

Chapter 1 : Violent Design: People's Park, Architectural Modernism and Urban Renewal

Alter Egos: Hillary Clinton, Barack Obama, and the Twilight Struggle Over American Power By Mark Landler Published by Random House, pages, \$28 Two encounters during an assignment to the Middle.

See Article History Asian values, set of values promoted since the late 20th century by some Asian political leaders and intellectuals as a conscious alternative to Western political values such as human rights , democracy , and capitalism. Advocates of Asian values typically claimed that the rapid development of many East Asian economies in the post-World War II period was due to the shared culture of their societies, especially those of Confucian heritage. They also asserted that Western political values were unsuited to East Asia because they fostered excessive individualism and legalism, which threatened to undermine the social order and destroy economic dynamism. Among Asian values that were frequently cited were discipline , hard work, frugality, educational achievement, balancing individual and societal needs, and deference to authority. Asian values and modernity Claims about the benefits of Asian values garnered particular attention in the early s, when they were articulated by prominent political figures such as former Singaporean prime minister Lee Kuan Yew. The Asian values debate was also internal to Asian societies. At a time of rapid economic and social change in East Asia, growing individualism and democratization and human rights movements challenged established socioeconomic orders and authoritarian regimes. The debate was an element within a larger struggle over competing visions of modernity and of how Asian societies should be organized. Proponents of Asian values made several related claims. In addition, because the state embodies the collective identity and interests of its citizens, its needs should take precedence over the rights of the individual. Accordingly, Asian-values proponents were strong defenders of state sovereignty , including the right to noninterference by outsiders. Those ideas were expressed in the Bangkok Declaration on human rights, which was signed by many Asian governments but criticized by Asian human rights organizations. Criticism of Asian values Critics of Asian values have dismissed claims on their behalf as attempts to shore up authoritarian and illiberal rule against domestic and external opponents and to obscure the weaknesses of the Asian economic development model. The Asian financial crisis of 1998 appeared to vindicate some of their arguments. Some critics have charged that the discourse of Asian values trades on simplistic stereotypes of Asian cultures and in that respect is similar to the Orientalism that had long characterized Western scholarship on Asian and Arabic societies. Others pointed to the apparent contradiction between the antiliberalism espoused by proponents of Asian values and their promotion of market-oriented development, which has challenged and disrupted the established social order. Finally, feminist theorists viewed the Asian-values discourse as an attempt to legitimate gender, class, ethnic, and racial hierarchies embedded in Asian cultures, in the Asian development model, and in wider capitalist social relations. The Asian values debate is relevant to arguments in political theory over whether commitments to global justice and equality can be grounded in human rights. Taking issue with the Western assumption that liberal political structures are the starting point for advancing human well-being, communitarians such as Charles Taylor have reflected on Asian cultural experiences to examine the potential and challenges of establishing a more inclusive , unforced, but robust global consensus on human rights. A growing literature, including that associated with Confucian communitarianism and reformist Islam , has examined whether particular values and institutions in Asian societies are consistent with human rights.

Chapter 2 : Competing visions of a political future - The Blade

The debate was an element within a larger struggle over competing visions of modernity and of how Asian societies should be organized. Proponents of Asian values made several related claims.

