

**History 340-01 (SI), Spring 2004**  
**The United States Since World War II**

Professor Tom Jackson  
Office: 200 McIver Building  
Office Phone: 334-3514; History Dept.: 334-5992  
Office Hours: Tuesday, 3:30-5:00; Wednesday, 3:15-4:30, Friday, 12-1, and by appointment

**M,W, F 11:00-11:50**  
McIver 222  
tjackson@uncg.edu

This course weaves together three rich strands of history. We will examine central ideas, events, decisions and controversies in the black freedom movement, the “Vietnam Wars” and the impact of mass communication technologies on American politics.

Other unifying themes of the course include:

The civil, political and economic dimensions of American rights.

Leadership and foreign policy decision making in a democracy; the impact of the Cold War and Vietnam on democracy.

The incredibly complex problems of when to talk, when to take nonviolent action, when to fight.

The importance of leadership and decision making at key historical junctures. The power of ideology and historical “lessons” to shape decisions.

The importance of what the philosophers call “contingency”: the fact that at any historical moment, people make choices from among an array of alternatives. People make history, but only in the context of a world shaped largely by others.

The shift from print media to electronic media and the growing power of television to define what is worthy of our attention and how to think about it.

The voices, strivings and experiences of ordinary people, who frequently get marginalized in the grand narratives of history that focus on leaders.

The varied ways people have of communicating, resolving their differences, or imposing their will upon others: through speech, negotiation, protest, violence and warfare.

Speaking itself, polite or otherwise, verbal or gestural, and the many forms political speech has taken.

The course balances reading, writing and speaking. But what happens in class – discussing, reporting, debating, clarifying differences, finding common ground, testing ideas against evidence – depends on everybody’s preparation, mutual respect and courage in speaking. It is a different kind of animal that may take getting used to: *a speaking intensive course*.

Classes will incorporate a range of structured opportunities for analysis, speaking and listening: 1) general discussions guided by me (with a *minimum* of lecture time); 2) small group discussions (groups will have stable membership throughout the semester); 3) individual reports of no more than ten minutes, followed by five minutes of question and answer; 4) “round-table” discussions or debates, followed by questions or comments from the public. Periodically, I will evaluate your general discussion contributions. Your peers will give me feedback on the small group dynamics and productivity, which I will pass on to you in summary form. Randomly selected class members and I will evaluate your oral report and your participation in a round-table.

**A Note on Speaking Styles and Personality Types**

“Introverts” and “extroverts” constitute two poles on the Meyers-Briggs personality profile scale. You can fall in the middle, and you can change, though we all seem to lean in one direction or the other. Each has its strengths and pitfalls in public speaking! Neither is necessarily more “effective” at true communication, which involves a variety of styles, from formal lectures to loudly singing “Ain’t Gonna Let Nobody Turn Me ‘Round” to your jailers. Introverts tend to process their thoughts and feelings before speaking, and they do their best thinking internally.

They can sometimes feel drained by social interaction, especially if it is lively. They can be brilliant and empathetic and articulate, but can feel that the discussion is too animated or “fast” for them to contribute, since they feel they need to have “settled” thoughts before expressing them. They are just as good at speaking, but a main pitfall can be their withholding: they cheat others by not sharing their good insights. Extroverts are comfortable processing their thoughts in public! They are energized, not drained by social interaction, however lively. They can be forceful and persuasive, and they will sometimes voice contradictory thoughts (which can really bug introverts). But their contradictions at least offer others the opportunity to clarify and resolve issues in public. They can often “hold forth” more than “hold back,” sometimes to the irritation of introverts or other extroverts trying to get a word in! At worst, they can dominate discussion, fail to listen, or ramble verbally without a coherent and succinct thought someone can respond to (Lyndon Johnson was like this, and we’ll listen to him speaking). All types of people can be insecure and unconfident and unclear about what they think, though extroverts can *seem* confident and introverts can *seem* shy. Welcome to humanity. All I can say is: Know Thyself, and make an honest effort!

**University Speaking Center:** [http://www.uncg.edu/cac/site\\_main.html](http://www.uncg.edu/cac/site_main.html)

“The principle of active learning is at the heart of the new program. As students express opinions, argue their viewpoints, question assumptions, present findings, and listen to their peers, they engage more fully in the subject matter, thus learning more.”

I require each of you in advance of your report to have a consultation at the speaking center as well as a conference with me. It is your responsibility to schedule both of these in advance. Take the guidelines and the assignment along. Surf their website for ideas—read the guidelines for SAC courses or if you want, even browse some of the articles in the bibliography. Take what is useful and incorporate it into your own style of speaking! One of the more useful approaches is to regard *speaking* as an essential tool to discover and refine your own *thinking and writing*.

This history in many ways is unfinished in a way quite different from if we were studying the French Revolution. We are all in many ways a product of this history, and its issues and controversies are very much alive today. So our identities and political convictions are bound to influence what we think. We should strive, however, to understand the past on its own terms, to understand that past actors did not have our knowledge of their future, and in fact had very different personal histories than we did. Academic study can help us clarify who we are and why we got here, but it also offers us the opportunity to rise above our inherited assumptions and become more wise and less parochial. So here is a ground rule: anecdotes from the past, and contemporary political issues are welcome as points of discussion, but they should *supplement* and in no way *supplant* our study of the complex study of past beliefs and actions. “The past is foreign country to us all.”

### **Course Requirements:**

**Attendance:** Attendance is mandatory, especially in this class where the quality of the learning depends disproportionately on student responsibility. *You must email me in advance if you will miss class, or, in case of emergency, within 24 hours after class.* I can excuse absences only on the grounds of personal or family illness or serious emergency or uncontrollable events (not conflicting work schedules, appointments, oversleep, or extracurricular activity). More than four unexcused absences and your final grade goes down 2 points for every day missed. Four *consecutive* unexcused absences constitute grounds for withdrawing you from the course.

### **I. Reading and Preparation**

For this class to work, everyone must consistently prepare and be willing to share your insights verbally. You will be responsible for reading approximately 100 pages per week. Two books are

available for purchase at the University Bookstore (Elliot Center) and Addams (Tate St.). Each day has brief, focused, often brilliant readings that mix scholarly writing with primary documents: speeches, letters, essays, oral histories, press releases, news articles.

Marilyn Young, *The Vietnam Wars, 1945-1990* (NY: Harper Perennial, 1990)

Adam Fairclough, *To Redeem the Soul of America: Martin Luther King, Jr.* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1987, 1995).

**ALL Other Reading (Unless Otherwise Noted) is on Electronic Reserves for HIS340.** These are usually short, excerpted primary and secondary sources, mostly primary sources such as speeches or memos or memoirs. Learn the ereserves system, locate the readings for a given day, and bring them to class with you.<sup>1</sup> I've tried to simplify the system of citation, but I don't have complete control over how the library records or arranges these documents! [They are alphabetized by TITLE, but sometimes erratically]. Even though you have to pay for them now, I've saved you some money by not ordering an expensive textbook (which can run over \$50), and I've selected pure gold from several published course readers and scholarly works. Whenever possible: Use the library's two-sided printers. And you can always download the adobe acrobat reader files and read them on screen to save paper and money. To help, I will also burn a few CD's as soon as the library has all the readings on-line. These CDs you may then copy to your hard drives or burn additional CDs for classmates [volunteers?].

**Collections of Primary and Secondary Sources on Hard Copy Reserve for This Course:** Browse through the document collections I will place on ereserves. They contain many more primary sources that will help you choose and follow through with your report.

