

## History 212-01-06, Spring 2016 [WI] Lives and Times: The United States Since 1865

### Professor Thomas Jackson

Office: MHRA 2141

Office Phone: 334-4040; History Dept.: 334-5992

Office Hours: M, W, 1-2, and by appointment

Teaching Assistants:

HIS 212-01 Mr. Matthew Esterline [mcesterl@uncg.edu](mailto:mcesterl@uncg.edu), F, 10-10:50 SOEB 106

HIS 212-02 Ms. Katrina Loperl, [kmloperl@uncg.edu](mailto:kmloperl@uncg.edu), F 10-10:50, Bryan 112

HIS 212-03 Ms. Kimberly Cheek [kmcheek2@uncg.edu](mailto:kmcheek2@uncg.edu), F 10-10:50 Bryan 121

HIS 212-04 Mr. Matthew Esterline [mcesterl@uncg.edu](mailto:mcesterl@uncg.edu), F, 11-11:50 Bryan 112

HIS 212-05 Ms. Katrina Loperl, [kmloperl@uncg.edu](mailto:kmloperl@uncg.edu), F 11-11:50, Curry 303

HIS 212-06 Ms. Kimberly Cheek [kmcheek2@uncg.edu](mailto:kmcheek2@uncg.edu), F 11-11:50 Bryan 132

M,W, 10-10:50

Ferguson 100

[tjackson@uncg.edu](mailto:tjackson@uncg.edu)

"Only now is the child finally divested of all that he has been. His origins are become remote as is his destiny and not again in all the world's turning will there be terrains so wild and barbarous to try whether the stuff of creation may be shaped to man's will or whether his own heart is not another kind of clay."

-- Cormac McCarthy, *Blood Meridian* (1985)

This course examines, through reading, discussion, and writing, how individual lives interacted with larger historical forces in the United States since 1865. **"Collective biography" offers an excellent way to understand how history shaped the experiences of ordinary (and exceptional) people, without losing sight of individual consciousness and choice.** People aspire to make history in concert or conflict with others. Biography brings the past alive and informs us how people move through the life cycle, shaped by family, community, and institutions that nurture or oppress them, and by their participation in organizations devoted to social change.

*Understanding* historical change requires that we put people in *contexts*: **events** like the Civil War or Great Depression; political **party shifts** like the elections of 1896 or 1936; popular **movements** like the Populist revolt or the civil rights movement; **ideologies** like individualism or progressivism; and changing **social locations and structures** of race, class, gender, or ethnicity. This is a fundamental skill of historical thinking: *contextualization*.

A second skill is called *taking historical perspective*, which asks us to understand people *first* as they understood themselves, in light of the norms and knowledge of their day. *Then* we can see in ways they might not have seen how their actions had consequences, how their ideas and strategies were shaped by larger group processes, rapidly changing circumstances, complex power relationships, and their own creative imaginations.

It *has* been a wild and sometimes barbarous 150 years. People were often driven beyond their knowing or even imagining to act against others in hostile, divisive, and violent ways. Yet they also acted in courageous, unifying, and redemptive ways. The quest for freedom, for mastery of our individual and collective destinies, is a major theme in this country's history. Yet we often seem destined to repeat the past, to walk rutted paths with hearts and minds made of a kind of ancient clay.

During and after European conquest of the Western Hemisphere, the United States became the home and the destination of an astounding array of the world's peoples. If they weren't already here, they arrived on these shores driven by hope, economic necessity, and in the case of African Americans, brutal force. The "Indians" of course never saw India; they were here. The country has since been riven with regional, class, ethnic, racial, religious, and cultural divisions. Yet often in the heat of conflict at home and abroad, we see extraordinary acts of cooperation and major strides toward inclusion. Despite our diversity and conflicts, we retain a rough, if sometimes forced, cohesiveness as a nation.

### Course Content and Major Themes

**The United States was a nation built upon ideals of freedom, equality, openness, and resistance to imperial tyranny. Yet it was also built by millions of unfree, coerced, and exploited laborers of all colors and nationalities.** The nation's power brokers excluded, subordinated, and segregated people as much as they included and integrated them. Some people

were welcomed into the circle of “We the People” even as others were pushed out -- only to fight their way into the circle later.

**Can this nation achieve peace and cooperation with other nations at the same time that we resolve our political conflicts with the rough democratic tools inherited from our forebearers?** Can we balance majority rule and minority rights in a country that divides its riches so unequally, and still segregates its people so efficiently? In a world beset by enemies foreign and domestic, real and imagined, can we continue to provide for our safety without diminishing our liberty? And here is a more recent, but perhaps the most pressing challenge: Can we retool our own means of production and consumption so as to not damage the biosphere?

History, as seen through the eyes of those who made it -- and through our own trained minds -- can be an invaluable tool in modeling the historical clay that you will give to your own children. Out of historical knowledge, you may create vessels of wisdom and sustenance rather than perpetuating heavy dead burdens dragged from one generation to the next.

The course will consider the biggest questions of American history through representative biographies of public figures who engaged in conflict over the meaning of democracy and how to achieve justice in the social order. We will follow their lives in context as they grappled with questions such as:

- What were the necessary **political and economic conditions to make real the 14<sup>th</sup> amendment’s promise of equal citizenship** after the Civil War ended slavery?
- Under **what rules of the economic game could Americans “better their condition,”** in Lincoln’s words, in a new era when “captains of industry” and armies of factory workers suddenly dominated large sectors of the American economy?
- How could **women achieve equality in the political sphere and the family**, when *both* public and private spheres traditionally subordinated them to men?
- How well did the nation strike a balance between **national security** in wartime, and **freedom of speech**, assembly, and movement?
- Was America a Christian Republic, and could the teachings of science be reconciled with evangelical beliefs in the inerrancy of the Bible?
- Why did Jim Crow segregation in the South become codified into law in the 1890s-1900s, and what strategies in the 1960s and 1970s proved effective in **African Americans’ struggle to dismantle this oppressive social system**?
- In an age of new media and economic distress, what solutions did political candidates pursue in order to rescue the country? **Was the media a conduit or an obstacle to serious democratic debate?**
- What role did ordinary citizens claim in defining the great issues affecting the U.S. role in the world: war and immigration?
- What impact did **radicalism and anti-radicalism** have on a country that was changing rapidly and incorporating many of world’s peoples into its economy, if not fully as citizens in its political system?

### Student Learning Objectives

**Upon successful completion of this course, students will be able to:**

- Demonstrate comprehension of major characters, events, decisions, ideologies, and trends in U.S. in a way that rises above recitation of facts to the level of *interpretation*. (People identify facts and dates accurately because they *matter* in explaining patterns of human experience and change).
- Discuss and debate conflicting positions taken by those who *lived* history *and* by historians who write about these actors. This involves critical analysis of primary and secondary sources.
- Write short essay quizzes and papers that compare, contrast and explain the points of view and actions of historical actors in terms of their *contexts* of opportunity and constraint.
- Conduct focused research, and write a paper based on scholarly and primary sources.
- Analyze lives in context so that you can imagine how your own life choices might respond to unpredictable change and shifting opportunities, and so that you may contribute to informed choices in a democratic society.

