



MÉTHODOLOGIE
CIVILISATION AMERICAINE
L1 – Semestre 1 - 2018-2019

Useful Literature

- F. Fichaux, A. Higgin, C. Loubignac, Cl. Loubignac, L. Martz, *Fiches de civilisation américaine et britannique*, Edition Ellipses, 2007.
- F. Fichaux, *Definitely British, Absolutely American !*, Edition Ellipses, 2001
- Marie-Christine Pauwels, *Civilisation des Etats-Unis*, Edition Hachette Supérieur, 2005
- Pierre Lagayette, *Les grandes dates de l'histoire américaine*, Edition Hachette Supérieur, 2007

Evaluation :

1 devoir maison distribué au 3e cours et à rendre **IMPERATIVEMENT au dernier cours.**
AUCUN RETARD NE SERA ACCEPTÉ.

Writing a Synthesis

You will not be able to write your synthesis unless you have carried out a number of things: here are a few steps that you must do in order to successfully do your piece of work.

Aim	How to do it? / Tips
Step 1: Understanding the main idea of the file.	<p>Read the texts that compose your file. Make sure to take notes on a separate piece of paper. If the author is someone who is famous for having a clear and definite opinion on the matter discussed in your text or belong, for instance, to a political party, it might be useful to mention her/him in your introduction as long as it adds up something to better understand the subject or it helps clarify a point. DO NOT ELABORATE ON him or her just for the sake of dropping a name.</p>
<p><i>Note: at this point in your work, you may also have an idea of all the points discussed in your texts. If you do, that's great! If you don't, do not worry because it was just your first reading :-)</i></p>	
Step 2: Have a clear idea of the ideas/themes/ concepts developed in each text. How the ideas or concepts are discussed.	<p>Read the texts again thoroughly with a highlighter, a pencil, and make sure you understand each term or concepts. Write the words you don't understand on a separate piece of paper. Look them up in a dictionary. DO NOT USE GOOGLE TRANSLATE: IT'S A DEAD END!</p>
<p><i>Note: some good sources of information on line: wordreference.com ; https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/please_1 ; <i>Le Robert et Collins en version papier.</i></i></p>	
Step 3: Answer the questions	<p>Step 1 and 2 must have helped you answering the questions. Read the text again to find some answers.</p>
Step 4: Sum up the themes ⇒ Prepare to build your outline	<p>Make a list of the themes/ideas. ↪ Ask yourself a different set of questions: What are the common themes/ideas discussed in the four documents?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You will be able to identify 2 or 3 themes that will end up being more or less how your outline is going to look like. • How are they discussed by the author? • Do the way they are argued in each text converge or diverge?

A synthesis essay should be organized so that others can understand the sources and evaluate your comprehension of them and their presentation of specific ideas and themes.

The Introduction (usually one paragraph)

1. Contains a one-sentence or two-sentence statement that sums up the focus of your synthesis.
2. Also introduces the texts/objects to be synthesized:
 - (i) Gives the title of each source;
 - (ii) Provides the name of each author;
 - (ii) Sometimes also provides pertinent background information about the authors, about the texts/object to be summarized, or about the general topic from which the texts/objects are drawn;

(iii) Provides an outline in 2 or 3 parts about the themes you have picked up in your texts.

Note that it is important to have a precise ideas of how the each theme are interpreted by their authors

The Body of a Synthesis Essay:

This should be organized by the outline you have just written in your introduction. Your organization will be determined by the assignment or by the patterns you see in the material you are synthesizing. The organization is the most important part of a synthesis, so try out more than one format.

Be sure that each paragraph:

1. Begins with a sentence or phrase that informs readers of the topic of the paragraph;
2. **Includes information from more than one source;**
3. Clearly indicates which material comes from which source using lead in phrases and in-text citations.
4. **Shows the similarities or differences between the different sources** in ways that make the paper as informative as possible;
5. Represents the texts fairly--even if that seems to weaken the paper! Look upon yourself as a synthesizing machine; you are simply repeating what the source says, in fewer words and in your own words. But the fact that you are using your own words, does not mean that you are in anyway changing what the source says.

Conclusion:

When you have finished your paper, write a conclusion reminding readers of the most significant themes you have found and the ways they connect to the overall topic. You may also want to suggest further research or comment on things that it was not possible for you to discuss in the paper. If you are writing a background synthesis, in some cases it may be appropriate for you to offer an interpretation of the material or take a position (thesis).

Useful expressions to write an essay

Introduction	
first of all to begin with in order to decide whetheror not to outline the main points firstly, secondly, thirdly, finally / eventually	Tout d'abord Tout d'abord afin de décider si.....ou non exposer les points principaux Premièrement, deuxièmement...

Enumerating arguments	
in addition to / additionally besides / moreover / furthermore above all	de plus, en outre surtout

Weighing up arguments	
on the one hand.....on the other hand to consider the advantages and disadvantages arguments for and against to discuss the pros and cons in theory in reality both... and.... not only but also anyway / at any rate / in any case in fact / actually / as a matter of fact up to a point so to speak by no means / not at all	D'un côté... D'un autre côté discuter le pour et le contre à la fois..... et..... de toute façon en fait jusqu'à un certain point pour ainsi dire pas du tout / en aucune façon

Comparisons	
compared to / in comparison with to draw / make a comparison between ...and similarly as well as	Comparé à... Faire une comparaison aussi bien que / de même que

Restrictions	
however / though	Cependant
nevertheless	Néanmoins
whereas	tandis que
although / though / even though	bien que / même si
in spite of / despite	malgré
unlike	à la différence de
in contrast to / with sth.	
on the contrary	Contrairement à
sth is contrary to sth	