## **II. Class Participation 25% (General Discussion and Small Group Peer Evaluation)**

Your peers and I will evaluate your speaking on the basis of how thoughtfully and how often you contribute to class discussion in the various formats outlined above (and improvement over the semester). Are you clear, concise, audible, focused, relevant, a respectful listener? (See the evaluation forms at the end of this syllabus). 1) General group discussion: respond to the day's questions; raise a question of your own; engage your peers' comments, either by supporting and elaborating or by respectfully disagreeing. 2) Small group discussion: each time your group will select a different "leader" and a different "recorder-reporter." The "leader" takes charge of breaking down aspects of a question or problem, keeping discussions on topic and "covering the bases." Each group will take up one or two of the questions you find under that day's readings. The "recorder-reporter" is responsible for taking accurate notes on what you all discussed, using them to report to the whole class about points of agreement and differences in your small group discussion.

## **III. Scholar's Logs: 10%.**

Write 5 log entries (400-500 words) on any of the readings where "**LOG**" appears on the syllabus (no more than one a week – I want two by week 5). This is a way to help you develop critical reading and writing skills and, frankly, to ensure there is always someone who prepared extra well for discussion. I require you to speak up on the days you write LOGS. WHAT THE HECK IS A SCHOLAR'S LOG? This is writing in the informal "thesis/response" framework. Briefly summarize the author's thesis, (the main *analytical* points he or she is trying to prove), in 1-3 sentences. Then write a one or two paragraph response containing *your* ideas about the reading. You might answer any of the following questions: How does the reading

---

<sup>1</sup> At <http://library.uncg.edu> click "reserves" and search HIS340. Usually the title comes first, the author last, and readings bunched according to topic (though not always). The username is "ereserves" and the password "spring2004". You must have acrobat reader. Ask for help at the Library reserve desk.

challenge or confirm what I previously believed or read? Does it shed unique light on broader themes in the course? Especially important: Is it persuasive or flawed? (Don't just *say* this. *Show it* by referring to evidence presented or omitted.) How does this history help explain *today's* choices or dilemmas? ***These are due the day of discussion and not acceptable after that.*** Grading: A, B, C and N/C, No Credit (which simply means it doesn't count and you have to do another one until you get the hang of it). Again, you aren't just summarizing randomly points the author made that are interesting, but selecting the "main ideas" that control the development of their argument or story line. Then give us *your* thoughts.

#### **IV. Oral Reports, Presentations, Performances (15%)**

Each student will sign up for a day whose content interests you (sign up soon—sheets on my door by Wednesday). You must have a conference with me and submit a 1 page proposal at least a week in advance of your talk. You will talk for ten minutes and take questions for five. You have various options:

1) Your own analysis of primary sources – oral histories, a memoir, a body of news coverage – that directly contributes to the class's appreciation of the issues under review for that day.

2) Your presentation of a scholar's thesis and evidence on a controversial question (these are logical and "argumentative" rather than random and descriptive). You could offer a more conservative point of view than Young's, clearly influenced by the anti-war movement (though she strives admirably for balance and accuracy and completeness). Or tell us about the internal conflicts in Birmingham's *white* community in 1963, or offer a different analysis of the May 10, 1963 Birmingham agreement.

3) For theatre majors or theatrically inclined: a dramatic re-enactment of a character or characters akin to Anna Deveare Smith's imaginative reconstruction of the black-Jewish conflict in Crown Heights, Brooklyn, *Fires in the Mirror* (followed up by an analytic paper placing your enactment in historical context). You could take a memoir, such as Truong Nhu Tang's, a woman leader of the NLF (Communist/Nationalist forces in South Vietnam) and put it in oral storytelling form. Or you could impersonate Bobby Kennedy in the Spring of 1968 in a press conference on why he decided to run for president. Or in the spirit of Smith, alternate between say, a black nationalist and a Jewish Rabbi.

None of these should be READ to the group. They should be TALKED, a result of practice and working from notes, using appropriate visual aids or handouts, making good audience connection. Visit the Speaking Center for an appointment with a consultant and read the materials I hand out. Obviously you need to *know your subject* well enough to dispense with a lot of paper text.

#### **V. Follow-up 4-5 Page Papers (10%): Due one week later.**

I don't just want a rehash of your report, but a more polished piece of critical scholarship where you offer your own independent conclusions about the importance, the truth-value and validity of the sources you examined. Maintain focus on the substance of your report, but critically assess these points in light of the scholarship we may have read and the questions or problems that may have come up in the question and answer session.

#### **VI. "Round table" Discussion-Debates (15%)**

Master the arguments, point of view and evidence of an historical actor or a journalist or academic active in public life at the time. One page proposal, with sources, is due two weeks in advance. One page synopsis of points and major quotes is due two class periods ahead of time, a copy to me and each of your round-table comrades/adversaries. Represent your figure as he or she would have wanted to be represented. Respond to others' points of view and evidence and to questions from the audience, as if it were a public forum occurring at the time (the final one will

take the form of a debate among journalists and historians who examine the media's biases in war reporting).

### **VII. Follow-up 4-5 Page Papers (10%).**

Then, one week after the round table, a paper will be due. Analyze your figure's position from the perspective of hindsight, more recent scholarship, and what the debate taught you.

### **VIII. Take-Home Exam (Due the Day of the Regular Final) and Oral Component (Last Day of Class, Tuesday May 4) 10%**

**A 4-5 page paper on the "lessons" of the past for future action.** 1) What principal lesson would you draw from this course that might be useful in advising future generations committed to advancing equality and freedom for all people and for oppressed minorities in particular? 2) What lesson would you draw from the Cold War and the Vietnam conflict?

Possible themes might involve the relationship between civil, political and economic rights; protest and electoral strategies; racial-ethnic unity and integration; violence and nonviolence. Other themes might involve the use of force and diplomacy, the wisdom of military intervention in the protection or furtherance of democracy abroad, the legitimate grounds for waging war, or the relationship between foreign policymaking and free public debate in a democracy. It is important that you have enough evidence that you have thought through in order to make what you write and say more than just a generality or an assertion (like "its always best to talk out our differences.")

**"Stonewall Jackson's" Extensions Policy:** Please, do not even ask unless personal illness, family loss or serious emergency intervenes. Otherwise, late work will suffer a 2-point grade reduction the day after it is due and every day after that.

**Written Work:** All papers must be typed and formatted as follows: Times New Roman font (or Garamond), 11 or 12 font size, double spaced lines, margins no larger than 1" all around. Too short papers or large font papers will be returned immediately for resubmission. For all writing other than LOGS, reference your quotes and paraphrases with **footnotes** the way all the authors we are reading use them. Example:<sup>2</sup>

**Conferences:** I require a preliminary informal discussion with me to help identify a topic, sources and the general outline of your report. We will also have at least one conference by mid-semester to discuss your progress in speaking. I am here to help with questions, to guide you in developing your ideas and speaking strategies, and to give you helpful, honest feedback on your work. Do not hesitate to visit my office hours or schedule an appointment if they are not convenient. Use the resources of the Speaking Center as well.

