



Syllabus: History 1302.307CL

Spring 2022 League City 117
Tue/Thur 7:10am – 8:30am

Instructor: James Bailey

Email: jbailey2497@com.edu

(When emailing please indicate your name **and** class, ie – Tue/Thu)

Office hours: before and after class by appointment

Location: League City room 117

Course Information

Required Textbook:

Joseph Locke & Ben Wright eds. The American Yawp, Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press, 2021.

(Open Source & free, online – Just click on <http://www.americanyawp.com/>)

Course Description

This course is essentially a study of the history of the United States from the reconstruction to the present and will emphasize political, economic and social events, trends, personalities and dynamic forces that have shaped the United States from 1877 to the present.

Course Requirements:

Students are expected to keep up with assigned readings, regularly attend class and be on time, take notes, participate in class discussions and activities, and exhibit appropriate behavior in the classroom. If a student misses a class, it is that student's responsibility to obtain class notes from another student. Students are also required to take all exams and quizzes and complete the Paper and Oral Presentation Assignment.

Determination of Grade

1.. The final grade will be based on **five grades:** three regular tests, a Final Exam and a participation score counting 10%. Each exam will count 22.5% of the final grade. If the student misses a test for good reason a make-up should be done in the COM Testing Center. 20% of the final exam grade will include an oral presentation. If "extra credit" is done a sixth grade will be added and averaged with the five above to attain a final grade.

2. All tests will be 80% multiple-choice with four subtle options. The basic rule of thumb is to choose the "**best**" answer. For each test a student **must** prepare and bring to class on the test day a **one page** internet research report which will count 20

points on the test taken that class period. [Relevance, coherency, grammar and spelling count on all reports.] Every student **must** prepare, use and turn-in one hand-written notesheet created for each exam.

3. All "note sheets" must be written on the back and front of 8 1/2 by 11 inch paper with **no Xerox or computer word processing**. These "notesheets" will be treated as an "alternative assessment" and bonus points will be added to the student's score based on the skill and knowledge exhibited on both multiple choice test and notes. [On the Final Exam students should use four "note sheets:" the three previously prepared plus one created especially for the final exam.]

Late Work and Make-Up Policy: a student who has a legitimate excuse for missing a test will be permitted to take a **make-up test** in the Testing Center on COM campus. Assigned work turned in late will get a reduced grade dependent on individual circumstances.

Extra Credit is available by emailed request and must be approved 10 days before the final. It is due 24 hours before the final exam.

All projects must:

- (1) **be based on internet research on a question about a "1301 Syllabus term,"** i.e. "What were the issues in the court packing fight of 1937?" or "Explain the significance of the Bakke case of 1978 ." or "How did the G.I. Bill of Rights change America
- (2) be word-processed and titled with your "**approved**" question,
- (3) begin with your best five web citations listed in order of research value; each to be followed by a short paragraph indicating the website's specific value,
- (4) end with a one page summary describing **two reasoned conclusions:**
First, an answer to your original question and **Second**, a statement of what you learned about internet research of a historical topic. For the conclusions section a caveat: The student will likely submit 2-3 pages but important questions must be answered:
 1. What elements of a website makes it more trustworthy for historical research?
 2. What difficulties did the student encounter in separating trustworthy information from bias or propaganda?

Grade scale:

A=90-100, B=80-89, C=70-79, D=60-69, F=60-

Attendance and tardiness Policy:

Promptness, regular attendance are required. **Email me if you are absent. Excessive tardiness or absence (3 or more) without acceptable reason will result in loss of points on your final grade. Use my email address at the top of page one.**

Communicating with your instructor: ALL electronic communication with the instructor must be through your COM email. Due to FERPA restrictions, faculty cannot share any information about performance in the class through other electronic means.

Mapping SLOs Core Objectives & Assignments

| Student Learner Outcomes | Maps to Core Objective | Assessed via this Assignment |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Create an argument through the use of historical evidence. | Critical Thinking Skills (CT) | Paper: Wikipedia Report |
| 2. Analyze and interpret primary and secondary sources. | Critical Thinking Skills (CT) | Exams |
| 3. Analyze the effects of historical, social, political, economic, cultural, and global forces on this period of United States history. | Critical Thinking Skills (CT) | Exams |
| 4. Develop, interpret, and express ideas on a History 1302-related topic through written communication. | Communication Skills (CS1) | Papers: Book TV Report & An art analysis report |
| 5. Develop, interpret, and express ideas on a History 1302-related topic through oral communication. | Communication Skills (CS2) | Oral Presentation Assignment |
| 6. Develop, interpret, and express ideas on a History 1302-related topic through visual communication. | Communication Skills (CS3) | Oral Presentation Assignment |

| | | |
|--|------------------------------|-------|
| 7. Students will demonstrate intercultural competence, knowledge of civic responsibility, and the ability to engage effectively in regional, national, and global communities. | Social Responsibility (SR) | Exams |
| 8. Evaluate choices and actions of others or one's own, and relate consequences to decision-making. | Personal Responsibility (PR) | Exams |

Academic Dishonesty such as cheating on exams is an extremely serious offense and will result in a grade of zero on that exam and the student may be referred to the Dean of Students for appropriate action.

Plagiarism: Plagiarism is using someone else's words or ideas and claiming them as your own. Plagiarism is a very serious offense. Plagiarism includes paraphrasing someone else's words without giving proper citation, copying directly from a website and pasting it into your paper, using someone else's words without quotation marks. Any assignment containing any plagiarized material will receive a **grade of zero** and the student will be referred to the Office of Student Conduct for the appropriate discipline action.

Link(s) to resource(s) about avoiding plagiarism:
<https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/589/02/>
<http://www.com.edu/on-site-services/speaking-reading-writing-center.php>

Concerns/Questions Statement:

If you have any questions or concerns about any aspect of this course, please contact me. My email address is at the top of page one. If, after discussing your concern with me, you continue to have questions, please contact Stacey Henderson at 409-933-8212.

Course Outline

1st class: January 18

- I. The New South
- II. Industrialism and the Labor Movement
- III. The Politics of the Gilded Age
- IV. The Farmer's Revolt
- V. The New Immigration
- VII. Thought and Society before WWI



Test One (February 14):

- lecture thus far + *Am. Yawp* 16-19
- + syllabus readings 1 - 4
- + *Book TV* assignment (see p. 5)

- VIII. The Progressive Era
- IX. The Rise to World Power
- X. The Return to "Normalcy"
- XI. Panic and Depression



Test Two (March 7):

- lecture since the last test & *Am. Yawp* 20 - 23
- + syllabus readings 5, 6 & 7,
- + Wikipedia project

- XII. The New Deal
- XIII. World War II at Home and Abroad
- XIV. The Origins of the Cold War
- XV. The Politics of the Truman Era
- XVI. The Mid-Century Cold War Era



Test Three (April 18):

- lecture since the last test & *Am. Yawp* 24 - 27
- + syllabus readings 8, 9, 10 & 11
- + art interpretation project

- XVII. The Civil Rights Crusade & Vietnam
- XIII. JFK/LBJ and the Politics of The Great Society
- XIX. The Watergate Era
- XX. Contemporary America.



Final Exam (May 10):

- lecture from the beginning
- & *Am. Yawp* 28 through 30
- + syllabus reading # 12-14 "Epilogue"

Institutional Policies and Guidelines

Grade Appeal Process: Concerns about the accuracy of grades should first be discussed with the instructor. A request for a change of grade is a formal request and must be made within six months of the grade assignment. Directions for filing an appeal can be found in the student handbook. <https://build.com.edu/uploads/sitecontent/files/student-services/Student_Handbook_2019-2020v5.pdf. *An appeal will not be considered because of general dissatisfaction with a grade, penalty, or outcome of a course. Disagreement with the instructor's professional judgment of the quality of the student's work and performance is also not an admissible basis for a grade appeal.* https://build.com.edu/uploads/sitecontent/files/student-service/s/Student_Handbook_2019-2020v5.pdf

Academic Success & Support Services: College of the Mainland is committed to providing students the necessary support and tools for success in their college careers. Support is offered through our Tutoring Services, Library, Counseling, and through Student Services. Please discuss any concerns with your faculty or an advisor.

ADA Statement: Any student with a documented disability needing academic accommodations is requested to contact Holly Bankston at 409-933-8520 or hbankston@com.edu. The Office of Services for Students with Disabilities is located in the Student Success Center.

Counseling Statement: Any student needing counseling services is requested to please contact Holly Bankston in the student success center at 409-933-8520 or hbankston@com.edu. Counseling services are available on campus in the student center for free and students can also email counseling@com.edu to set up their appointment. Appointments are strongly encouraged; however, some concerns may be addressed on a walk-in basis.

Textbook Purchasing Statement: A student attending College of the Mainland is not under any obligation to purchase a textbook from the college-affiliated bookstore. The same textbook may also be available from an independent retailer, including an online retailer.

Withdrawal Policy: Students may withdraw from this course for any reason prior to the last eligible day for a "W" grade. Before withdrawing students should speak with the instructor and consult an advisor. Students are permitted to withdraw only six times during their college career by state law. The last date to withdraw from the 1st 8-week session is March 2. The last date to withdraw from the 16-week session is April 25. The last date to withdraw for the 2nd 8-week session is May 4.

F_N Grading: The F_N grade is issued in cases of *failure due to a lack of attendance*, as determined by the instructor. The F_N grade may be issued for cases in which the student ceases or fails to attend class, submit assignments, or participate in required capacities, and for which the student has failed to withdraw. The issuing of the F_N grade is at the

discretion of the instructor. The last date of attendance should be documented for submission of an F_N grade.

Early Alert Program: The Student Success Center at College of the Mainland has implemented an Early Alert Program because student success and retention are very important to us. I have been asked to refer students to the program throughout the semester if they are having difficulty completing assignments or have poor attendance. If you are referred to the Early Alert Program you will be contacted by someone in the Student Success Center who will schedule a meeting with you to see what assistance they can offer in order for you to meet your academic goals.

COVID-19 Statement: All students, faculty, and staff are expected to familiarize themselves with materials and information contained on the College of the Mainland's Coronavirus Information site at www.com.edu/coronavirus. In compliance with Governor Abbott's May 18 Executive Order, face coverings/masks will no longer be required on COM campus. Protocols and college signage are being updated. We will no longer enforce any COM protocol that requires face coverings. We continue to encourage all members of the COM community to distance when possible, use hygiene measures, and get vaccinated to protect against COVID-19. Please visit com.edu/coronavirus for future updates.

A 20-Point Assignment p. 4 for Your First Test

The first 20 points of your first test will come from the internet activity described below.

Book TV is devoted to the presentation of interviews and public appearances of the authors of non-fiction books. Many of these programs offer a glimpse into the mind of a working historian. Take care to choose a program that fits with an American History course. Look at your syllabus and text at the topics covered. That should give you a good clue to the best topics. Feel free to talk to me if you have any anxiety about making a program choice.