## Student Learning Activities – A Summary

**Participation, Group Discussion Reports, Quizzes, a Short Primary Source Analysis, a Focused Research Paper, and an Interpretive Final.** In this syllabus and (more refined) in the CANVAS modules for this course, I will provide focus questions for each class along with the full assignments. I mix textbook and scholarly readings, with loads of primary sources, including audiovisual materials available either on CANVAS or through Internet links. Classes will have short lectures, general question and answer sessions, and small group discussions. Lectures supply new material, amplify examples of themes discussed in texts, and introduce my own interpretations of the past. Weekly on-line quizzes draw on any assigned material or content presented in lectures. In 1 or 2 classes per week, groups of 5 meet in Teams for 15-20 minutes. Every 5<sup>th</sup> meeting, each student will lead the discussion and will be the “scribe” or “recorder-reporter” who summarizes and reports the discussion in writing. Reports draw upon notes that you share with your group, and discussions you have in teams. Use the Google Docs feature within “Groups” in CANVAS to prepare for these discussions.

The research paper, due the last day of class, will *explore in depth and in context one of the figures discussed in class*, drawing on original research in primary and secondary sources. But it will be *focused on a decision or controversy or key thread of expression*. A short proposal several weeks before the class will be reviewed by me, your TA, and one of your classmates. The paper will be evaluated by me in consultation with your TA and peer reviewer. Then, a final exam will ask you to tie together some of the major themes of the course, with selected examples.

## Required Reading and Other Materials

With a class this size I require that you bring paper copies of the reading, annotated in a way that aids you and your team mates in the mastery of key ideas and examples.

**John Hollitz** *Contending Voices: Biographical Explorations of the American Past, Volume II: Since 1865 (4th Edition)*

Available at the campus bookstore (if you purchase an earlier edition, make sure you get copies of new chapters on Sitting Bull, Ida Tarbell, and John Yoo).

**Course Reader of Primary Sources and Supplemental Readings available at Copy King**, 611 W. Lee St., Greensboro, ph. 333-9900 (I will announce when this is ready, but call them first). This will have most, but not all of the texts-- sometimes sources are better available on-line, and you have to buy Davidson's *Best of Enemies*.

Photographs, cartoons, films, television shows, either on the web or embedded in CANVAS. ALWAYS check the CANVAS site before preparing for class.

## Strategic Reading with a Purpose

Expect to read about 50-60 pages per week-- not a heavy reading load for a University course, and pared down since I started teaching this in 2000. **I require thorough preparation and focused analysis.** Your team-mates will be relying on you to pull your share, and there is no way to parse out readings among group members. You will need all eyes on everything to make sense of the main ideas and have a discussion that reveals agreement and disagreement. The University and I (following guidelines from the U.S. Department of Education) assume that **every 3 credit hour course will involve an additional 6 hours of reading and writing and preparation** outside of class. **Please find another class if you cannot make that minimal commitment to reading, preparing, and collaborating with your classmates on answering weekly questions.**

Every assignment will set up a dialogue drawing upon today's scholarship to help understand the primary sources, the “voices” of the principal actors who lived the history. Hollitz does this well with his chapters (pointing you directly to the primary sources when he discusses them). **I will add great sources, and you should use Hollitz's questions and mine to put scholarship and evidence in conversation.** This is the *most critical* critical thinking skill history can give you.

**How to Read:** Use the guiding questions at the end of the Hollitz textbook chapters and focusing questions in each of the CANVAS modules that I write (partial lists are in this syllabus, but CANVAS will have the most refined and helpful questions). Employ your skills of **previewing, reading, highlighting, note taking**, and of course, **writing**. Good writing consists of accurate **paraphrase, summary, and selective quotation**. **Then come grammatical sentences, coherent**

**paragraph construction** (one controlling idea), and **overall essay coherence** (frequently evident in good **transitions** between paragraphs. But see guidelines for group discussion reports below—essay coherence does not rigidly apply there).

### Know the Difference Between Primary and Secondary Sources

Primary sources are created by historical actors, usually close to the events; secondary sources are later writers who piece a story together with a variety of primary sources; scholarly secondary sources are the most systematic attempt professional historians and writers have of reconciling contradictions in the evidence and interpreting the past in ways intended to be full and complete and accurate.

**REQUIRED:** View the Jackson Library's excellent Tutorial: "Primary And Secondary Sources In Us History Tutorial." <http://library.uncg.edu/research/tutorials/video.aspx?f=PrimaryUS&t=Primary%20and%20Secondary%20Sources%20in%20US%20History>

### Electronic Devices

**Banned unless required** for class exercises. I used to leave to students' discretion how and whether to use laptops and cell phones and tablets in class. Now I have concluded that their effect on class attention as a whole is detrimental, which is not just an individual phenomenon. *Multi-tasking is a false promise. It is cognitively impossible to do it well, studies repeatedly show.* We will all be focused on paper texts and face to face interactions in class. (If you use Google Docs for small group discussion, the discussion leader may have that document open). <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/answer-sheet/wp/2014/09/25/why-a-leading-professor-of-new-media-just-banned-technology-use-in-class/>

### Assignments, Evaluation, and Weights in Calculating Your Final Grade

**Rev. Jackson Preaches:** "If you never risk saying something 'stupid,' you will never learn to say anything smart." -- Rev. Jackson

**Attendance and Preparation:** We expect you to attend every class and be on time: you will need to sit with your team. TAs will quietly take roll in Canvas and not count anyone after they finish. *More than four absences and your final grade drops a point for every day missed.* I make exceptions only on the grounds of documented personal or family illness, serious emergency, or the impending birth to a future UNCG student (**please do not even ask for exceptions on account of work schedules, appointments, oversleep, or extracurricular activity**). Email your TA in advance, or 24 hours after a legitimate excuse, with documentation attached. Five *consecutive* absences with no word from you constitute grounds for withdrawing you from the course. This class will rise or fall on your preparation and participation. Your success, particularly in groups, depends on faithful preparation and *bringing notes in*. If you *do* miss class, you should still make an effort to collaborate with your group on questions.

### Coursework will be graded according to the following criteria:

- 1) **Level of analysis/argumentation.** Present a thoughtful argument and interpretation, *not* a mere summary of facts. (It does not matter which side of an issue one argues, only how well or how poorly one makes the argument based on evidence. And usually we see elements of validity in different arguments. That is what groups and group reports on agreement and disagreement will show). When analyzing primary sources, be clear about authorship, audience, and key points. Explain them by putting them in the *contexts* of personal development, debate, conflict, or cooperation in which people felt moved to speak and act. With secondary scholarship, appreciate the author's **evidence and argument**. Be able to explain how the historian **analyzes** past controversies. Scholarly writing always has a discernable **structure** – see it before you dive in.
- 2) **Use of evidence.** The material you select to support your points should be relevant or pertinent to the question, and must clearly back up your points. In the final research paper, you must use footnotes according to the Chicago Manual of Style guide on Canvas.
- 3) **Clarity of communication.** Present the evidence and express your argument in a clear, comprehensible manner, in writing and orally. Strive to be concise, avoid rambling around an issue.
- 4) **Comprehension of events, personalities, developments in the context of interpretation.** This pertains to the quizzes and discussion reports and final project and exam.