**Honor Code:** I remind you that the URL for the University's Academic integrity policy is <http://saf.dept.uncg.edu/studiscp/Honor.html> If you have not read it, please do so thoroughly. I am unusually good at identifying violators and have lost more sleep on this issue than I wish in my entire career. Beware of copying without citing sources; this is a special danger with respect to the Internet, a wonderful research tool that has also contributed to the proliferation of plagiarism. I will pursue violators to the fullest extent. The university requires me to impose a range of punishments depending on the infraction: failure of an assignment, failure in the course, an Honor Board hearing. Recall that university expulsion is automatic for repeat offenders with a record of plagiarism in the Office of Student Affairs. It cheapens the value of honestly earned university degrees to permit plagiarism to thrive. Grade inflation is bad enough.

---

<sup>2</sup> Use Turabian FN (footnote): <http://library.uncg.edu/depts/ref/handouts/turabian.html>  
If you need further guidance, consult Mary Lynn Rampola, *A Pocket Guide to Writing in History* (New York: St. Martin's, 1995), on hard copy reserve in the Library for **HIS340**.

## Schedule of Class Meetings and Assignments

**CODES:** “ER340” means Ereserves under HIS340. “ER524” Means Ereserves under HIS524. JSTOR means the humanities electronic journal JSTOR through the “Databases” portal on the library’s home page. “LOG” means I will accept a “Scholar’s Log” on this reading.

The diversity of selected readings is designed to provide you with a range of historical arguments and perspectives from experience. This requires you use the ereserves well and follow each day’s instructions carefully. Look at the discussion questions FIRST; then go look for answers or better questions. These were the best questions I could come up with in advance, and you should feel free to pose your own, within the boundaries of the issues at hand. So you have my permission to focus (use your highlighters, notes, marginal comments in the text to guide you for class discussion).

### 1/14: The Cold War and Global Containment

Godfrey Hodgson, *America in Our Time: From World War II to Nixon—What Happened and Why* (New York: Random House, 1976, 1995), 17-47. ER340. LOG

Discussion: 1) What were the fundamental assumptions of the Cold Warriors? 2) How does Hodgson explain how the U.S. confrontation with the Soviet Union (and China) turned into a domestic crusade against “communist subversives” in government and in the American Left more broadly? 3) How important to Cold War psychology was the loss of the American nuclear monopoly. 4) Did the Cold War and McCarthyism *necessarily* lead to U.S. intervention in Vietnam? How? How might we evaluate Hodgson’s claim that McCarthyism was “deeply rooted in the political culture of the United States?” How might we assess the statement that it grew out of “the instinctive fears of a large fraction of the American people?”

### 1/16: McCarthyism

Robert Griffith, “American Politics and the Origins of ‘McCarthyism’ in Chafe and Sitkoff, *A History of Our Time* pp. 62-73. ER340 LOG

Ellen Schrecker, *Age of McCarthyism*, Primary source excerpts: J. Edgar Hoover, 113-120; Joseph McCarthy, 210-214; William O. Douglas, 243-246. ER340 Pick out the most illuminating passage from one of the three speeches and be prepared to read it as if publicly spoken. Then tell us why it is important.

**Discussion:** 1) Did McCarthyism reflect popular fear broadly shared (Hodgson) or party politics and powerful right-wing interest groups (Griffith)? 2) According to Griffith, who were the Anticommunists? What were their purposes? 3) How does an analysis of Hoover’s and McCarthy’s “rhetorical techniques” help reveal central aspects of the anticommunist crusade? (Several historians think it should be called “Hooverism” instead).

### 1/19: Martin Luther King Holiday – No Class

### 1/21: Vietnamese Communism, Nationalism, the French and U.S. Policy

Young, *The Vietnam Wars*, 1, The Fate of OSS Agent 19 (1945-1946), 1-20. LOG  
Ho Chi Minh, “Declaration of Independence of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, September 2, 1945,” in Cohen, ed., *Vietnam*, pp. 24-26. **ER340 [Read short ones on screen to save paper]**

Young, *The Vietnam Wars*, 2, The Thirty-Year War Begins (1946-1954), 20-36. LOG  
John Foster Dulles, “America Should Consider Direct Military Intervention in Indochina,” 4/12/54, vs. John Fitzgerald Kennedy, “America Should Be Cautious,” 4/6/ 54, in William Dudley, ed., *The Vietnam War: Opposing Viewpoints* (San Diego: Greenhaven, 1998), pp. 36-46.

Discussion: 1) Was there ever a chance that the U.S. might *support* the Viet Minh? Was Ho a Communist ideologue bent on armed conquest, a Soviet puppet or a pragmatist willing to compromise in his goal of national independence? What were the U.S. government's and State Department's changing reasons for supporting the French re-conquest of Vietnam? 2) How did the Cold Warriors analyze Vietnamese Communism, especially after the Chinese revolution in 1949? What historical analogies informed their thinking? 3) What lessons might they have drawn from the French defeat at Dienbienphu? 4) Why did Secretary of State Dulles fail to secure more vigorous "united action" to rescue the French? What were America's vital interests in the conflict? 5) What were John Kennedy's main reservations regarding American intervention in 1954?

### **1/23: Geneva and The Early Regime of Ngo Dinh Diem**

Young, *The Vietnam Wars*, 3, A Pause Between the Wars (1954-1956), 37-59. LOG

**Geneva Documents all Together ER340:** 1) "Final Declaration of the Geneva Conference, July 21, 1954" in Cohen, ed., *Vietnam*, pp. 47-49. 2) "Statement By Walter Bedell Smith at the Geneva Conference, July 21, 1954), in Cohen, ed., *Vietnam*, pp. 49-50. 3) Ngo Dinh Diem, "Statement Regarding the Geneva Agreements, July 22, 1954," in Cohen, ed., *Vietnam*, pp. 50-51. 4) Ho Chi Minh, "Long Live Peace, Unity, Independence and Democracy in Vietnam, July 30, 1954," in Cohen, ed., *Vietnam*, pp. 51-52.

**VERY IMPORTANT QUESTION:** What were the central provisions of the Geneva Accords? What commitments did the Americans make? Is there anything in the Walter Smith or Ngo Dinh Diem statements that might have clued anyone that the U.S. and Diem would subvert national elections in 1956? Why was he successful in doing so?

### **1/26: The Regime of Ngo Dinh Diem [Reports Start on This Day]**

Young, *The Vietnam Wars*, 4, The War for the South Begins (1955-1962), 60-88. LOG

1) William Henderson, "American Aid Has Helped Create A Stable Government in South Vietnam," 1/57, 51-61; 2) David Hotham, "American Aid Has Not Created a Stable Government in Vietnam," 11/25/57, 62-70. In William Dudley, ed., *The Vietnam War: Opposing Viewpoints* (San Diego: Greenhaven, 1998). **ER340**

**If you have time,** look up in Jackson Library Databases, New York Times via Proquest: "An Asian Liberator," (Man in the News Article on Diem) *New York Times* (May 10, 1957)

Discussion: 1) How did the Americans support and build up Diem's public image and his state? What role did the U.S. media and academic social science play? 2) Behind this image, how did Diem try to consolidate a South Vietnamese nation? 3) Why couldn't the Americans see the NLF as indigenous South Vietnamese Nationalists and Communists? Was there an "intelligence failure" or a failure to heed the intelligence? 4) Why did policymakers ignore their own experts, who claimed that NLF had broad popular support? Why was the NLF so successful?