Instructions & Documentation for your work:

1. Comcast (**CSPAN 2**) offers **Book TV** from 7am Saturday to 7am Monday, however these programs are available online anytime. For the schedule go to www.booktv.org. Your assignment will be to prove to me that you watched a program with a degree of insight. To do that you must contrast the author's presentation with a published review of the presented book. To document your task, I am asking you to create a **500 word report**.
2. Go to www.booktv.org to discover numerous archived programs. Scroll to "Most Recent Book TV" and choose "View all Book TV videos" On the left, filter choices by clicking both "American History TV" and "Book TV" to find a program that interests you. You may have to click several times to find one you really like. Choose only a program of 40 minutes or more. If more than one book is presented in the video, select only one.
3. Take notes as you watch the program and as you read the published review of that book, then compose your report. Be sure you cite the published review.
4. **Questions to consider:** Just what three or four points did you think the author was trying to get across? What trouble did you have understanding the major points the author was trying to make? What historical question dealing with this video would you want for class discussion? Did the author say anything surprising to you? If you were in the audience what question would you have wanted to ask the author? But most of all: **How did the author's version and the published review version compare or contrast?**

Earn your first 20 points on Test Two

1. **Begin by reading "Unethical Editing & Wikipedia's Credibility"** by Eric Haas[See p. 4-5] and then select an item from your textbook in the remainder of the book [for example "1912 election," "red scare" or "Mae West"]
2. **Critically read the narrative of your chosen item on Wikipedia.com.** Warning: As part of the grade you must include references from the "Talk" tab located at the top of the Wikipedia page. Also, check the index in your textbook as a basis of comparison.
3. **Condense your critical analysis** of this Wikipedia article into one page (1-2 paragraphs) indicating any problems with (1) "point of view," (2) "white washing" or (3) "lack of contextual frame." Include points brought out in "Talk." I am looking for an expression of your opinion (NOT a summary of the Wiki article.) Some Wiki articles have few critical comments in "Talk." Use intuition using the three Haas criteria listed above.
4. **Turn in your critical analysis page before Test Two.**

Unethical Editing &

Wikipedia's Credibility

By Eric Haas, rockridgeinstitute.org, 10-26-07

Wikipedia is making a tremendous contribution to the democratization of information.... [There is] ... a joke about a man wanting to know what 2 + 2 equaled. Everyone told him four until he came upon an accountant who whispered, "What would you like it to be?" Nothing personal against accountants, it just seems that we have become so jaded by spin that we believe nothing is absolute. How then do we separate information that is truth from lies, damned lies, and statistics? Wikipedia has an opportunity to play an important role in answering this question in a way that reaches millions of people worldwide.

Wikipedia has been attempting to get to the truth by requiring the use of facts, not opinions, in its entries and relying on the integrity of open-source editors to adhere to its rules.... More transparency safeguards should be put in place. But more importantly for the long run, Wikipedia will need to resolve some kinks in its understanding of the links between facts, neutrality, and truth.

Wikipedia seeks entries that are written from a "neutral point of view" (NPOV). Every editor has a **point of view**, so Wikipedia has some basic guidelines for editing that include a prohibition on creating or editing an entry about one's self or organization and a requirement that editors present "facts" -- which Wikipedia defines as "piece[s] of information about which there is no serious dispute."The predominant violation is that people and institutions from politicians to the CIA... to ExxonMobil to the Democratic Headquarters have been anonymously changing

their own entries or the entries of their opponents, to make them more positive or negative, respectively. These acts are clearly inappropriate, but, as a problem, they appear to have some ready solutions. Adding additional levels of editor identification will make Wikipedia more transparent and will likely make these rule violations more obvious and less likely....

But another editing practice... called "**white washing**" is more problematic, because it violates the logic, but likely not the letter, of Wikipedia's guidelines. In this way, it challenges Wikipedia's reliance on factual accuracy both as neutrality and as a means to truth.

White washing is where someone replaces negative or neutral adjectives -- words or phrases -- with more positive synonyms. Here's an example of the conundrum that white washing creates for the idea that one can achieve truth through neutrality derived from facts. In May 2005, someone at a Wal-Mart IP address changed a sentence in the Wal-Mart entry about employee wages. The original paragraph, with the key sentence in bold, read:

As with many US retailers, Wal-Mart experiences a high rate of employee turnover (approximately 50% of employees leave every year, according to the company). **Wages at Wal-Mart are about 20% less than at other retail stores.** Founder

[Sam Walton] once argued that his company should be exempt from the [minimum wage]...

The new entry edited by Wal-Mart became this:

As with many US retailers, Wal-Mart experiences a high rate of employee turnover (approximately 50% of employees leave every year, according to the company). **The average wage at Wal-Mart is almost double the federal minimum wage** (Wal-Mart). However, founder [Sam Walton] once argued that his company should be exempt from the [minimum wage]...

There are two problems with these changes, and neither of them has to do with the facts. The facts are accurate, and that's actually part of the problem.

According to Wal-Mart documents, Wal-Mart paid its employees an average of \$9.68 per hour in 2005. According to a well-documented report by Arindrajit Dube and Steven Wertheim of the University of California, Berkeley, Wal-Mart's average wage of \$9.68 per hour was between 17% and 25% less than comparable general merchandise and large merchandise stores. So, the first statement is basically true. In 2005, the federal minimum wage was \$5.15 per hour. So, the second statement is also basically true.

Leaving aside Wal-Mart's violation of the self-editing guideline, both sentences pass the undisputed fact test. But they also violate the logic of Wikipedia's rule: undisputed facts equal neutrality which leads to truth. Both statements made \$9.68 per hour mean something different. The first made it a criticism of Wal-Mart as an exploitive corporation, while the second made it a positive attribute, portraying Wal-Mart as going way beyond its duties as an employer.

Both statements are accurate. They're also pretty meaningless, possibly misleading. Neither strikes a reader as really neutral, either. How could this happen? And, what does it mean about the future of Wikipedia as a democratic source of reliable information?

The first, and more obvious, problem is that both statements are incomplete. Neither directly states the actual wage of \$9.68 per hour. That both statements presented the fact only indirectly through describing its relationship to something else -- as a percentage of other retailers' wages and as a multiple of the federal minimum wage -- should be a red flag for spin. The simple correction is to require the statistics themselves, in this case, the actual wage in dollars and cents. Combined with greater editor transparency, this problem is easily solved.

This leaves a second, more difficult problem of incompleteness -- **the lack of contextual frame**. How do we understand what the hourly wage of Wal-Mart means? On its own, \$9.68 per hour means almost nothing. That is why, it appears, that the first and second entries framed the context surreptitiously. They compared the Wal-Mart wage to that of comparable employers and to the federal minimum wage,

respectively. By implying a frame, both editors made the frame for understanding the Wal-Mart wage seem neutral. This meets the letter of the Wikipedia rules, but violates its logic.

But this appears to be the fault, so to speak, of Wikipedia's guidelines, rather than the editors (leaving aside Wal-Mart's self-editing violation). Facts by themselves aren't neutral because they don't have an intrinsic meaning that is universally understood. As the philosopher Thomas Nagel put it succinctly, you can't have a view from nowhere.

Facts require "frames" because they only make sense in context. Current research in neuroscience and linguistics shows that we understand reality through frames composed of neural networks in our brains. These mental structures or frames, structure our ideas, shape our reasoning and impact how we act. They define common sense.

Frames operate through the words we use to discuss the world around us by linking together values, principles and ideal models of everyday things like fairness, a living wage and what a typical corporation does. Words and phrases trigger related frames deep in our unconscious minds that give them meaning. This is the mental process through which we understand what we hear and read.

This mental process is why the Wal-Mart edits are so enlightening. They show us that describing the Wal-Mart wage as being below that of comparable employers or above minimum wage can make Wal-Mart appear to be bad or good, without ever saying so. Depending on one's mental frames, one is already predisposed to understand the implied value connection. There is no factual neutrality because our brains are built to interpret. We assign value to information unconsciously. That is understanding. Without this ability, we would continually spend paragraphs explaining the context that is unconsciously obvious to most people in a few words.

For Wikipedia, reliance on facts alone to achieve neutrality that will lead to, or is itself, an understandable truth will result in a number of on-going problems:

- entries that are -- difficult to understand -- collections of dates and statistics.
- Indeterminate interpretations that vary widely from the editor's intent due to the prevailing political frames and those brought by each individual reader.
- the creatively implied contextual frames of white washing.

Adding more facts will not solve these problems. Wikipedia must re-think its reliance on the logic of its guidelines that link facts to neutrality to truth. In other words, Wikipedia's verifiability policy -- previous publication by a reliable source -- is no longer enough. Wikipedia can address blatant rule violations by dishonest editors through more transparency and greater administrator oversight. These changes are straightforward and some are already being implemented. White washing, however, will require a more thoughtful examination of Wikipedia's process for arriving at truth. That examination

should include a **discussion**, best on Wikipedia itself, of recent research developments in neuroscience and linguistics. These developments demonstrate the **importance and necessity of frames in understanding facts....**

The idea that a collection of facts doesn't equal neutrality and doesn't lead to truth could be Wikipedia's undoing, discrediting open-source information as a reliable democratic force. This problem, if explicitly addressed and debated, could also be another historical opportunity for Wikipedia. If the relationship between facts and frames is embraced correctly, then Wikipedia could bring a new understanding of information to millions of people. Here's hoping it does.

Art Interpretation Assignment for Test Three

To receive the last 20 points on test three you must provide a paragraph interpretation of any **three** of the below-listed American paintings. Note carefully **the date** of the painting and interpret what you believe the artist was attempting to tell his viewers about that moment in history. Use historical events, people, trends or attitudes of the appropriate time. Turn in: One page with **three** different paragraphs. Your written interpretation for each paragraph should answer:

1. What historical issue is being addressed by the artist?
2. What is the artist's message?
3. How does the artist use color, symbol, form and shape to get across his meaning.

The Paintings:

1. *The Gulf Stream* by Winslow Homer (1899)
2. *Stag at Sharkey's* by George Bellows (1907)
3. *Boomtown* by Thomas Hart Benton (1928)
4. *American Gothic* by Grant Wood (1930)
5. *Flags* by Jasper Johns (1973) (any version)

To view the image of each of these paintings go to www.artcyclopedia.com/ and enter the name of the artist and painting and go directly to hyperlinks that will allow you to see an image of the painting chosen. In most cases clicking on "archive" and then on "image viewer" will get a better view of your painting. If there is no "archive" choice click on the first choice.

Hint: Several websites attempt to interpret paintings and you are welcome to visit those to gather ideas. However, your own unique view is encouraged and can get full credit if I understand your logic.

Information About Your Instructor

I grew up in Van Zandt County, Texas and by working as a movie projectionist was able to graduate from Van HS and Tyler Junior College by 1961. With a National Defense Education Loan I got my BA at East Texas State University (now Texas A&M at Commerce) two years later with a major in

History and a minor in Government. Teaching freshmen as a Graduate Assistant in the History Department I completed 24 graduate hours in History and Government and began working on a Master's thesis.

In 1964 I moved to Galveston County and began teaching at Dickinson HS and within three years began teaching as an adjunct History/Government instructor for Alvin and Mainland Community Colleges which I continue to this day. After retiring from Dickinson ISD in 2002 I have remained active in professional and civic pursuits. Spending the summer of 1970 in Puebla, Mexico I took courses in Mexican history and pre-Columbian art. In 1977, after twelve years of research involving hundreds of interviews, countless trips to archives and 33 more graduate hours in History and Sociology at the University of Houston at Clear Lake I received my MA degree. My thesis dealt with the development of the Dickinson Italian colony.