A = excellent performance on all four criteria.

B = above average on all four, or excellent on some tempered by flaws in others.

C = average across the board, or above average in part but with significant flaws.

D = below average overall performance. This is a minimal pass that reflects some effort, but you will need to up your game if you expect to graduate.

**Grading Scale:** A+: 98-100; A: 93-97; A-: 90-92; B+: 87-89; B: 83-86; B-: 80-82; C+: 77-79; C: 73-76; C-: 70-72; D+: 67-69; D: 63-66; D-: 60-62; F: 59 and lower; N/C: 0 (as in No Credit in cases of failure to produce any work, and oh yes, in cases of plagiarism).

**Plagiarism: What it is and How to Avoid It!!**

Plagiarism, cheating, recycling old papers, any violation of the Academic Integrity Policy will be reported to the Dean of Students and appropriate penalties assigned. I am obligated to the University, the state of North Carolina, and every student who honestly earns their grades to uphold this policy. It is *your responsibility* to know the various forms of plagiarism and the university procedures for dealing with them.

The Dean of Students has an excellent website: <http://sa.uncg.edu/dean/academic-integrity/> See especially “Tutorial & Quiz,” and watch the video “Plagiarism 2.0: Information Ethics in the Digital Age.” <http://sa.uncg.edu/dean/academic-integrity/tutorial-quiz/>

**NB: DUE TO FLAGRANT ABUSES OF THIS POLICY LAST SEMESTER IN THIS CLASS, THIS VIDEO IS THE FIRST REQUIREMENT OF THE COURSE.** The most common form of plagiarism is so-called “patch plagiarism,” in which a student may or may not cite a website, but goes ahead and changes a few words in every sentence without in any way making an effort to sequence or express thoughts in their own words. If you have any doubt about what plagiarism is after reading the UNCG website, consult the UNC Chapel Hill “What is Plagiarism” Tutorial:

<http://www.lib.unc.edu/instruct/plagiarism/how/>

CITATION, PARAPHRASE, QUOTATION: see the canvas syllabus page for two reliable guides.

## Graded Assignments

**I. GENERAL PARTICIPATION AND PEER REVIEWS OF FINAL PROPOSALS AND ESSAYS 10%: We evaluate the clarity, relevance, and conciseness of your comments and questions during the general class discussion and discussion sections. Later in the semester, you will write a thorough and helpful one page peer evaluation of one of your peers’ final papers. Self-assessments and team members’ assessments will factor in this grade.**

**II. 10 BEST QUIZZES ON CANVAS, 30%--20 minute quizzes taken between Friday after class and Saturday night at 8:00. Combining multiple choice and short essay responses all to questions that MATTER.**

This is “formative” rather than “summative” assessment. It helps you digest the week’s material in a way that reinforces key points. We thereby what you are getting and not getting. I can thereby adjust my delivery. This is a running gauge of your comprehension. Quizzes must be your individual work, done alone; they are based on readings and mini-lectures. “Academic integrity” means that you do not discuss answers with your teammates or anyone. You may refer to all course materials and lecture notes while taking the quizzes. No way do I expect you to remember everything. Evidence of cheating is not hard to detect (patterns of wrong answers, identical verbiage). Not every student will take the same quiz.

Though quizzes have multiple choice questions, you will never be asked to remember meaningless facts or dates that do not bear on the burning questions that keep Americans so interested in their own past. This factual knowledge will also be important to higher-level written assignments. **Example:** Anyone who thinks Presidential Reconstruction *followed* Congressional Reconstruction, for example, would not understand how in 1866 popular Black protest forced Congress to confront President Johnson and pass the 14<sup>th</sup> amendment. This amendment revolutionized everyone’s citizenship. Later, the *formal* rights of citizenship, as you know, were *substantively* lost to African Americans (and many poor whites) for 70 years! But the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments form the cornerstones of everyone's rights.

**III. Team discussion reports 20%--600-900 word reports on CANVAS after each small group discussion (normally 2 per week), written up by one of your FIVE Team members on a revolving basis-- DUE by midnight the day after you have the discussion, or at latest, Saturday night at midnight for discussions that overlap class periods.**

**Everyone on your team gets the same grade.** *Everyone prepares and takes turns writing. Accountability to your classmates is part of the incentive structure of this big class. But you each aren’t writing an essay a week and we aren’t reading 150! (Educational research strongly suggests students write BETTER for each other than for their professors!) Evaluation Rubrics and any Team assignments will accompany everything in the “Module.” (We will drop the lowest 20% of your scores). Grades: A, B, C, F.*

TWICE in the semester each team member will confidentially estimate how much each member is actually contributing to the effort. Consistent peer evaluations of any member will lead to a discussion with that person, a plan to equalize contributions,

some follow up, and the possibility that grades will be adjusted for group members according to our best inferences. CONFIDENTIALITY will be strictly observed. In the past most groups have worked well together, and people have been pretty honest about themselves and others.

This is admittedly a tricky assignment, since we are asking you to be fair to past actors *and* your team mates! Focusing questions will be clearly outlined in a day's Canvas module. ***But the scribe is ultimately responsible for delimiting the scope of discussion, recording individual agreement and disagreement, making sure that people's best points are backed up by concrete evidence from assigned material.*** This way, you are not passive participants in a "traditional" lecture course. In Canvas – the "Groups" feature -- provides options for collaboration in Google Docs. Feel free to experiment with this feature in compiling and combining notes in advance as you read (each person's contribution pops up in real time with their name attached, a common and very cool collaboration tool). Make inferences, draw conclusions, select evidence and the best quotes, comment on each other's ideas. THEN discuss in your groups to clarify and perhaps resolve differences. You can even upload a picture of your hand-written notes into the Group space.

Do not try to answer all questions, but show that as a group you have **grappled with at least two characters and at least two of the core issues.** (Sometimes we will assign positions to each team so the class can flesh out a debate). But read all the selections to know what others argued, unless I clearly assign different readings to different teams.

**AGAIN: AFTER EVERY SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION, ONE OF FIVE GROUP MEMBERS—THE "SCRIBE" OR "RECORDER-REPORTER," WILL SYNTHESIZE THE WRITTEN AND SPOKEN DISCUSSION POINTS. HE OR SHE WILL NOTE INDIVIDUAL GROUP MEMBERS' AGREEMENTS AND DISAGREEMENTS, MAJOR COMPARISONS AND CONCLUSIONS, AND INCLUDE CHOICES OF "BEST EVIDENCE" FROM THE HISTORICAL ACTORS THEMSELVES.** These have no rigid templates, as long as they are reflective of authentic discussion, and not narrowly focused or minimally compliant. *In other words, they don't have to have a coherent thesis or integrated development, the way formal essays do,* as long as the sentences are complete and reflect areas of agreement and disagreement and concrete references to evidence, either as a *paraphrase* or a succinct *direct quote*. On the other hand, they can't just be pastiches of different people's notes without evidence that the group tried to hash out contradictions. Always identify the **historical person** who produced a historical quote or argument.