### **1/28: The Fall of Diem**

Young, *The Vietnam Wars*, 5, The Fall of Diem (1963), 89-104. LOG

1) "South Vietnamese Forces are Making Significant Progress," ["Their Own Battle, *Time*, 9/21/63], 81-84; 2) Sol Sanders, "South Vietnamese Forces Are Not Making Significant Progress," ["The Truth about a War Americans Aren't Winning," *US News & World Report*, 8/5/63], 85-93. in William Dudley, ed., *The Vietnam War: Opposing Viewpoints* (San Diego: Greenhaven, 1998). **ER340**

Discussion: 1) Should the fall of Diem have signaled to the Americans, not a failure of leadership, but problems with the very idea of a South Vietnamese anticommunist state? 2) How can you explain such differing press accounts of the war's progress? In the case of *Time* and *U.S. News*, what journalistic sources did each author draw upon? 3) What sources was Kennedy relying upon?

### **1/30: Inside the “Viet Cong” – A Village Girl Chooses Sides**

Le Ly Hayslip, *When Heaven and Earth Changed Places* (Plume, 1989), ix, xv, 33-53.

#### **ER340**

Discussion: What were Le Ly Hayslip’s main reasons for joining the National Liberation Front? Caught between RVN (Republic of Vietnam) forces and the NLF (National Liberation Front, the “Viet Cong”), how did villagers cope? Who had inherent advantages and why?

Suggested report: Truong Nhu Tang’s memoir of the transition of Southern Viet Minh to armed struggle.

### **2/2: Social History and Biography: The Making of Martin Luther King, Jr.**

Morris, Aldon D. "A Man Prepared for the Times: A Sociological Analysis of the Leadership of Martin Luther King, Jr." and comments by Robert Parris Moses, In *We Shall Overcome Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Black Freedom Struggle*, eds. Peter J. Albert and Ronald Hoffman, (NY: Pantheon, 1990), 35-58. **ER340 LOG**

Martin Luther King, Jr., “Selected Documents from the 1940s and 1950s” **ER340 [NB: You need only print out pp. 1-10 of this Acrobat file; the rest is optional reading]:** 1) “The Negro and the Constitution,” 5/44, in Carson, ed., *Papers of Martin Luther King, v. 1*, pp. 109-111. 2) “Kick Up Dust,” 8/6/46, in Carson, ed., *Papers of Martin Luther King, Jr., v. 1*, pp. 121. 3) Letter to Coretta, July 18, 1952, in Carson, ed., *Autobiography of MLK*, p. 36. **4) Optional:** “An Autobiography of Religious Development,” 11/22/50, in Carson, ed., *Papers of Martin Luther King, Jr., v. 1*, pp. 359-363.

Discussion: How does our view of Martin Luther King change from the dominant public image of him when we look at his youth and education, and the earliest things he wrote, before he became famous? What changes were taking place within Southern black communities, national and international politics, and the media to make a mass movement possible in the 1950s?

**Optional:** If you want to know some of your professor’s basic assumptions about the civil rights movement, read Thomas Jackson, “The Civil Rights Movement,” in *The Encyclopedia of Poverty and Social Welfare in the U.S.*, eds. Gwendolyn Mink and Alice O’Connor (ABC-CLIO, forthcoming) **ER524**

### **2/4: The Montgomery Bus Boycott**

Fairclough, *To Redeem the Soul of America*, 1-29. LOG

Burns, Stewart, ed. *Daybreak of Freedom: The Montgomery Bus Boycott*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997, selected voices of protest and resistance: pp. 101-3, 115, 118-119, 125-133, 222-225. **ER340** [You can skim the mass meeting material].

**Optional:** Martin Luther King, Jr., et. al., “MIA Mass Meeting at Holt Street Baptist Church,” in Clayborne Carson, ed., *Papers of King*, v. 3, pp. 71-5, 78-9. **ER340**. What were the key rights involved in the protest? What were the historical precedents King looked toward?

**Optional:** Bayard Rustin and Glenn Smiley, “Correspondence on Montgomery,” in the Bayard Rustin Papers, Library of Congress **ER524**

Discussion: 1) Why, in a city full of long-standing leaders, did a relative newcomer rise to become President of the Montgomery Improvement Association? Why did leadership pass from women to male ministers? 2) The course of the boycott was shaped by white resistance and white support. In what ways? 3) What can the voices of ordinary people tell us about the big issues of racial conflict, nonviolent social change and the possibilities of reconciliation? 4) Optional reading: Assess the impact of older nonviolent activists from New York on King’s leadership and the public face of the Montgomery movement.



Report Option: The women who started the bus boycott.

## 2/6: Human Rights and Nonviolence

Fairclough, *To Redeem the Soul of America*, 29-55. LOG

**From Martin Luther King, Jr., "Selected Documents from the 1940s and 1950s"**  
**ER340:** 1) "Paul's Letter to American Christians," 11/4/56, in Carson, ed., *Papers of Martin Luther King, Jr.*, v. 3, 414-20. **THE FOLLOWING IS OPTIONAL** (pp. 11-18 of Ereserve Acroread file): "'Some Things We Must Do,' Address Delivered at the Second Annual Institute on Nonviolence and Social Change," 12/5/57, in Carson, ed., *Papers of Martin Luther King, Jr.*, v. 4, pp. 328-342.

"Palm Sunday Sermon on Mohandas K. Gandhi," 3/22/59, in Carson, ed., *Papers of Martin Luther King, Jr.*, v. 1, v. 5 (forthcoming, no pagination).

Discussion: A. Fairclough states: "non-violence had, at least potentially, a radical political edge." Pro or con: "King's radical political edge was completely blunted in the 1950s." I'll define radicalism: 1) a sharp critique of capitalism and advocacy of a more equal society; 2) a commitment to popular mobilization against the racial status quo by all necessary and effective means; 3) a refusal to take sides in the Cold War and an insistence that anticolonial liberation in the Third World is the true international corollary to black freedom at home. B. What should African American activists learn from the life of Gandhi, apart from the nonviolent method of massive resistance?

Report Option: Robert Williams, *Negroes with Guns*, and the controversy over self-defense in 1959.

Essential but optional reading for anyone interested in the media and the movement:

Walker, Jenny. "A Media-Made Movement? Black Violence and Nonviolence in the Historiography of the Civil Rights Movement." In *Media, Culture and the Modern African American Freedom Struggle*, edited by Brian Ward, 41-66. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2001. **ER524 LOG**

## 2/9: Sit-ins, Freedom Rides and Charismatic Leadership

Fairclough, *To Redeem the Soul of America*, 57-83, ch. 3. (27) LOG

"An Appeal for Human Rights," in Garrow, ed., *Atlanta, Georgia, 1960-1961* (Carlson, 1989), 183-187. **ER340**

John Lewis and Franklin McCain, "Interviews," in Howell Raines, *My Soul is Rested* (Putnam's, 1977), 71-82. Ereserves under "Raines, My Soul is Rested, excerpts" **ER340**

**OPTIONAL:** "Documents on the Student Sit-Ins, 1960," in Carson, et. al., eds., *The Eyes on the Prize Civil Rights Reader*, "SNCC Statement of Purpose," 119-120; Ella J. Baker, "Bigger Than a Hamburger," 120-123, James Lawson, "Eve of Nonviolent Revolution?" 130-132 **ER524**

Discussion: What did the students want in the sit-ins, besides a hamburger at a lunch counter? Who inspired them? What was their *analysis* of the system of segregation (as revealed by "An Appeal for Human Rights") they were attacking and how did lunch counters fit? How was King responding to or contributing to the wave of student activism? Was his rhetoric and role different from the other adults involved, James Lawson and Ella Baker, especially?