In 1980, I received a "Practicum" grant from the University of Texas to create activities for economics classes. For this project I worked for several weeks with executives and employees at Phillips Petroleum in Houston and Bartlesville, Oklahoma. In 1986-87, I completed three more graduate political science courses at the University of Houston: *British Government* where I interviewed municipal workers in central England, *Political Parties* with Dr. Richard Murray and *International Relations* where I produced a paper with the hypothesis that the Soviet Union would morph into European socialism without a revolution. In 1991, I completed a course under Columbia's University's 90-year old W. Edward Deming in "*Quality Management*" which profoundly influenced the way I see students and my role as teacher. After retiring from Dickinson ISD in 2002 I remain active in professional and civic pursuits.

Questions While Reading *Am. Yawp*.

Some Direction: Every student will be preparing a "note sheet." That "note sheet" should show evidence that you took the following questions seriously as you read each text assignment. Some students may want to consider using **one segment** of your paper for lecture notes and the other for text.

For Test One

Chapter 16-19

1. What was "scientific management" (Taylorism) What aspect of business did it most affect? Was it more management or production?
2. Describes the arguments for Social Darwinism used years ago. To what degree would they find advocates today?
3. In the 1890s Southern Populists were unable to maintain party unity. What appears to be the problem?
4. What were the various planks of the Populist platform? To what degree did those planks become law in the years that followed?
5. What were the positive and negative aspects of party and machine politics in urban America in the 50 years after the Civil War? Comparing the positive and negative elements why did machine politics last well into the 20th century.
6. In the gilded age how well did American party politics fairly and effectively work? Did more people vote and were our presidents effective?
7. To what degree was the Hollywood version of the West based more on fantasy than reality?
8. Why were boarding schools established for the Indians in the West?
9. Who received more land from the government: homesteaders or railroads?
10. What was Frederick Jackson Turner's "Frontier Thesis?" How did it compare with Social Darwinism?
11. How did railroads transform the American economy?
12. Why did the "Lost Cause" appeal to Southerners?

For Test Two

Chapters 20 – 23

1. How did southern reformers seek to combat corruption? In what ways did the Court case *Plessy v. Ferguson* extend that quest?
2. What is the significance of the Northern Securities case of 1902 and the cases surrounding the Triangle Shirtwaist Factory fire?
3. What is the Social Gospel and how did it influence America?
4. Compare and contrast the beliefs and effectiveness of W. E. B. Du Bois and Booker T. Washington. How did Black leaders respond to World War I?
5. Contrast the four basic candidates in the 1912 Presidential election.

6. How did Upton Sinclair, Jacob Riis, Edward Bellamy and Ida B. Wells change American attitudes?
5. How was “Black Jack” Pershing, Pancho Villa and the Zimmerman Telegram all connected to Mexico and WWI?
6. How did the outbreak of the flu change our view of World War I?
7. During and after World War I the federal government dramatically changed its relationship with business, labor unions, dissenters and the Bolshevik Revolution. How did this play out during the 1920s??
8. . How did increased availability of consumer credit in the 1920s influence American expenditures? How did popular entertainment, urban life and culture change?
9. What was the Harlem Renaissance? How can we explain the contrast of what happened in 1921 in Tulsa, Oklahoma and the accomplishments of Langston Hughes, Alain Locke and Zora Neale Hurston?
10. How prosperous were American farmers do in the 20s? How did the Smoot-Hawley Tariff of 1930 affect their exports to other countries?
11. How did Commerce Secretary Hoover’s “associationalism” help the economy in the 1920s? How did the Federal Reserve respond to the financial collapse in 1929?
12. How did Roosevelt respond to the Great Depression on his first day, with the Glass-Steagall Banking Act later and his Fair Labor Standards Act six years later?
13. .What did Louisiana Senator Huey long and the Radio Priest criticize about Roosevelt’s New Deal programs? How did they differ?
14. How did Americans cope with the problems of the Great Depression? Specifically, what did each of the following groups do: Midwestern farmers, WWI veterans, families without a breadwinner and those who had no one that could offer help?
15. What is the legacy of the New Deal? How did it redefine the meaning of “liberalism?” To what degree did New Deal programs end the Great Depression? What were its most enduring elements of economic and political policy?

For Test Three

Chapter 24 – 27 Questions are tentative

1. What events, political groups and attitudes caused Americans to avoid involvement in World War II before December, 1941? What role did the Nye Committee and the America First group play?
2. Who was “Rosie the Riveter” and how important was the civilian workforce to victory during World War II? How did daily life change for workers during the War?
3. The United States used some sophisticated communication operations dealing with World War II. Describe some of the most effective and unique.
4. How did the conditions of African-Americans during the 2nd World War change. To what degree did EO 8802 work?
5. What was the Holocaust and to what degree did the United States try to help alleviate the situation during the War?
6. What were the major features of FDR’s “Second Bill of Rights” in 1944? To what degree did President Truman use those ideas with the Truman Fair Deal?

7. What was the “Zoot Suit” riot of 1943? To what degree did that event reflect the problems of other minority groups during World War II?
8. What was the real reason for spending so much money on the Marshall Plan? To what degree did the U.S. made a wise investment?
9. Many historians consider the G.I. Bill at the end of World War II to be critical in understanding the increased productivity of the next generation. What were the component parts of this law?
10. To what degree did our containment and anti-communist crusade prove counter-productive to our democratic ideals during the next decades? How did the Army-McCarthy Hearings cause us to reevaluate our thinking?
11. What were the various provisions of President Truman’s Fair Deal? What got passed by Congress and what didn’t?
12. Some historians call President Eisenhower a New Dealer” In what ways did he surpass FDR’s New Deal?
13. What and where was “Levittown?” How did this phenomenon change urban America and to what degree did the interstate highway system help the change.
14. The “baby boom” began in 1945. How does your textbook explain its cause? What do you think will happen to those children by 1965 ? By 2019?
13. What was the “Cuban Missile Crisis” of 1962? How did we arrive at the final decision by compromise with Khrushchev?
14. Like all presidencies, the Kennedy presidency had it’s highest and lowest point. Assess the highest and the lowest.
15. What were the most important accomplishments of the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 60s? To what degree was racial disfranchisement, Jim Crow and separatism ended in America?
16. To what degree was the civil rights movement a “spur of the moment” beginning in 1954. Contrast the roles played by Thurgood Marshall, Martin Luther King and Rosa Parks.

For the Final Exam

Chapter 28 – 30 Questions are tentative

1. What were some of the notable differences between John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson in their experience, their interests and personality?
2. What was the Great Society’s most successful program? To what degree was the Great Society similar to the New Deal?
3. What happened in the 1968 “Tet offensive” and why is it significant in American history?
4. The Great Society’s “war on poverty” was much less successful than planned. What were the major factors in reducing its success?
5. What were the Pentagon Papers? What influence did they have on the public’s support of the Vietnam War?
6. During the 1970s what was the critical factor that disrupted the American economy? Did that factor get resolved in the next two decades?
7. In the politics of identity “Gay Pride” parades appear common today but what event is marked by American historians as the beginning of the gay political movement?

8. What was the basic principle established by the Supreme Court in *Roe v. Wade* (1973)? How did later cases affect that principle?
9. The Watergate saga had many consequences on politics, public attitudes and laws passed by Congress? What were some of those consequences?
10. To what degree did President Carter's foreign policy emphasize human rights compared to Presidents Ford or Reagan?
11. What caused President Carter to lose popularity? To what degree did the Moscow Olympics and the Iranian hostage crisis play a part?
12. From 1980 to 2000 many changes occurred in the way business is organized and conducts its operations. Describe some of those changes.
13. Assess the presidency of Ronald Reagan. What were the positives? What were the negatives? To what degree are those problems still with us. What problems were made worse? What problems were solved?
14. Presidents Reagan, Bush and Clinton were polarizing political figures. What groups of voters were attracted to each President.
15. President Clinton attempted to deal with health-care reform. How did he go about doing it and to what degree was it a success?
16. The internet had a convoluted development. What was its original purpose? When did a majority of the population begin to actually use it in their everyday lives?
17. Assess the presidency of Bill Clinton. What were the positives? What were the negatives? [Historians are reluctant to seriously assess a recent president. Generally, it takes about 20 years to begin getting the necessary data and recorded perspectives for valid history. We are just now beginning to accurately fully understand with the Reagan presidency. History teachers usually run about five years behind the historians.]

History 1302 Syllabus Readings

#1 History as Alternate Perspective

Marriage in the March of Time

By Colbert I. King *Washington Post*, 2-12-05

There's really no telling what the 29 black intellectuals who met 100 years ago in Niagara Falls would think of America today. Of course, the same might be said of Americans in the year 2105 who look back to see how we lived out our lives a century before. There's good reason, however, to believe that the 29 men, led by **W.E.B. Du Bois**, then a professor at Atlanta University, would hardly recognize this as the same country.

At the dawn of 20th-century America, those black men journeyed to Niagara Falls, N.Y., to prepare a militant statement on race and inequality that was to stand in sharp contrast to the conciliatory and **accommodationist** stance of **Booker T. Washington** -- white America's favorite black man at the time. Hotels on the U.S. side of Niagara Falls wouldn't let them register, however. So their demands were drafted in a hotel on the Canadian side of the falls.

The breadth of legally sanctioned segregation and discrimination 100 years ago remains a historical shame. But what will Americans 100 years down the road think when they examine our era?

In 1905, when the **Niagara Movement** -- forerunner to the NAACP -- was born, nowhere was the color line more heat-tempered and rock-hard than when it came to sex. The prohibition against interracial marriage was a national obsession, enshrined in both law and tradition...

In the 19th century, interracial marriage was illegal in most states. As the Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund noted in a brief in a New Jersey case, "by the 1960s, at least 41 states had enacted anti-miscegenation statutes."

The arguments mounted against interracial marriage also had a familiar ring. Fact and God played heavily in the judgments. The Georgia Supreme Court in 1869 based its interracial marriage ban on natural law, observing that "the God of nature made it otherwise, and no human law can produce it, and no human tribunal can enforce it."

Hear the 1871 Indiana Supreme Court quoting an 1867 Pennsylvania decision: Racial separation is enacted not because of "prejudice, nor caste, nor injustice of any kind, but simply to suffer men to follow the law of races established by the Creator himself, and not to compel them to intermix contrary to their instincts."

The North Carolina Supreme Court in 1869 upheld the state's anti-race mixing law, stating that "the policy of prohibiting the intermarriage of the two races is so well established, and the wishes of both races so well known."

A host of state anti-miscegenation laws -- strongly backed by white public sentiment -- were upheld in state courts well into the 20th century. The reasoning was simple and absolute: Marriage between the races defied the natural order; intermarriage bans had legitimate historical roots and were based on a "divinely ordained" scheme.