Referring to	
with reference to regarding as regards as far as ... is concerned according to (according to is used to introduce someone else's opinion. Don't say "according to me")	en ce qui concerne selon

Emphasizing	
I'd like to point out that I'd like to emphasize	J'aimerais faire remarquer que J'aimerais mettre l'accent sur
Generalizing	
on the whole in general / generally speaking as a rule to some extent to a large extent / to what extent ? in many ways in all respects in most / many cases basically	en règle générale dans une certaine mesure dans quelle mesure à bien des égards à tous les égards dans la plupart / beaucoup de cas fondamentalement / à la base

Giving examples	
for example / for instance such as / including in particular / particularly to give you an example of what I mean to illustrate this point what I mean is et cetera / and so on / and so forth that is to say / i.e	tel que / y compris Ce que je veux dire... et caetera c'est à dire

Making exceptions	
apart from except with the exception of	Excepté

Giving reasons	
because as / since because of the reason for this is the reason why for some reasons or another I have every reason to believe that	Parce que comme, puisque A cause de... La raison en est... La raison pour laquelle Pour une raison ou pour une autre J'ai toute raison de croire que...

Consequences	
therefore consequently / as a result for this reason / all these reasons	Donc Par conséquent Pour cete raison

Personal point of view	
I think that	Je pense que
in my opinion/ in my view / to my mind	A mon avis
this is a matter of opinion	
in my experience	D'après mon experience...
as far as I know	Autant que je sache
as far as I am concerned	En ce qui me concerne
to be aware / unaware of a problem	Être conscient de
to tell the truth	A vrai dire
the fact is that	Le fait est que....
I am convinced that	Je suis convaincu que
I firmly believe that	Je crois fermement que
I feel sth should be done about that	J'ai le sentiment que quelques chose devriat être fait...

Some useful verbs	
Add	Ajouter
Admit	Admettre
Affirm	Affirmer
Allege	Prétendre
Announce	Annoncer
Argue	Discuter, argumenter
Believe	Croire
Comment	Commenter
Confirm	Confirmer
Criticize	Critiquer
Complain	se plaindre
Declare	déclarer
Deny	nier, refuser
Disagree	ne pas être d'accord
Emphasize	Insister sur le fait, souligner
Estimate	Estimer

Exclaim	S'exclamer
Insist	Insister
Mention	Mentionner
Note	Noter
Observe	Observer
Posit	Avancer
Predict	Prédire
Proclaim	Proclamer
Propose	Proposer
Question	Remettre en cause, questionner
Remark	Remarquer
Respond	Répondre
Retort	Rétorquer
Reply	Répondre
Reveal	Reveler
Say	Dire
State	Déclarer
Think	Penser
Verify	Vérifier
write	Ecrire

Summarizing and drawing conclusions	
finally	Finalement
last of all	
last but not least	
in conclusion / to conclude	En conclusion
we can draw the conclusion	Nous pouvons tirer la conclusion
to sum up / to summarize we can say	Pour résumer
all in all	L'un dans l'autre
in short / in brief / briefly	En résumé
all things considered	Tout bien considéré
the subject under discussion	Le sujet
I find it difficult to reach a conclusion but I'm tempted to say	Il me semble difficile de tirer une conclusion mais je suis tenté de dire

Modifying adverbs	
totally / entirely / completely mostly / mainly / chiefly partly	surtout / principalement, essentiellement
comparatively / relatively extremely / incredibly	Comparativement

PLAN DE COURS

PART 1. THE SECOND AMENDMENT

- QUESTIONNAIRE
- DOCUMENT 1: Second Amendment - Definition
- DOCUMENT 2: 'Why the Arguments Against Gun Control are Wrong ?'
- DOCUMENT 3: 'Of course we should let teachers carry guns at school'.
- DOCUMENT4: 'The solution to America's gun violence isn't more guns'.

PART 2. AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

- QUESTIONNAIRE
- DOCUMENT 1: Affirmative Action - Definition
- DOCUMENT 2: 'Trump Officials Reverse Obama's Policy on Affirmative Action in Schools'
- DOCUMENT 3: 'Does the nation still need affirmative action?'
- DOCUMENT 4: 'Black people aren't keeping white Americans out of college. Rich people are.'

PART 3. THE MELTING POT

- QUESTIONNAIRE
- DOCUMENT 1: The Melting Pot – Definition
- DOCUMENT 2: The Rise and Fall of the American Melting Pot
- DOCUMENT 3: Melting Pots and Salad Bowls
- DOCUMENT 4: The Great Melting Pot

DOSSIER 1
SECOND AMENDEMENT

DOCUMENT 1 – ‘THE SECOND AMENDMENT-DEFINITION’

PRELIMINARY WORK

Make sure you understand the following concepts and references to people or events:

Bill of Rights, Revolutionary War, Supreme Court, NRA, Concealed carriers, James Madison

INTRODUCTION

- 1) Present the document (title, date, source, author)
- 2) What is the topic discussed in this document?

ANALYSIS

- 1) Having read the text, can you give a definition of the Second Amendment?
- 2) Why were the militias created?
- 3) What are the two interpretations of the Second Amendment?
- 4) According to the author, will mass shootings change the law regarding the right to bear arms?

CONCLUSION

Sum up the main ideas discussed above to show why the Second Amendment is still a matter of debate in the USA.

The Second Amendment – Definition

Introduction

The Second Amendment is one of 10 amendments that form the Bill of Rights, ratified in 1791 by the U.S. Congress. Differing interpretations of the amendment — often referred to as the right to bear arms — have fueled a long-running debate over gun control legislation and the rights of individual citizens to buy, own and carry firearms.