**Example:** the *subject* of some sentences will be historical people we are studying, as in "Richard Cain reflected the black elite's fear of negative prejudices of lazy freedpeople, we all agreed." Or you might write: "Jonathan pointed out that Richard Cain shared many of the anti-welfare prejudices about the Freedman's Bureau's alleged corruption of "indolent" Blacks that white Democrats had voiced in their campaigns against the Bureau. But Yasmeen countered that this was probably a strategic position, since what he wanted most of all was public money spent not on relief, but on "independent homesteads," where he was confident Blacks would be *anything but indolent* if they worked their own land." (Cain, 15)).

**Evaluation Criteria:** Balanced and accurate representation of major viewpoints and choices of the main actors in the case study. Evidence that individuals within your group have considered several perspectives, that you are able to put these viewpoints in debate or dialogue (role playing is encouraged in some instances to get all the issues and viewpoints on the table). **This is training in an essential job skill for the 21st century: you all are used to collaborating by now.** If I ask a Team to represent or champion the views of one person, make sure you understand how he or she is seen by others in light of their values. You are grappling with people in situations of conflict and cooperation, so you need to understand all sides if you are to understand or represent one of the actors. Nuff said!

#### **IV. One short paper, extra research and analysis of one or more primary sources in context from one of the MAIN characters in the course. 2 pages, 5%**

In one class, for one person, come in extra well prepared. You will have researched and discovered additional primary sources—speeches, letters, recordings, news reports, Congressional Testimony, whatever—reflecting his or her specific views on a focused controversy at a pivotal moment of their lives. ***Signups are coming shortly. Rubric for evaluation will be on Canvas.***

***I have a TON of extra material I have collected which I will make available in Google Docs folders linked to the Canvas assignment pages, but part of this assignment asks you to exercise "information literacy." So if you show us initiative in the use of Jackson Library databases and search engines, you will do extra well. BONUS points for finding something that I'll use in future classes!!***

**V. Research Essay, Due Last Day of Class. April 26, 6:00 PM, And Peer Review of One Student Essay Due the next day at 6:00 PM: 6-8 pages. 25%. A 1 page proposal (see canvas assignment and rubric) will be due April 15.**

Focus upon ONE of our individuals who lived history in a way that sparks *your* imagination. You must rely upon at least two scholarly sources not assigned in class, and at least two more primary sources for the person we studied (a good paper that renders your person in context and interaction would require at least 100 pages of extra reading and research). **Reading in the last month of the class gets lighter to make room for this effort. Use the time well.** Check **biographies or historical monographs** out of the library. (Use Hollitz's "Additional Reading" suggestions, search the Library catalog, and *America History and Life*, download primary documents from the Library of Congress or the Truman Library). **Use the BEST sources of information, NO Wikipedia, no high school curriculum websites, NO.com or other sites without REPUTABLE and identifiable editors.**

How did history shape these peoples' lives and how did they try to shape history? Focus upon a decision they made or a set of beliefs they held. Try to get evidence about their personal history and their consciousness of broader historical change, evidence that will help you explain *why* they did or said what they did. **But please please please do not just summarize facts of their biography that don't contribute to an explanation.** For example: "Roy Wilkins opposed Black Power because he and his organization had been using legal means to achieve racial desegregation for 40 years, and Black Power carried connotations of street violence. Like his forbearers in the NAACP, he dreamed of a country without color consciousness or group identities . . . But he failed to see that some of his own ideas about violence in the cities were remarkably similar to the more thoughtful Black Power theorists." This kind of focus **builds** on one of the chapters we will read, and it suggests you have done research on a particular analysis Wilkins developed in a particular context, that of Black Power and the urban crisis of 1965-1968.

**V. Final exam: Take Home Essay Due 6-8 pp. MAX!! Due Monday May 2 at 3 PM, 20%**

Students will be given two of the four following questions and asked to write about one. These will be synthetic essays that range over the course since 1865. But they are specific and manageable, as you draw upon several of the case studies to discuss the substance of the question. SMART STRATEGY: Throughout keep separate files of notes on each theme, with examples and a sense of conflicting viewpoints and strategies. Get creative, color code your notes!

1. Minority individuals have pursued racial justice in diverse ways in the context of fierce opposition, often in powerful yet problematic alliances with the majority or other groups. Sometimes their stress has been on autonomy (or self-determination), sometimes on inclusion (or equal participation). (Sometimes they became self-conscious "revolutionaries"). With concrete reference to three or four case studies, discuss how strategies for advancing racial justice changed as a result of individual understanding and changing structural opportunities. [NB: yes, at one point Italians were considered an alien "race."]
2. Women are of course everywhere in the social order, in families and communities, and today more fully than ever, they are in politics. But women's entry into the public sphere was a long struggle, and women did not always agree among themselves as to the best strategies to advance gender equality. Discuss at least three instances in which women tried to achieve equal rights in the public spheres of voting and job opportunity, *at the same time* that they debated how and whether to challenge separate spheres or sexual double standards within the family and home. Was it more effective to fight for public rights and not alienate families, men, or other women content with traditional marriage? On what terms did they seek to advance "women's power"?
3. Since the Civil War, mobilizing a unified home front in wartime has been as important as battlefield strategy in achieving success. In at least three instances, discuss how civil liberties, freedom of expression and association, and the freedom of minorities to dissent from official policy were either set back and/or fiercely defended under the stress of these conflicts.
4. Capitalism has changed tremendously since the days of small shops and farms. Inequalities and abuses of capitalist power have drawn legions of radical critics, but these radicals have themselves come under withering criticism and sometimes repression. With concrete references to three or four individuals, discuss how these critics "outside the system" understood the flaws of capitalism. Discuss the strengths and weaknesses of their strategies for either humanizing or transforming the "free enterprise" system. How did they use the language of freedom to do this?

**Course Schedule of Meetings, Topics, Due Dates**  
**(Always Consult Canvas for Full Assignments, Complete Readings and**  
**Updates, Including Refined Questions)**

**NOTA BENE:** Pick a day and a person that interests you and sign up soon for the 2 page extra primary source paper. Everyone will write at different times for that requirement, but your insights will add immeasurably to the class. [**NB: NOTA BENE is Latin for “note well,” and is abbreviated as “NB”!**]

NB: unless otherwise indicated, readings are either from Hollitz or the course reader available only from Copy King.

**1/11: Introductions**

View the Jackson Library’s excellent Tutorial: “Primary And Secondary Sources In Us History Tutorial.”

<http://library.uncg.edu/research/tutorials/video.aspx?f=PrimaryUS&t=Primary%20and%20Secondary%20Sources%20in%20US%20History>

**1/13: Reconstruction -- The Promise and Betrayal of Biracial Democracy**

Hollitz, *Contending Voices*, ch. 1. “Race and Redemption in the Reconstructed South: Robert Smalls and Wade Hampton, 1-26.