Conclusion: Government had the right to define marriage as a union of two persons of the same race

It remained that way for generations, until 1967, when the U.S. Supreme Court, in *Loving v. Virginia*, ruled that state setting forth who can marry whom violate "one of the vital personal rights essential to the orderly pursuit of happiness by free men" -- marriage -- and the "principle of equality at the heart of the Fourteenth Amendment." So much, therefore, for the ruling of the Virginia judge who, in 1959, had sentenced the interracial couple, the Lovings, stating: "Almighty God created the races, white, black, yellow, malay and red, and he placed them on separate continents. And but for the interference with his arrangement there would be no cause for such marriages. The fact that he separated the races shows that he did not intend for the races to mix."

So much, too, for the unbending, firmly ingrained, immutable understanding enshrined in law and court rulings that interracial partners cannot marry.

Now fast-forward past today to 100 years from now. How will future generations view our present-day fight against allowing monogamous couples with life commitments to each other to marry? What will they think of our rush to enact state laws prohibiting same-sex life partners from joining the same institution shared by different-sex couples? How will they regard our assertion that there is a public interest in promoting discrimination in the marriage statute?

Let's get one issue out of the way before the e-mails and letters start flooding in. I don't equate the long, bloody struggle of African Americans against racial injustice, ugly brutality and unjust treatment with the effort to give equal rights to lesbians and gay men.

But I do believe that homosexuals are subject to prejudice and that they are forbidden the same rights and safeguards that heterosexuals enjoy, including the right to marry. That, in my book, is wrong. There is justice to their cause that should be ours, too. Leaving the security of the majority to stand up and say so ought not be so hard in 2005. Sadly, for many Americans, it is. Just as it was 1905.

#2 History as Civic Enlightenment

Steal This Vote...

an excerpt from an interview with Andrew Gumbel
conducted by Matthew Wheeland on Altnet.org, 2-15-06

Throughout American political history one or another of two opposing parties have controlled the infrastructure of popular elections. First it was the Federalists, Democrats & Whigs and for the last 150 years Democrats and Republicans. It is from these cycles that Andrew Gumbel's book, *Steal This Vote: Dirty Elections and the Rotten History of Democracy in America*, (Nation Books, 2005) draws its story.

Our 19th Century Heritage

In many ways, the U.S. was way out in front of any other country in developing universal suffrage in the 1830s and 1840s. Suffrage was granted to just about all white men, and in some cases black men, and in a few cases, in certain states, women too. Whereas at the same time in Europe, suffrage was extremely restricted to men of property, if that. But by the late 19th century in the U.S., starting with the post-Civil War era, you had a lot of restrictions on voting -- literacy tests, good character tests, and so on -- aimed to systematically deprive

not only blacks but poor whites and immigrants of the right to vote.

And gradually the two parties took political control, and essentially what happened in the late 19th century was that instead of the parties corrupting voters one by one -- by paying them, by getting them to cast more than one ballot, by taking them around from precinct to precinct to vote repeatedly -- the parties changed tactics and started corrupting the electoral officials and the electoral process instead.

So you had corrupt officials working on behalf of the parties, and in jurisdictions where one party was in control, they managed to fiddle the vote. And you also had the introduction of voting machines, which were trumpeted as something that of great value to the individual voter by making the process of voting much easier, but in every instance, whether you're talking about lever machines from the 1890s onwards or whether you're talking about punch-cards from the 1960s onwards, or now if you're talking about computer voting machines, the real interested parties are the county's voting officials. These machines were designed to make their jobs easier.

And to differing degrees it made the job of... corrupting the electoral process, if they were so inclined, much easier as well. Every technology was trumpeted as a kind of miracle solution that was going to clean up the system. What it turned out to be was a different platform on which electoral shenanigans could be carried out. That has been true of every single type of machinery.

[Gumble then recounts the familiar stories of poll taxes, literacy tests and the grandfather clause.]

The 1948 Texas Senate Election as Example

The most extreme examples of corruption on the local level, the most wonderful example of a stolen election that I've ever come across, was how Lyndon Johnson won the Senate in Texas in 1948. He did it in a very large number of ways, but what it came down to in the end was that he was trailing by about 120 votes. It was six days after the election, and it seemed like all the votes were in and one of his operatives in Jim Wells County, which is down near the Rio Grande River on the Mexican border, changed that 7 to a 9, gave him 200 more votes, and he ended up the winner.

When they inspected the voting ledger, they saw that the last 200 names had been written in in alphabetical order in a different color of ink from all the rest. And Coke Stevenson, who was the losing candidate, went down to Jim Wells County with Frank Hamer, the marshall who caught Bonnie and Clyde 15 years earlier. They went through this list and tried to find the people on the list, and they found every irregularity conceivable.

The story which I go into is quite extraordinary, not only because LBJ stole that election, but that he got away with it when his theft was so brazen. He essentially got away with it because it was a primary election rather than a general election, so the ultimate authority was the Democratic Party. The executive committee of the Texas Democratic Party took a crucial vote, and people were so afraid to vote against LBJ that some of them didn't even show up to the meeting. The absolutely last, critical vote came when LBJ's operative searched the building for a couple of people who were missing and found one of them skulking in the mens' toilet and hauled him out and forced him to vote for LBJ, and that was the end of

that. They voted against conducting further investigation, and he became the senator....

And then, if we skip forward to the Voting Rights Act in the mid-1960s, that certainly solved a lot of the problems in theory, but not always in practice. If you look at the pattern of discrimination and exclusion from voting since then, you see a very heavy burden being carried by African-Americans. The kinds of stories you hear about people being misdirected to the wrong precinct, or told if they have outstanding warrants or parking tickets they're not going to be allowed to vote, or having too few voting machines or too few precincts always seem to be in heavily African-American areas.

The other important category in the South in particular is the laws that do not grant automatic restoration of voting rights to a felon once they've completed their sentences. This was a particularly big issue in Florida in 2000, when roughly 600,000 people were excluded by this law.

You also had the problem that they drew up a felon purge list which was supposed to identify people who had criminal records and therefore should be disqualified. That list turned out to be riddled with errors to where in counties where they checked, up to 95 percent of the names turned out to be wrong, which again was another big suppression mechanism against African-American votes....

Our 21st Century Dilemma: Computer or No

We are now in a situation where the new generation of touch screen computer voting machines hold that very particular danger, not because people cheat more or less, but because instead of being able to cheat in one county at a time, which was essentially the way you had to do it in the old days with lever machines or with punch cards, you now have computer tabulation software that applies to machines that might be used over several counties, or indeed over several states....

That's something utterly new and holds new dangers, but the basic structure of how elections are corrupted and who corrupts them hasn't really changed at all in 100 years....

#3 History as a perspective on Partisanship Populist vs. Republican Warfare in 1893 Kansas

Lorenzo Lewelling was swept into the Kansas governor's office as a third-party Populist candidate in the highly contentious election of 1892. The Populist victory was not so clear for the Kansas legislature.

The Populists accused the Republicans (who had just a slight majority in the House) of having obtained 18 seats by fraud. Only two Democrats had been elected.

At a mass meeting of the Populists the night of the inauguration, a resolve was adopted reading: "We are here by the voice of the people and we will disperse only at the point of the bayonet." In this charged atmosphere the Populist governor made his Inaugural Address.

The following are excerpts from that Address, January, 1893.

"If it be true that the poor have no right to the property of the rich, let it also be declared that the rich have no right to the property of the poor. It is the mission of Kansas to protect and advance the moral and material interests of all her citizens. It is her especial duty at the present time to protect the producer from the ravages of combined wealth. National

legislation has for twenty years fostered and protected the interests of the few, while it has left the South and West to supply the products with which to feed and clothe the world, and thus to become the servants of wealth. The purchasing power of the dollar has become so great that corn, wheat, beef, pork and cotton have scarcely commanded a price equal to the cost of production. The instincts of patriotism have naturally rebelled against these unwarranted encroachments of the power of money. Sectional hatred has also been kept alive by the old powers, the better to enable them to control the products and make the producer contribute to the millionaire. And thus, while the producer labors in the field, the shop, and the factory, the millionaire usurps his earnings and rides in gilded carriages with liveried servants.

To check and change these conditions for the good of all, Kansas steps forth today. . . . There must be change, and change

must be exaltation and progress. . . . Under the peaceful revolution that comes to Kansas today, let us hope there may also come a spirit of renewed devotion to the interests of the people, a spirit of sympathy for those who struggle, and an awakening to the greatness and responsibility of citizenship. The state is greater than the party, but the citizen is greater than the state, while the family is the priceless jewel of our civilization. The problem of today is to make the state subservient to the individual rather than to become his master."

The Kansas Legislative War of 1893

During the weeks that followed Gov. Lewelling's address the Kansas legislature conducted a kind of legislative war. The Senate had been elected clearly with a Populist majority but the House could not begin the lawmaking process because too many legislators claimed the same legislative seat. There had been several disputed elections so both the Populists and the Republicans claimed the leadership.

Gov. Lewelling and the Senate recognized the Populist side. Over a number of days the Populists and Republicans met as two different bodies in the legislative chamber, one in the morning and the other in the afternoon. Finally, the Republicans, using a sledge hammer, bashed the door down and occupied the chamber by force of arms. As these events unfolded the Populist governor called out the state militia to support the Populist House. In opposition to the Governor's action, the local sheriff organized a local police force and joined the Republicans in the Capitol House chamber. By this time armed citizens, some representing Populists and others supporting the Republicans, were gathering at the capitol as the Kansas Supreme Court handed down a decision in favor of the Republicans. Reasonable order was restored and the two warring sides somehow finished the legislative session of 1893. Gov. Lewelling was defeated by a Republican the following year.

#4 History as Political Persuasion (Propaganda?)

Of Darwinism and Social Darwinism

by Robert B. Reich, *The American Prospect*, December 2005

The Conservative Movement, as its progenitors like to call it, is now mounting a full-throttled attack on Darwinism even as

it has thoroughly embraced Darwin's bastard child, **social Darwinism**. On the face of it, these positions may appear inconsistent. What unites them is a profound disdain for science, logic, and fact.

In *The Origin of the Species*, published 150 years ago, Charles Darwin amassed evidence that mankind evolved through the ages from simpler forms of life through a process he called "natural selection." This insight became the foundation of modern biological science. But it also greatly disturbed those who believe the Bible's account of creation to be literally true. In recent years, as America's Conservative Movement has grown, some of these people have taken over local and state school boards with the result that, for example, Kansas's new biology standards now single out evolution as a "controversial theory." Until a few weeks ago, teachers in Dover, Pennsylvania were required to tell their students they should explore "intelligent design" as an alternative to evolution. (The good citizens of Dover just booted out the school board responsible for this, summoning a warning from Conservative Coalition broadcaster Pat Robertson that God would wreak disaster on them.)

