operating budget stands at $4.2 billion, of which the United States contributes $924 million. The UN’s main headquarters is located in New York City, and it has important offices in Geneva, Vienna and Nairobi. Currently, there are 192 member states and it is involved in 16 active peacekeeping operations.

The United Nations has many responsibilities, including facilitating cooperation for international law, international security, human rights, economic development and world peace. Among the ongoing tasks are these:

- The United Nations Development Programme: charged with poverty reduction, crisis prevention and recovery, environment and energy priorities and HIV / AIDS programs.
- The United Nations Peacekeeping Mission, established in 1948, deploys armed troops from member nations to areas of inter-State, intra-State conflicts and civil war.
- The United Nations International Court of Justice (ICJ), located in The Hague, Netherlands; it was created in 1945.
- The International Criminal Court (ICC), organized in 2002. It is charged with trying those who have committed the most serious crimes under international law, including war crimes and genocide.
The United Nations High Commission for Refugees was established on December 14, 1950 with a three-year mandate. That mandate was changed the next year, and today the it “now deals with 34.4 million people of concern to UNHCR: 14.4 million internally displaced people, 10.5 million refugees, 2 million returnees, 6.6 million stateless people and more than 800,000 asylum seekers. An organization with a three-year mandate to solve the problem of refugees will soon be celebrating its 60th anniversary, aware that the humanitarian needs are unlikely to disappear.”

In addition, The World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) are independent organizations under the UN framework: the UN publishes the Human Development Index annually; developed the Millennium Development Goals that was signed in September 2000; established the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty with its three pillars (non-proliferation, disarmament and the right to peacefully use nuclear technology); the international convention against the use of landmines; the Kyoto Climate Protocol; and helped establish organizations such as The World Health Organization (WHO) and UNAIDS.

Visitors to the UN Headquarters in New York observe a variety of peace memorials, monuments and plaques located throughout the buildings. In front of the visitor’s entrance are two large symbols for peace: the first, an artist’s conception of a revolver with the barrel tied in a
knot; the second, a gift from the Vatican of a large, broken globe. The broken globe suggests that the world will only be repaired and made whole again when world peace has been achieved. Another significant work of art located outside the UN is the large statue, donated by the Soviet Union in 1959, of a man beating a sword into a plowshare.

This artwork is based on the Biblical text found in Isaiah and Micah:

He shall judge between the nations,  
and shall arbitrate for many peoples;  
they shall beat their swords into plowshares,  
and their spears into pruning hooks;  
nation shall not lift up sword against nation,  
neither shall they learn war any more. (Isa 2:4; Mic 4:3)

Artistic peace symbols are found throughout the UN building and range from abstract to practical. An interesting symbol of peace inside the headquarters is an Escopetarra, a guitar created out of a rifle and created by Colombian peace activist César López in 2003. The tour guide who led my group through the UN in the fall of 2009 said that it was López’s idea that if you want to shoot something, shoot music. It reminds me of a peace phrase from a Reform Jewish prayer book:

Don’t stop after beating the swords into plowshares, don’t stop!  
Go on beating and make musical instruments out of them.  
Whoever wants to make war again will have to turn them into plowshares first.
There is a large mosaic reproduction of a Normal Rockwell painting that is a gift from the United States. Presented by Nancy Reagan in 1985, it includes the phrase “Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.” (Luke 6:21) Other gifts located throughout the building include a large Buddhist Memorial given in recognition of the International Ufsak Day, a large model boat from Thailand, and an ivory carving from China of a peaceful village scene that took 98 artists two years to complete. Nearly every wall and open space is covered with artwork or quotes, such as this one from former Secretary General of the UN Dag Hammarskold: “The UN was not created to take humanity to heave but to save it from hell."35

Despite its best intentions, most Americans see the UN as relatively ineffective. A Gallup Poll conducted from February 9 – 12, 2009 (N = 1,022 adults nationwide with a MoE of ± 3) asked this question: "Do you think the United Nations is doing a good job or a poor job in trying to solve the problems it has had to face?" 26 percent answered “Good Job,” and 65 percent answered “Poor Job,” with 9 percent “Unsure.”36 Factors that contribute to the perceived ineffectiveness include the veto power of the Security Council, and the limited budget, exemplified in statistics such as this one: “The total UN Peacekeeping budget is less than 0.5 % of all total worldwide military expenditures.”37

The process of shifting the dominant worldview within the US towards the current recessive worldview gene (with an emphasis on peaceful cooperation, communication and collaboration) will not be easy or fast. It is clear that a multi-faceted policy approach is necessary to address the huge challenges associated with achieving the goal of shifting the dominant worldview within the US from supporting redemptive violence and an
imbalance between the components of 3 – D Security to the recessive gene that supports cooperation, multilateralism, and non-violent means of solving international issues. John Paul Lederach writes: “Change will require a rebalancing of power in the relationship by which all those involved recognize one another in new ways. Such recognition will increase the voice and participation of the less powerful in addressing their basic needs and will legitimate their concerns.”

Today, “much of the public interest in and media coverage of peacemaking centers on the personality of the peacemaker, rather than on what is needed to sustain a constructive process . . . in contrast to this focus on personality, a number of researchers and practitioners have argued that peacebuilding, and more specifically intermediary work, should be understood as a process made up of roles and functions rather than as an activity that resides in the person of the mediator of intermediary team.”

The process of peacebuilding will need to take place within a culture and with a worldview that perceives of peace and peacebuilding as important, vital ingredients in solving humanity’s needs in the 21st Century. The old phrase, “When the only tool you have is a hammer, every problem looks like a nail” is appropriate for a nation that places a great majority of its security resources in the military and largely disregards the potential dividends that could be reaped by a more balanced approach using diplomacy and development. But this shift will only take place when the worldview supports it.

Change in the dominant worldview within the US will begin with the generation of new ideas and the dissemination of these ideas. It is my conviction that policy makers will not consider legislation and systemic changes until the culture and worldview
themselves change. Therefore, to form lobbies, to create advocacy campaigns, to collect
signatures on petitions or to pressure legislators with proposed funding requests or desires
for new laws promoting peaceful, cooperative approaches to conflict will be
unsuccessful. The generation and dissemination of new ideas is therefore, the first step.

Fifty years ago economist Milton Friedman proposed many changes and new
ideas in his book Capital and Freedom. Although the culture and worldview were not
yet ready to accept the radical positions he put forward, his ideas took root and essentially
provided the groundwork for the Reagan Revolution twenty years later that focused on
de-regulation, lower taxes, smaller government and fewer social services. Friedman
wrote:

There is enormous inertia – a tyranny of the status quo – in private and especially
governmental arrangements. Only a crisis – actual or perceived – produces real
change. When that crisis occurs, the actions that are taken depend on the ideas
that are lying around. That, I believe, is our basic function: to keep them alive
and available until the politically impossible becomes politically inevitable.