Right to bear arms

The text of the Second Amendment reads in full: “A well-regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.” The framers of the Bill of Rights adapted the wording of the amendment from nearly identical clauses in some of the original 13 state constitutions.

During the Revolutionary War era, “militia” referred to groups of men who banded together to protect their communities, towns, colonies and eventually states, once the United States declared its independence from Great Britain in 1776.

Many people in America at the time believed governments used soldiers to oppress the people, and thought the federal government should only be allowed to raise armies (with full-time, paid soldiers) when facing foreign adversaries. For all other purposes, they believed, it should turn to part-time militias, or ordinary civilians using their own weapons.

State militias

But as militias had proved insufficient against the British, the Constitutional Convention gave the new federal government the power to establish a standing army, even in peacetime.

However, opponents of a strong central government (known as Anti-Federalists) argued that this federal army deprived states of their ability to defend themselves against oppression. They feared that Congress might abuse its constitutional power of “organizing, arming and disciplining the Militia” by failing to keep militiamen equipped with adequate arms.

So, shortly after the U.S. Constitution was officially ratified, James Madison proposed the Second Amendment as a way to empower these state militias. While the Second Amendment did not answer the broader Anti-Federalist concern that the federal government had too much power, it did establish the principle (held by both Federalists and their opponents) that the government did not have the authority to disarm citizens.

Well-regulated militias

Practically since its ratification, Americans have debated the meaning of the Second Amendment, with vehement arguments being made on both sides.

The crux of the debate is whether the amendment protects the right of private individuals to keep and bear arms, or whether it instead protects a collective right that should be exercised only through formal militia units.

Those who argue it is a collective right point to the “well-regulated Militia” clause in the Second Amendment. They argue that the right to bear arms should be given only to organized groups, like the National Guard, a reserve military force that replaced the state militias after the Civil War.

On the other side are those who argue that the Second Amendment gives all citizens, not just militias, the right to own guns in order to protect themselves. The National Rifle Association (NRA), founded in 1871, and its supporters have been the most visible proponents of this argument, and have pursued a vigorous campaign against gun control measures at the local, state and federal levels.

Those who support stricter gun control legislation have argued that limits are necessary on gun ownership, including who can own them, where they can be carried and what type of guns should be available for purchase.

Congress passed one of the most high-profile federal gun control efforts, the so-called Brady Bill, in the 1990s, largely thanks to the efforts of former White House Press Secretary James S. Brady, who had been shot in the head during an assassination attempt on President Ronald Reagan in 1981.

District of Columbia v. Heller

Since the passage of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act, which mandated background checks for gun purchases from licensed dealers, the debate on gun control has changed dramatically.

This is partially due to the actions of the Supreme Court, which departed from its past stance on the Second Amendment with its verdicts in two major cases, District of Columbia v. Heller (2008) and McDonald v. Chicago (2010).

For a long time, the federal judiciary held the opinion that the Second Amendment remained among the few provisions of the Bill of Rights that did not fall under the due process clause of the 14th Amendment, which would thereby apply its limitations to state governments. For example, in the 1886 case Presser v. Illinois, the Court held that the Second Amendment applied only to the federal government, and did not prohibit state governments from regulating an individual’s ownership or use of guns.

But in its 5-4 decision in District of Columbia v. Heller, which invalidated a federal law barring nearly all civilians from possessing guns in the District of Columbia, the Supreme Court extended Second Amendment protection to individuals in federal (non-state) enclaves.

Writing the majority decision in that case, Justice Antonin Scalia lent the Court’s weight to the idea that the Second Amendment protects the right of individual private gun ownership for self-defense purposes.

McDonald v. Chicago

Two years later, in *McDonald v. Chicago*, the Supreme Court struck down (also in a 5-4 decision) a similar citywide handgun ban, ruling that the Second Amendment applies to the states as well as to the federal government.

In the majority ruling in that case, Justice Samuel Alito wrote: “Self-defense is a basic right, recognized by many legal systems from ancient times to the present day, and in *Heller*, we held that individual self-defense is ‘the central component’ of the Second Amendment right.”

Gun control debates

The Supreme Court’s narrow rulings in the *Heller* and *McDonald* cases left open many key issues in the gun control debate.

In the *Heller* decision, the Court suggested a list of “presumptively lawful” regulations, including bans on possession of firearms by felons and the mentally ill; bans on carrying arms in schools and government buildings; restrictions on gun sales; bans on the concealed carrying of weapons; and generally bans on weapons “not typically possessed by law-abiding citizens for lawful purposes.”

Mass shootings

Since that verdict, as lower courts battle back and forth on cases involving such restrictions, the public debate over Second Amendment rights and gun control remains very much open, even as mass shootings became an increasingly frequent occurrence in American life.

To take just two recent examples, the Sandy Hook shooting of 18 children and two adults at the Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut, led President Barack Obama and many others to call for tighter background checks and a renewed ban on assault weapons.

And in 2017, the mass shooting of 58 people attending a country music concert in Las Vegas (to date the largest mass shooting in U.S. history, overtaking the 2016 attack on the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, Florida) inspired calls to restrict sales of “bump stocks,” attachments that enable semiautomatic weapons to fire faster.

On the other side of the ongoing debate of gun control measures are the NRA and other gun rights supporters, powerful and vocal groups that views such restrictions as an unacceptable violation of their Second Amendment rights.

Sources

Bill of Rights, The Oxford Guide to the United States Government.
Jack Rakove, ed. The Annotated U.S. Constitution and Declaration of Independence.
Amendment II, National Constitution Center.
The Second Amendment and the Right to Bear Arms, LiveScience.
Second Amendment, Legal Information Institute.

<https://www.history.com/topics/2nd-amendment>

DOCUMENT 2 – ‘WHY THE ARGUMENTS AGAINST GUN CONTROL ARE WRONG?’