Report Option, Septima Clark, *Echo in My Soul* (Founder of the Citizenship Education Program, which SCLC would incorporate in 1961; one of the most influential women in the movement).

## 2/11: The Albany, Georgia Movement, 1961-1962

Fairclough, ch. 4, *To Redeem the Soul of America*, 85-109. LOG

Forman, *Making of Black Revolutionaries*, 247-259, 274-277. **ER340**

**Optional: “Documents on SNCC in Georgia and Mississippi,”** Tom Hayden (skip, look at only pp.94-99): Robert Moses, Slater King, Bernice Reagon, excerpted in Levy, ed., *Documentary History*, 94-99. (useful in capturing the positive value local participants found in the Albany movement) **ER340**

Discussion: Why did Albany widen the breach between King and the students? In what ways was Albany a movement “failure,” and in what ways was it an achievement in itself, or at least a step in the social learning of the movement? What kind of relationships with local people could students form that King could not, simply by virtue of their commitment to “the long haul?”

### **2/13: Confrontation: Birmingham**

Fairclough, *To Redeem the Soul of America*, ch. 5, pp. 111-139 (28) **LOG**  
Ed Gardner, “Interview,” in Raines, *My Soul is Rested*, 139-145. Ereserves under “Raines, My Soul is Rested, excerpts” ER340

Rosenberg, Jonathan, and Zachary Karabell, eds. *Kennedy, Johnson, and the Quest for Justice: The Civil Rights Tapes*. New York: Norton, 2003, “Meeting on Civil Rights, May 21, 1963”, 106-113. 7 **ER524 [Print the whole of this, since we’ll be using it for the next three classes]**

**Optional:** Martin Luther King, Jr., *Why We Can’t Wait* (Mentor, 1964), pp. 102-115, on Birmingham and aftermath. **ER340** [King claimed they had won all of their goals in Birmingham. Why?]

Discussion: What does Gardner’s oral history add to Fairclough’s historical narrative focused on SCLC? Why do you think King settled in the end for so much less than what he and Shuttlesworth had demanded? What can we learn from Robert Kennedy’s vantage point, about the events in Birmingham and how the Kennedy administration tried to shape them and respond to them? **Optional:** Why do you think King’s presentation of the final agreement May 10 differs the way it does from Fairclough’s?

Report Option: The May 10 agreement and what really went down in Birmingham.

### **2/16: The “Negro Revolution” and Crisis Management: From Birmingham to the Civil Rights Bill**

Fairclough, *To Redeem the Soul of America*, 141-149. [NO LOG]  
“Debate on the Civil Rights Bill of 1963”: John F. Kennedy, June 11, 1963, vs. Richard Russell, June 12, 1963, in Dudley, ed., *The Civil Rights Movement: Opposing viewpoints*, 177-186. **ER340**

Rosenberg, Jonathan, and Zachary Karabell, eds. *Kennedy, Johnson, and the Quest for Justice: The Civil Rights Tapes*. New York: Norton, 2003, pp. 114-129. 15 **ER524**.

“President Kennedy’s Report to Congress Outlining a Civil Rights Bill,” in Leon Friedman, *The Civil Rights Reader*, 245-249. 4 **ER340**

**Optional:** Lentz, Richard. “Snarls Echoing ‘Round the World: The 1963 Birmingham Civil Rights Campaign on the World Stage.” *American Journalism* (2000), 69-89. **ER524 . LOG**

Discussion: What new civil rights issues were black people forcing onto local agendas and the national agenda in the spring and summer of 1963? What pushed the Kennedys to submit a civil rights bill, and how did the demands of the movement shape the legislative content? How did JFK get around the property rights argument advanced by business owners declaring an absolute right to serve whoever they chose? Examine his rhetoric carefully: what kind of country would he have liked to be able to show to the rest of the “Free World?”

### **2/18: A Revolution or a Picnic? The 1963 March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom**

Fairclough, *To Redeem the Soul of America*, 149-161. 7 [NO LOG]

Rosenberg, Jonathan, and Zachary Karabell, eds. *Kennedy, Johnson, and the Quest for Justice: The Civil Rights Tapes*. New York: Norton, 2003, "Meeting on Civil Rights," August 28, 1963 in pp. 130-140. **ER524** 10

Tom Kahn, "March's radical demands point way for struggle," *New America*, 9/24/63, (1963 march on Washington document) **ER340**

John Lewis, "Address at the March on Washington," and Martin Luther King, "I Have a Dream," Aug. 28, 1963, in Carson, ed, *Eyes on the Prize Reader*, 163-165. **ER340**, 3

**OPTIONAL:** Randolph, Rustin, et.al., "Correspondence Regarding the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom," 1963 (Rustin Papers and National Urban League Papers, Library of Congress). **ER524**.

**Both Optional:** Martin Luther King, Jr., *Why We Can't Wait* (Mentor, 1964), pp. 122-125 on the March.; Malcolm X, "Message to the Grass Roots," November 1963, in George Breitman, ed., *Malcolm X Speaks* (NY: 1965), pp. 12-17.

Discussion: Today tests our ability to analyze primary documents. In the optional reading, King later called the March on Washington a "dynamic experience of democracy . . . visible to the world," of which every "dedicated American could be proud." Malcolm X denounced it as a "farce on Washington." The Kennedys had turned a promising plan for massive civil disobedience into a "picnic" and a "circus," he alleged. By integrating the march, whites "infiltrated it" and weakened its militancy. Years later, March organizer Bayard Rustin lamented that the original economic demands for jobs were "lost" in the dominant rhetoric of "pass the bill." How clear in these readings was the purported shift in the march's goals from jobs to civil rights (*passing* the Kennedy bill)? How clear was the shift in the march's tactics from militant civil disobedience to tame rallying? Finally, judging from the March leaders' conversations with John Kennedy, was the march simply an exercise in mobilizing support for the Kennedy bill? How capable of listening to their suggestions does Kennedy seem?

### **2/20: Contingent Moments: The Media, the Crisis and the Presidential Transition**

Godfrey Hodgson, *America in Our Time: From World War II to Nixon—What Happened and Why* (New York: Random House, 1976, 1995), 7 The Media, 8, The Crisis, excerpts. LOG

Discussion: How did the new technology of television news come to dominate political communication in 1963? How did the circumstances of the Kennedy assassination feed into the growing sense of national crisis amplified by television? How did it shape the choices Lyndon Johnson made in his first weeks in office?

### **2/23: Ambivalent Muddling: Lyndon Johnson Embraces "That Bitch of a War"**

Young, *The Vietnam Wars*, 6, Taking the War North (1963-1964), 105-123. 18 pp. LOG  
Barry Goldwater, "Victory in Asia," from *Where I Stand* (1964), in Cohen, ed., *Vietnam*, 97.

Lyndon Johnson, Richard Russell, Adlai Stevenson, McGeorge Bundy, Presidential telephone conversations, May 27, 1964, in Michael Beschloss, ed., *Taking Charge: The Johnson White House Tapes, 1963-1964* (Touchstone, 1997), 362-374. *These tapes were a real news sensation when they were released a few years ago, specifically these conversations.*

Discussion: How did domestic politics affect Lyndon Johnson's approach to Vietnam? Why, despite his pessimism and that of many of his advisors, did he press ahead with the war? Was the administration deceiving the Congress and the people? Did CBS News mirror that ambivalence? Was he indeed seeking "no wider war?" What was the point of bombing the North? What evidence exists to support Young's thesis that the United States would simply not allow a South Vietnamese leader to seek "neutralization" through negotiation?

