



# Hoover Articles Submission Guidelines

**What it is:** A Hoover Article is a short, powerful, succinct paper summarizing or discussing an event, person, issue or other subject.

**Why:** The purpose of a Hoover Article is *transformation* – it is to transform the reader, to get him or her to know, feel or do something. A successful Hoover Article changes the reader. It shares new knowledge or insight, and gets the reader to think about things in a new way – and it does all of this on one page.

**How do you write it?** A Hoover Article

- Is between 500-900 words in length
- Is formatted in **two columns**
- Has **sharp opening and closing** statements
- Has **two bolded statements** (consisting no more than a few lines), one near the beginning (but not in the first paragraph,) and one near the end (but not in the last paragraph.) The bolded paragraphs are the author's *key points*. By reading the opening and closing paragraphs and the bolded paragraph, the reader should be able to clearly discern the author's purpose in writing the Hoover Article.

Begin by deciding **Who is your audience?** Are you writing to academics? To mothers? To politicians? To statesmen? In considering who your audience should be, it is helpful to consider what you want to share, what your reasons are for wanting to share that, and how you intend to share your idea/s. The better you understand your audience, the better you will be able to communicate your ideas to them.

Second, decide **What is your desired transformation?** In other words, what do you want your audience to know, feel or do? This rule becomes the measuring rod to test your article against. Too often students write with the intent of not looking too bad; their purpose is to "just make it." A better method is to consider the needs of your audience, what do they need to know, feel or do in order to be better? What do you need to communicate in order to cause the change you want to see? Your article is only as good as the transformation it causes. Don't be content with merely getting your thoughts on paper. Often it takes three or four, or nine or ten, drafts of an article to achieve the transformation you desire. Your final paragraph will usually call your intended audience to some kind of action.

## Ambition for Education

According to his son, Abe, Thomas Lincoln, “grew up literally without education.” But who could blame him? He chose to settle in a region where, “there was absolutely nothing to excite ambition for education.” Human beings depend on reasons to do things; and since Newton’s (and Murphy’s) laws are forever working upon us, these *reasons* have to be pretty exciting.

Certainly life on the frontier was trying and excited its inhabitants to every means of survival. What could possibly motivate human action more than the hopes of making it through a biting, Great Lakes winter, or, for that matter, eating in the morning? But something should, and Lincoln understood that that *something* was education. Building forts, clearing timber and turning soil were necessary for physical survival, and so men and women of frontier America were eager for training. **But survival wasn’t enough for Lincoln, he wanted to live, he wanted an education.**

Many a proponent of the Georgic Tradition has lauded the frontier as, a natural incubator for virtue, reflection and hard work. They echo Virgil and the stoics, that simplicity, soil and the absence of luxury make for good men. But Lincoln knew that an education was more than learning to ford a river or build a dam. He saw past the training in periods and commas, names and dates, and theorems and postulates to something that made men free from ignorance and, subsequently, from oppression. He knew that man’s hardest work does more than simply tire muscles and moisten brows.

Education is more than job-training. Training is a valuable process, a precious possession as one seeks to *survive* in this world and to provide for himself and his family. But education is more: It is the

process and possession that empowers us to *live*.

In the January, 2004 State of the Union Address, President Bush mentioned the words *education* and *school* over twenty times. The word *jobs* came in a close second at seventeen mentions. Americans were told that schools would combat drug abuse and sexually-transmitted diseases. The President’s “Jobs for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century” program would help schools to ensure better employment and, most importantly, a thriving economy. On the other side of the camera, simple people listened and hoped the government would help them make a living when, in reality, most of them are making a surviving at best and a dieing at par.

One might think that Lincoln meant refined cities were the place to excite educational ambition, but that isn’t at all what he meant. In a material world where jobs promise security and money guarantees happiness, primordial guarantees and hopes of are silly and romantic if not forgotten entirely.

The frontier is always the place to make education not only an exciting ambition, but a powerful reality. However, it’s not the leafy wilderness or the muddy road that imparts the breath of life. Mind animates heart and strength. **The abolition of ignorance is the frontier of freedom, and the place where mind and spirit transcend body.** Education seeks to acquire a knowledge of God and man. Perhaps forbidden fruit forced man to *train for bread*, but marks of love constantly entice him to *educate for life*.

--John Doe

## Diplomacy in the Courts?

Roger B. Taney became Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court after John Marshall vacated the post in 1836. For the most part, Taney maintained the Jacksonian concept of basic national powers and Marshall's precedent of broad construction of the Constitution. **The most controversial decision of his life, and possibly the most divisive ruling ever affecting our national character occurred in 1857.** The fact that Taney was from Maryland made it all the more astonishing.

By 1850, the north/south rivalries that had begun to simmer 200 years before were boiling over State's Rights, Fair Tariffs, Federal vs. National Character, and most intensely, Slavery. With California being recently admitted to the Union as a Free State, something had to be done to quell tensions and the compromise of that year seemed just the thing. Congress passed a series of acts allowing territories becoming states to practice "popular sovereignty"—if the people wanted it, they could have it. In addition, the fugitive slave law required Northerners to return escaped slaves to their owners.

Far from settling the issue, tensions actually heightened as a result and attempted jail breaks, riots, district gerrymandering, temporary relocation during elections, and other acts of divisiveness and violence occurred. Many abolitionists who loved the Union but, even more, abhorred slavery were far from persuasive and a lot closer to forceful in their efforts to "change minds and hearts". Southerners resisted what they felt to be a blatant encroachment on their rural, agricultural way of life by Northern factory owners and annoying religious zealots. Harriet Beecher-Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin* powerfully showed the humanity of black Americans, as well as a corrupt system that threatened decent, God-fearing whites like Saint-Claire and Shelby into becoming detestable animals like Simon Legree.

The Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854 attempted to add clarity to popular sovereignty and state creation. "Once slavery was in a State", feared Northern abolitionists, "it was there to stay. Kansas and Nebraska would surely become slave States, and the tensions became even more tense. In fact, anti-slavery **Senator Charles Sumner was beaten bloody and unconscious**

by South Carolina Representative Preston Brooks. It was then, in 1857, amongst all of this, that the overstepping of the Marshall Court reared its ugly head. It was then that Maryland-born Chief Justice Taney heard and decided on that fateful case.

The case was *Dred Scott v. Sanford*. Scott after living for several years in the free territory of Wisconsin and the free State of Illinois, moved back to the slave State of Missouri and claimed that he was now free. Taney declared that the black man, "had no rights which the white man was bound to respect; and that the negro might justly and lawfully be reduced to slavery for his benefit. He was bought and sold and treated as an ordinary article of merchandise and traffic, whenever profit could be made by it." And referring to the language in the Declaration of Independence that includes the phrase, "all men are created equal," Taney reasoned that, "it is too clear for dispute, that the enslaved African race were not intended to be included, and formed no part of the people who framed and adopted this declaration..." When blacks are property, they are to be treated as such. They cannot be considered citizens and Congress has no Constitutional authority to prohibit slavery anywhere. Yes, "anywhere".

This decision was bad for the nation, as well as the future of the judiciary. The Congress of the United States should have determined the issue of slavery. So what if the Marshall Court precedent allowed for such judicial review. Taney should have referred this one to Congress, for if he had, the people, not the Courts, would have made the decision (however long it may have taken) and would have been more likely to abide by its decision—it being their own decision. By nullifying the Missouri Compromise and subsequent related legislation, the Taney Court weakened confidence in the popular decision-making process of Congress. **The fact that Justices are supposed to be above politics is good, but when they attempt to legislate, the Court would do well to either adopt a little more diplomacy, or refuse to enter the legislative process.** Diplomacy is something that popularly-elected legislators do well. And when it comes to hot and divided topics like slavery, it may be impossible to have "diplomacy in the courts".

--John Doe

# Saggy Politicians

When Governor Romney openly denounced the actions of the supreme court of his state many wondered if he had committed political suicide. Homosexual marriage, according to our best media sources, seems to be gaining popular support throughout the world, and in a clearly Democratic State like MA, maybe Mitt would have done better to refuse comment until he at least knew his party was behind him. Or maybe he did exactly what he should have.

When the rule of politics is “cover your [backside]”, the rule of statesmanship is “act boldly on principle and others will follow”. And if they don’t follow, then try, try again until you die either of natural causes or, as has sometimes happened to those who would dare speak against power, a bullet. The latter of course would be lawless and isn’t law what it’s all about?

As civilizations have evolved, vengeance and defiance by angry individuals has been replaced by the respectable judgments of fathers and tribal chiefs and finally by the rule of law. When tribes—seeking slaves and mates—conquered, combined with, and brought in outsiders, the city was created and customs became the framework for written laws.

Will Durant says that, “...custom rises out of the people, whereas law is forced upon them from above; law is usually a decree of the master, but custom is the natural selection of those modes of action that have been found most convenient in the experience of the group.” So, good laws are based on the traditions, customs, mores and wills of the majority of the people. It is forced upon them but it doesn’t molest them. It comes from above but only by their express or implied consent

Montesquieu differentiated between a monarch and a tyrant by one simple distinction: Monarchs create, uphold and follow laws that are based on the traditions and mores of the people, while the tyrant becomes the law, and anything he says—whether or not it is sustained by custom—must be followed by all. Those who dare speak against it might get a bullet, but at the very minimum they will be ostracized by everyone who fears to find themselves out of favor with the tyrant.

We see the tyrant today in the Massachusetts Supreme Court, US Supreme Court, Ninth

Circuit Court of Appeals, the media goliaths that seem to speak with one voice against our better instincts, possibly by a wartime President and most definitely by weak congressmen who relinquish their responsibility of declaring war to that President and then complain about it, hoping that a new administration, simply because it’s new, will fix everything. Tyrants are never a single individual because everyone that helps him are a part of him and thus equally tyrannical.

The customs, traditions and overall sentiments of a vast majority of Americans do not have room for defiling the sanctity of marriage between *a* man and *a* woman. No matter what the loud minority, or the media, or the courts or anyone else says, our traditions do not sanction open acceptance of homosexuality.

In a time when people had little say in government action, the common man or woman may find it impossible to speak out against what everything real suggests to them is right. But add our name to the list of tyrants if we do nothing to support law that is supported by custom and refute law that is grossly against who we are and what we believe. And misplaced parallels to slavery must be shut down because it is not the same argument. Any slavery that was more than indentured servitude was, is and will always be against our traditions. Most southerners were not fighting against the abolition of slavery, but for the maintenance of States’ rights.

Citizens who would keep their rights and freedoms would do well to act less like saggy politicians afraid of losing a paycheck and more like Statesmen unafraid to stand for something. Statutory law antithetical to natural law is barely law at all; and it is the citizenry of this nation who must be understand the difference, and see that only good law governs so that liberty will prevail.

--John Doe