PRELIMINARY WORK

Make sure you understand the following words, concepts and references to people or events:

The Founding Fathers, national gun buyback, Ronald Reagan, the FBI, flawed, shoddy

INTRODUCTION

- 1) Present the document (title, date, source, author)
- 2) What is the topic discussed in this document?

ANALYSIS

- 1) Why has the right to bear arms already been infringed (according to the author)?
- 2) Why is it difficult to assess the efficiency of “gun control” (according to the author)?
- 3) Why does he think that guns are the problems?
- 4) Give three examples supporting the idea that guns are not always a solution to protect oneself.
- 5) Can a gun offer a good protection? How does the author acknowledge his point?
- 6) What is the role of the parents/school regarding weapons?

CONCLUSION

Sum up the main ideas discussed above to acknowledge that some arguments against gun control may be irrelevant.

Why The Arguments Against Gun Control Are Wrong ?

By David Edward Burke, Contributor
Oct 05, 2017

This week at least 59 people were killed and over 500 injured in the deadliest mass shooting in American history. Naturally, the gun control debate — the same one we have been having for decades — has ramped up again, and opponents are using redundant, deeply flawed arguments against even modest proposals like more background checks or a federal database to track gun sales.

Given the current composition of Congress and the over \$60 million from the NRA that helped create it, the chances for rapid reform are slim. But that doesn't mean that the debate should end. Shoddy arguments should be exposed and people who make them should be challenged. To that end, below are five of the most common arguments against gun control, and why those arguments are wrong.

1. Gun Control Violates The Second Amendment

Many opponents of gun control argue that limits on gun ownership are unconstitutional because they violate the Second Amendment, which includes the phrase “the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.” Opponents often emphasize the “shall not be infringed” part while ignoring the other clause about the right being connected to a “well regulated Militia,” but nobody's perfect. Even emphasizing the “right” component, however, if we slow down and think about what an absolute right to bear arms would look like, it's clear that even the people making the argument don't believe in it.

If the right to bear arms cannot be infringed, mentally ill felons can own nuclear weapons. Children can own machine guns. Terrorists can bring hand grenades on airplanes, right? Because the right to bear arms *shall not be infringed*.

Since nobody who buys into the concept of society actually believes that, it's clear that everybody believes in some level of gun control, including conservative courts that have allowed assault weapons bans, background checks, and other limits on gun ownership to stand for years. So the clear consensus among ordinary Americans and constitutional law scholars is that the type of gun control being proposed today does not violate the Second Amendment.

Slightly more reasonable people may concede that point and argue that Americans at least have a right to own military grade weapons, claiming that the Founding Fathers intended as much. But the truth is that we have no way of knowing what men who lived in the era of muskets would think of assault rifles. Anyone who says otherwise is some combination of insincere or foolish.

2. Gun Control Doesn't Work

The two primary prongs of the “gun control doesn't work” argument are that: 1) gun control does not reduce gun deaths largely because 2) it does not actually make it more difficult for people to obtain guns.

One fundamental problem with this argument is that gun control can mean a number of different things: more stringent background checks, bans on high capacity magazines, licensing requirements, etc. So making the general statement “gun control doesn't work” without referencing a specific proposal is kind of like saying “this food tastes bad” before know what's on the menu.

To be fair, both sides of this argument can always find evidence to support their position. Gun control advocates can point to Australia, where both suicide and murder rates plummeted after a

national gun buyback of over 650,000 guns in 1996 and 1997. On the other hand, opponents can correctly state that Chicago has strict gun laws but an alarmingly high rate of firearm related deaths. Anyone can cherry-pick a city, state, or country to support their argument, which is why we need a larger sample size.

Luckily, we have a few large samples. One is called the United States. Another is called Earth. And both large samples establish a consistent correlation: places with more guns generally have more gun deaths than places with fewer guns. It's not always true. But it's usually true. And if something usually works, it seems foolish not to try it in this country, especially in light of our absurd level of gun ownership—we have 4.4 percent of the world's population, but 42 percent of civilian owned guns.

As for the argument that gun control won't make it more difficult for people to obtain guns, Ronald Reagan addresses that pretty well in the letter he signed supporting an assault weapons ban, stating that,

“While we recognize that assault weapon legislation will not stop all assault weapon crime, statistics prove that we can dry up the supply of these guns, making them less accessible to criminals. We urge you to listen to the American public and to the law enforcement community and support a ban on the further manufacture of these weapons.”

That's right gun control opponents. Even Ronald Reagan disagrees with you.

3. People Are The Problem and They Will Harm Others Without Guns

In my opinion, it's a reflection of poor parenting or a subpar education system, but an alarming number of Americans actually argue that banning assault weapons is pointless because without them, criminals would just use knives or cars—as if a society without weapons of any kind would be equally dangerous to ours. For those who do think that, let's concede that people killed people before guns and will continue to do so even if the supply of guns diminishes. Everyone agrees.

But the key element here is that guns make it a lot easier to kill someone than knives or cars. And it seems fairly obvious that making it more difficult to kill someone is a good thing since it may lead to some life-saving contemplation or a victim who has time to escape unscathed or with less severe injuries. Lastly, gun control doesn't have to eliminate violence to be successful. A reduction in violence is still a success.

4. But I Need Guns For Protection From Criminals And The Government

First, contrary to what the NRA has led many to believe, gun control does not mean abolishing the Second Amendment or taking away all guns. Doing so would not only be unpopular, but politically and logistically impossible. We are talking about limits, not abolition. So the relevant question is not whether guns can be used for protection because of course they can. What matters is whether we can place some limits on gun ownership—like on certain types of guns or a total number of guns—while allowing Americans to protect themselves against criminals. The evidence indicates that we can.