Enlarge The presidential election will be a struggle between competing visions of the future “ as have been all American elections since. But it may not be just a battle over the direction of the country. More than most elections, it may set one past against another “ or given the emerging character of the Republican race, it may involve three separate, contradictory, memories of the past. The first is the memory of the Bill Clinton s. Scrubbed clean of the controversies over gays in the military, health care, terrorism, and presidential impeachment, it now survives, in the view of Democrats at least, as a modern golden age. It was a fin-de-siecle renaissance, where culture flourished and affluence spread. Raise a dissenting view and Clinton loyalists all have the same response: The second is the memory of the George W. Bush years at the beginning of the new century. There is terrorism, of course, but few blame the 43rd president for the attacks on the Pentagon and the World Trade Center and for the deadly plunge of a plane into a Pennsylvania field. Bush is pilloried, sometimes as often on the right as on the left, for the financial crisis and his response to it, and for the invasion of Iraq on specious grounds “ and the conduct of the conflict once the invasion was under way. Jeb Bush face each other in the general election. They may even collide as the two fight to win their respective presidential nominations. Already, there is unease that the presence of these two figures at the top of their tickets would transform American politics into the sort of dynastic politics at home that the country has held in contempt abroad. On the surface, the peace-and-prosperity perspective of the Clinton years trumps the two-wars-and-recession retrospective of the years of the second President Bush. But presidential politics is different from all other aspects of American civic life. Such politics produce deep emotions, prompting and reflecting deep introspection. The surface perspectives seldom suffice. For that reason, the rearview-mirror images of the Clinton years are far more complicated. Those memories of through are full of tumult and upheaval. For every genial reverie about the Clinton past, there is a nightmare memory of the political and cultural bedlam it produced. Then there is the changing view of Mr. This complicates matters on both the Democratic and Republican side. Today, the first President Bush is viewed as a figure of selfless service and chivalric virtues. His conduct of the first Gulf War is regarded as a model of strategic insight. So the nostalgia-warmed memories of Bush 41 are in conflict with the bitter memories of the Bush 43 years, and the man who would be Bush 45 must navigate those difficult shoals. It is a complicated journey, and perhaps more than any other American presidential election in history, the coming contest will be determined by a struggle over how the past is redefined. Related Items op-ed columns , david shribman , columnists Click to comment Guidelines: Please keep your comments smart and civil. To post comments, you must be a registered user on toledoblade. To find out more, please visit the FAQ. Quis autem vel eum iure reprehenderit qui in ea voluptate velit esse quam nihil molestiae consequatur, vel illum qui dolorem? Temporibus autem quibusdam et aut officiis debitis aut rerum necessitatibus saepe eveniet.

The struggle over the cultural conditions of the Cold War has come to be known as the Cultural Cold War.3 Wedged between the United States on one side and the Soviet Bloc and Soviet Union on the other, Western Europe represented an.

Civil War Reconstruction failed to assure the full rights of citizens to the freed slaves. By the s, Ku Klux Klan terrorism, lynchings, racial-segregation laws, and voting restrictions made a mockery of the rights guaranteed by the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments, which were passed after the Civil War. The problem for African Americans in the early years of the 20th century was how to respond to a white society that for the most part did not want to treat black people as equals. Three black visionaries offered different solutions to the problem. Washington argued for African Americans to first improve themselves through education, industrial training, and business ownership. Equal rights would naturally come later, he believed. Du Bois agreed that self-improvement was a good idea, but that it should not happen at the expense of giving up immediate full citizenship rights. Another visionary, Marcus Garvey, believed black Americans would never be accepted as equals in the United States. He pushed for them to develop their own separate communities or even emigrate back to Africa. Washington was born a slave in Virginia in . Early on in his life, he developed a thirst for reading and learning. After attending an elementary school for African-American children, Washington walked miles to enroll in Hampton Institute, one of the few black high schools in the South. Armstrong, a former Union officer, had developed a highly structured curriculum, stressing discipline, moral character, and training for practical trades. Following his graduation from Hampton, for a few years Washington taught elementary school in his hometown. In , General Armstrong invited him to return to teach at Hampton. A year later, Armstrong nominated Washington to head a new school in Tuskegee, Alabama, for the training of black teachers, farmers, and skilled workers. Washington designed, developed, and guided the Tuskegee Institute. It became a powerhouse of African-American education and political influence in the United States. He used the Hampton Institute, with its emphasis on agricultural and industrial training, as his model. Washington argued that African Americans must concentrate on educating themselves, learning useful trades, and investing in their own businesses. Hard work, economic progress, and merit, he believed, would prove to whites the value of blacks to the American economy. Washington believed that his vision for black people would eventually lead to equal political and civil rights. In the meantime, he advised blacks to put aside immediate demands for voting and ending racial segregation. In his famous address to the Cotton States and International Exposition in Atlanta, Georgia, Washington accepted the reality of racial segregation. He insisted, however, that African Americans be included in the economic progress of the South. Washington declared to an all-white audience, "In all things social we can be as separate as the fingers, yet one as the hand in all things essential to mutual progress. Recognized by whites as the spokesman for his people, Washington soon became the most powerful black leader in the United States. He had a say in political appointments and which African-American colleges and charities would get funding from white philanthropists. He controlled a number of newspapers that attacked anyone who questioned his vision. Washington considered himself a bridge between the races. But other black leaders criticized him for tolerating racial segregation at a time of increasing anti-black violence and discrimination. Washington did publicly speak out against the evils of segregation, lynching, and discrimination in voting. He also secretly participated in lawsuits involving voter registration tests, exclusion of blacks from juries, and unequal railroad facilities. By the time Booker T. Washington died in , segregation laws and racial discrimination were firmly established throughout the South and in many other parts of the United States. This persistent racism blocked the advancement of African Americans. Du Bois was born in Massachusetts in . He attended racially integrated elementary and high schools and went off to Fiske College in Tennessee at age 16 on a scholarship. Du Bois completed his formal education at Harvard with a Ph. Du Bois briefly taught at a college in Ohio before he became the director of a major study on the social conditions of blacks in Philadelphia. He concluded from his research that white discrimination was what kept African Americans from good-paying jobs. In , two years after Booker T. The NAACP used publicity, protests,