Martha Derthick and Paul Quirk, in The Politics of Deregulation, conclude their book
with a chapter titled “The Politics of Ideas.” There they describe a three-fold process of
development to produce policy change – each based for different organizations or
different problems. They write:

In the first stage, analysts evaluate existing policies and, in broad outlines,
propose alternatives. Judgment is based on general conceptions of the public
interest, such as an economic definition or social welfare . . . In the second
stage, analysis must be introduced into the political process in the form of
advice to policymakers who are capable of initiating action – especially, but not
only, the president . . . Finally, a third stage of analysis is concerned with
adjusting proposals, devising selling points, and answering objections to enlist
the support of a larger group of decisionmakers – most often the members of
Congress.
It is my contention that the proposed changes made here are still, using the framework designed by Derthick and Quirk, at the first stage of the process, that is, proposing alternatives. The existence of a dominant worldview within the US that supports redemptive violence and an imbalance between the components of 3 – D Security has led to the failed policies of the War on Terror. Evidence exists that today violence creates more violence, the choosing of war leads to more wars, the killing of innocents generates anger and resentment and the need for revenge.\(^{44}\) Robert Kennedy, in a speech the day after Martin Luther King Jr. was assassinated, said:

> We seemingly tolerate a rising level of violence that ignores our common humanity and our claims to civilization alike. We calmly accept newspaper reports of civilian slaughter in far-off lands. We glorify killing on movie and television screens and call it entertainment. We make it easy for men of all shades of sanity to acquire whatever weapons and ammunition they desire. Too often we honor swagger and bluster and the wielders of force: too often we excuse those who are willing to build their own lives on the shattered dreams of others . . . Some look for scapegoats, others look for conspiracies, but this is clear: violence breeds violence, repression brings retaliation, and only a cleansing of our whole society can remove this sickness from our soul.\(^{45}\)

The Middle East today is a seething cauldron of rage and fury. Our policies in Iraq have unleashed unintended consequences including the death of thousands of Americans and tens of thousands of Iraqis, an unstable government with ties to Iran and a questionable future. Afghanistan is in chaotic anarchy. Lebanon has been destroyed. Iran is working towards the production of nuclear weapons. Saudi Arabia has a monarchial government that oppresses its people and is ripe for revolutionary change. Osama Bin Laden has not yet been captured.
We will not win the War on Terror with weapons. We will need a new strategy, a new way of winning the hearts and minds of the world’s people. We must find ways for the peaceful leaders and members of the world’s nations to join together in opposition to those who offer terrorists attacks and the waging of war to solve complex international issues.

Hence, to effect change in the current worldview, the following policy recommendations are made:

1. Build, create and support more peace memorials, monuments and plaques within towns and cities across the United States. Themes that can be used include hands and handshakes, lion laying down with the lamb (Isaiah 11: 6 – 9), swords into plowshares, world globes, fountains, bells, gardens, statues, trees or groves of trees, walls and murals, etc. A few notable examples of peace monuments can be found within the Commonwealth of Virginia:

   a. In Richmond there is a street named Monument Boulevard. Monument Boulevard is the only street in the United States to be designated on the National Register of Historic Places. Remembering that the capital of the Confederacy was Richmond, Monument Boulevard pays honor to Confederate leaders. The first monument to be built there was a statue of Robert E. Lee, dedicated in 1910. Following the statue to Lee monuments were erected to J. E. B. Stuart, Stonewall Jackson and Jefferson Davis – all significant Confederate leaders. Another monument was built to honor Matthew Fontaine Maury - not necessarily a Confederate monument because, although Maury served in the Confederacy, his greatest legacy was his work in the sciences that earned him the title “Pathfinder of the Seas.” But what is remarkable is the newest monument, a statue of Arthur Ashe that was dedicated on July 10, 1996. What is remarkable about this is that Arthur Ashe was an African-
American tennis player who died of complications from AIDS. The inclusion of the Ashe monument has been described in this manner: “placing this statue of Arthur Ashe on Richmond’s Historic Monument Avenue was one of the most important things to happen in Virginia in the entire 20th century."46 The placement of the Ashe statue in relation to the Confederate statues is a sign of healing and reconciliation for the City of Richmond between the races.

b. In the small town of Hopewell, Virginia, a bust was erected of Martin Luther King on April 4, 2004 2002 to honor his speaking event in that town in 1962 when King spoke the phrase: “Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.

2. Increase the number of towns and cities that celebrate Martin Luther King’s birthday each year, and emphasize during those events King’s non-violent conflict resolution means towards reaching his goal of civil rights.

3. Select a date and create a Federal Peace Holiday. The most likely date would be September 21 that has already been established as The International Day of Peace. “The United Nations' International Day of Peace - marked every year on September 21 - is a global holiday when individuals, communities, nations and governments highlight efforts to end conflict and promote peace. Established by U.N. resolution in 1982, "Peace Day" has grown to include millions of people around the world who participate in all kinds of events, large and small."47 The celebration of a day of peace would help elevate the importance and credibility of those who work for peace and justice in the world and foster a worldview where the topic of peace is valued and supported by the United States.

4. Introduce alternative curriculum that focuses on peace. Coleman McCarthy has edited two books for classroom curriculum on peace: *Strength Through Peace*48 and *Solutions to Violence*.49 If students in the United States are not taught about the history of peacemaking and its important practitioners, peace will not be seen as a viable path for the future. The imprinting of worldview begins early in the life cycle – placing a positive stamp early in life is an important component of creating
an alternative worldview that fosters cooperation and peaceful co-existence for the 21st Century.

5. Include in the standards and frameworks for US textbooks more names and information regarding peacemakers and peacebuilders. The standards and frameworks currently existing across the five states selected for this analysis focus on wars and conflicts: eras like the 1920’s and 1930’s are described often as “the inter-war period.” Standards can be established that emphasize the importance of those who have worked for peace within the US and around the world that can help foster an appreciation for these effort.

6. Reduce the war making, redemptive violence influence of civil religion within the US. This may be the most difficult to address because you cannot tell people what to believe: however, there are untapped opportunities for interfaith dialogue between Jews, Christians and Muslims. The fostering of these relationships in towns and cities across the United States can be used to promote the building of relationships that lead to peaceful coexistence.

7. Increase the budget, scope and influence of the Peace Corps. In addition to providing Peace Corps workers to the 20 new nations asking for help, recruit seasoned professionals to work with young college graduates. Establish competitive salaries that will attract persons with experience and skills in economic development. The Peace Corps, established by John Kennedy, exports the highest values Americans cherish: generosity, kindness and a willingness to help. But the scope and vision are too narrow for the global needs. The Peace Corps can be so much more than an opportunity for college graduates to spend two years living in undeveloped communities. A combination of youthful exuberance and enthusiasm with experienced American know-how, funded properly, could make a real impact on the reduction of extreme poverty and promote sustainable peace with justice.

8. Expand the support for the United Nations. The UN is in need of reform, true. But the UN is also doing extraordinary work with the limited resources it receives. The US contribution to the UN is $924 million; this amount is less than 0.001 percent of
the military expenses of the US at $1 trillion. Two thousand years ago an itinerant Israeli rabbi said: “Where your treasure is, there your heart will also be.” The United States can lead the way for global peace by supporting the efforts of the UN even when it does not seem to promote US interests. Enlightened self-interests could be described as seeing what is best for the whole world that in turn will benefit all nations, including the US.

9. Reduce the transfer of weapons and military equipment from the US to foreign nations. The United States is, and has been since the end of World War II, the leading manufacturer and exporter of military equipment and weapons around the world. Throughout the Cold War a “Donor – Recipient Relationship Model” was developed wherein the US gave or sold weapons to 160 different nations. Today, despite the collapse of the Soviet Union and end of the Cold War, military exports continue to expand: “The international trade in weapons is big business. In fact, it is currently worth in excess of $25 billion per year. The United Stats is the world’s biggest arms exported (its exports totaled $13.6 billion in 2003) followed by the UK ($4.7 billion), Russia (3.4 billion), the Ukraine (1.5 billion), France and Germany (both $1.2 billion). Glen and Barbara Stassen write, “In almost every country where U.S. forces fought in the last two decades, they were attacked by weapons that the United States had supplied.”