“Colloquy With Colored Ministers” (1865) Savannah Georgia; “Petition of Committee in Behalf of the Freedmen to Andrew Johnson” (1865) Edisto Island South Carolina, in Eric Foner, ed., *Voices of Freedom v. 2* (2005)

Richard H. Cain, “An Advocate of Federal Aid for Land Purchase (1868)”, in McSeveny, ed., *Selected Historical Documents* (NY, 2001) 17-20.

1866 Democratic Campaign Cartoon: “The Freedman’s Bureau! An agency to keep the Negro in idleness.” CANVAS link.

**Questions for Consideration and Writing:** Want efforts by freedpeople like Richard Cain and Robert Smalls do you think posed the greatest threat to white supremacy, after the 13<sup>th</sup> amendment abolished slavery? How did the freed people define freedom? Why was land ownership so important to newly freed African Americans? In other words, why did ex-slaves resist working for wages on plantations? The Freedmen’s Bureau supplied material relief to blacks and poor whites, mediated labor contracts, sponsored schools. Why did the Democrats run so aggressively against it, as seen in the 1866 Pennsylvania cartoon?

[NB: Questions will only make full sense when you actually do the reading. Don’t come into group expecting to have a sensible contribution without considering both readings and questions].

**1/15: Reconstruction discussion sections**

**1/18: Martin Luther King Day No Class**

**1/20: Indian Dispossession and Cultural Change [NB: These 50 pages were carefully selected to represent a range of views on Indian Allotment and Education; make sure you appreciate all of the perspectives]**

Hollitz, *Contending Voices*, ch. 2. Culture and Conflict on the Late Nineteenth-Century Plains: Sitting Bull and Richard Henry Pratt, 27-48.

Luther Standing Bear, “Indian Education Should Not Destroy Indian Culture,” Viewpoint 4 in “Viewpoints on Indian Assimilation,” from William Dudley, ed., *Native Americans: Opposing Viewpoints* (Greenhaven, 1998).

Carl Schurtz, “Indian Tribal Lands Should Be Divided,” (1881); Minority Members of the House Committee on Indian Affairs, “Indian Tribal Land Should Not Be Divided,” (1880), “Viewpoints 1-2 on Indian Assimilation,” from William Dudley, ed., *Native Americans: Opposing Viewpoints* (Greenhaven, 1998).

Wooden Leg, “A Cheyenne Tells His Son about the Land” (ca. 1876) 62-63; John Stands in Timber, “Cheyennes try Farming” (ca. 1877): 63-64; Ella C. Deloria, “A Sioux Recalls Severalty” (1900), 64-65, all from *Thinking Through the Past, 2e*, John Hollitz, ed. (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 2001).

**Questions:** The white “Indian reformers” of the 1880s had a particular view of what it would take to save the Indians from extinction and make them citizens with “rights.” What kind of skills and values and habits did they hope to inculcate with both allotment of land and Indian education? What were the options for the Lakota in the 1880s, as seen by Sitting Bull and Richard Henry Pratt? Did either one acknowledge the perspective of the other? Did the Native Americans and their advocates have notions of native rights that conflicted with the white reformers’ policies of land distribution and education? (See especially



Luther Standing Bear's longer explanation of his time at Carlyle; Make sure you finish this reading: Luther Standing Bear's concluding observations are crucial to understanding the whole project). How did they fare in the off reservation boarding schools? How did they survive as "in between peoples"? How did a minority of the House Committee on Indian Affairs assess the Dawes Act scheme of individualizing agricultural landholding and farming? How did reservation farmers fare under the new plan to "Americanize" them?

**1/22: Indian Assimilation and Resistance Discussion Sections**

**Again, one group discussion report due this week. Groups may focus on allotment or education, but the latter, from the perspectives of at least 3 people, would be appropriate to write about.**

**1/25: Industrial Capitalism -- Corporate Titans and Barons of Labor**

Hollitz, *Contending Voices*, ch. 3, Organizing Labor in the Age of Industry: Terence Powderly and Samuel Gompers 49-69. "The Knights of Labor Attack on Jay Gould" (1886), from Hollitz, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition.

"WHAT MR. JAY GOULD SAYS: STRIKES AND THEIR EFFECT UPON WORKINGMEN," New York Times, Apr 30, 1886 (EXCERPTED).

**Questions:** What were the main differences between Terence Powderly and Samuel Gompers in their approach to workers' (or producers') politics and trade union strategies? To what did the Knights of Labor owe their spectacular success in 1886, and their just as spectacular decline after that? Over time, what do you think happened to workers' sense of themselves as producers, potential capitalists, or permanent wage workers? What was industrial work like on the rail lines, the steel mills, the coal fields of the day? In what direction did Gompers hope to channel that class consciousness? Why do you think class-consciousness and trade union loyalty were strongest among the "artisans," the native-born skilled workers whose jobs were often threatened when owners sought to introduce new technology?

**1/27: Voting Rights and Sexual Freedom: The Strange Case of Victoria Woodhull**

Nancy Wolloch, "The Crisis of the NWSA" 308-325, from, *Women and the American Experience* (1984). 17 pp.

Victoria C. Woodhull, "The Principles of Social Freedom," Nov 20 1871 (NY: Woodhull, Claflin, 1871).

**Questions:** Like Powderly, Woodhull aimed for a broad transformation of social relations, in this case of gender and class, including marital and sexual relations. Make no mistake: her actions split the suffrage movement and opponents thereafter painted suffragists as anti-family Communists. But did she not also lead the way for later feminists who questioned "personal politics" as well as women's exclusion from formal politics?

**1/29: Radicalism and Reform in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century Discussion**

Two group discussion reports are due this week, unless I say otherwise (this may happen if groups don't get enough class time to actually discuss).

**2/1: Suffs and Antis: The Great Debate Over Woman Suffrage in the Progressive Era**

Jane Addams, *Why Women Should Vote* (1915)

Adela Hunt **Logan**, "Colored Women As Voters," 1912

Caroline Lowe and Leonora O'Reilly, "On Behalf of 7,000,000 Wage Earning Women," 1912 from *One Half the People: The Fight for Woman Suffrage*

**The Nebraska Association of Women Opposed to Woman Suffrage**, "Why We Do Not Approve of Woman Suffrage," 1914.

Helen Kendrick Johnson, The world's need of women, *The Reply : an anti-suffrage magazine.* , 1/1 (1913), 8-10

**Questions:** Woodhull grounded her argument for woman suffrage on women's rights as individuals and citizens. Addams and Logan here spoke more of women's duties to protect home and family. Why does Addams say women *should* vote, rather than have a *right* to vote? Pay special attention to how she sees immigrant women, because many politicians wanted to restrict the immigrant vote as well as woman suffrage. The factory women, Lowe and O'Reilly, spoke a new language of self-interest, sometimes of responsibilities to families in which they were the only breadwinners. Why did they need the vote? Who were the men they felt they needed protection from? Many women, in this case the Nebraska Association, opposed suffrage, out of traditionalism or a sense that women's civil sphere was broad enough. Why *didn't* women need the vote? Helen Johnson was much more famous as a traditional "anti" who saw in suffrage a great threat to families. (People like Jane Addams trying to deflect her allegations that suffragists were all home-wrecking radicals, but Johnson was more popular than you might think).