lawsuits, and the editorial pages of *The Crisis* to attack racial segregation, discrimination, and the lynching of blacks. Washington rejected this confrontational approach, but by the time of his death in his Tuskegee vision had lost influence among many African Americans. But he became disillusioned after the war when white Americans continued to deny black Americans equal political and civil rights. This led to his resignation as editor of *The Crisis* in 1910. Du Bois grew increasingly critical of U.S. He praised the accomplishments of communism in the Soviet Union. In 1917, he joined the U.S. Shortly afterward, he left the country, renounced his American citizenship, and became a citizen of Ghana in Africa. He died there at age 95 in 1963. Du Bois never took part in the black civil rights movement of the 1950s and 60s, which secured many of the rights that he had fought for during his lifetime.

Marcus Garvey Marcus Garvey, the third major black visionary in the early part of the 20th century, was born in Jamaica in 1888. Washington whom Garvey admired. Garvey, however, had greater international ambitions, including the development of worldwide black-owned industries and shipping lines. He also called for the end of white colonial rule in Africa. At the invitation of Washington, Garvey traveled to the United States in 1914. The publicity over the Black Star Line caused great excitement among black Americans, many of whom bought stock in it. Garvey organized huge parades to promote this and other UNIA projects. He often appeared in a colorful uniform, wearing a plumed hat. The convention produced a "Declaration of Negro Rights," which denounced lynchings, segregated public transportation, job discrimination, and inferior black public schools. The document also demanded "Africa for the Africans. Therefore, he called for the separate self-development of African Americans within the United States. The UNIA set up many small black-owned businesses such as restaurants, groceries, a publishing house, and even a toy company that made black dolls. Ultimately, Garvey argued, all black people in the world should return to their homeland in Africa, which should be free of white colonial rule. Garvey had grand plans for settling black Americans in Liberia, the only country in Africa governed by Africans. He launched a recruitment campaign in the South, which he had ignored because of strong white resistance. Garvey even praised racial segregation laws, explaining that they were good for building black businesses. Little came of this recruitment effort. Criticism from his followers grew. In 1915, the U.S. At his trial, the evidence showed that Garvey was a poor businessman, but the facts were less clear about outright fraud. The jury convicted him anyway, and he was sentenced to prison. In 1917, President Calvin Coolidge commuted his sentence, and he was released. The government immediately deported him to Jamaica. His vision for black separatism and "back to Africa" never caught on with most African Americans, and he and his spectacular movement soon faded away. Garvey died in 1930, an almost forgotten man. In the mid-20th century, new leaders emerged to guide the civil rights movement. Martin Luther King Jr. Some took more militant stands. The Black Muslims led by Elijah Muhammad advocated separation. Malcolm X broke from the Muslims and founded a rival organization opposing separation. The Black Panthers led by Huey Newton prepared for revolution. Today, new black leaders continue to struggle among themselves over the best way for African Americans to improve their lives. Du Bois, and Marcus Garvey. Write an editorial that critiques the vision of Washington, Du Bois, or Garvey. Considering the state of race relations in the United States in the early years of the 20th century, what do you think was the best way for black people to improve their lives as American citizens? University Press of Mississippi, *The World of Marcus Garvey*. Louisiana State University Press, *Du Bois and His Rivals*. University of Missouri Press, Form the class into sets of two students. Each set will research one of the following current African American leaders:

Chapter 4 : Project MUSE - Competing Visions: The Alternate Wests of Elinore Pruitt Stewart and N. C. Wyeth

In the early years of the 20th century, Booker T. Washington, W. E. B. Du Bois, and Marcus Garvey developed competing visions for the future of African Americans. Civil War Reconstruction failed to assure the full rights of citizens to the freed slaves.