10. Expand the understanding of what it means to “serve one’s country.” This could lead to the development of a POTC (Peace Officer’s Training Corps) wherein college students are provided with college tuition funds in exchange for a two-year commitment to work for peace domestically or internationally. Citizens who disagree with the decisions of national leaders to go to war are as patriotic as those who support those decisions – they just have a different orientation in regard to what is best for the nation. A nation that supports dissent and open dialogue regarding budgets for the military and for peace operations will benefit from this exchange of ideas. Maintaining military spending as a sacred cow will tempt the nation into future wars as its military prowess continues to expand.
In 1886 Friedrich Nietzsche warned: “He who fights with monsters might take care lest he thereby become a monster.” The dominant worldview articulated from the research conducted herein is both immoral and unsustainable as humanity moves into the 21st Century facing global issues such as climate change, extreme poverty and the proliferation of weapons. The daily death toll of 26,000 children from the effects of extreme poverty itself should create an incentive for addressing this issue that contributes to global instability and creates incubators for terrorists. Edmund Hillary wrote: “Slowly and painfully, we are seeing worldwide acceptance of the fact that the wealthier and more technologically advanced countries have a responsibility to help the underdeveloped ones. Not only through a sense of charity, but also because only in this way can we ever hope to see any permanent peace and security for ourselves.”

The fostering of the recessive worldview within the United States, the worldview that rejects redemptive violence and seeks cooperation, conflict resolution and peaceful means of solving international issues is the path that offers humanity the best hope for confronting the issues threatening humanity. This worldview, like all worldviews, is constructed on the building blocks of history, collective memory, religious heritage, symbols and myths / legends / folktales. It is my recommendation that a fundamental shift in what these building blocks are comprised of is essential so that generational shifts are possible within the US worldview.

Radical change in worldview is possible. 50 years ago Jim Crowe laws still defined race relations in the South, and civil rights remained an elusive dream 100 years
after the Emancipation Proclamation. The Anita Hill testimony changed instantly the perception of Americans towards sexual harassment. The killing of Matthew Shepard radically altered how hate crimes were understood. Change is not only possible, it is inevitable. How change is shaped is within our hands.

There is a classic American Indian story about a grandfather who tells his grandson about the battle between two wolves inside us all - one full of angry, fearful energy and one full of compassionate, benevolent energy. When the boy asks, "Which wolf wins?" the grandfather replies, "The one you choose to feed."

This is what meaning making is all about. We keep feeding the wrong wolf.

---
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APPENDIX A:
INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

Can you tell me, in 5 – 10 minutes, how you got into your profession / line of work?

What is your favorite movie? Movies?

Have you seen “300”?

Favorite author, authors? Favorite book?

Favorite musician?

What kind of music do you listen to?

What is it that you like most about the United States?

What is it that you like the least about the US?

- Have you heard of 3 – D Security?

- How effective do you believe diplomacy is?

- How effective do you believe development is?

- Do you believe that violence can be used to achieve peace and security?

- Do you believe that the US used torture against detainees since the start of the War on Terror?
  
  o If yes, do you believe that torture was justified?

On a scale of 1 – 10, 10 being the highest, how patriotic would you describe yourself?
APPENDIX B:
PREAMBLES – STATE CONSTITUTIONS

Alabama (1901)
We the people of the State of Alabama, invoking the favor and guidance of Almighty God, do ordain and establish the following Constitution.

Alaska (1956)
We the people of Alaska, grateful to God and to those who founded our nation and pioneered this great land, in order to secure and transmit to succeeding generations our heritage of political, civil, and religious liberty within the Union of States, do ordain and establish this constitution for the State of Alaska.

Arizona (1911)
We the people of the State of Arizona, grateful to Almighty God for our liberties, do ordain this Constitution.

Arkansas (1874)
We, the People of the State of Arkansas, grateful to Almighty God for the privilege of choosing our own form of government; for our civil and religious liberty; and desiring to perpetuate its blessings, and secure the same to our selves and posterity; do ordain and establish this Constitution.

California (1879)
We, the People of the State of California, grateful to Almighty God for our freedom, in order to secure and perpetuate its blessings, do establish this Constitution.

Colorado (1876)
We, the people of Colorado, with profound reverence for the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, in order to form a more independent and perfect government; establish justice; insure tranquility; provide for the common defense; promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this constitution for the "State of Colorado".
Connecticut (1818)

The People of Connecticut acknowledging with gratitude, the good providence of God, in having permitted them to enjoy a free government; do, in order more effectually to define, secure, and perpetuate the liberties, rights and privileges which they have derived from their ancestors; hereby, after a careful consideration and revision, ordain and establish the following constitution and form of civil government.

Delaware (1792)

Through Divine goodness, all men have by nature the rights of worshiping and serving their Creator according to the dictates of their consciences, of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring and protecting reputation and property, and in general of obtaining objects suitable to their condition, without injury by one to another; and as these rights are essential to their welfare, for due exercise thereof, power is inherent in them; and therefore all just authority in the institutions of political society is derived from the people, and established with their consent, to advance their happiness; and they may for this end, as circumstances require, from time to time, alter their Constitution of government.

Florida (Revised in 1968 and amended in 1975)

We, the people of the State of Florida, being grateful to Almighty God for our constitutional liberty, in order to secure its benefits, perfect our government, insure domestic tranquility, maintain public order, and guarantee equal civil and political rights to all, do ordain and establish this constitution.

Georgia (amended in 1998 general election)

To perpetuate the principles of free government, insure justice to all, preserve peace, promote the interest and happiness of the citizen and of the family, and transmit to posterity the enjoyment of liberty, we the people of Georgia, relying upon the protection and guidance of Almighty God, do ordain and establish this Constitution.

Hawaii (1959)

We, the people of Hawaii, grateful for Divine Guidance, and mindful of our Hawaiian heritage and uniqueness as an island State, dedicate our efforts to fulfill the philosophy decreed by the Hawaii State motto, “Ua mau ke ea o ka aina I la pono.”
We reserve the right to control our destiny, to nurture the integrity of our people and culture, and to preserve the quality of life that we desire.
We reaffirm our belief in a government of the people, by the people and for the people, and with an understanding and compassionate heart toward all the peoples of the earth, do hereby ordain and establish this constitution for the state of Hawaii.

**Idaho (1889 and amended in 1975)**

We, the people of the State of Idaho, grateful to Almighty God for our freedom, to secure its blessings and promote our common welfare do establish this Constitution.

**Illinois (1870)**

We, the People of the State of Illinois - grateful to Almighty God for the civil, political and religious liberty which He has permitted us to enjoy and seeking His blessing upon our endeavors - in order to provide for the health, safety and welfare of the people; maintain a representative and orderly government; eliminate poverty and inequality; assure legal, social and economic justice; provide opportunity for the fullest development of the individual; insure domestic tranquility; provide for the common defense; and secure the blessings of freedom and liberty to ourselves and our posterity - do ordain and establish this Constitution for the State of Illinois.

**Indiana (1851)**

TO THE END, that justice be established, public order maintained, and liberty perpetuated; WE, the people of the State of Indiana, grateful to ALMIGHTY GOD for the free exercise of the right to choose our own form of government, do ordain this Constitution.

**Iowa (1857) No preamble**

**Kansas (1859)**

We, the people of Kansas, grateful to Almighty God for our civil and religious privileges, in order to insure the full enjoyment of our rights as American citizens, do ordain and establish this constitution of the state of Kansas, with the following boundaries, to wit: Beginning at a point on the western boundary of the state of Missouri, where the thirty-seventh parallel of north latitude crosses the same; thence running west on said parallel to the twenty-fifth meridian of longitude west from Washington; thence north on said meridian to the fortieth parallel of north latitude; thence east on said parallel to the western boundary of the state of Missouri; thence south with the western boundary of said state to the place of beginning.