### **2/25: "Seduction": Missed Opportunities, Bombing and the Ground War**

Young, *The Vietnam Wars*, 7, A Wider War (1964-1965), 124-149. LOG

“New York Times Coverage of the U Thant Diplomatic Initiative, February/March 1965,” Max Frankel and Thomas Hamilton (Ereserves).

Lyndon B. Johnson, “Peace Without Conquest, April 7, 1965,” in Cohen, ed., *Vietnam*, 108-112.

Discussion: 1) Why were the peacemakers (Ball, U Thant, de Gaulle) unsuccessful? 2) What was the point of bombing (Rolling Thunder), the March coup overthrowing General Khanh, the introduction of ground troops in March 1965? 3) What potential existed for “pacification” as advocated by ambassador Lodge and John Paul Vann, instead of large scale bombing and the commitment of conventional forces? 4) Johnson’s speech wrapped up in one package every major justification any president ever offered for fighting. Which justification was most important to him, do you think? Which was most at odds with North Vietnamese perceptions and determination?

Report Suggestion: The State Department White Paper of February 1965 and Journalist I.F. Stone’s critique.

### **2/27: On the Tiger’s Back: The American Way of War**

Young, *The Vietnam Wars*, 8, The American Invasion of South Vietnam (1965-1966), 150-171. LOG

“Memoranda on Vietnam Escalation,” July-December 1965, by George Ball and Robert McNamara, in Gettleman, et.al. *America and Vietnam* 281-83, 286-9, 291. (In class re-enactment of the Ball-McNamara debate – 1 point person on each side). Ereserves.

In class: LBJ and MLK discuss Vietnam on the white house tapes, August 1965.

Discussion: 1) What was LBJ prepared to offer Hanoi? Why did diplomacy again fail? 2) How did LBJ and his advisers see democratic debate and dissent? 3) Was the July 1965 debate between Ball and McNamara a real debate leading to an authentic decision, or one staged with foregone conclusions (i.e. had Johnson already made decisions committing the U.S. to a course of action)? 4) What was the American way of war? Were there alternatives to “search and destroy” and “body counts” and “attrition?”

### **3/1: Desegregation and Poverty at the Civil Rights Crossroads, 1964**

Fairclough, *To Redeem the Soul of America*, 163-191. (28) LOG

King, “People in Action,” Selections from King’s *New York Amsterdam News* column.

Discussion: What kinds of lessons did King and others draw from the Atlanta demonstrations and the St. Augustine movement? Was direct action likely to address the underlying inequities and exclusions in jobs and housing?

### **3/3: All the Way with LBJ?**

Fairclough, *To Redeem the Soul of America*, ch. 8, 193-223. LOG

Martin Luther King, Jr., *Why We Can’t Wait* (Mentor, 1964), read or print only pp. 134-146, on the Bill of Rights for the Disadvantaged.

“Statement by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. On Accepting the N.Y.C. Medallion,” 12/17/64, Cleveland Robinson Papers, NYU Tamiment Library. Compare this statement with Fairclough’s treatment of King’s economic philosophy in 1964 and, if time permits, with the New York Times coverage of the event (search under “King” and “Medallion” and December 1964).

Discussion: How did King support Freedom Summer and the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party challenge in Atlantic City? Was King’s attempt to bridge the interests of the black and white poor in *Why We Can’t Wait* “not altogether successful” as Fairclough argues? Finally, how do you evaluate Fairclough’s point that by 1964, King was “behind the times” in terms of his

economic thought? Why did Hoover go after King when he did, calling him America's "most notorious liar?"

### **3/5: No Class – Reading Day SPRING BREAK**

#### **3/15: Selma and the Voting Rights Act**

Fairclough, *To Redeem the Soul of America*, 225-51. LOG  
"NAACP Petition to the All-White Board of Aldermen, Natchez, Mississippi, 8/24/65," in Jack Davis, ed., *The Civil Rights Movement* (Blackwell, 2001), pp. 248-251.

- 1) How did the local nonviolent protests in Selma make such an impact on the national debate over passing the voting rights act? Through what channels of influence and communication? 2) Was King dishonest with his own people when he secretly agreed to turn back in the first march to Montgomery after "Bloody Sunday" and the death of Jimmie Lee Jackson? Why did he do so? 3) How in particular might you interpret the Natchez, Mississippi petition as a response to the Voting Rights Act's passage, and an expression of how local movements sought to use the vote?

#### **3/17: Organizational Decline and the Southern Roots of Black Power**

Fairclough, *To Redeem the Soul of America*, 253-70. LOG  
Smith, Jean. "I Learned to Feel Black." In *The Black Power Revolt*, edited by Floyd Barbour, 247-62. New York: Collier, 1968. ER524

#### **3/19: Round Table 1: 1965–1966: Black Freedom Movement -- Where Do We Go from Here?**

After the Selma to Montgomery march and the voting rights act, the debate swirled around where the freedom movement should dedicate its attention and time. Protest or politics? Interracialism or independent black political power? How to assess and join the new War on Poverty? Isn't poverty and Northern racism a far more formidable challenge than dismantling Southern Jim Crow? Or shouldn't the movement concentrate on completing the civil rights revolution in the South and enforcement of existing legislation? Can the federal government really be relied upon as an ally? Candidates: Malcolm X, a range of Mississippi activists, Bayard Rustin, Lyndon Johnson, King, Fannie Lou Hamer, Stokely Carmichael (and the Loundes County Freedom Organization, the original Black Panther Party), Reginald Hawkins (Charlotte black leader protesting lack of representation of the poor on local antipoverty boards), Adam Clayton Powell (Chair of the House Education and Labor Committee in charge of oversight, Whitney M. Young. [A list of candidates and a bibliography will follow, but this assignment also depends on your resourcefulness in locating research materials].

Class: Please Read: King, Martin Luther, Jr. "The American Dream, Sermon delivered at Ebenezer Baptist Church." 7/4/65. Atlanta, Ga. In *A Knock at Midnight* (Martin Luther King, Jr. Papers Project, Stanford University)  
[http://www.stanford.edu/group/King/publications/sermons/650704\\_The\\_American\\_Dream.html](http://www.stanford.edu/group/King/publications/sermons/650704_The_American_Dream.html)

#### **3/22: The Arrogance of Power? War and Diplomacy in the Deepening Quagmire**

Young, *The Vietnam Wars*, 9, An American War (1966-1967), 172-191. 18 LOG  
Senator J. William Fulbright, "The Arrogance of Power," (1966), in Mooney and West, eds., *Vietnam*, 97-99. 2  
David Ross, Medic, "The New-Life Hamlet," in Al Santoli, ed., *Everything We Had: An Oral History of the Vietnam War* (Ballantine, 1981), 44-51.

How did the Americanization of the war change the society of the South? How did it look from the ground to David Ross? And again, were there real diplomatic alternatives to deepening American involvement? Or were the U.S. and North Vietnam so at odds about the nature of the

conflict that they could not compromise on the other side's demands without undermining completely their own rationales?

Report suggestion: More on the diplomatic initiative by British Prime Minister Harold Wilson and Soviet Foreign Minister Alexi Kosygin, or the opening by Harry Ashmore and William Baggs.