Reconstruction and the Formerly Enslaved W. Fitzhugh Brundage William B. First, it was a period of tremendous political complexity and far-reaching consequences. A cursory survey of Reconstruction is never satisfying, but a fuller treatment of Reconstruction can be like quick sand—easy to get into but impossible to get out of. Second, to the extent that students may have any preconceptions about Reconstruction, The Big Questions of Reconstruction Who was an American? What rights should all Americans enjoy? What rights would only some Americans possess? On what terms would the nation be reunited? What was the status of the former Confederate states? How would citizenship be defined? Were the former slaves American citizens? When and how would former Confederates regain their citizenship? What form of labor would replace slavery? However important a command of the chronology of Reconstruction may be, it is equally important that students understand that Reconstruction was a period when American waged a sustained debate over who was an American, what rights should all Americans enjoy, and what rights would only some Americans possess. In short, Americans engaged in a strenuous debate about the nature of freedom and equality. With the surrender of Confederate armies and the capture of Jefferson Davis in the spring of 1865, pressing questions demanded immediate answers. How would citizenship be defined in the postwar nation? Were the former slaves American citizens now? When and how would former Confederates regain their American citizenship? White Americans did not expect blacks to participate in Reconstruction-era debates. If white northerners had only gradually come to understand that the Civil War was a war to end slavery, they recognized immediately during the postwar era that the place of blacks in American society was inextricably bound up in all these pressing questions of the day. Even so, white northerners, and more so white southerners, presumed that they would debate and resolve these questions with little or no consideration of black opinion. Nothing in the previous history of race relations in North America prepared white Americans for the conspicuous role that African Americans played in the events after the Civil War. By the end of Reconstruction, no Americans could doubt that African Americans were intent on claiming their rights as citizens or participating in the debate about their future. Black citizenship depended on the status of the Confederate states. That African Americans became American citizens was arguably the signal development during Reconstruction. Only a decade earlier the Supreme Court had ruled in the Dred Scott decision that people of African descent imported into the United States and held as slaves, or their descendants—whether or not they were slaves—could never be citizens of the United States. However, any resolution of the status of former slaves had to be resolved within the context of American federalism, because until that time citizenship was defined and protected by state law. Therefore, the resolution of the citizenship status of blacks was contingent on the status of the former Confederate states and their relationship with the nation at large. After the Civil War, were the Confederate states conquered lands, frontier territories, or states in good standing? Who exercised the power to define the rights of former slaves would depend upon who held the power to dictate what happened in the former Confederacy. Were the former Confederate states conquered territory? If so, then the federal government or, in other words, northern whites and Republicans could dictate the reconstruction of the South. Or were the former Confederate states essentially quasi-frontier territories that had to be readmitted to the union? If so, then the voters of the South would decide the course of the former Confederacy. In addition, those same voters would decide the content of citizenship in their states. Or were the former Confederate states still states in good standing that would return to their former, pre-war status as soon as southerners elected congressmen, senators, governors? If that were the case, then presumably the southern states, and the definition of citizenship that prevailed in them before the Civil War, would be restored. Northern opinion on this question varied widely. Abraham Lincoln, before his murder, had recommended the speedy return of the southern states. Lincoln presumed that the reunion of the nation was of paramount importance. While willing to grant