### **2/3: Trust Busting and Progressivism**

Hollitz, *Contending Voices*, ch. 4. Monopoly, Money, and Power in Progressive America: John D. Rockefeller and Ida Tarbell, 70-93.

Theodore Roosevelt, "The New Nationalism," August 31, 1910; and Woodrow Wilson, Speech at Pueblo Colorado, October 7, 1912 (on "the New Freedom"), in Flehinger, ed., *The 1912 Election* (NY, 3003).

**Questions:** Was John D. Rockefeller the "Robber Baron" of Progressive mythology, or a businessman who played by the rules and won? Was Ida Tarbell right, that not all the charity in the world would have made up for the injustices inherent in his business methods, which unethically gobbled up scores of independent businesses through secret collusion with railroads and price fixing schemes? What does the struggle between Tarbell as an independent journalist and Rockefeller as a monopolist tell us about the Progressive Era's changing approach to laissez faire capitalism? Was trust busting effective or just political grandstanding? How did the Trusts influence the competition of the 1912 election, and were Theodore Roosevelt's and Woodrow Wilson's political philosophies all that different?

### **2/5: Suffrage and Progressivism Discussion**

There will be two discussion reports this week.

### **2/8: World War I, Dissent, and the Manufacture of Consent**

Hollitz, *Contending Voices*, ch. 5. Progressives at War: Randolph Bourne and George Creel, 94-111.

"Who Willed American Participation," *New Republic* 14 Apr 1917; "Public Opinion," *New Republic* 21 Apr 1917.

Randolph Bourne, "The War and the Intellectuals," *The Seven Arts* June 1917.

**Questions:** On what grounds did the editors of the *New Republic*—the "intellectuals" in both their own and Bourne's terms—think that planning for war would advance the cause of Progressive Reform? National planning, the distribution of wealth, the rights of labor, free and open democratic debate, the hope for a "liberal" democratic world order? On what grounds did Randolph Bourne deny and disparage these illusions? Was he right to fear they were promoting "herd-intellect" and reaction and imperialism, not Progressivism? In the Committee on Public Information, moving from the Progressivism to the cause of war, journalist George Creel went far beyond presentation of unbiased "facts" to influence public opinion. Where, if anywhere, may he have crossed the line into undemocratic propaganda, in the name of freedom and democracy?

### **2/10: A Great Wave of Intolerance: From Red Scare to Immigration Restriction**

Woodrow Wilson, "Americanism and the Foreign-Born," 10 May 1915,

"Roosevelt Bars the Hyphenated," *New York Times* 13 Oct 1915, 1.

Randolph Bourne, "Trans-National America," *Atlantic Monthly* (July 1916)

Loyalty Leaflets, Committee on Public Information, "Plain Issues of the War," Elihu Root, no. 5,

Attorney General [A. Mitchell] Palmer, "The Case Against The "Reds," *Forum* (February 1920).

Calvin Coolidge, "Whose Country is This?" *Good Housekeeping*, volume 72 number 2, February 1921, pages 13-14, 109

Reps. Parrish, Rosedale, Raker Debating Immigration Restriction (with Letter from Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes) *Congressional Record* (20 Apr 1921), 511-12.

Speech by Robert H. Clancy, April 8, 1924, *Congressional Record*, 68<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session (Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1924), vol. 65, 5929-593

**Questions:** Woodrow Wilson, and before him, Theodore Roosevelt, advocated a kind of Americanism that drew a sharp line between Old World and New World loyalties, and denied Americans could have "dual citizenship," or "hyphenated" identities (German-American, etc.). Wilson even identified Americanism with universal humanitarianism. On what basis did they ground their fears and hope? What alternative ideals of Americanism, or possibilities, did Bourne advocate? Why did he consider Wilson's ideals to be hollow, and his "melting pot" philosophy not only a failure, but dangerous? Why were Representatives Parrish and Raker of Texas, Vice-President Elect Calvin Coolidge, the Attorney General of the United States, A. Mitchell Palmer, and the Secretary of State, Charles Evans Hughes, so motivated to exclude and deport un-naturalized immigrants? Reps Rosedale and Clancy, not to mention Bourne, voice a minority view (for the 1920s) that gained ground over the rest of the century. Why?

### **2/12: World War I And Red Scare Discussion**

### **2/15: Sacco and Vanzetti and the Rise of Immigration Restriction**

Davidson and Lytle, *After the Fact*, 11. Sacco and Vanzetti, 256-280 (24).

Speeches by Sacco and Vanzetti to the Court at the Time of Sentencing (April 9, 1927 at the Dedham Court House)

**Questions:** How does the criminal case of Sacco and Vanzetti shed important light on the 1920s rights of criminal defendants, the rights of immigrants, the fear of radicalism and terrorism, and the conservative pressures for 100% Americanism and immigration restriction? Trials can be barometers of the national mood, lightning rods drawing energy from across the cultural sky. The trial of the century pitted civil libertarians and immigrant advocates against defenders of an older self-consciously “Anglo-Saxon” or “Nordic” America. A murder trial of two obscure radical Italian immigrants become an international cause célèbre. What social divisions, and conflicting ideas about America, did such a highly publicized trial reveal about the country in the 1920s? By all means draw upon the material from last week, as well as the KKK reading for next time, to help with this context of nativism.

**2/17: The Scopes Evolution Trial: The Revolt against Modernism**

Hollitz, *Contending Voices*, ch. 6. Science, Religion, and “Culture Wars” in the 1920s: William Jennings Bryan and Clarence Darrow, 112-131.

**Questions:** Another lightning rod for cultural conflicts, tensions between city and country, cosmopolitan and Christian, scientific expertise and local democracy. How did Darrow and Bryan embody conflicting values about science and religion, who should control education, and who we should be as a people? If the great split of the 19<sup>th</sup> century was between labor and capital, if Sacco and Vanzetti exemplify splits between immigrant and native born, and between radicals and anti-Communists, how does the Scopes trial add to your knowledge of the divisions of the 1920s and the rapid changes in society and culture? H.L. Mencken was a kind of guru to intellectuals on the left and the right who were highly critical of the anti-intellectualism they saw in rural and small-town America. (Many of these intellectuals and writers joined the “expatriate” movement to Paris). Why in his view does Bryan represent the worst that is in America?

**2/19: The Tribal Twenties and the Trials of the Century – Discussion**

**2/22: The New Deal, EPIC, and the Dawn of the New Media Politics**

Hollitz, *Contending Voices*, 7. Politics and the Big Screen in the Great Depression: Upton Sinclair and Louis B. Mayer, 132-151.

VIEW California Election News, “Inquiring Camera Man,” one of the shorts Mayer produced to discredit Sinclair. On Google Drive here.

Duncan Aikman, “California Voters Debate the EPIC Issue Bitterly.” *New York Times*. October 14, 1934. (at least presents EPIC fairly).