Take assault weapons for starters. Despite the attention they get due to mass shootings, assault weapons are not a leading killer of innocent Americans. They account for only a small fraction of

gun-related deaths—about one or two hundred a year out of over 10,000. Nonetheless, it is undeniable that every year people are killed by assault weapons who would not have died if the perpetrator had a gun without “military style” features. By contrast, there is little evidence that assault weapons are ever essential for self-defense.

Don’t get me wrong, assault weapons can be used for self-defense and they occasionally are. But it is difficult to find documented incidents in which an assault weapon was successfully used for self-defense by a civilian when a lesser gun would not have sufficed. On balance, it appears that assault weapons are far more frequently used for assault than for protection.

There is a similar lack of evidence that owing, say, eight guns, is necessary for protection. If that number sounds absurdly high, it isn’t—the average gun owning household in American has more than eight guns. If that many guns are essential for protection, we should be able to find studies or verified stories that prove it—“My first seven guns jammed but I was able to shoot the intruder with my eighth. Thank God I had eight guns!” Without such cases, it seems as though limiting individuals to say, three guns per person, would still give Americans the same level of “protection” they have today.

Lastly, as to the argument that guns are necessary to for protection from government tyranny, as noted above, gun control does not mean taking away all guns. But more importantly, if there were some unprecedented battle of government versus civilians, what good would guns, even assault weapons do, against the United states military? The military has tanks, drones, aircraft carriers, missiles, cyber warfare capabilities, far-reaching surveillance, and more. In the arms race between government and civilians, civilians lost years ago. Background checks, a federal database tracking gun sales, or a ban on high capacity magazines are not going to change the equation.

5. The Only Thing That Stops A Bad Guy With A Gun Is A Good Guy With A Gun

There is no dispute that law enforcement officers and sometimes even civilians use guns to stop bad people with guns. But once again, the question is not whether a gun can be used for good; the question is whether the protection guns provide equals or outweighs the danger. Polls show that a majority of people believe owning a gun makes them safer, but the available evidence indicates otherwise.

FBI data as recently as 2014 showed that almost eight times as many people were killed by guns in arguments than by civilians using a gun in self-defense. Multiple surveys, including the National Crime Victimization Survey, show that guns are used to commit crimes about ten times more often than they are used to stop a crime. And an analysis of hundreds of shootings in Philadelphia found that people carrying firearms were about 4.5 times more likely to be shot than those not carrying, likely due to unnecessary conflict escalation. So on balance, guns make situations more dangerous, not less.

When broken down in detail, the most common arguments against gun control share similar traits. They are based on cherry picked evidence, hypothetical situations that don’t happen in reality, or flawed reasoning. Facts and logic both support the idea that limiting the supply of guns and access to them generally makes people safer. Facts and the logic may not gain you much ground with opponents these days, but just like sensible limits on gun ownership, it’s worth a try.

https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/why-the-arguments-against-gun-control-are-wrong_us_59d6405ce4b0666ad0c3cb34

DOCUMENT 3 – ‘OF COURSE WE SHOULD LET TEACHERS CARRY GUNS AT SCHOOL’

PRELIMINARY WORK

Make sure you understand the following words and references:

An alien culture, to fix school shooting, concealed carriers

INTRODUCTION

- 1) Present the document (title, date, source, author)
- 2) What is the topic discussed in this document?

ANALYSIS

- 1) Can teachers be good educators if they carry a concealed gun? Elaborate.
- 2) Why do some people believe that guns should be carried in schools?
- 3) What is the writer’s solution to mass shootings in schools?
- 4) Why are school shootings more frequent than in other places?
- 5) Why does he believe that guns will not lead to more violent acts? What kind of examples does he give to justify his point?

CONCLUSION

Sum up the main ideas discussed above to show that teachers need to carry a concealed gun in schools.

Of course we should let teachers carry guns in school

By Daniel Payne

Daniel Payne is a writer based in Virginia. He is an assistant editor for the College Fix, the news magazine of the Student Free Press Association.

February 20, 2018

I have not yet heard a single good argument for why we shouldn't generally allow teachers to carry concealed firearms on school grounds. With as many school shootings as we've experienced in this country, it is time we stop ignoring this absurdly simple solution. It is among the lowest-hanging fruit of the gun debate.

The objections to this proposal usually take two forms, both of them utterly useless and insufficient. The first is shock and disgust: "We shouldn't have educators carry weapons of war in places where children are supposed to be learning!" This is a purely sentimental reaction, not a realistic counterargument; it is full of hot air and empty of any meaningful content.

This objection presupposes as a matter of course that guns are somehow incompatible with a learning environment — that a classroom in which a concealed weapon is present is a bad one.

Nonsense. A qualified teacher with a handgun on their hip is perfectly capable of instructing a classroom. Where is the evidence to suggest otherwise? That's not a rhetorical question. For all the hyperventilating over the idea of teachers carrying guns in schools, partisans have not, to my knowledge, ever been able to prove why it is, for some reason, such a wildly bad idea.

One suspects that it is an ideological objection more than anything: Some people simply do not like guns — they see guns as nasty, profane, scary, loud, part of an alien culture of which they are entirely unfamiliar — and they believe that letting teachers carry guns will somehow denigrate or defile the educational environment. People are perfectly entitled to their opinions, of course. But this is a debate concerning vital matters of public safety, and we should not allow irrational anti-gun ideology to influence such a pressing and critical dialogue. It's fine if some people don't like guns, but that doesn't mean we should prevent responsible people from carrying them and using them.