presidential pardons to even high-ranking Confederate officers and politicians, Johnson displayed no interest in extending citizenship to former slaves. Northerners who had just fought against secession for four years and who had buried hundreds of thousands of wartime casualties refused to tolerate the seating of Confederates in Congress less than a year after the guns fell silent. The issue of African American citizenship provoked equally complex competing views. White southerners had clear ideas about the social and racial order that would replace slavery; they intended to restrict the rights of citizenship to whites as much as possible. The Codes explicitly denied blacks the right to vote, limited their freedom of movement, and criminalized behavior. White southerners overplayed their hand. The combination of the harsh Black Codes and the prevalence of Confederates in southern delegations to Congress in the fall hastened the beginning of what became known as Congressional Reconstruction. The recalcitrance of white Southerners opened Republicans to extending full citizenship to the formerly enslaved. Congressional Reconstruction thus may be understood as an attempt to prevent white southerners from dictating the outcome of Reconstruction. The only consensus that existed among northern politicians during Reconstruction was that white southerners should not have a free hand, as they had in late and early , to impose their will on the South. The delegates were about a hundred and twenty in number, but crowds of colored citizens were interested spectators through the four days, and the house was always filled full. The majority of white southerners had already demonstrated their reactionary preferences when they voted for former Confederates and supported the Black Codes. Consequently, by many white Republicans were open to the prospect of extending full citizenship to former slaves. Black southerners did everything within their power to speed the evolution of northern attitudes. Within months of the end of the Civil War former slaves in the South had gathered in conventions to proclaim their vision for their region and their race. Contrasting their devotion to the Union with the treason of their white neighbors, black southerners also stressed that the reconstruction of the former Confederacy could not proceed without their participation. Most white northerners were reticent to embrace these demands in . Within two years white southern intransigence, African American appeals, and political necessity convinced many northern Republicans that extending citizenship to former slaves was a prerequisite for the restoration of the Union. But how could the guarantees of citizenship be extended to blacks when states had traditionally been the guarantors of rights and the former states of the Confederacy were now controlled by white southerners who championed white supremacy? The resolution of this conundrum was the Military Reconstruction Act . It divided the states of the South into military districts under federal military command. No southern state could return to civilian rule until its voters, including black men, framed a state constitution that guaranteed black suffrage. In addition, each southern state had to ratify the Fourteenth Amendment to the federal Constitution. The Fourteenth Amendment was multi-purpose constitutional device that was intended to resolve several of the questions hanging over the nation. Most important, it established a constitutional guarantee of basic citizenship for all Americans, including African Americans. It is worth pausing for a moment and acknowledging just how extraordinary the developments in “the Military Reconstruction Act and the Fourteenth Amendment” were. The United States made itself unique among modern slave societies when it gave the vote to former slaves almost immediately after emancipation. Whereas elsewhere “Jamaica, Haiti, Brazil, etc. Once the franchise was extended to blacks through the Military Reconstruction Act, the political mobilization of blacks took place with lightening speed. Throughout Reconstruction, when not deterred by violence, blacks participated in extraordinary numbers in elections. Their turnout in some instances approached 90 percent. Indeed, because black political mobilization was of paramount importance to the success of the Republican Party, Republicans in Congress pushed for the ratification of the Fifteenth Amendment in . Despite some glaring loopholes that would be later exploited to restrict the right to vote, the Fifteenth Amendment expanded on the implications of the Fourteenth Amendment and guaranteed the right to vote to all male citizens. The crucial point is that the definition of citizenship in the United States expanded substantially during Reconstruction era and by in principle, all African American men were American citizens. It would be another half century until comparable rights were extended to black and white women. The participants in Reconstruction fully understood that contests over political and civil rights could not be isolated from the economic reconstruction of the South and the nation. For blacks, the end of slavery of course

did not mean the end of work, but rather an end to forced labor. Blacks relished the prospect of receiving the benefits of their own labor. But the vast majority of blacks emerged from slavery lacking the ability to buy land and confronted by a white community opposed to extending credit to blacks or to selling them property. At the same time, that whites looked for a system of labor and the Black Codes to bind blacks to the land, as slavery had, freed people coveted land of their own and struggled to be masters of their own time and labor. Former slave owners in the South were vigilant about protecting their interests. Before the Civil War labor was the key to wealth in the South; after the war land was the key. It was these powerful national and international forces that guaranteed the restored nation had a more unified economy than ever before. Arguably railroads did as much as anything else to stitch the nation back together again. The late 1840s and 1850s were a period of breakneck railroad construction and consolidation. Although it is commonplace to dwell on the completion of a transcontinental rail line in 1869, the extensive reconstruction and expansion of southern railroads destroyed during the Civil War was of equal importance. Northern railroad companies and investors loomed large in these developments. Nothing more dramatically symbolized the emerging integrated national market than the massive regional effort on a single day in 1842 when all of the small gauge rail lines in the South were moved several inches wider and realigned with the rail lines of the North. Country store, Jenkins County, Georgia. Another crucial economic development of the Reconstruction era was the transformation of the southern system of credit. That is, southern planters borrowed against their projected earnings in cotton. This system of credit was shattered by the Civil War, and the South became a credit poor region for decades to come. White landowners had land but no cash to pay laborers; former slaves had labor but no cash or credit to buy land. As a result, a system of sharecropping emerged in the South that enabled landowners to secure labor and workers to secure access to land. Little if any cash was exchanged in the system of sharecropping; both the landowner and the laborer received cash only at the end of the growing season when harvested cotton was sold at the market. In this new economy, the most important source of credit was the local store where agricultural supplies and food were purchased. In other words, the local merchant, not some distant British cotton trader, was the immediate source of credit. In short, the South was effectively brought into a national system of credit and labor as a result of Reconstruction.

Chapter 5 : Differences between Federalists and Antifederalists | Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History

the debate over the proposed establishment of an Eurasian army unit. There were not just one, but different and competing visions as to why and how the Empire.

Chapter 6 : Three Visions for African Americans - Constitutional Rights Foundation

Start studying Am Const. - Civil War. Learn vocabulary, terms, and more with flashcards, games, and other study tools. - Struggle over competing visions of.