Social Darwinism was developed some thirty years after Darwin's famous book by a social thinker named Herbert Spencer. Extending Darwin into a realm Darwin never intended, **Spencer and his followers saw society as a competitive struggle where only those with the strongest moral character should survive, or else the society would weaken. It was Spencer, not Darwin, who coined the phrase "survival of the fittest." Social Darwinism thereby offered a perfect moral justification for America's Gilded Age, when robber barons controlled much of American industry, the gap between rich and poor turned into a chasm, urban slums festered, and politicians were bought off by the wealthy. It allowed John D. Rockefeller, for example, to claim that the fortune he accumulated through the giant Standard Oil Trust was "merely a survival of the fittest, ... the working out of a law of nature and a law of God."**

The modern Conservative Movement has embraced social Darwinism with no less fervor than it has condemned Darwinism. Social Darwinism gives a moral justification for rejecting social insurance and supporting tax cuts for the rich. "In America," says Robert Bork, "the rich' are overwhelmingly people – entrepreneurs, small businessmen, corporate executives, doctors, lawyers, etc. – who have gained their higher incomes through intelligence, imagination, and hard work." Any transfer of wealth from rich to poor thereby undermines the nation's moral fiber. Allow the virtuous rich to keep more of their earnings and pay less in taxes, and they'll be even more virtuous. Give the non-virtuous poor food stamps, Medicaid, and what's left of welfare, and they'll fall into deeper moral torpor.

There is, of course, an ideological inconsistency here. If mankind did not evolve according to Darwinist logic, but began instead with Adam and Eve, then it seems unlikely societies evolve according to the survival-of-the-fittest logic of social Darwinism. By the same token, if you believe one's economic status is the consequence of an automatic process of natural selection, then, presumably, you'd believe that human beings represent the culmination of a similar process, over the ages. That the conservative mind endures such cognitive

dissonance is stunning, but not nearly as remarkable as the repeated attempts of conservative mouthpieces such as the editorial pages of the *Wall Street Journal* and the *Weekly Standard* to convince readers the conservative movement is intellectually coherent.

The only consistency between the right's attack on Darwinism and embrace of social Darwinism is the utter fatuousness of both. Darwinism is correct. Scientists who are legitimized by peer review and published research are unanimous in their view that evolution is a fact, not a theory. Social Darwinism, meanwhile, is hogwash. Social scientists have long understood that one's economic status in society is not a function of one's moral worth. It depends largely on the economic status of one's parents, the models of success available while growing up, and educational opportunities along the way.

A democracy is imperiled when large numbers of citizens turn their backs on scientific fact. Half of Americans recently polled say they don't believe in evolution. Almost as many say they believe income and wealth depend on moral worthiness. At a time when American children are slipping behind on international measures of educational attainment, especially in the sciences; when global competition is intensifying; and when the median incomes of Americans are stagnating and the ranks of the poor are increasing, these ideas, propagated by the so-called Conservative Movement, are moving us rapidly backwards.

Robert B. Reich is Professor of Public Policy at the Goldman School of Public Policy at the University of California at Berkeley. He has served in three national administrations, most recently as secretary of labor. He has written ten books, including The Work of Nations, The Future of Success and Locked in the Cabinet, and his most recent book, Reason.

5 History as Political Metaphor

Viewing Muckrakers over the century

Cragg Hines, *chron.com*, 3-12-06

Cragg Hines observed that President Bush in a speech before the venerable news reporters organization known as the Gridiron Club in Washington in March, 2006, would likely have sharp remarks regarding some highly unpopular decisions which aggressive news reporters had made public. The following is the remainder of that editorial.

Presidents are human. They bleed. The nation's leaders have always liked it when folks are with them but grow less charitable when the tide turns.... But I can report that at a Gridiron dinner on **March 17, 1906, President Theodore Roosevelt** expressed irritation when he believed that some writers had quit preaching and gone to meddling. When crusading reporters early in the 20th century focused on corporate America — with scathing pieces on Standard Oil, meat packers and patent medicines — TR was well pleased. But when the reportage turned to government, with articles such as **"The Treason of the Senate"** (an anti-corruption series of magazine pieces that began in February 1906), TR bridled. And he lashed out in his Gridiron speech: **"The men with the muckrakes are often indispensable to the well-being of society; but only if they know when to stop raking the muck and to look upward to the celestial crown above them, to the crown of worthy endeavor."**

Instantly, a form of aggressive reportage was christened "muckraking." TR's imagery was from **John Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress**. It's irrelevant that some historians believe TR got Bunyan twisted. The name stuck to writers who, by and large, today would rather be called "**investigative journalists**."

As speeches to the Gridiron, a group of sometimes self-important journalists (including me) are at least theoretically off-the-record, TR's speech was not reported. But it was talked about, and he was urged to speak out publicly. He did so, more or less working the "muckrake" remarks into a dedicatory address the following month.

According to Charles Willis Thompson, in his *Presidents I've Known*, Roosevelt's remarks "crushed the muckraking trade." So, TR's speech may have been more successful than he intended.

As TR's words suggest, he was often in sympathy with muckrakers. That was certainly the case with Roosevelt's view of *The Jungle*, the novel-exposé of the Chicago meatpacking industry by Upton Sinclair, published in February 1906.

According Christopher Phelps, a historian at Ohio State University at Mansfield, even as Roosevelt denounced some muckrakers, he was sending personal emissaries to investigate the squalid Chicago slaughterhouses.

Their damning report, which is republished in Phelps' new edition of *The Jungle* (Bedford/St. Martin's), influenced TR's decision later in 1906 to sign the **Pure Food and Drug Act** and the **Meat Inspection Act**.

As Phelps noted in an interview, Roosevelt was "incredibly complicated," positioning himself between forces of business conservatism ... and radicals and revolutionaries. "Although TR was progressive, Phelps said, "when it came from someone else, it was subversive." Phelps said that TR once told *The Jungle*'s publisher, Frank Doubleday: "Tell Sinclair to go home and let me run the country for a while."

The initial phase of muckraking was intense, with a golden age early in the 1900s. "Then it sort of ebbed" as corporate America regrouped and gave their advertising and public relations arms "free rein to attack," said Carl Jensen, author of *Stories That Changed America: Muckrakers of the 20th Century* (Seven Stories).

To Harold Brayman, the late journalist and Gridiron member, **muckrakers' reporting was "frequently very unfair, and they made no attempts to give a balanced or objective picture" But that wasn't their point.**

There was a muckraking renaissance in the 1960s and 70s, exemplified by **Ralph Nader** and his 1965, *Unsafe at Any Speed*, said Jensen, who has retired from Sonoma State University, where he founded Project Censored.

Beyond the Watergate reporting of **Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein** in the 1970s, Jensen was hard-pressed to select contemporary writing that was genuine muckraking. Perhaps that of filmmaker **Michael Moore (Roger & Me, Fahrenheit 9/11 [Sicko in 2007])**, Jensen said, although "his moment of greatness has yet to come." Perhaps filmmaker Morgan Spurlock (**Super Size Me**) for his personalized look at the effect of a steady diet of fast food.

In the post-World War II era, muckrakers often have been merely political props. President Lyndon B. Johnson bid Sinclair to the White House in 1967, the year before the author's death at 90, for the signing of the Wholesome Meat

Act. Maybe Roger Moore will get a White House invitation in a few decades for the signing of a bailout bill to force some rationalization on a truly down-and-out American automobile industry....

6 History for comprehending taxes

The 1913 Income Tax Evolves to 2021

[In 1913 the federal income tax pulled about 1% from the economy; by the 1990's it would become about 20%.]

One of the key platforms of the Progressives in the early 20th century was to find a way to make taxation fair and at the same time find a solution to the **maldistribution of wealth**. By 1900, the wealthiest 12% owned 90% of America's wealth and the upper 1% held 50%. They began by creating an "inheritance tax" whereby very wealthy people would be limited in passing on great wealth to their children (sometimes called the "death tax" by modern conservatives). The original inheritance tax began at a figure that was equal to around one million in today's money. Since 2020 this tax only affects estates worth over 11 million.

The second drive was to pass a Constitutional amendment (the 16th) allowing the "**ability to pay**" principle to be used for a new federal income tax. **In 1913, this amendment was sold to the people with the assurance that the income tax would be simple to compute, fair to all, and would never apply to any part of a person's income needed to sustain a "decent standard of living."** For the 1913 tax, [expressed in 2010 real dollars] there was an exemption on the first fifty thousand of income and a 1% rate on the next \$250,000, 2% on the next \$375,000 and 7% on all income above 6 million. During World War I the rate increased so that the highest bracket [somewhere above 6 million] became 73%, reduced to 25% shortly after the War. During the **Great Depression**, President Hoover raised all tax rates, putting the highest rate [for multi-millionaires] at 63%.

Until World War II, the median-income family rarely ever had to pay any income tax. However, that would change with the huge expenses of the Second World War. **In 1942 the "Victory tax," as it was then called, required average-income households to pay for the first time.**

Most state and local taxes remained as sales tax and fee systems which were intrinsically **regressive**, whereby the poor pay at a higher tax rate than the rich.

The Income tax was supposed to off-set regressive taxes and create "fairness" but the enormous costs of the "Cold War" after 1946 appeared to justify a continuation of the "Victory Tax." [much of the above from Alan Reynolds, 11-14-02, Cato Institute Website]

Deductions & Credits: From 1913 to 1939 the salary and wages of state and local employees were exempt from income taxes & by 1917 deductions for dependents and charities were added. The first easy tax tables began in 1941 and the first "standard deduction" came in 1944. During the 1970's the "minimum tax" and the "**earned income credit**" were introduced. The popular "earned Income tax credit" has been expanded several times since. In the 1980's tax rates increased for the below-median income taxpayers when unemployment compensation & Social Security were made taxable and interest costs on credit card debt was dropped as

deductible. However, tax schedules, at that time, began to be adjusted for inflation. Rates for the above median taxpayers were drastically lowered. [www.irs.gov/pub/irssoi/02inpetr] The top bracket usually applying to the upper 1% of taxpayers, had increased to 80% by 1936 and began creeping higher throughout World War II to 91% by 1944 where it stayed until the Kennedy-Johnson tax cut reduced it to 70%. (Of course these high rates were off-set by generous deductions.) By 2002, the top bracket began at \$307,000 and took only 35%. In 2002 the bottom bracket was set at 10% and remains. Over the years, inflation has made family exemptions less beneficial to the bottom half of taxpayers. (Miles Benson, October 10, 2003, *Newhouse News Service*)

By 1952, a family of three at the median income [\$23,500, 2010 dollars] would have paid 11.6% to federal income tax. By 1972, that same family now making \$42,000 [2010 dollars] would have paid about 14% of total income to federal income tax. By 2005, still making \$42,000 the median family of three would be paying 10.4%. *

Who pays the income tax today?

1. The upper 1% paid 24% of all income and payroll taxes in 2020. [Today, you need an income of about \$600,000 to enter this group.] However, if state and local taxes are considered add another 6 percentage points. *Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy*

2. In 2003, the upper 1/10 of 1% paid 16% of all income taxes. This group made almost as much as the rest of the upper 1% as a whole and averaged 4 million dollars for each family reporting. By 2020, according to the IRS, the top 1/10 of 1% — those with incomes now at least \$10 million—paid a 25% effective federal income-tax rate. For comparison the typical middle class single taxpayer in the 60 to 90k income group paid 18% in 2020. However, if state and local taxes are considered add another 8 percentage points for those folks..

3. Are you rich? If one assumes the upper 5% makes you "rich" then in 2020 you needed a \$263,000; but in 1972 you only needed \$97,000 and in 1937 only \$48,000. In 1929, before the crash, it required 59,000.

4. Today many progressives claim that the upper 1% are supposed to be paying 50% of income federal income taxes and the upper 50% should be paying 100% by the standards used in 1913.