The second objection is more equivocal: People will often say, "We should be working to keep guns out of the hands of homicidal maniacs instead of allowing teachers to carry guns." I agree with the first part: We need to do something about our school shooting problem. It is a brutal and absolutely pressing problem, the abolition of which should be the prime objective of every good person in this country.

But you can do both. In fact, you should do both, because until we begin fixing our school shooting problem in a systemic way, schools will still remain vulnerable, attractive targets for psychotic madmen. We should not leave our schools open to such attacks. There is a reason that crazed gunmen never shoot up police stations or gun stores: Because they know that the armed populace inside will shoot back, and their rampage will end in quick and ignominious death. A school, on the

other hand, is as low-risk a target as one can hope for. That would change if we allowed teachers and administrators to carry guns.

Occasionally one hears other, even less-rational objections to concealed carry in schools. For instance, “It will cause even more gun violence!” This is profoundly silly. Concealed carriers are among the most law-abiding individuals in the country. And schools could insist on strict safety protocols for teachers who carry: training, certification, a careful and deliberate system of ensuring that guns remain where they’re supposed to at all times.

It’s not complicated, it’s ridiculously simple.

If someone has an objection to teachers carrying guns in schools that isn’t “Guns gross me out” or “Let’s focus on the criminals instead,” I’d be delighted to hear it. If not, then for goodness’ sake, what are we waiting for? Let the teachers carry.

<https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/of-course-we-should-let-teachers-carry-guns-in-school>

DOCUMENT 4 – ‘THE SOLUTION TO AMERICA’S GUN VIOLENCE ISN’T MORE GUNS’

PRELIMINARY WORK

Make sure you understand the following words, concepts and references to people or events:

Lawmakers, GOP, Stanford, John Donohue, ‘average Joe’, the Republicans, the Democrats, Congressmen, felons

INTRODUCTION

- 1) Present the document (title, date, source, author)
- 2) What is the topic discussed in this document?

ANALYSIS

- 1) What are the Republicans’ and the Democrats’ opinions over the issue of gun violence?
- 2) What is Barry Loudermilk’s idea?
- 3) What is the journalist’s opinion concerning members of Congress’ personal security?
- 4) What is the position of researchers on the questions of the right to bear arms?
- 5) According to Daniel Webster, what is the problem with the legislation?
- 6) Are armed bystanders always ready to react in a mass shootings?

CONCLUSION

Sum up the main ideas discussed above and show the reasons why more guns may not be the right solution to gun violence.

The Solution To America's Gun Violence Isn't More Guns

After Wednesday's shooting, some Republicans are saying more people should be armed. That's not going to help.

By Nick Wing

Jun 16, 2017

WASHINGTON — For a few hours after a gunman shot a member of Congress and four other people at baseball practice in the Northern Virginia suburbs on Wednesday, lawmakers were unified against the political vitriol that seemed to drive the attack.

But when questions inevitably shifted to how lawmakers would respond to the bloodshed of yet another mass shooting, it became clear that the brief display of agreement was more symbolism than substance.

Democrats and Republicans both were quick to stake out their standard positions in the seemingly intractable debate over gun violence. At a press conference shortly after the shooting, Virginia Gov. Terry McAuliffe (D) expressed concern that “there are too many guns on the street,” and called for legislative action “to protect all of our citizens.”

For some Republicans, however, the immediate answer to the violence — the 153rd mass shooting of this year, but the first of 2017 to involve lawmakers — was more guns.

Rep. Chris Collins (R-N.Y.) told a news outlet in Buffalo, New York, that he'd be carrying his pistol in his pocket “from this day forward,” though it was unclear if he also planned to do so in Washington, where concealed carry is strictly regulated. Rep. Barry Loudermilk (R-Ga.), who was at the scene of the attack, said the shooting showed the need for a reciprocity law that would give members of Congress from states with more permissive gun laws the right to carry firearms in D.C. as well. Virginia allows concealed and open carry of firearms, but Loudermilk pointed out that most lawmakers and their staffers are based in Washington.

Rep. Louie Gohmert (R-Texas) made a pitch for a GOP bill that would offer similar reciprocity to all permitted gun owners, not just members of Congress.

It may make sense for politicians to be concerned about personal security, given mounting hostility and an apparent uptick in threats to members of Congress. But some of these lawmakers already have their own security teams to usher them through a heavily armed society.

Besides, arming more civilians is hardly a solution to mass shootings, which have become more frequent in recent years. The more-guns argument is grounded in a controversial belief that allowing more people to carry weapons in more places is a good way prevent violence — a belief based on scant evidence.

“There's no empirical evidence to support the idea that more guns would make things better, and my study says it would make things worse.”

Stanford law professor John Donohue

Economist and gun-rights advocate John Lott first attempted to give empirical support to this theory in a paper and 1998 book, *More Guns, Less Crime*. Lott claimed his research showed that as the number of people with concealed-carry permits went up in a state, crime rates went down. Gun lobbyists and lawmakers across the country eagerly adopted Lott's writing to push pro-gun legislation, and still appear to be using it to make it easier to own guns and carry them pretty much everywhere.

But other researchers have questioned Lott's work, and study after study in the years since has contradicted his conclusion and cast doubt on the supposed correlation between concealed-carry laws and crime.

A paper published this week, from Stanford law professor John Donohue, found violent crime is higher in states that allow concealed carry — building on his previous research that shows more guns actually led to more crime.

“There's no empirical evidence to support the idea that more guns would make things better, and my study says it would make things worse,” Donohue told HuffPost in an interview.

There are a few simple reasons for this, said Donohue.

“Once everybody's carrying guns, a lot of guns get lost and stolen, which means they're in the hands of criminal right away,” Donohue explained. “Also, criminals start becoming a lot quicker to shoot when they think a lot of guns are in circulation, for the same reason police in the United States shoot a lot more people than police in England or France or Germany or Italy — they're afraid that they're gonna meet somebody who's got a gun.”