**Kentucky (1891)**
We, the people of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, grateful to Almighty God for the civil, political and religious liberties we enjoy, and invoking the continuance of these blessings, do ordain and establish this Constitution.

**Louisiana** (1921)

We, the people of Louisiana, grateful to Almighty God for the civil, political, economic, and religious liberties we enjoy, and desiring to protect individual rights to life, liberty, and property; afford opportunity for the fullest development of the individual; assure equality of rights; promote the health, safety, education, and welfare of the people; maintain a representative and orderly government; ensure domestic tranquility; provide for the common defense; and secure the blessings of freedom and justice to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this constitution.

**Maine** (1820)

We the people of Maine, in order to establish justice, insure tranquility, provide for our mutual defense, promote our common welfare, and secure to ourselves and our posterity the blessings of liberty, acknowledging with grateful hearts the goodness of the Sovereign Ruler of the Universe in affording us an opportunity, so favorable to the design; and, imploring God's aid and direction in its accomplishment, do agree to form ourselves into a free and independent State, by the style and title of the State of Maine and do ordain and establish the following Constitution for the government of the same.

**Maryland** (1776)

We, the People of the State of Maryland, grateful to Almighty God for our civil and religious liberty, and taking into our serious consideration the best means of establishing a good Constitution in this State for the sure foundation and more permanent security thereof, declare:

**Massachusetts** (1780)

The end of the institution, maintenance, and administration of government, is to secure the existence of the body politic, to protect it, and to furnish the individuals who compose it with the power of enjoying in safety and tranquility their natural rights, and the blessings of life: and whenever these great objects are not obtained, the people have a right to alter the government, and to take measures necessary for their safety, prosperity and happiness.

The body politic is formed by a voluntary association of individuals: it is a social compact, by which the whole people covenants with each citizen, and each citizen with the whole people, that all shall be governed by certain laws for the common good. It is the duty of the people, therefore, in framing a constitution of government, to provide for an equitable mode of making laws, as well as for an impartial interpretation, and a faithful execution of them; that every man may, at all times, find his security in them.
We, therefore, the people of Massachusetts, acknowledging, with grateful hearts, the goodness of the great Legislator of the universe, in affording us, in the course of His providence, an opportunity, deliberately and peaceably, without fraud, violence or surprise, of entering into an original, explicit, and solemn compact with each other; and of forming a new constitution of civil government, for ourselves and posterity; and devoutly imploring His direction in so interesting a design, do agree upon, ordain and establish the following Declaration of Rights, and Frame of Government, as the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

**Michigan** (As amended to 1972)

We, the people of the state of Michigan, grateful to Almighty God for the blessings and freedom, and earnestly desiring to secure these blessings undiminished to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution.

**Minnesota** (Adopted Oct. 13, 1857, amendments thru1998)

We, the people of the state of Minnesota, grateful to God for our civil and religious liberty, and desiring to perpetuate its blessings and secure the same to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution.

**Mississippi** (Adopted Nov. 1, A. D., 1890)

We, the people of Mississippi in convention assembled, grateful to Almighty God, and involving his blessing on our work, do ordain and establish this Constitution.

**Missouri** (as revised to 1974)

We the people of Missouri, with profound reverence for the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, and grateful for His goodness, do establish this Constitution for the better government of the State.

**Montana** (as ratified to 1973)

We the people of Montana grateful to God for the quiet beauty of our state, the grandeur of our mountains, the vastness of our rolling plains, and desiring to improve the quality of life, equality of opportunity and to secure the blessings of liberty for this and future generations do ordain and establish this constitution.

**Nebraska** (Of 1875)
We, the people, grateful to Almighty God for our freedom, do ordain and establish the following declaration of rights and frame of government, as the Constitution of the State of Nebraska.

**Nevada** (as amended to 1974)

We the people of the State of Nevada Grateful to Almighty God for our freedom in order to secure its blessings, insure domestic tranquility, and form a more perfect Government, do establish this CONSTITUTION.

**New Hampshire** (1792) No preamble

**New Jersey** (as amended to Jan. 1, 1975)

We, the people of the State of New Jersey, grateful to Almighty God for the civil and religious liberty which He hath so long permitted us to enjoy, and looking to Him for a blessing upon our endeavors to secure and transmit the same unimpaired to succeeding generations, do ordain and establish this Constitution.

**New Mexico** (as amended through 1974)

We, the people of New Mexico, grateful to Almighty God for the blessings of liberty, in order to secure the advantages of a state government, do ordain and establish this Constitution.

**New York** (as amended and in force Jan. 1, 1985)

WE, THE PEOPLE of the State of New York, grateful to Almighty God for our freedom, in order to secure its blessings, DO ESTABLISH THIS CONSTITUTION.

**North Carolina** (1869)

We, the people of the State of North Carolina, grateful to Almighty God, the Sovereign Ruler of Nations, for the preservation of the American Union and the existence of our civil, political and religious liberties, and acknowledging our dependence upon Him for the continuance of these blessings to us and our posterity, do, for the more certain security thereof and for the better government of the State, ordain and establish this Constitution.

**North Dakota** (as amended to 1973)

We, the people of North Dakota, grateful to Almighty God for the blessings of civil and religious liberty, do ordain and establish this constitution.
Ohio (as amended to 1974)

We, the people of the State of Ohio, grateful to Almighty God for our freedom, to establish its blessings and promote our common welfare, do establish this Constitution.

Oklahoma (1907)

Invoking the guidance of Almighty God, in order to execute and perpetuate the blessings of liberty, to secure just and rightful government, to promote our mutual welfare and happiness, we, the people of the State of Oklahoma, do ordain and establish this Constitution.

Oregon (1857) No preamble

Pennsylvania (1776)

We the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, grateful to Almighty God for the blessings of civil and religious liberty, and humbly invoking His guidance, do ordain and establish this Constitution.

Rhode Island (1842)

We, the people of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, grateful to Almighty God for the civil and religious liberty which He hath so long permitted us to enjoy, and looking to Him for a blessing upon our endeavors to secure and to transmit the same, unimpaired, to succeeding generations, do ordain and establish this Constitution of government.

South Carolina (1778)

We, the people of the State of South Carolina, in Convention assembled, grateful to God for our liberties, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the preservation and perpetuation of the same.

South Dakota (as amended to 1975)

We, the people of South Dakota, grateful to Almighty God for our civil and religious liberties, in order to form a more perfect and independent government, establish justice, insure tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and preserve to ourselves and to our posterity the blessings of liberty, do ordain and establish this constitution for the State of South Dakota.

Tennessee (1796) No Preamble
Texas (as amended to Aug. 1969)

Humbly invoking the blessings of Almighty God, the people of the State of Texas do ordain and establish this Constitution.

Utah (as amended to 1973)

Grateful to Almighty God for life and liberty, we, the people of Utah, in order to secure and perpetuate the principles of free government, do ordain and establish this CONSTITUTION.

Vermont (1777)

Whereas, all government ought to be instituted and supported, for the security and protection of the community, as such, and to enable the individuals who compose it, to enjoy their natural rights, and the other blessings which the Author of existence has bestowed upon man; and whenever those great ends of government are not obtained, the people have a right, by common consent, to change it, and take such measures as to them may appear necessary to promote their safety and happiness.

Virginia (1776) No preamble.

Washington (1889)

We, the people of the State of Washington, grateful to the Supreme Ruler of the Universe for our liberties, do ordain this Constitution.