### **3/24: The Antiwar Movement – Establishment Liberals and Radicalized Civil Rights Leaders**

Fairclough, *To Redeem the Soul of America*, 333-345 12 [NO LOG]

J. William Fullbright, "U.S. Imperial Policy is Creating Two Wars: The War Abroad and the War at Home," American Bar Association, 8/8/67, 127-137. Ryn Shane-Armstrong and Lynn Armstrong, eds., *The Vietnam War: Great Speeches in History* (Greenhaven, 2003) 10 ER340

Martin Luther King, Jr. "A Time to Break Silence," April 4, 1967, in James Washington, ed., *A Testament of Hope*, 231-243. 12 ER340

Septima P. Clark, "The New Resistance Movement," 1/15/69, Septima Clark Papers, Avery Research Center for African American History and Culture, Charleston, S.C. 6 **ER524**

Discussion: According to our dissenters, was the government simply making unwise allocations of resources or was there something fundamentally wrong with the government? Could King's position now be called a radical one? How does his opposition differ from Fullbright's? How far has grassroots activist Septima Clark come from her days as a Citizenship educator in the SCLC?

### **3/26: The Antiwar Movement – Radicalism, Repression and Splits on the Left**

Young, *The Vietnam Wars*, 10, *The War in America (1965-1967)*, 192-209. **LOG**

1) SDS, "The Antiwar Movement Should Seek Radical Change in America," National Action Brochure, 8/1/69, 192-196; 2) Sam Brown, "The Antiwar Movement Should Seek to Influence Mainstream America," *Washington Monthly*, 8/70, 197-203. William Dudley, ed., *The Vietnam War: Opposing Viewpoints* (San Diego: Greenhaven, 1998). **ER340**

Norman Mailer, *The Armies of the Night* (New American Library, 1968), 102-105, 135-143, 300-309. **ER340**

Discussion: Why did antiwar protesters target corporations and universities and induction centers? How did their tactics change over time as the war dragged on? Is it simply the brutality of the war, as revealed in journalism, that is pushing them to more open and culturally outrageous forms of protest and civil disobedience? Were the left wing anti-imperialists and the "hippies" helping or hurting the anti-war movement?

Suggested Report: The Media and the Antiwar Movement: Gitlin, Todd. *The Whole World Is Watching: Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980, central chapters.

### **3/29: The Soldiers: Working Class War [Heavier Reading than Usual]**

Christian G. Appy, *Working-Class War*, pp. 6-9, 12-15, 18-23, 28-43, 266-69, 298-305.

**LOG** (Skim the early sections on the geography and working class origins of the soldiers. Focus on the machinery of induction, their experiences and the class consciousness they left the war with).

Discussion: Where did they come from? Who were they? How did the machinery of the draft work? Who got sent where and what happened? Were the inequities mainly a function of class (as our author argues) or did racism also inform the draft and the combat assignments? What experiences did soldiers bring back and how were they met upon return? How many of them were really called "baby killers?"

Suggested Report: British Journalist Godfrey Hodgson, *America in Our Time*, observations on the anti-war movement and the tide of American public opinion against the war. How could it be that by 1970 the only thing more unpopular than the war itself in American public opinion polls were the anti-war protesters? Essentially he argues that there were two antiwar movements: one working class and pragmatic, seeking to get out of a pointless “mess”; the other middle-class and moralistic, seeking to stop a “crime” against the Vietnamese.

### **3/31: Black Soldiers in the Nam**

Wallace Terry, ed., *Bloods: An Oral History of the Vietnam War by Black Veterans* New York, Ballantine, 1984. Specialist 4 Richard J. Ford, 31-5, 42-3, 48-52; Specialist 5 Emmanuel J. Holloman, 79-88; Specialist 4 Stephen A. Howard, 118-129. **ER340**

Robert Rawls, Rifleman, “A Black GI,” in Al Santoli, ed., *Everything We Had: An Oral History of the Vietnam War* (Ballantine, 1981), 153-159. **ER340**

Discussion: How much did “race matter” in Vietnam? To what degree did battle or the experience of heightened racial consciousness among African American soldiers? Are there common difficulties blacks encountered in “re-integrating” themselves into a still segregated society?

### **4/2: Round Table 2: Fall 1967 Should the U.S. Stay the Course in Vietnam, Escalate, or Withdraw? Fall 1967.**

A representative sample of “hawks” and “doves.” Make sure the person you select left enough of a record to fill a 5 page paper: Hawks: Lyndon Johnson, Robert McNamara, Walt Whitman Rostow, William Westmoreland. Doves: Robert F. Kennedy, Howard Zinn, Dave Dellinger, Abbie Hoffman.

### **4/5: The 1968 Tet Offensive and the Turning of US Public Opinion**

Young, *The Vietnam Wars*, 11, The “Cross-Over Point” (1967-1968), 210-231. **LOG**  
“Documents on Tet, 1968: Perception and Reality,” **ER340** in Cohen, ed., *Vietnam*, pp. 205-11, 214-15: “Mike Wallace, “Saigon Under Fire: CBS News Special Report, January 31, 1968” Walt W. Rostow, “The Diffusion of Power,” 2/8/68; General Earle Wheeler, “Report on the Situation” 2/27/68; Walter Cronkite, “Who, What, When, Where, Why: Report from Vietnam, 2/27/68”

Discussion: What was the American response to the Tet offensive on the ground in Vietnam? Could it be said to have been a victory for the US and RVN? Was television news reporting a defeat or editorializing? Or were military officials and policymakers living in their own fantasy worlds?

**4/7: Round Table 3: Media Debate, 1999 --** Were the real prospects for defeating the Communist insurgency in Vietnam somehow compromised or defeated by the liberal media? Participants will include journalists who covered the war and scholars who have tried to assess the impact of reporting on public support for the war. [Bibliography to Follow]:

Did the media misreport the nature of Tet, causing a collapse of support for the Johnson strategy of winning the war through attrition, pacification and bombing? Or was reporting accurate and the rapid loss of elite and public support for Johnson rooted in an accurate perception of the war’s reality?

Class reading: Seymour M. Hersh, “What Happened at My Lai?” in Gettleman, et.al. eds, *Vietnam and America*, 410-424. **ER340**

**4/9: Spring Holiday – No classes**

#### **4/12: Freedom North: The Chicago Freedom Movement**

Fairclough, *To Redeem the Soul of America*, 271-307 LOG  
“Program of the Chicago Freedom Movement, July 1966,” in David Garrow, ed., *Chicago, 1966* (New York: Carlson, 1989), 97-109. **ER340**  
**Optional:** John McKnight, “The Summit Negotiations: Chicago, August 17, 1966-August 26, 1966,” in David Garrow, ed., *Chicago, 1966* (New York: Carlson, 1989), 111, 118-23, 126-134, 139-145. **ER524**

Discussion: King drew directly on the rhetoric of the “Program” in his speeches. What ideology does it reflect (or patchwork of ideas)? Why did the movement choose direct action in white suburbs in June? Was the Chicago movement any more a “failure” than Birmingham? What are Fairclough’s main sources when he discusses the rioting in July? What do the negotiations tell us about different participants’ visions of how social change should occur, morally and politically?

#### **4/14: Black Power**

Fairclough, *To Redeem the Soul of America*, 309-331 LOG 23  
Stokely Carmichael, “Power and Racism” (*New York Review of Books*, September 1966), 63-76; Floyd McKissick, “Programs for Black Power,” 211-214 In *The Black Power Revolt*, edited by Floyd Barbour. New York: Collier, 1968. **ER340**

Discussion: What were the sources and rationales for black power? How central is the popular image of violence to the practitioners of black power? To what degree did King concede essential points to the Black Power critique? To what degree did he resist its impulses?