The National Rifle Association often repeats the quote: “The only way to stop a bad guy with a gun is with a good guy with a gun.” Using that logic, gun advocates argue that the objective should be to increase the number of good guys who have guns.

But there are already an estimated 300 million firearms, or more, in civilian hands in the United States — 112.6 guns per 100 residents, according to a recent survey — and it's hard to argue we're safer because of it. While the U.S. has the highest rate of gun ownership in the world, it endures far more gun violence than any other developed nation.

There's a distinct difference between the black-and-white rhetoric of the law-abiding “good guy” gun owner and the practical implications of a wholesale loosening of gun laws, said Daniel Webster, director of the Johns Hopkins Center for Gun Policy and Research.

“The reality of the policy is that the standards for legal gun ownership and carrying loaded guns in public is so low that you very commonly get individuals who don't hit the threshold for legal prohibition to own a gun, but if you look in their background you see problems,” Webster told HuffPost. “If you're not a felon, you're a so-called legal good guy with a gun.”

Such a broad definition misses the “hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of people out there, who have anger issues or other issues of impulse control or histories of reckless or violent behavior,” added Webster. “When the door is open to so many people to carry guns legally, it only takes a relatively small number of those who aren't such good guys.”

The gunman in Wednesday's shooting, for example, was a legally licensed gun owner in Illinois, although authorities haven't said where he got the weapons he used in the attack. Despite a history of criminal charges involving firearms and domestic violence that were ultimately dropped, he was still considered "good" enough to have a gun — until he started shooting.

The gun lobby's reductive thinking may be useful to increase sales, but it gets dangerous when it's used to promote policies that affect millions of people.

"The NRA is always playing a game of checkers and the world is a game of chess, and if you play checkers in a world of chess, you almost always lose," said Donohue.

Beyond the possible effects of a heavily armed populace on crime, there's also reason to be skeptical of the idea that armed bystanders — lawmakers or otherwise — would be able to successfully intervene in a mass shooting.

A 2014 FBI study on 160 active-shooter incidents from 2000 to 2013 found evidence of just five instances in which armed individuals who were not law enforcement personnel engaged with gunmen. Only one of those involved a civilian with a valid firearms permit who was not a security guard.

"It's a hard enough thing for a well-trained officer or military person to respond to fire," said Donohue. "It's not a very easy thing for just your average Joe to do."

When untrained gun owners do get involved in tense active-shooter scenarios, there can be a fine line between success and catastrophe. In 2011, an armed bystander rushed to confront a man he thought had just carried out the mass shooting in Tucson, Arizona, that nearly killed then-Rep. Gabrielle Giffords (D-Ariz.). He later admitted he nearly shot the wrong man.

With mass shooters increasingly using military-style weaponry to inflict vast casualties — the gunman in Wednesday's shooting was reportedly armed with an SKS rifle — there's also a good chance that someone carrying a concealed handgun would be "outgunned," said Webster. Although the Capitol Police officers who neutralized the shooter had the benefit of training, they were armed with pistols. The perpetrator had the advantage of a rifle with better range, power and accuracy.

It's not yet clear how Wednesday's shooting will affect the gun debate in Congress. Democrats were not particularly optimistic that lawmakers would be moved to act at all, noting that they hadn't been able to pass any gun legislation following high-profile mass shootings in Tucson or in Newtown, Connecticut, which left 26 dead, including 20 young children.

Some Republicans seemed satisfied to say they should continue to do nothing.

"We've got plenty of gun laws. I own a gun; I don't go around shooting people with it," Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.) told reporters on Wednesday. "Bottom line: People get shot, run over by cars, stabbed. It's just a crazy world."

[https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/gun-violence-more-guns us 5942e8dae4b01eab7a2c6d0f](https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/gun-violence-more-guns-us_5942e8dae4b01eab7a2c6d0f)

DOSSIER 2
AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

DOCUMENT 1 – ‘AFFIRMATIVE ACTION - DEFINITION’

PRELIMINARY WORK

Make sure you understand the following words, concepts and references to people or events:

President Kennedy, creed, Executive Order, The Equal Employment Opportunity commission, rod, sue, hobbyhorse, fringe, legacy applicants, alumni

INTRODUCTION

- 1) Present the document (title, date, source, author)
- 2) What is the topic discussed in this document?

ANALYSIS

- 1) Define the reasons and the origins of Affirmative Action.
- 2) Who are required to document their affirmative action practices?
- 3) Sum up the Supreme Court decisions.

CONCLUSION

Sum up the main ideas discussed above in order to understand the very first purpose of Affirmative Action.

Affirmative Action – Definition

◦ Definition

A set of procedures designed to eliminate unlawful discrimination among applicants, remedy the results of such prior discrimination, and prevent such discrimination in the future. Applicants may be seeking admission to an educational program or looking for professional employment. In modern American jurisprudence, it typically imposes remedies against discrimination on the basis of, at the very least, race, creed, color, and national origin.

◦ Legal Origins

While the concept of affirmative action has existed in America since the 19th century, it first appeared in its current form in President Kennedy's Executive Order 10925 (1961): "The contractor will take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed, and that employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, creed, color, or national origin."

◦ Employment

▪ Government Contractors

In 1961, President John F. Kennedy issued an executive order mandating government contractors to "take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed, and that employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, creed, color, or national origin." (Executive Order 10925) Since 1965, government contractors have been required to document their affirmative action programs through compliance reports, to contain "such information as to the practices, policies, programs, and employment policies, programs, and employment statistics of the contractor and each subcontractor . . ." (Executive Order 11246). Enforcement is conducted by the U.S. Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs.