Plain Farmer, “How I See Sinclair,” *Los Angeles Times*, Nov 2, 1934, A4. (anti-EPIC)

Arthur Sears Henning, “Paupers and Tramps Flock to California as Jittery Capital Takes Leave of State,” *Chicago Tribune*, Oct 13, 1934, 4. (Repeats Mayer’s scare tactics, which Sinclair did little to counter).

**Questions:** What were the real issues and policy differences of the Sinclair-Merriam EPIC battle in 1934 for the future of California? Why did Louis B. Mayer respond with the attack ads claiming that paupers and tramps were flocking to California? What difficulties did Sinclair have in getting the details of the EPIC plan across to the voters? Were splits in the Democratic Party as important as the propaganda campaign waged by Mayer (and his allies in the Chandler Family’s *Los Angeles Times* and the *Chicago Tribune*)? Did the newspapers help clarify or further muddle the issues? Are any newspapers particularly biased against EPIC? How can you tell?

**2/24: The Ethics and Politics of Relief: Letters to Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt**

Robert S. McElvaine, ed., *Down and Out in the Great Depression: Letters from the Forgotten Man* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1983), selected letters.

**Questions:** This is an exercise in interpreting American values under the pressure of the worst Depression in U.S. history. Several historians argue that working class Americans (and many middle class Americans) in the 1930s turned away from individualism and came to believe that the economic system was unfair – even that everyone had a right to economic security guaranteed by the federal government. Other historians challenge this interpretation, arguing that neither the Great Depression nor the New Deal dramatically altered Americans’ commitment to individualism, self-reliance and limited government. Is there stronger evidence for one or the other interpretations in these letters from ordinary people to Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt? How much did these people hold to self-reliance as a value, shunning the “welfare chiseler” stereotype? Beyond special pleading, how much did they make the moral case that all citizens were “intitled” to assistance and security? How do blacks see themselves in relation to local relief administrators, and to poor whites? How do whites who write in feel about the administration of relief for Negroes? Did the elderly and disabled base their demands for government pensions on any consistent themes? Most people seemed to prefer work relief to “the dole.” So why was work

relief so controversial in practice? Many people were grateful for relief. Yet it seems that many harbored either resentments or a deep sense of moral unfairness against the local relief “racket.” Whom did people blame for this state of affairs? When did criticism of the local relief administration spill over into criticism of the CLASS SYSTEM and POLITICAL SYSTEM? Did the radicals who warned about the coming revolution or who demanded redistribution of income draw on any language you have encountered before? Did the conservatives or those opposed to government relief or social security show any consistent principled objections or burning resentments?

## 2/26: Depression, EPIC, New Deal Discussion

### 2/29: World War II and Internment of Japanese Americans

Hollitz, *Contending Voices*, ch. 8. Racism and Relocation During World War II: Harry Ueno and Dillon Myer, 152-168.  
 “Charles Kukuchi on Life in a Japanese Internment Camp 1942”, in Belmonte, *Speaking of America*, 716-721

**Questions:** Among other things, this chapter is about complexity in times of conflict, the internal conflicts among Americans and among Japanese Americans in a time of persecution and cooperation. What accounts for Harry Ueno’s treatment, both his internment along with 127,000 other Japanese Americans, and his segregation from the rest of the internees as a “troublemaker”? How was he “doubly alienated” from Americans and Japanese Americans? How could Dillon S. Myer be BOTH the man responsible for a policy of “custodial detention” of supposedly disloyal Japanese Americans, like Harry Ueno, AND celebrated by the Japanese-American Citizens League for being an “American and champion of human rights”? What were the consequences of his sincere belief in *total* assimilation? Finally, what kind of “Americanism” would the more assimilationist Charles Kukuchi want to realize? (You might compare Myer with Richard Henry Pratt as a “humanitarian” and liberal).

### 3/2: The Atomic Bomb: Ending WWII and Commencing the Cold War

Davidson and Lytle, *After the Fact*, 13. The Decision to Drop the Bomb, 310-334 (24).

Harry Truman's diary entries for July 17-18, and July 25, 1945, From “Notes by Harry S. Truman on the Potsdam Conference, July 17-30, 1945,” Harry S. Truman Presidential Library

**Questions:** How did Harry Truman justify using the bomb against Japan? Did he make the decision? Was dropping the bomb necessary? The authors argue that a long string of decisions and bureaucratic politics, not just Harry Truman, explains why the US used the bomb. As you move from consideration of Truman’s “rational actor” role to a model of bureaucratic organizational rivalry and people following “sop’s,” how does your appreciation of wartime leadership change? *Where did the power to use and not use the weapon really reside?* But consider also Truman’s diary. Were there alternatives? Did Truman feel that dropping the bomb was in particular need of justification? Did he see it as a historic “winning weapon” that was morally distinct from conventional bombs? Did he or anyone calculate the long-term consequences in terms of unleashing a global nuclear arms race? Might the war have been ended without the bomb through diplomacy or the shock of Soviet military entry into the war? “Atomic Diplomacy” -- is it possible that Truman dropped the bomb at least in part to *intimidate* the Soviets in the *post-war world* and not simply to end *World War II* against Japan as soon as possible?

## 3/4: Discussion: US and the Japanese War

### SPRING BREAK

### 3/14: Origins of the Cold War – What if Either of These Men Had Been President?

Hollitz, *Contending Voices*, ch. 9. Confrontation and Compromise in the Cold War: James Byrnes and Henry A. Wallace, 169-187.

Henry Wallace, “The Century of the Common Man,” 8 May 1942 [excerpted by Prof. Jackson]

Report, "American Relations With The Soviet Union" by Clark Clifford ["Clifford-Else Report"], September 24, 1946. Conway Files, Truman Papers. Harry S. Truman Presidential Library [trumanlibrary.gov](http://trumanlibrary.gov)

**Questions:** What are the common themes that endured from Henry Wallace's 1942 speech "The Century of the Common Man," and his later criticism of Truman's foreign-policy? How did his perceptions of the Soviet Union differ in fundamental ways than the hard-line positions articulated by James Byrnes, Harry Truman, and Clark Clifford, in his enormously influential September 1946 report to the president? Here more than anywhere can the case be made for the importance of the individual in history and of contingent events. How might history have been different if either of these two men been vice president at the time of FDR's death?

### **3/16: Red Scare II: McCarthyism**

Hollitz, *Contending Voices*, ch. 10. Politics and Principle in the Second Red Scare: Joseph McCarthy and Margaret Chase Smith, 188-208.

J Edgar Hoover, "Testimony before HUAC," March 26, 1947, from Schrecker, *Age of McCarthyism*, 126-133.

Supreme Court Justice William O Douglas, "The *Black Silence of Fear*," *New York Times Magazine* (13 Jan 1952)

**Questions:** why did a Cold War against communism abroad turn into a homegrown fear of communists within? Or better, who made the second Red Scare happen and why? What distinguishes the two Republicans, Joseph McCarthy and Margaret Chase Smith, and what do they have in common? How do you account for the differences in terms of their background or political ideology? In this case the liberals defending civil liberties (Margaret Chase Smith and William O Douglas) don't criticize US policy toward the Soviet Union or the division of the world into "slave and free." On what grounds did they claim to defend freedom at home? Compared to the liberalism of Henry Wallace, what is missing and what is present if you take Douglas and Smith to be voices for 1950s liberalism?