5. Today, the share of federal income taxes paid by the poorest fifth of Americans is about 2%. However, if state and local taxes are considered it closer to 20%.

* Computations are from

[www.minneapolisfed.org/research/data/us/calc] 9th Federal Reserve Dist. To access the more recent Statistics of Income Bulletin, visit the IRS Web site www.irs.gov and click on "Tax Stats."

#7 History showing how issues remain

Triangle Shirtwaist Fire Lessons

By Harold Meyerson, 3-23-11, *Washington Post*

The seamstresses were just getting off work that Saturday, some of them singing a new popular song, "Every Little Movement (Has a Meaning of Its Own)," when they heard shouts from the eighth floor just below. They saw smoke outside the windows, and then fire. As David Von Drehle recounts the ensuing catastrophe, in his award-winning book *Triangle*, just a couple minutes later the ninth floor was fully ablaze.

The fire engines that rushed to the scene did not have ladders that reached to the ninth floor. The fire escape — which didn't reach all the way to the street anyway — was not built to accommodate more than a few people and soon collapsed. The stairwell that led to the roof was already burning, and after few minutes was consumed by flames. The other stairwell led down to the street, but the door was padlocked from the outside so that the men and women who worked at the Triangle Shirtwaist Company would be compelled to use just the one stairwell or the two elevators to exit, lest any of them elude inspection and make off with leftover scraps of cloth. The elevator operators made runs up to the ninth floor several times before their cables stopped working, and before desperate sewers sought to escape by jumping down one of the elevator

shafts, hoping to find a softer landing atop the descending elevator than on the sidewalk nine stories down.

But many, facing the choice of death by fire or death by impact on the city streets, chose the latter and leapt. Down they came, some already engulfed in flame — first a few, then a torrent, before the horrified crowd that had gathered by the building, which was just off Washington Square in the heart of New York's Greenwich Village.

When it was over, 146 people had either died by fire or jumped to their deaths. Most were young women, almost entirely Jewish or Italian immigrants, many still in their teens.... That was 100 years ago Friday — March 25, 1911. But the battles that arose in the wake of Triangle over worker safety, worker rights and whether government should regulate business are with us still. Triangle's owners, Max Blanck and Isaac Harris, had fiercely opposed the general strike of Lower East Side garment workers two years earlier and had hired thugs to beat up their seamstresses when they picketed the plant. They rebuffed the union's demand for sprinklers and unlocked stairwells — and when these facts became widely known in the fire's aftermath, outrage swept the city. Blanck and Harris were tried for manslaughter — but acquitted in the absence of any laws that set workplace safety standards. But standards were on the way. In Triangle's wake, and facing the prospect of losing New York's Jewish community to an ascending Socialist Party, Charlie Murphy, who ran Tammany Hall and controlled the state's Democratic Party, told two young protégés — Assembly Speaker **Al Smith** and state Senate President Robert Wagner — to make some changes to New York's industrial order. Aided by **Frances Perkins**, a young social worker who was in Washington Square looking on in horror as the seamstresses jumped to their deaths, Smith and Wagner visited hundreds of factories and sweatshops. Over time, they authored and enacted legislation that required

certain workplaces to have sprinklers, open doors, fireproof stairwells and functioning fire escapes; limited women's workweeks to 54 hours and banned children under 18 from certain hazardous jobs. (Years later, Wagner, by then a U.S. senator, authored — with help from Perkins, who had become labor secretary — the legislation establishing Social Security; he also wrote the bill legalizing collective bargaining.) Businesses reacted as if the revolution had arrived. The changes to the fire code, said a spokesman for the Associated Industries of New York, would lead to "the wiping out of industry in this state." The regulations, wrote George Olvany, special counsel to the Real Estate Board of New York City, would force expenditures on precautions that were "absolutely needless and useless."

"The best government is the least possible government," said Laurence McGuire, president of the Real Estate Board. "To my mind, this [the post-Triangle regulations] is all wrong." Such complaints, of course, are with us still. We hear them from mine operators after fatal explosions, from bankers after they've crashed the economy, from energy moguls after their rig explodes or their plant starts leaking radiation. We hear them from politicians who take their money. We hear them from Republican members of Congress and from some Democrats, too. A century after Triangle, greed encased in libertarianism remains a fixture of — and danger to — American life.

8 History confronting unpleasant facts

George Will, *Houston Chronicle*, 9-9-21

On the side of a lightly used road, from which drivers can look across Puget Sound to Seattle's skyline, a small sign identifies the turnoff to the "Japanese American Exclusion Memorial." On a recent sun-dappled midweek summer morning, 79 years after the exclusion began, a smattering of visitors were facing a dark episode in American history. They, and the memorial, are quiet refutations of current loud accusations that the United States does not face unpleasant facts about its past. Seventy-four days after Pearl Harbor — Feb. 19, 1942; today, among Japanese Americans, Feb. 19 is a "Day of Remembrance" — President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066 authorizing the evacuation to concentration camps of, eventually, about 120,000 people of Japanese ancestry. Two-thirds were U.S. citizens, half of them children. The first 227 left this island from a dock a few yards from the memorial's sinuous wall listing all of their names. They were destined for Idaho, via California. While they were away, many of their homes, farms and businesses sold for much less than their value.

Gen. John DeWitt, head of the Western Defense Command, had a theory: "A Jap is a Jap." A 1943 report on the "evacuation," prepared under his direction, made clear that the supposed "military necessity" was based on racism. The report said that an invasion by Japan of the West Coast was probable, and that it was "impossible" to distinguish loyal (if there were such) from disloyal Japanese American citizens: "The Japanese race is an

enemy race and while many second- and third-generation Japanese born on United States soil, possessed of United States citizenship, have become 'Americanized,' the racial strains are undiluted." This report was kept from the Supreme Court when it upheld the internments in 1944. As was a report, prepared for Chief of Naval Operations Ernest King, estimating that perhaps 3 percent of Japanese Americans were potentially disloyal, and that these were "already fairly well known to naval intelligence."

DeWitt said that "the interception of unauthorized radio communications" emanating from along the West Coast "conclusively" explained Japanese attacks on U.S. ships. The FBI, however, found "no information" of "any espionage activity ashore or ... illicit shore-to-ship signaling." Nevertheless, to some people, whose racial animus was heated by war fever, the complete absence of Japanese American sabotage was seen as sinister evidence of how stealthily the homegrown enemies were biding their time.

Meanwhile, Japanese American soldiers, some of whose families were interned, were distinguishing themselves in the war's European theater — even though for a period after Pearl Harbor the Army took away their rifles. The 442nd Regimental Combat Team, composed of Japanese Americans, fought its way up Italy and into France, where it suffered 1,000 casualties rescuing 175 Texans of the 36th Texas Division's "lost battalion" that had been cut off by Germans. By the war's end, the 442nd was the most decorated unit for its size in U.S. history.

In time, the fever of war abated. Then, the civil rights movement sensitized the nation, and occasioned much soul-searching, some of it retrospective. In 1988, Congress formally apologized for the internments, and provided reparations checks of \$20,000 to 82,000 victims. In 2018, the Supreme Court repudiated its 1944 decision as "gravely wrong the day it was decided" and "overruled in the court of history." In 2011, here by the dock where the exclusions began, this island's memorial was opened.

In 1994, David Guterson, a high school English teacher on the island, published a novel, "Snow Falling on Cedars," set on a fictional island in Puget Sound, where Japanese residents had been blown about by the winds of World War II. The novel won the PEN/Faulkner Award for Fiction. One of Guterson's characters remembers signs posted by the War Relocation Authority on March 21, 1942, notifying all "Japanese islanders" that they must leave in eight days. The novel sold 4 million copies during a year and a half on bestseller lists. It was kept there by readers who were willing to be immersed by him in the unpleasantness of a fictional internment camp. It is not unlike the one the Bainbridge Islanders were sent to: Idaho's Minidoka War Relocation Center, which is a National Historic Site administered by the National Park

Service.

This island's small memorial, a modest contribution to the national memory, is a pebble from a mountain of evidence against those who accuse Americans of being too calloused or squeamish to redeem their nation's honor by confronting departures from it.

Will is a Pulitzer Prize-winning syndicated columnist, based in Washington, D.C.

9 Using History as Political Pep Rally

We need a GI Bill for the 21st century

By Edward Humes, *Houston Chronicle*, 10-29-06

Imagine telling the members of an entire generation they could receive a free college education at any school that accepted them courtesy of Uncle Sam. Throw in a monthly stipend and textbooks. After graduation, there are government-backed home loans, no money down — buy a house cheaper than renting. Throw in subsidized business loans, farm loans, job training, medical care and up to a year's worth of unemployment checks.

What insane politician would propose such a costly boondoggle, such outright social engineering? It would be the most enormous, far-reaching, life-changing government program in the history of the world.

And so it was. We know it today as the original GI Bill.

Today's unthinkable was yesterday's matter of course.

FDR and Congress adopted the humbly named Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 with bipartisan fervor. The stated goal was simple: to help 16 million veterans and their families resume their lives after the scourge of WW II.

But this investment in the nation's future powered far more than a return to the status quo. It transformed the nation and the very nature of the American dream, opening up the colleges, raising suburbs out of bean fields, creating a new middle class and providing the medical, engineering and scientific prowess that conquered long-feared diseases, ushered in the Information Age and helped win the Cold War.

There was never anything like the GI Bill. There's nothing like it on the horizon. And that's a problem. Today's veterans are getting shortchanged. Instead of a full ride to any college, the modern GI Bill's support tops out at \$36,000 for a four-year degree — barely enough to cover the average state university. Forget about the private colleges once covered by the GI Bill — \$36,000 would pay for only a year at many of them.

Reservists and National Guard troops in Iraq receive even less — only 27 percent of the education benefits that regular troops receive....

But this is not simply a story of slighted veterans, scandalous as that may be. This is a story of a United States no longer investing in its future. The GI Bill was an engine of opportunity for all of us. It powered U.S. prosperity after World War II, turning a nation of renters into a nation of homeowners, transforming college from an elite bastion into almost an entitlement and making a tiny middle class into America's leading demographic.

The "greatest generation" endured depression and war, but its members also ended up our most privileged generation, gifted with more government largess than any

group in history. More than 7 million veterans took advantage of the education benefits alone for college or trade schools. This proved a costly but sound investment: For every dollar paid out, there was a \$7 return to the economy in terms of increased earnings, consumer spending and tax revenue, according to a 1988 congressional study.

Three presidents — George H.W. Bush, Gerald Ford and Jimmy Carter — dozens of congressmen, 14 Nobel Prize winners, giants of literature, Broadway and Hollywood and hundreds of thousands of teachers, doctors, nurses and businessmen got their starts with the help of the GI Bill. "Biggest piece of legislation the country ever passed," says former Sen. Bob Dole, a war hero and GI Bill beneficiary. "Maybe we need something like it again."

Which begs the question: What happened to the Washington that created something so magnificent? Why do we no longer expect — or demand — greatness from Americans' joint enterprise, our government? In the 1960s, before Watergate and Vietnam, most Americans believed that their government usually did the right thing. Now we've accepted Ronald Reagan's formulation about the nine most dangerous words in the English language: "I'm from the government and I'm here to help." How ironic that a member of the GI Bill generation would sell his countrymen on that idea. But it's not a truism; it's self-fulfilling prophecy. We expect our government to fail, and it meets our expectations.