West Virginia (1872)

Since through Divine Providence we enjoy the blessings of civil, political and religious liberty, we, the people of West Virginia, in and through the provisions of this Constitution, reaffirm our faith in and constant reliance upon God and seek diligently to promote, preserve and perpetuate good government in the state of West Virginia for the common welfare, freedom and security of ourselves and our posterity.

Wisconsin (1848)

We, the people of Wisconsin, grateful to Almighty God for our freedom, in order to secure its blessings, form a more perfect government, insure domestic tranquility and promote the general welfare, do establish this Constitution.

Wyoming (1890)
We, the people of the State of Wyoming, grateful to God for our civil, political and religious liberties, and desiring to secure them to our selves and perpetuate them to our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution.
# APPENDIX C:
US HISTORY APPROVED TEXTBOOKS FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

*Virginia Board of Education Approved Textbooks*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade/Topic</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Copyright</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kindergarten</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>Harcourt School Publishers</td>
<td>Kindergarten - All About Me (includes 20 copies of the Virginia SOL Practice for Student Supplement)</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>Scott Foresman (Pearson Education, Inc.)</td>
<td>Kindergarten System (includes class set of SOL supplement booklets)</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>Scott Foresman (Pearson Education, Inc.)</td>
<td>Kindergarten - Big Book Package (includes class set of SOL supplement booklets)</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Grade</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>Harcourt School Publishers</td>
<td>Grade One Virginia Pupil Edition Package, About My World (includes the Virginia SOL Practice for Student Supplement)</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>Harcourt School Publishers</td>
<td>Grade One - About My World, Hardcover Unit Big Book Collection (includes 20 copies of the Virginia SOL Practice for Student Supplement)</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>Scott Foresman (Pearson Education, Inc.)</td>
<td>Grade One - All Together (includes SOL supplement booklet)</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>Scott Foresman (Pearson Education, Inc.)</td>
<td>Grade One - Big Book Package (includes class set of SOL supplement booklets)</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second Grade</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>Harcourt School Publishers</td>
<td>Grade Two Virginia Pupil Edition Package, About My Community (includes the Virginia SOL Practice for Student Supplement)</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>Harcourt School Publishers</td>
<td>Grade Two - About My Community, Hardcover Unit Big Book Collection (includes 20 copies of the Virginia SOL Practice for Student Supplement)</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>Scott Foresman (Pearson Education, Inc.)</td>
<td>Grade Two Pupil Edition, People and Places (includes SOL supplement booklet)</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>Scott Foresman (Pearson Education, Inc.)</td>
<td>Grade Two - Big Book Package (includes class set of SOL supplement booklets)</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Virginia Board of Education Approved Textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade/Topic</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Copyright</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Grade</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>Harcourt School Publishers</td>
<td>Grade Three Virginia Pupil Edition Package, People and Communities (includes the Virginia SOL Practice for Student Supplement)</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>Scott Foresman (Pearson Education, Inc.)</td>
<td>Grade Three Pupil Edition, Communities (includes SOL supplement booklet)</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Virginia Studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Studies</td>
<td>Scott Foresman (Pearson Education, Inc.)</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States History to 1877</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US History to 1877</td>
<td>Glencoe/McGraw-Hill</td>
<td>The American Republic to 1877</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US History to 1877</td>
<td>Glencoe/McGraw-Hill</td>
<td>The American Republic to 1877 (online)</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US History to 1877</td>
<td>Globe/Pearson (Pearson Education, Inc.)</td>
<td>American History (comprehensive survey textbook)</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US History to 1877</td>
<td>Holt, Rinehart, Winston</td>
<td>Call to Freedom: Beginnings to 1877</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US History to 1877</td>
<td>Holt, Rinehart, Winston</td>
<td>Call to Freedom: Beginnings to 1877 (online)</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US History to 1877</td>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>Creating America: Beginnings through Reconstruction (CD-ROM)</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US History to 1877</td>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>Creating America: A History of the United States (comprehensive survey textbook)</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US History to 1877</td>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>Creating America: A History of the United States (comprehensive survey textbook) CD-ROM</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US History to 1877</td>
<td>Oxford University Press</td>
<td>A History of US, 3rd Ed, Seven Volume Set includes the following books: 1) Making Thirteen Colonies (1600-1740) From Colonies to Country (1735-1791); 2) The New Nation (1789-1850); 3) Liberty for All? (1820-1860) Ware, Terrible War (1860-1865) Reconstructing America (1865-1890)</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Virginia Board of Education Approved Textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade/Topic</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Copyright</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US History 1877 to Present</td>
<td>Glencoe/McGraw-Hill</td>
<td>The American Journey (online)</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US History 1877 to Present</td>
<td>Harcourt School Publishers</td>
<td>Horizons: United States History: From Civil War to Present</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US History 1877 to Present</td>
<td>Holt, Rinehart, Winston</td>
<td>Call to Freedom: 1865 to the Present</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US History 1877 to Present</td>
<td>Holt, Rinehart, Winston</td>
<td>Call to Freedom: 1865 to the Present (online)</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US History 1877 to Present</td>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>Creating America: 1877 to the 21st Century</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US History 1877 to Present</td>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>Creating America: 1877 to the 21st Century (CD-ROM)</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US History 1877 to Present</td>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>Creating America: A History of the United States (comprehensive textbook)</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US History 1877 to Present</td>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>Creating America: A History of the United States (comprehensive textbook) (CD-ROM)</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US History 1877 to Present</td>
<td>Oxford University Press</td>
<td>A History of Us, 3rd Ed., Four Volume Set includes the following books: 1) Reconstructing America (1865-1890); 2) An Age of Extremes (1880-1917); 3) War, Peace and All That Jazz (1918-1945); 4) All the People (1945-2001)</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US History 1877 to Present</td>
<td>Prentice Hall (Pearson Education, Inc.)</td>
<td>The American Nation (comprehensive survey textbook)</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Virginia Board of Education Approved Textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade/Topic</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Copyright</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginia /US History</td>
<td>Holt, Rinehart, Winston</td>
<td>American Nation (online)</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia /US History</td>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>The Americans</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia /US History</td>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>The Americans (CD-ROM)</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia /US History</td>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>The American Pageant</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia /US History</td>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>The Enduring Vision</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia /US History</td>
<td>Prentice Hall (Pearson</td>
<td>America: Pathways to the Present</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education, Inc.)</td>
<td>(comprehensive edition)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia /US History</td>
<td>Prentice Hall (Pearson</td>
<td>America: Pathways to the Present</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education, Inc.)</td>
<td>Modern American History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D
SURVEY RESULTS, STANDARDS AND FRAMEWORKS, US APPROVED HISTORY BOOKS FROM ARIZONA, CONNECTICUT, MISSOURI, OREGON AND VIRGINIA

Arizona: Grade 5 (Source: Arizona Department of Education: Standards Based Teaching and Learning Matrix)

Concept 3: Exploration and Colonization
Recognize Native American tribes resided throughout NA before the period of European exploration and colonization.
Explain the reasons for the explorations: Samuel Champlain, Henry Hudson, John Cabot, Ponce de Leon, de Soto – in the New World.
Explain the reasons (religious, economic, new life) for colonization in America.
Describe the contributions of geographic and economic conditions, religious and colonial systems of gov. to the development of American democratic practices.
Describe the geography, cultures and economics of the Southern Middle Atlantic and New England Colonies.
Identify significant contributions of individuals – John Smith, William Penn, Lord Baltimore, Roger Williams, Anne Hutchinson, and James Oglethorpe. And their role in colonization.
Describe interactions, alliances, cultural interactions, and conflicts with Native Americans.
Describe the causes and effects of triangular trade.