### **3/18: Discussions: From Cold War to McCarthyism**

#### **3/21: Modern Civil Rights Movement**

Hollitz, *Contending Voices*, ch. 11 From Black Protest to Black Power: Roy Wilkins and Fannie Lou Hamer, 209-225.

Roy Wilkins, "Wilkins Speaks: Tells Youth Rioting is a Patsy Play," *Baltimore Afro-American*, August 13, 1966

Roy Wilkins, "Shock Tactics Bring Shove Forward," Sep 3 1966.

Donald Janson, "Negro Walkouts in Delta Spurred: Rights Groups Turn Attention to Labor Activities," *New York Times*, June 7, 1965.

**Questions:** How did Roy Wilkins's biography, with his experiences of integration and racial terrorism, help account for his later views on civil rights and Black power? Fannie Lou Hamer was from the rural working class in what was arguably the most oppressive state. How do you account for her courage, her search for democratic representation, her hopes for the Mississippi Freedom Democrats and the Mississippi Freedom Labor Union? What does her Congressional platform from 1971 reveal about her constituency and values? Try to understand the 1964 fight over the delegates from all sides – why did Wilkins seek to impose a solution that seated none of the Freedom Democrats as representatives of Mississippi? What was LBJ afraid of? Why did Mrs. Hammer and the Freedom Democrats reject the compromise? Was Wilkins insensitive to class issues within the civil rights movement and the needs of poor people generally? Make sure you read the journalism.

#### **3/23: From Civil Rights to Human Rights: The Odyssey of Martin Luther King, Jr.**

Thomas F. Jackson, "Bread of Freedom: Martin Luther King, Jr. and Human Rights," *OAH Magazine of History* (April 2008), 14-16.

Martin Luther King, Jr., "If the Negro Wins, Labor Wins," (1961), in Washington, ed., *Testament of Hope* (1986)

Martin Luther King, Jr., "The American Dream," Ebenezer Baptist Church, July 4 1965.

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.

**Questions:** How did King develop an economic justice agenda from within the Southern black freedom movement and in alliance with Northern labor unions and progressives? How did the urban crisis shape his understanding of national and black power? How did he see the relationship between pluralism (something to celebrate as in Jamaica) and economic equality, especially with respect to low wages? What strategies of economic and political empowerment did King develop in the last years of his life? If the American economy produced the beggars on the modern Jericho Road, what was the Good Samaritan supposed to do?

**Optional:** read the conclusion of King's famous Selma to Montgomery March, when he addresses a crowd of 30,000 in Montgomery Ala March 25, 1965. Race and class are core themes for the rest of his life: [http://kingencyclopedia.stanford.edu/encyclopedia/documentsentry/doc\\_address\\_at\\_the\\_conclusion\\_of\\_selma\\_march/](http://kingencyclopedia.stanford.edu/encyclopedia/documentsentry/doc_address_at_the_conclusion_of_selma_march/)

**3/25: NO CLASS-- Spring Holiday [NB: The Last month of this course lightens up the reading load, so that you may make strides toward your research paper!! Please shift your efforts accordingly]**

**3/28: From Rosie to Lucy:** Davidson and Lytle, *After the Fact*, 14. From Rosie to Lucy, 339-363 (24).

**Watch:** "Betty--Girl Engineer," *Father Knows Best* (1956) on Google Drive. [.mov files viewable with QuickTime]

**Questions:** How did gender norms for women change from World War II to the Cold War? Do you think the popular media reflected or shaped popular attitudes toward motherhood, housework, and women's paid work outside the home? How can we know? Within the dominant patriarchal norms of the time, how much room could women like Lucy Ricardo carve for autonomy, even rebellion? Was Cold War culture uniformly down on married women's work? Might different women have taken different messages out of "Betty-Girl Engineer," or was the message pretty plain about the dangers of stepping outside of traditional "women's work?"

### **3/30: Women's Rights and Women's Liberation**

Hollitz, *Contending Voices*, ch. 13. From Mystique to Militance: Betty Friedan and Gloria Steinem, 247-265.

"The Politics of Housework" privately published by Pat Mainardi of Redstockings

Tillmon, Johnnie. "Welfare Is a Women's Issue." *Liberation News Service* (415) February 1972, in Linda Gordon, ed., *America's Working Women* (1976), 355-358.

**Questions:** What kinds of "rights" were Betty Friedan, Gloria Steinem, Pat Mainardi, Johnnie Tillmon, principally interested in? What was the difference between **women's rights** and **women's liberation**? What changes did each think needed to happen before women could enjoy equality? How did each think that gender equality was related to other struggles for peace and justice? How can anything so trivial as housework be considered "political"? Did women really believe they had a "right" to welfare? How?

### **4/1: Discussions: Women's Roles, Women's Activism**

#### **4/4: Vietnam: Fighting for Freedom Abroad, Fracturing Consensus at Home**

Hollitz, *Contending Voices*, ch. 12. The Battles of Vietnam: Robert McNamara and Jan Barry, 226-246.

Vietnam Veterans Against the War, Statement by John Kerry, April 23, 1971.

**Questions:** Examine the life experiences of all three military men, and try to explain how they ended up in such different places. What did Kerry and Barry share that McNamara, with all his managerial expertise, could not comprehend?

#### **4/6: How to write a history research paper! TUTORIAL on finding and critically assessing reliable sources**

See Canvas for selected chapters from various student guides to research and writing.

#### **4/8: Discussions: Students will announce their topics and get feedback from peers and TAs.**

#### **4/11: Environmentalism in the 1980s**

Hollitz, *Contending Voices*, ch. 14, 14. Individualism and the Environment in the 1980s: Edward Abbey and James Watt, 266-281. See Canvas questions.

#### **4/13: Environmentalism and Environmental Justice**

George Lipsitz, *A Life in the Struggle*, ch. 7, "Lead Poisoning: Peace and Pain in the Struggle," pp. 174-185.vi

See Canvas Questions.

#### **4/15: Discussions**

#### **4/18: The Recent Past and Future of Capitalism**

John Hollitz, "Conservatism and the Limits of Consumer Capitalism: **Irving Kristol** and **Ralph Nader**," in *Contending Voices v. 2* (New York, 2007), 292-314. NOT in your edition; in the course reader. See Canvas questions.

#### **4/20: National Security and Freedom (Again): Rendition and Torture in the War on Terror**

Hollitz, *Contending Voices*, ch. 15. Fighting a "War on Terror": Richard Clarke and John Yoo, 282-304.

#### **4/22: Discussions**

#### **4/25: The Past and the Future of Us All: Prof. Jackson's Attempt to Synthesize Themes to Prepare You for the Final**

**4/26: LAST CLASS WILL MEET in Sections with TAs and Report on Key Findings of your research papers  
Research Papers are Due in Class, Paper Copies with Endnotes and Canvas Electronic Submission (with Turnitin Protections)**