The original GI Bill was powerful because it touched a whole generation, and the ripple effects washed over the entire nation, not just veterans. Today's GI Bill reaches less than 1 percent of the population. It is no longer an engine for greatness, and Americans desperately need such an engine. We always have been the nation in which the children can expect a better life than the parents; we no longer believe this is likely.

Before he died, FDR offered a solution that did not require a world war and a military draft. He proposed a program of national service, in which young people earned education, medical, housing and pension benefits. Not just veterans but all young people. It was, in essence, a peacetime civilian GI Bill — an investment in the future and in civic service. Polls suggested a receptive public, but the idea died with Roosevelt....

In an era in which college is a skyrocketing financial burden for many families, when homeownership is less affordable than ever, when the nation is losing its competitive edge in advanced degrees and when the American dream so generously nurtured after World War II is under siege, it is time to expect greatness from our government once again. Our children deserve it.

Humes, a journalist and author, wrote "Over Here: How the GI Bill Transformed the American Dream." This article originally appeared in the Los Angeles Times.

#10 History: Forgotten Charge

"The Economic Bill of Rights"

Excerpt from Franklin Roosevelt's 1944 State of the Union

It is our duty now to begin to lay the plans and determine the strategy for the winning of a lasting peace and the establishment of an American standard of living higher than ever before known. We cannot be content, no matter how high

that general standard of living may be, if some fraction of our people—whether it be one-third or one-fifth or one-tenth—is ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed, and insecure.

This Republic had its beginning, and grew to its present strength, under the protection of certain inalienable political rights—among them the right of free speech, free press, free worship, trial by jury, freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures. They were our rights to life and liberty.

As our nation has grown in size and stature, however—as our industrial economy expanded—these political rights proved inadequate to assure us equality in the pursuit of happiness.

We have come to a clear realization of the fact that true individual freedom cannot exist without economic security and independence. “Necessitous men are not free men.”

People who are hungry and out of a job are the stuff of which dictatorships are made.

In our day these economic truths have become accepted as self-evident. We have accepted, so to speak, a second Bill of Rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all—regardless of station, race, or creed.

Among these are:

The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the nation;

The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation;

The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living;

The right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad;

The right of every family to a decent home;

The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health;

The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment; the right to a good education.

All of these rights spell security. And after this war is won we must be prepared to move forward, in the implementation of these rights, to new goals of human happiness and well-being. America’s own rightful place in the world depends in large part upon how fully these and similar rights have been carried into practice for our citizens.

source: *The Public Papers & Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt* (Samuel Rosenman, ed.), Vol XIII (NY: Harper, 1950), 40-42

11 History as a Revisionist’s Weapon

President Eisenhower was paid little tribute by historians during the quarter century after his presidency but time brings the discovery of letters, dairies and previously unspoken observations revealed year by year.

Much to like about Ike, but Maybe not everything.

by Max Boot, *Houston Chronicle*, 11-6-06

Dwight D. Eisenhower's reputation was rehabilitated in the 1980s by political scientist Fred Greenstein, author of *The Hidden-Hand Presidency*, and historian Stephen Ambrose, author of a two-volume biography. They punctured the myth that he was a brainless doofus who spent all his time playing golf. Behind his amiable persona, they revealed a shrewd politician and a hardworking manager.

Now one myth has replaced another, and we are left with a

commonly accepted picture of Ike as a supremely successful president. A more nuanced assessment is called for.

Ironically, the two major black marks often cited against Eisenhower — **the CIA's overthrow of leftist leaders Mohammad Mossadegh in Iran and Jacobo Arbenz in Guatemala** — are undeserved. The Cold War was on, and Ike was justified in blocking rising communist influence in these two countries. It is unfair to blame him, as some now do, for the **1979 revolution against Shah Mohammed Reza Pahlavi in Iran**. Eisenhower may have helped return the shah to power, but the Iranian ruler had a quarter of a century to win the allegiance of his people. That he failed should not be laid at Ike's doorstep. **Eisenhower was more responsible for events in Cuba: The U.S. cutoff of military aid to Cuban strongman Fulgencio Batista opened the door to Fidel Castro**, a far more noxious dictator.

Eisenhower was even more culpable for the twin disasters of 1956. **He had run for office promising to "roll back" the Soviet empire. Radio Free Europe, funded by the CIA, encouraged Hungarians to rise up. Yet when they did, the U.S. did nothing to help them.** There may have been little the U.S. could have done, but if so, Eisenhower shouldn't have incited the rebellion....

For a retired Army general, Eisenhower pursued a remarkably misguided defense policy. **Generations of liberals have celebrated his warning against the "military-industrial complex," but they ignore how he reduced defense expenditures: by cutting the size and readiness of costly conventional forces while expanding the relatively cheap nuclear arsenal in the expectation that threats of "massive retaliation" would solve all our defense needs.** It didn't work out that way. The existence of U.S. nukes did nothing to avert the **French defeat at Dien Bien Phu** and the rise of a communist North Vietnam bent on conquering its southern neighbor.

Eisenhower was unfairly accused of presiding over bomber and missile "gaps" with the Soviet Union. What he really did was just as bad — **he left the armed forces ill-prepared to fight non-nuclear wars, especially a counterinsurgency of the kind they would face in Vietnam. His infatuation with atomic power also led him to set up the "atoms for peace" program to promote the use of nuclear energy across the world.** "No other U.S. policy, no commercial initiative, no theft of technology has done more to accelerate and expand the global spread of nuclear bombs," writes arms control expert Fred Ikle.

Don't get me wrong. **There was much to like about Ike. He ended the Korean War and avoided potential conflicts with China and the Soviet Union. He built interstate highways and balanced the budget. But he was no profile in courage when he refused to stand up to the demagogic Joseph McCarthy or to do much to enforce the Supreme Court's Brown vs. Board of Education school integration decision. It was left to the Senate to end McCarthy's reign of terror, and to President Johnson to desegregate schools. In the final analysis, Eisenhower was a status quo president who ratified the successful policies of his gifted predecessors — the New Deal and containment. Maybe that's what the nation needed in the 1950s, but it's no reason to celebrate him as a "near great" president (his**

ranking in a 2005 survey of scholars). And don't get me started on his checkered record as a general.

Boot is a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations and author of "War Made New: Technology, Warfare, and the Course of History, 1500 to Today."

#12 History Used as Political Myth:

The Use and Abuse of Reagan

by Victor Davis Hanson, RealClearPolitics.com, 1-17-08

Ronald Reagan's presidency was a great success. He rebuilt a chaotic U.S. military and helped end the Cold War. Reagan's radical tax cuts in 1981 spurred economic growth and redefined the relationship between U.S. citizens and their government. And he appointed conservative federal judges and bureaucrats who tried to roll back the half-century trend of expanded governmental control over our lives.

Reagan's nice-guy charm made it difficult for even his critics to stay angry with him for long. But he was no mere smiling dunce, as liberal intellectuals used to snicker. His private papers and diaries instead reveal that he was widely informed, read voraciously, drew on a powerful intellect and was an effective writer.

It is no wonder that conservative leaders... constantly evoke Ronald Reagan's successful presidency. In contrast, they rarely hearken back to the uprightness of the one-term Gerald Ford, or praise the foreign-policy accomplishments of the two Bush Republican presidencies. Instead, [Republican] candidates try to "out-Reagan" each other by claiming they alone are the true Reaganites while their rivals in the primaries are too liberal, flip-floppers or without consistent conservative principles. In short, Ronald Reagan has been **beatified** into some sort of saint, as if he were above the petty lapses and contradictions of today's candidates....

They have forgotten that Reagan - facing spiraling deficits, sinking poll ratings and a hostile Congress - reluctantly signed legislation raising payroll, income and gasoline taxes, some of them among the largest in our history. He promised to limit government and eliminate the Departments of Education and Energy. Instead, when faced with congressional and popular opposition, he relented and even grew government by adding a secretary of veteran affairs to the Cabinet.

Two of his Supreme Court appointments, Sandra Day O'Connor and Anthony Kennedy, were far more liberal than George W. Bush's selections, the diehard constructionists, John Roberts and Samuel Alito.

Reagan's 1986 comprehensive immigration bill turned out to be the most liberal amnesty for illegal aliens in our nation's history, and set the stage for the present problem of 12 million aliens here unlawfully. Republicans forget all this - but so do Democrats, who for their own reasons want to perpetuate an unflattering myth of Ronald Reagan as an extremist right-wing reactionary.

In foreign affairs, Reagan was not always sober and judicious. He shocked Cold Warriors by advocating complete nuclear disarmament at his Reykjavik summit with Michel Gorbachev. In the middle of Lebanon's civil war, he first put American troops into a crossfire. Then, when 241 marines were blown up, he withdrew them. That about-face, and the failure to retaliate in serious fashion, helped to embolden Hezbollah's anti-American terrorism for decades.

The Iran-Contra scandal exploded when a few rogue administration officials sold state-of-the-art missiles under the table to Iran's terrorist-sponsoring theocracy, and prompted opposition talk of impeachment.

In other words, a great president like Ronald Reagan made mistakes. He sometimes reversed positions, played politics and baffled his conservative base....

When a candidate today says, "Reagan would have done this or that," he apparently has a poor memory of what Reagan - the often lonely, flesh-and-blood conservative in the 1980s - was forced to do to get elected, govern and be re-elected. While in office, he proved more often the pragmatic leader than the purist knight slaying ideological dragons on the campaign trail.

So what is the real Reagan legacy? It is mostly the Great Communicator's uncanny ability to distill complex problems, offer a more conservative solution than America was used to or ready for, and then inspire and enact difficult change through a brilliant "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall" turn of phrase.

But 2008 is a different world from a quarter-century ago, when Reagan began his presidency. Amnesiac candidates need to separate the myth of Reagan - the perfect conservative - from the real man when stridently chastising their rivals for their past fudging on taxes, illegal immigration or the size of government.

...[S]erious Republican candidates should call on the spirit and principled inspiration of Ronald Reagan for guidance about new problems in the way they evoke Abraham Lincoln or Teddy Roosevelt. [Republican] candidates only do his memory - and their own careers - a disservice by claiming sainthood for Ronald Reagan, and thereby demanding a standard of immaculate conservative conduct that neither Reagan nor they could ever attain.

Victor Davis Hanson is a classicist and historian at the Hoover Institution, Stanford University, and author, most recently, of "A War Like No Other: How the Athenians and Spartans Fought the Peloponnesian War."

#13 Using History to revisit Eisenhower's Farewell

By Fareed Zakaria, *Washington Post*, 8-3-11

[Zakaria writes in support of a 2011 congressional compromise to reduce overall government spending over the next several years half of which to come from the military.]

...If so, let the guillotine fall. It would be a much-needed adjustment to an out-of-control military-industrial complex. First, some history. The Pentagon's budget has risen for 13 years, which is unprecedented. Between 2001 and 2009, overall spending on defense rose from \$412 billion to \$699 billion, a 70% increase, which is larger than in any comparable period since the Korean War. Including the supplementary spending on Iraq and Afghanistan, we spent \$250 billion more than average U.S. defense expenditures during the Cold War — a time when the Soviet, Chinese and Eastern European militaries were arrayed against the United States and its allies. Over the past decade, when we had no serious national adversaries, U.S. defense spending has gone from about a third of total worldwide defense spending to 50

percent. In other words, we spend more on defense than the planet's remaining countries put together.