Concept 4:
Revolution and New Nation (note: Colonial American and the Revolutionary War were introduced in the 4th grade).
Describe the significance of these events leading to the Am. Rev. (French Indian War, Proclamation of 1763, Tea Act, Stamp Act, Boston Massacre, Intolerable Acts.
Describe the significance of the following events in the Am. Rev. Declaration of Independence, Lexington and Concord, Saratoga, aid from France, surrender at Yorktown.
Describe the impact of these individuals in the Am. Rev. Ben Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, Patrick Henry, Thomas Paine, King George III.
Describe how one nation evolved from 13 colonies through the following events: Constitutional Convention, George Washington’s presidency, creation of political parties.
Concept 5: Westward Expansion (note: Westward Expansion was introduced in Grades 2, 4).
Describe the following events of 19th century presidencies of: Thomas Jefferson/Louisiana Purchase/Lewis & Clark Expedition, James Madison – War of 1812, James Monroe – the Monroe Doctrine, Andrew Jackson – Nationalism and Sectionalism/Trail of Tears, James Polk – Mexican-American War/discovery of gold in CA.
Describe the different perspectives (native Americans v. settlers v. Spanish v. US Gov’t v. prospectors) of Manifest Destiny.
Identify major westward migration routes of the 19th Century.
Describe how manufacturing, textiles, transportation improvements and other innovations of the Industrial Revolution contributed to US growth and expansion.
Describe the following individuals roles in the reform movement before the civil war: Frederick Douglas, Harriet Tubman, William Lloyd Garrison, Sojourner Truth.

Concept 6: Civil War and Reconstruction (note: The civil war was introduced in Grade 3 and the Civil War in Arizona was taught in grade 4).
Describe the factors leading up to the war: role of abolitionists, underground railroad, sectionalism between north and south westward expansion.
Identify the reasons why the following were important events of the CW: firing on Ft. Sumter, major battles, delivery of the Emancipation Proclamation, surrender at Appomattox Courthouse.

Concept 8: Great Depression and World War II (no performance objectives at this grade).

Concept 9: Postwar United States (no performance objectives at this grade).

Concept 10: Contemporary United States
Describe current events using information from class discussions and various resources (newspapers, magazines, television, Internet, books, maps).
Discuss the connections between current and historical events and issue from content studied in American History.

Connecticut: Grades 5 and 8 (Source: CT State Department of Education – CT Social Studies Curriculum Framework Grades PK – 12)

Early American History through the American Revolution (5th Grade)
Explain how specific individuals and their ideas influenced US History – John Smith, Anne Hutchinson, Uncas, Ben Franklin.
Compare and contrast the economic, political and religious differences that contributed to conflicts (French and Indian wars, Am Rev.).
Analyze how some conflict have been resolved through compromise (US Constitution, Northwest Ordinance).
Evaluate the relative influence of individual events that contributed to the Amer. Rev.
Explain the significant results achieved at the Constitutional Convention.
Explain the connections between local, state and national events (Charter of Connecticut, colonization, Amer Rev. US Constitution.
Trace the evolving relationship between England and the American colonies.
Compare the perspectives of England the Colonies relative to the events proceeding the Amer Rev.
Compare and contrast the factors leading to Colonial settlement.
Compare and contrast the value of using local/regional/thematic maps to research early settlements in America.
Examine the geographical/topographical significance of the location of early American colonial settlements (coastal areas, mountains, rivers, plains).
Describe how early colonists had to adapt to their new environments (building materials, food).
Compare and contrast settlement patterns in specific areas of the 13 Amer Colonies.
Analyze and assess factors that contributed to European migration.
Describe our national government’s purpose, structure and functions.
Analyze how local, state and national governments share power in the United States.
Explain the process through which citizens can influence lawmaking in the United States (Colonial government, state constitution).
Demonstrate one’s rights and responsibilities as a citizen (voting, paying taxes, obeying laws).
Explaining that when resources vary so does wealth and poverty.
Analyze how businesses use limited resources to create goods and services.
Demonstrate examples of disagreements between government and citizens regarding taxation.
Illustrate how trade has linked different parts of the world (exploration, Colonial settlement, triangle trade, intra-Colonial trade).
Examine different ethnic/cultural groups contributions to the settlement and growth of the United States.

American History from the Constitution through the 19th Century with an emphasis on local history connections and use of primary materials.
Describe examples of conflicts that have been resolved through compromise (compromises over slavery, social reforms).
Describe the influences that contributed to American social reform movements.
Explain how the arts, architecture, music and literature of the US reflect its history and cultural heterogeneity.
Explain how specific individuals and their ideas and beliefs influenced US history.
Compare and contrast the causes and effects of the Amer. Rev and the CW.
Examine the significance of precedents established during the Federalist era.
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Analyze the similarities and differences between Manifest Destiny in the 1840’s and the late 19th Century imperialism.
Evaluate the impact of America’s westward expansion on Native American nations (Trail of Tears, Dawes Act).
Evaluate the impact of the compromises made at the Constitutional Convention.
Analyze the connections among local state and national historical events (immigration, CW, participation, trade, manufacturing).
Assess the slave trade’s impact on American social institutions.
Analyze foreign reactions to the institution of slavery in American (Amistad, Liberia, English abolition).
Describe examples of the US influence on other cultures and world events (trade, wars, Monroe Doctrine).
Examine how geography influenced the economic and political development of the US.
Weigh the impact of America’s Industrial Revolution, industrialization and urbanization on the environment.
Analyze and draw conclusions on immigration’s impact on the US at different stages in its history.
Differentiate the functions (including checks and balances) of the US three branches of government using contemporary examples.
Evaluate the impact of the US Constitution on the lives of US citizens (amendments, court cases).
Explain US citizens’ rights and responsibilities under the Constitution.
Analyze the impact of court cases that expanded or limited rights and responsibilities enumerated in the Constitution and Bill of Rights.
Debate instances where right and responsibilities of citizens are in conflict (free speech and public safety, private property, eminent domain).
Analyze how technology has influenced productivity (cotton gin, steam power, interchangeable parts).
Show the relationship between supply and demand and the prices of goods and services in a market economy.
Identify and analyze specific factors that promoted growth and economic expansion in the US.
Outline how trade affected nationalism and sectionalism in US history (roads, canals, railroads, “cotton culture.”).
Compare similarities and differences of ethnic/cultural groups in US (beliefs, values, traditions) and their impact on American social systems.
Analyze the contributions and challenges of different cultural/ethnic groups in the US over time.
Examine how stereotypes develop and explain the impact in history and contemporary events.
Gather information from historical maps (Lewis and Clark, Colonial settlement, CW).
Compare information about the same event using a variety of primary sources.
Assess primary and secondary sources, including Internet sources, to determine accuracy and validity.
Detect and analyze propaganda, censorship and bias.
Evaluate the credibility of a speaker (hidden agendas, slants or bias).
Analyze maps and charts to support conclusions about historical events.

Missouri: Grade 5 (Source: Show Me Standards – Missouri Department of Education and Secondary Education)

Principles and Processes of Governance System

Concept: Principles of constitutional democracy in the US.
Identify important principles in the Declaration of Independence, such as inalienable rights and government by consent of the governed.
Identify important principles in the Constitution (limited government, rule of law, majority rules, minority rights, separation of powers, checks and balances).
Identify important principles in the Bill of Rights, such as basic rights and freedoms.

Concept: Processes of governmental systems.
Distinguish between powers and functions of local, state and national government.