#### **4/16: Where Do We Go From Here?**

Fairclough, *To Redeem the Soul of America*, 345-55. [NO LOG]  
King, Martin Luther, “The President’s Address to the Tenth Anniversary Convention of the SCLC, Atlanta, Ga., August 16, 1967,” in Robert L. Scott and Wayne Brockriede, eds., *The Rhetoric of Black Power* (NY: Harper, 1969), 146-165. **ER340** Transcription of the original sound recording is at the King Papers Project website:  
[http://www.stanford.edu/group/King/publications/speeches/Where\\_do\\_we\\_go\\_from\\_here.html](http://www.stanford.edu/group/King/publications/speeches/Where_do_we_go_from_here.html)

How was King absorbing the black power philosophy and yet trying to go beyond the integration/separatism dichotomy?

#### **4/19: Fires in the “Dark Ghettoes”**

Eldridge Cleaver, “Domestic Law and International Order,” in Howard, ed., *The Sixties* (Washington Square Press, 1982)125-132 **ER524**  
King, “The Crisis in America’s Cities,” *Gandhi Marg* 12 (January 1968), 17-23. **ER524** Delivered 8/15/67, SCLC Convention and before the Kerner Commission on Civil Disorders.  
Richard Nixon, “If Mob Rule Takes Hold in the U.S.,” in Bloom and Breines, eds., *Takin’ It to the Streets*, 338-342. **ER340**  
Ryan, William. *Blaming the Victim*. New York: Vintage, 1971, ch. 9 “Counting Black Bodies.” **ER340**

Discussion: What does each of our speakers regard as the primary reasons for ghetto revolts? What solutions do they offer? [our reporter will help guide discussion and provide information on the empirical research into the “riots.”]

Suggested Report: Fogelson, Robert M. *Violence as Protest: A Study of Riots and Ghettoes*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1971.



**4/21: Round Table 4: Causes and Remedies for the “Urban Crisis” – Fall 1967**

A representative sample of voices – liberal, radical, conservative, black and white. Draw from the extensive congressional hearings and the Kerner Commission microfilm collection in Jackson library. Who is rioting? Why? What needs to be done about it?

**4/23: The Nonviolent Dream and the Poor People’s March**

Fairclough, *To Redeem the Soul of America*, 357-397. LOG  
Jose Yglesias, “Dr. King’s March on Washington, Part II,” NYT Magazine, 3/31/68, reprinted in *Black Protest in the Sixties*, ed. August Meier, et. al., (Marcus Weiner, 1991), 276-293. 16

Was it Quixotic to think that an “interracial coalition of the poor” could march on Washington and compel the government to revitalize the War on Poverty? Was the March a “failure”? By what standards? Was the loss of King’s leadership fatal or the effort doomed from the start? Or did they succeed in some ways?

Report: The Public Statements or Press Coverage of the Poor People’s March

**4/26: Nixon’s War: Peace or Honor?**

Young, *The Vietnam Wars*, 12, Bloodbaths (1968-1971), 232-253. LOG  
Richard Nixon, “Vietnamization Provides America a Way Out of Vietnam,” TV Speech, 11/3/69, 141-150; George McGovern, “Vietnamization is a Cruel Hoax,” U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, 2/4/70, 151-155. William Dudley, ed., *The Vietnam War: Opposing Viewpoints* (San Diego: Greenhaven, 1998) ER340

Discussion: Describe key elements and decisions in Richard Nixon's "secret plan" for ending the war in Vietnam and bringing U.S. troops home. How did he justify the invasion of Cambodia in these terms? What was the American public’s and Congress’s response to the invasion of Cambodia? How was it possible for Nixon to prolong the war for 4 years (1969-1973) without major social upheaval in the U.S.? What kind of war was Nixon’s war?

**4/28: American Demoralization, Vietnamization and Air War**

Young, *The Vietnam Wars*, 13, “A Savage Retreat” (1971-1973), 254-280. LOG  
“Vietnam Veterans against the War, Statement by John Kerry,” 4/23/71, in Cohen, ed., *Vietnam*, 366-371.

Discussion: As the official rationale for the war became “withdrawal” and the maintenance of “credibility,” how did the troops in Vietnam and returning veterans respond? Discuss the range of coping among soldiers, from self-medication to outspoken protest. How did Nixon respond to disclosure and dissent at home?

**4/30: Their War: American Legacies and Southeast Asian Bloodletting**

Young, *The Vietnam Wars*, 14, “Their War” (1973-1975), 281-299, LOG What do the final actions of the Americans, the South Vietnamese, and the PRG/DRV reveal about the respective societies and how they waged war? Young, *The Vietnam Wars*, 15, After the War (1975-1990), 300-318. LOG How can we explain the hostilities that broke out with Vietnam and its neighbors, and how was the nature of the “peace” imposed on the South an outgrowth of the years of war itself?

**3/3: Legacies of Struggle and Violence: Amnesia and Commemoration**

Young, *The Vietnam Wars*, Epilogue, 319-330.  
Fairclough, *To Redeem the Soul of America*, 397-405.

In the years since the U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam, how well has the nation learned from its experience of defeat? How far has the country moved toward fulfillment of King’s dreams? Have the ways in which we commemorate the sacrifices of veterans of the civil rights conflict and the Vietnam war done justice to what they sacrificed?

**3/4: Final Discussion: Lessons of the Past**

By now you ought to have some solid ideas for the final exam question. Share with the class one of the lessons and the evidence or episode that most clearly illustrates it.

**CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF STUDENT ORAL PERFORMANCE:**

**These are the sheets I will separately hand back to you periodically.**

**Student General Participation Evaluation—Poor (1) Fine (2), Good (3), Excellent (4) (Comments)**

Student \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 Consistency of preparation and participation. 1 2 3 4

**Listening/Speaking on Topic:** listening well and responding to something specific.  
 1 2 3 4

**Differentiation:** Expressing your own conclusions and opinions separately from the people who made history and wrote about, from your classmates’ and the professor’s views. Clarity and respect in expressing differences and agreements.

Evidence: Reference to statements, events, data that support your truth claims.  
 1 2 3 4

**Small Group Discussion Peer Evaluation—Poor (1) Fine (2), Good (3), Excellent (4) (Comments)**

Remember: Change leaders and recorder/reporters every time. Remember, you are not evaluating whether your group member agrees or disagrees with you or whether you like them as a person. Rather you are judging how well and consistently they participate, challenge, respect and contribute to a productive group dynamic, which can often have conflict!

Student \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 Reviewed by (Optional) \_\_\_\_\_

Consistent Preparation. 1 2 3 4  
 On-topic insights based on evidence the class has considered. 1 2 3 4  
 Leadership and help keeping the group “on track.” 1 2 3 4  
 Listening and permission of others to participate or differ. 1 2 3 4

**Oral Report**

Student \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 1. Attention-grabbing introduction. 1 2 3 4  
 2. Succinct preview of content. 1 2 3 4  
 3. Clarity and accuracy of content. 1 2 3 4  
 4. **Connection between Analysis and Evidence:** Are you presenting the most compelling pieces of evidence in support of each point? 1 2 3 4

**6. Logical development. Do your points lead to one another, or is your talk “choppy,” without smooth transitions or a clear sense of where you are going?**  
 1 2 3 4

**Delivery/Audience Connection:** Is your talk spoken, not read? Are you connecting well with your audience, with eye contact, gesture, projection and varied tone of your voice?