It is not unprecedented for defense spending to fall substantially as we scale back or end military actions. After the Korean War, President Dwight Eisenhower cut defense spending 27%. Richard Nixon cut it 29% after Vietnam. As tensions declined in the 1980s, Ronald Reagan began scaling back his military spending, a process accelerated under Presidents George H.W. Bush and Bill Clinton. Given the enormous run-up in spending under George W. Bush, even if President Obama made comparable cuts to that of those presidents today, defense spending would remain substantially above the levels under all those presidents. The Bowles-Simpson commission's plan

proposed \$750 billion in defense cuts over 10 years. Lawrence Korb, who worked at the Pentagon for Ronald Reagan, believes that a \$1 trillion cut over 10 to 12 years is feasible without compromising national security.

Serious conservatives should examine the defense budget, which contains tons of evidence of liberalism run amok that they usually decry. Most talk of waste, fraud and abuse in government is vastly exaggerated; there simply isn't enough money in discretionary spending. Most of the federal government's spending is transfer payments and tax expenditures, which are — whatever their merits — highly efficient at funneling money to their beneficiaries. The exception is defense, a cradle-to-grave system of housing, subsidies, cost-plus procurement, early retirement and lifetime pension and health-care guarantees. There is so much overlap among the military services, so much duplication and so much waste that no one bothers to defend it anymore. Today, the U.S. defense establishment is the world's largest socialist economy.

Defense budget cuts would also force a healthy rebalancing of American foreign policy. Since the Cold War, Congress has tended to fatten the Pentagon while starving foreign policy agencies. As former defense secretary Robert Gates pointed out, there are more members of military marching bands than make up the entire U.S. foreign service. Anyone who has ever watched American foreign policy on the ground has seen this imbalance play out. Top State Department officials seeking to negotiate vital matters arrive without aides and bedraggled after a 14-hour flight in coach. Their military counterparts whisk in on a fleet of planes, with dozens of aides and pots of money to dispense....

The result is a warped American foreign policy, ready to conceive of problems in military terms and present a ready military solution. Describing precisely this phenomenon, Eisenhower remarked that to a man with a hammer, every problem looks like a nail. In his often-quoted farewell address, Eisenhower urged a balance between military and non-military spending. Unfortunately, it has become far more unbalanced in the decades since his speech.

Epilogue

History as a Rush to Judgment:

Move Over, Hoover

By Douglas Brinkley, *Washington Post*, 12-3-06

Shortly after Thanksgiving I had dinner in California with Ronald Reagan's best biographer, **Lou Cannon**. Like many historians these days, we discussed whether **George W. Bush** is, conceivably, the worst U.S. president ever. Cannon bristled at the idea.

Bush has two more years to leave his mark, he argued. What if there is a news flash that U.S. Special Forces have killed Osama bin Laden or that North Korea has renounced its nuclear program? What if a decade from now Iraq is a democracy and a statue of Bush is erected on Firdaus Square where that famously toppled one of Saddam Hussein once stood?

There is wisdom in Cannon's prudence. Clearly it's dangerous for historians to wield the "worst president" label like a scalp-hungry tomahawk simply because they object to Bush's record. But we live in speedy times and, the truth is, after six years in power and barring a couple of miracles, it's safe to bet that Bush will be forever handcuffed to the bottom rungs of the presidential ladder. The reason: Iraq. Some presidents, such as **Bill Clinton & John F.**

Kennedy, are **political sailors** -- they tack with the wind, reaching difficult policy objectives through bipartisan maneuvering and pulse-taking. **Franklin D. Roosevelt**, for example, was deemed a "**chameleon on plaid**," changing colors regularly to control the zeitgeist of the moment.

Other presidents are **submariners**, refusing to zigzag in rough waters, preferring to go from Point A to Point B with directional certitude. **Harry S. Truman** and **[Ronald] Reagan** are exemplars of this modus operandi, and they are the two presidents Bush has tried to emulate.

The problem for Bush is that certitude is only a virtue if the policy enacted is proven correct. Most Americans applaud Truman's dropping of bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki because they achieved the desired effect: Japan surrendered. Reagan's anti-communist zeal -- including increased defense budgets and Star Wars -- is only now perceived as positive because the Soviet Union started to unravel on his watch.

Nobody has accused Bush of flinching. After 9/11, he decided to circumvent the United Nations and declare war on Iraq. The principal pretext was that Baghdad supposedly was stockpiling weapons of mass destruction. From the get-go, the Iraq war was a matter of choice. Call it Mr. Bush's War. Like a high-stakes poker player pushing in all his chips on one hand, he bet the credibility of the United States on the notion that Sunnis and Shiites wanted democracy, just like the Poles and the Czechs during the Cold War.

Bush wasn't operating in a historical bubble. Other presidents had **gambled on wars of choice** and won. **James K. Polk**, for example, begged Gen. Zachary Taylor

to start a border war with Mexico along the Rio Grande. An ardent expansionist, he wanted to annex land in what are now Arizona, California and New Mexico. Nearly half of the American population in 1846 screamed foul, including Henry David Thoreau, who refused to pay taxes for an unjust war. Yet in short order, Polk achieved his land-grab objective with a string of stunning military successes. **Mr. Polk's War was a success, even if the pretext was immoral.** On virtually every presidential rating poll, Polk is deemed a "near great" president.

Half a century later, **William McKinley** also launched a **war of choice based on the bogus notion** that the USS Maine, anchored in Cuba, had been sabotaged by Spain. The Maine, in truth, was crippled by a boiler explosion. An imperialist, McKinley used the Maine as a pretext to fight Spain in the Caribbean and in the Philippines. A group of anti-imperialists led by Mark Twain and William James, among others, vehemently objected, rightfully accusing McKinley of warmongering. But McKinley had the last word in what his secretary of state, John Hay, deemed "a splendid little war." In just six months, McKinley had achieved his objectives. History chalks up Mr. McKinley's War as a U.S. win, and he also polls favorably as a "near great" president.

Mr. Bush's War, by contrast, has not gone well. When you don't achieve a stealth-like victory in a war of choice, then you're seen as being stuck in a quagmire. Already the United States has fought longer in the Iraq war than in World War II. As the death toll continues to rise, more and more Americans are objecting....

At first, you'd want to compare Bush's Iraq predicament to that of **Lyndon B. Johnson** during the Vietnam War. But LBJ had major domestic accomplishments to boast about when leaving the White House, such as the Civil Rights Act and Medicare/Medicaid. Bush has virtually none. Look at how he dealt with the biggest post-9/11 domestic crisis of his tenure. He didn't rush to help the Gulf region after Hurricane Katrina because the country was overextended in Iraq and had a massive budget deficit. Texas conservatives always say that LBJ's biggest mistake was thinking that he could fund both the Great Society and Vietnam. They believe he had to choose one or the other. They call Johnson fiscally irresponsible. Bush learned this lesson: He chose Iraq over New Orleans.

So Bush's legacy hinges on Iraq, which is an unmitigated disaster. Instead of being forgiven, like Polk and McKinley, for his phony pretext for war (WMD and al-Qaeda operatives in Baghdad), he stands to be lambasted by future scholars. **What once were his two best sound bites -- "Wanted dead or alive" and "Mission accomplished" -- will be used like billy clubs to shatter his legacy every time it gets a revisionist lift.** The left will keep battering him for warmongering while the right will remember its outrage that he didn't send enough battalions to Iraq.

There isn't much that Bush can do now to salvage his reputation. His presidential library will someday be built

around two accomplishments: that after 9/11, the U.S. homeland wasn't again attacked by terrorists (knock on wood) and that he won two presidential elections, allowing him to appoint conservatives to key judicial posts. I also believe that he is an honest man and that his administration has been largely void of widespread corruption. This will help him from being portrayed as a true villain. This last point is crucial. Though Bush may be viewed as a laughingstock, he won't have the **zero-integrity factors** that have kept Nixon and Harding at the bottom in the presidential sweepstakes. Oddly, the president whom Bush most reminds me of is **Herbert Hoover**, whose name is synonymous with failure to respond to the Great Depression. When the stock market collapsed, Hoover, for ideological reasons, did too little. When 9/11 happened, Bush did too much, attacking the wrong country at the wrong time for the wrong reasons. He has joined Hoover as a case study on how not to be president.

Douglas Brinkley is currently teaching at the James Baker Institute for Public Policy at Rice University.

And a final word from George Orwell:

"If you can't see the past you can't see the future. If you can't see the relationship between the present and the past you can't understand where the present might go. Who controls the past controls the present, who controls the present controls the future."

Some Success Tips for Students :

1. Attend every class
2. Pay attention in class
3. Make a detailed notesheet
4. Study lecture notes after every class
5. Use the study guide
6. Use the study technique that works best for you (highlighting, flashcards, study groups)
7. Read the textbook carefully and for retention
8. Organize your time
9. Take advantage of the extra credit opportunities
10. _____

The following 12 quotations are observations made by prominent writers, political leaders and historians. In order of preference select the four that come closest to “truth about America and Americans” based on your group’s consensus.

1. “You can always count on Americans to do the right thing - after they've tried everything else.”
 ☞ Winston Churchill
2. “America is the only country that went from barbarism to decadence without civilization in between.”
 ☞ Oscar Wilde
3. “I love America more than any other country in this world, and, exactly for this reason, I insist on the right to criticize her perpetually.”
 ☞ James Baldwin
4. “America's abundance was not created by public sacrifices to "the common good", but by the productive genius of free men who pursued their own personal interests and the making of their own private fortunes”
 ☞ Ayn Rand
5. “The surface of American society is covered with a layer of democratic paint, but from time to time one can see the old aristocratic colors breaking through.”
 ☞ Alexis de Tocqueville
6. “As one digs deeper into the national character of the Americans, one sees that they have sought the value of everything in this world only in the answer to this single question: how much money will it bring in?”
 ☞ Alexis de Tocqueville
7. “There are those who will say that the liberation of humanity, the freedom of man and mind is nothing but a dream. They are right. It is the American Dream.”
 ☞ Archibald MacLeish

8. “The corporate grip on opinion in the United States is one of the wonders of the Western world. No First World country has ever managed to eliminate so entirely from its media all objectivity - much less dissent.”
 ☞ Gore Vidal
9. “If you have a weak candidate and a weak platform, wrap yourself up in the American flag and talk about the Constitution”
 ☞ Matthew Stanley Quay
10. “We need a new spirit of community, a sense that we are all in this together, or the American Dream will continue to wither. Our destiny is bound up with the destiny of every other American.”
 ☞ Bill Clinton
11. “Americans have been taught that their nation is civilized and humane. But, too often, U.S. actions have been uncivilized and inhumane.”
 ☞ Howard Zinn
12. “Democracy does not require perfect equality, but it does require that citizens share in a common life. ... For this is how we learn to negotiate and abide our differences, and how we come to care for the common good.”
 ☞ Michael Sandel