United States History

Concept:
Understand the migrations of people from many regions to North American.
Summarize the viability and diversity of Native American cultures before Europeans came.

Concept: Discovery, Exploration and Settlement of the US.
Outline the discovery, exploration of early settlement of America.

Concept: Perspectives on the American Revolution.
Explain the American Revolution, including the perspectives of patriots and loyalists and factors that explain why the American colonists were successful.

Concept: Westward Expansion and settlements in the US.
Investigate the causes and consequences of Westward Expansion including Texas and the Mexican War, Oregon Territory, California Gold Rush.
Examine cultural interactions among these groups from colonial times to CW (Native Americans, Immigrants from Europe, Africans brought to America).
Oregon: Grades 5 & 8 (Source: Oregon Department of State. Grade Level Map of Oregon’s Common Curriculum Goals, Content Standards and Eligible Content – US History only)

Grade – Level Maps:
Develop and interpret time lines showing major people, events and developments in the early history of the US. Examine a historical narrative about an issue of the time and distinguish between statements or opinion and those that are factually grounded. Summarize causes and effects of European exploration and settlement of the US and the Western Hemisphere.
Consider patterns of change and continuity in history in relationship to contemporary events, issues, problems and phenomena.

Grade – Level Map: Compare and contrast primary and secondary accounts of selected historical events.

Grade – Level Map: Identify and understand the groups living in the Western Hemisphere before European exploration, their ways of life, and the empires they developed.
Understand the impact of early European exploration on Native Americans and on the Land.
Understand the impact of individuals through the period of the American Revolution, on ideas, ways of life or the course of events in US History.
Understand the colonial experience and how it led to the Amer. Rev.
Identify and understand the causes, course and impact of the Amer. Revco. Including the roles of George Washington, Samuel Adams and Thomas Jefferson.
Understand the impact of European exploration on Native American ideas about land use, land ownership and control, health, ways of life.
Revolutionary War: Attempts by the British to recoup costs of the Seven Years War (French and Indian War) issue of “no taxation without representation” British prohibition of American settlement west of the Appalachians, Boston Massacre, Boston Tea Party, boycotts, colonial efforts to raise and maintain an army, role of the French, lack of unity among the colonies (Tories v. Patriots, lack of central government), style of fighting by
colonial forces and British army, British Blockade, offensive (British) v. defensive (America) wars, factors in American victory and British defeat (guerilla warfare tactics employed by the colonists, support of the French, military leadership of Washington, geographic distance between Britain and colonies) birth of the US, impact of the principals of the Declaration of Independence, Samuel Adams – organizer of the Sons of Liberty who were strong proponents of independence.

**Grade – Level Map:** Identify significant connections between Oregon and the period of history studied.

**Grade – Level Map:** Make appropriate connections between the local community and events in the period of history studied.

**Grade – Level Map:** Formulate questions to guide and focus research. Introduce Bloom’s Taxonomy.

**Grade – Level Map:** Gather and use information from a variety of resources: diaries, letters, periodicals, literature, oral histories, artifacts, art, documentary photographs, and films.

**Grade – Level Map:** Identify events from different historical perspectives

**Grade – Level Map:** Analyze the effect of two or more courses of action and reach a decision about the best solution.

**EIGHTH GRADE**

**Grade – Level Map:** Develop and interpret US history time lines from the period of US history studied, designating appropriate intervals of time and recording events according to the chronological order in which they occurred. Identify similarities and differences in historical interpretations based on the experiences of different gender, racial or cultural groups. Issues and events are limited to those included in the US history benchmark and eligible content for Benchmark III

**Grade – Level Map:** Understands ways patterns, chronology, sequencing (including cause and effect), and the identification of historical periods are influenced by frames of reference. Recognize how forces from different spheres of life (political, economic, and social) can cause or shape an event. Events will be limited to those included in the US History benchmark and eligible content for Benchmark III. For example, the forced relocation of Indians in the 19th century was shaped by economic forces (the desire of white settlers for land), political forces (treaties and military actions) and social forces (attitudes about native peoples).


Consider and use other examples for themes: American isolationism, domestic reform, development of capitalism, the conduct of war, rights of African Americans, Native Americans, Hispanic Americans, women; the role of youth; racism.

Consider patterns of change and continuity in history in relationship to contemporary events, issues, problems and phenomena.

Grade – Level Map: Evaluate sources of information for a purpose (relevance, reliability, accuracy, objectivity).

Know ways to develop and support a point of view based on historical event.

Recognize historical perspective by identifying the historical context in which events unfolded and by avoiding evaluation of the past solely in terms of present-day norms.

Grade – Level Map: Identify and understand the issues and events that were addressed at the Constitutional Convention; Articles of Confederation, Shay’s Rebellion, The Great Compromise, 3/5 Compromise, Trade Compromise. Trace the route (St. Louis to Fort Clatsop) and understand the significance of the Lewis and Clark Expedition: mapped the Louisiana Purchase, established relationships with Indian tribes.

Understand the effects of 19th century westward migration, the idea of Manifest Destiny, European immigration, and rural to urban migration on indigenous populations and newcomers in the United States: effects of 19th century westward migration, (Indians were forced onto reservations, killed in wars and by diseases; Mexicans lost land claims, most newcomers benefited from migration (gold, 49ers, land opportunities, religious freedom). European immigration, (populations from northern and western Europe in the mid-1800s; increasing numbers from southern and eastern Europe in the late 1800s; white native populations often resented newcomers i.e. Chinese, Irish immigrants and others). And rural to urban migrations on native populations and newcomer in the United States.

Understand the effect of Jacksonian Democracy on political practices: effects on political practices, party politics, political campaigning.

Recognize and understand conditions of the African slave trade and experiences of enslaved African Americans and “free Blacks” in the US: conditions of the African slave trade (experience of the Middle Passage) and experiences of enslaved African Americans (slave codes, threat of violence, housing, clothing, diet), and “free Blacks” in the US
(restrictions on freedoms – movement, assembly, carry weapons, testify in court against whites).
Understand how abolitionists advocated for the end of slavery and the impact of their activities press – newspapers, pamphlets, Uncle Tom’s Cabin, lectures, some violence – Kansas, and the impact of their activities (movement grew and became more political over time.
Understand how African Americans dealt with the conditions of their enslavement and used religion and family to create a viable culture to cope with the effects of slavery: how African Americans dealt with the conditions of their enslavement (escape- Harriet Tubman and the underground rr. rebellion – few successful revolts, passive aggressive behaviors – remarks with double meanings and used religion and family to create a viable culture to cope with the effects of slavery (music and Bible stories express a longing for freedom); focus on the importance of family.
Identify and understand the events that led to the Civil War: differing economies, social patterns and attitudes about slavery in the North and South; sectional disputes about the expansion of slavery into western territories; concept of states’ rights; breakup of the Democratic Party and emergence of the Republican Party (role of Abe Lincoln).
Understand the political, economic and social causes, course and impact of the Civil War; Northern and Southern Advantages in the war (N-industrial production, transportation and finance S – strong military leaders, defensive war), the purpose and impact of the Emancipation Proclamation, key events (where the war began and ended; Gettysburg as the turning point; Sherman’s march to the sea; effect of union blockade); role of Grant and Lee.
Understand reconstruction affected the country: end of Reconstruction and emergence of formal/legal segregation (Plessey v. Ferguson, Black Codes), sharecropping, and hostility among southern whites, KKK.
Identify and understand Constitutional changes that resulted from the Civil War and Reconstruction: Constitutional amendments including abolishing of slavery, equal protection, and right of non-whites to vote.
Understand the effects of the Indian Wars and the opening of the West on Indian Tribes; various strategies employed by Indians in response to increase in white encroachment; attempts to assimilate Indian people (impact of the government’s reservation policy; intent of the Dawes Act and Indian people’s response).
Understand the effects of the Irish potato famine in the mid 1800s on the US society; large numbers of Irish emigrated to the US; provided labor for construction of western railroads, sometimes displaced native-born workers in factories because they worked for less.
Understand the motivations for territorial expansion to the Pacific Ocean/Hawaii – Manifest Destiny; effect of territorial expansion on other nations and their people (Mexican War), Hawaii.
Understand the effect of territorial expansion on other nations and their people: motivations for territorial expansion to the Pacific Ocean– demand for more land for settlement and gold and overseas (expansionistic foreign policy) in the late 19th century,
to spread democracy, expand and control international trade, influence global balance of power.

**Virginia: Grade 5** (Source: Board of Education Commonwealth of Virginia: History and Social Science Standards of Learning for Virginia Public Schools)

**Exploration to Revolution: Pre-Columbian Times to 1770s**
The student will demonstrate knowledge of how early cultures developed in North America by:
- Describing how archaeologists have recovered material evidence of ancient settlements including Cactus Hill in Virginia.
- Locating where the American Indians lived, with emphasis on the Arctic (Inuit), Northwest (Kwakiutl), Plains (Lakota), Southwest (Pueblo), and Eastern Woodlands (Iroquois).
- Describing how the American Indians used the resources in their environment.

The student will demonstrate knowledge of European exploration in North America and West Africa by:
- Describing the motivations for obstacles to and the accomplishments of the Spanish, French, Portuguese, and English explorations.
- Describing cultural and economic interactions between Europeans and American Indians that led to cooperation and conflict, with emphasis on the American Indian concept of land.
- Identifying the location and describing the characteristics of West African societies (Ghana, Mali, and Songhai) and their interactions with traders.

The students will demonstrate knowledge of the factors that shaped colonial America by:
- Describing the religious and economic events and conditions that led to the colonization of America.
- Describing life in the New England, Mid-Atlantic, and Southern colonies with emphasis on how people interacted with their environment to produce goods and services, including examples of specialization and interdependence.
- Describing colonial life in America from the perspectives of large landowners, farmers, artisans, women, free African Americans, indentured servants, and enslaved African Americans.
- Identifying the political and economic relationships between the colonies and Great Britain.

**Revolution and the New Nation: 1770s to the Early 1800s**
The student will demonstrate knowledge of the causes and results of the American Revolution by:
- Identifying the issues of dissatisfaction that led to the American Revolution.
- Identifying how political ideas shaped the revolutionary movement in America and led to the Declaration of Independence.
Describing key events and the roles of key individuals in the Amer. Rev. with emphasis on George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson and Patrick Henry. Explaining reasons why the colonies were able to defeat Great Britain. The students will demonstrate knowledge of the challenges faced by the new nation by: Identifying the weakness of the government established by the Articles of Confederation. Describing the historical development of the Constitution of the US. Describing the major accomplishments of the first five presidents of the US.

**Expansion and Reform: 1801 to 1861**
The student will demonstrate knowledge of westward expansion and reform in America from 1801 to 1861 by:
Describing territorial expansion ad how it affected the political map of the US with emphasis on the Louisiana Purchase, the Lewis and Clark expedition and the acquisitions of Florida, Texas, Oregon and California. Identifying the geographic and economic factors that influenced the westward movement of settlers. Describing the impact of inventions, including the cotton gin, the reaper the steamboat and the steam locomotive on life in Identifying the main ideas of the abolitionist and women’s suffrage movements.

**Civil War: 1816 to 1865**
The student will demonstrate knowledge of the causes, major events and effects of the Civil War by:
Describing the cultural, economic and constitutional issues that divided the nation. Explaining how the issues of states’ rights and slavery increased sectional tensions. Identifying on a map the states that seceded from the Union and those that remained in the Union. Describing the roles of Abraham Lincoln, Jefferson Davis, Ulysses S. Grant, Robert E. Lee, Thomas “Stonewall” Jackson and Frederick Douglass in events leading to and during the war. Using maps to explain critical developments in the war, including major battles. Describing the effects of war from the perspectives of Union and Confederate soldiers (including African American soldiers), women and enslaved African Americans.

**US History: 1865 to the Present**

**Reconstruction: 1865 to 1877**
The student will demonstrate knowledge of the effects of Reconstruction on American life by:
Analyzing the impact of the 13th, 14th, 15th Amendments to the Constitution of the US. Describing the impact of Reconstruction policies on the South and North. Describing the legacies of Abe Lincoln, RE Lee and Frederick Douglass.
**Reshaping the Nation and the Emergence of Modern America: 1877 to the Early 1900s**
The student will demonstrate knowledge of how life changed after the Civil War by:
Identifying the reasons for westward expansion including its impact on American Indians.
Explaining the reasons for the increase in immigration, growth of cities, and challenges arising from this expansions.
Describing racial segregation, the rise of “Jim Crow” and other constraints faced by African Americans and other groups in the post-Reconstruction South.
Explaining the impact of new inventions, the rise of big business, the growth of industry, and life on American farms.
Describing the impact of the Progressive Movement on child labor, working conditions, the rise of organized labor, women’s suffrage and the temperance movement.

**Turmoil and Change: 1890s to 1945:**
The student will demonstrate knowledge of the changing role of the US from the late nineteenth century through World War I by:
Explaining the reasons for and results of the Spanish American War.
Describing Theodore Roosevelt’s impact on the foreign policy of the US.
Explaining the reason for the United States’ involvement in World War I and its internal leadership role at the conclusion of the war.
The student will demonstrate knowledge of the social, economic, and technological changes of the early twentieth century by:
Explaining how developments in factor and labor productivity transportation (including the use of the automobile) Communication and rural electrification changed American life and standard of living.
Describing the social and economic changes that took place, including prohibition and the Great Migration north and west;
Examining art, literature and music from the 1920s and 1930s with emphasis on Langston Hughes, Duke Ellington, Georgia O’Keeffe and the Harlem Renaissance.
Identifying the causes of the Great Depression, its impact on Americans and the major features of Franklin D. Roosevelt’s New Deal.
The student will demonstrate knowledge of the major causes and effects of American involvement in World War II by:
Identifying the causes and events that led to American involvement in the war, including the attack on Pearl Harbor.
Locating and describing the major events and turning points of the war in Europe and the Pacific.
Describing the impact of the war on the home front.

**The United States since World War II**
The student will demonstrate knowledge of the economic, social and political transformation of the US and the world between the end of WWII and the present by:
Describing the rebuilding of Europe and Japan after World War II the emergence of the US as a superpower, and the establishment of the United Nations.
Describing the conversion from a wartime to a peacetime economy.
Identifying the role of America’s military and veterans in defending freedom during the Cold War, including the wars in Korea and Vietnam, the Cuban missile crisis, the collapse of communism in Europe, and the rise of new challenges.
Describing the changing patterns of society, including expanded educational and economic opportunities for military veterans, women and minorities.
Describing how international trade and globalization have impacted American life.
The student will demonstrate knowledge of the key domestic and international issues during the second half of the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries.
Examining the Civil Rights Movement and the changing role of women.
Describing the development of new technologies in communication, entertainment and business and their impact on American life.
Identifying representative citizens from the time period who have influenced America scientifically, culturally, academically, and economically.
Examining American foreign policy, immigration the global environment and other emerging issues.
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