In *Richmond v. Croson*, 488 U.S. 469 (1989), the Supreme Court held that strict scrutiny applies to state statutes which set standards for affirmative action.

▪ General

Employers who contract with the government or who otherwise receive federal funds are required to document their affirmative action practices and metrics. Affirmative action is also a remedy, under the Civil Rights Act of 1964, where a court finds that an employer has intentionally engaged in discriminatory practices.

The Equal Employment Opportunity commission, created by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, enforces the following employment anti-discrimination laws: (source: EEOC).

- Equal Pay Act of 1963
- Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (race, color, religion, national origin)
- Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (people of a certain age)

- Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Sections 501 and 505 (people with disabilities)
- Titles I and V of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990
- Civil Rights Act of 1991

- **Education**

Recipients of federal funds are required to document their affirmative action practices and metrics. Educational institutions which have acted discriminatorily in the past must take affirmative action as a remedy. (34 CFR § 100.3(6)(ii)).

The Office of Civil Rights enforces the following education anti-discrimination laws: (source: OCR)

- Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (race, color, religion, national origin)
- Age Discrimination Act of 1975 (people of a certain age)
- Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972 (gender)
- Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (people with disabilities)
- Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990
- The Boy Scouts of America Equal Access Act (Section 9525 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001) (equal access for outside community groups to school facilities during non-school hours)

- **Supreme Court Decisions Related to Education**

In chronological order, here is a non-exhaustive list of Supreme Court decisions related to affirmative action.

- **Brown v Board**

In *Brown v. Board of Education*, 374 U.S. 483 (1954), the Supreme Court held that public schools may not exclude minority students from white schools by sending the minority students to a school that separately services minority students. This decision acted as a precursor to many of the education-based affirmative action cases in the Supreme Court which followed in later years.

- **Regents v. Bakke**

In *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*, 438 U.S. 265 (1978), the University of California's Medical School at Davis reserved 16 spots in each entering class of 100 students for minority students. The Court did not hold a majority opinion, but the main legal takeaway from *Bakke* is that the Constitution prohibits a school from having racial quotas.

- **Gratz v. Bollinger**

In *Gratz v. Bollinger*, 539 U.S. 244 (2003), the University of Michigan's Undergraduate Admissions Office used a points-based system in its admission process. The office added points for an applicant who was an underrepresented minority. The Supreme Court held that the race-based methods must use strict scrutiny. The Court held that the generalization of "underrepresented minorities" failed the narrow tailoring requirement that strict scrutiny imposes.

- **Grutter v. Bollinger**

In *Grutter v. Bollinger*, 539 U.S. 306 (2003), the University of Michigan Law School Admissions Office used race in its admissions process. However, the school did not assign points based on race. Instead, the school used race as one of a number of factors; race could not automatically result in an acceptance or a rejection (which contrasts with *Gratz*, in which those 20 points used in *Gratz* could have resulted in admission or rejection). The Court held that this plan is narrowly tailored enough to satisfy strict scrutiny because the "program is flexible enough to ensure that each applicant is evaluated as an individual and not in a way that makes race or ethnicity the defining feature of the application . . . The Law School engages in a highly individualized, holistic review of each applicant's file, giving serious consideration to all the ways an applicant might contribute to a diverse educational environment." In dicta contained in the majority opinion, Justice O'Connor wrote, "The Court expects that 25 years from now, the use of racial preferences will no longer be necessary to further the interest approved today."

- **Fisher v. Texas**

In *Fisher v. University of Texas*, 579 U.S. ___ (2016), the University of Texas at Austin used a Top Ten Percent Law, in which any student who graduated in the top 10% of his or her high school class would be granted admission to the University. If an applicant was not in the top 10% of his or her high school class, the University would create an Academic Index (AI) and a Personal Achievement Index (PAI) for each student.

The AI calculated SAT scores and high school academic performance, the PAI considered applicant's essays, as well as a full-file review" which included leadership and work experience, extracurricular activities, community service, and other "special characteristics" that might give the admissions committee insight into a student's background; race was included as one of these special characteristics.

The Court found that the University's use of race constitutes a "factor of a factor of a factor," which, as one factor in the University's holistic review process, is narrow enough to meet strict scrutiny. The Court also held that there is a compelling interest in "obtaining the educational benefits that flow from student body diversity." As such, strict scrutiny is satisfied, and the Court held that the use of race in the University's admissions efforts was constitutional.

◦ Further Reading

For more on affirmative action, see this New York University Law Review article, this Harvard Law Review article, and this Michigan Law Review article.

https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/affirmative_action

DOCUMENT 2 – ‘TRUMP OFFICIALS REVERSE OBAMA’S POLICY ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN SCHOOLS’

PRELIMINARY WORK

Make sure you understand the following words, concepts and references to people or events:

Race-blind admissions standards, President Obama, Harvard

INTRODUCTION

- 1) Present the document (title, date, source, author)
- 2) What is the topic discussed in this document?

ANALYSIS

- 1) What are the results of affirmative action?
- 2) What are the side effects of affirmative action?
- 3) What could be the consequences of the Trump administration’s decision to curb affirmative action?
- 4) What happened in Harvard?
- 5) Is it easy to combine diversity and equal treatment in schools?

CONCLUSION

Sum up the main ideas discussed above focusing on the idea of how to promote diversity in schools.

Trump Officials Reverse Obama’s Policy on Affirmative Action in Schools

By Erica L. Green, Matt Apuzzo and Katie Benner

July 3, 2018

WASHINGTON — The Trump administration said Tuesday that it was abandoning Obama administration policies that called on universities to consider race as a factor in diversifying their campuses, signaling that the administration will champion race-blind admissions standards.

In a joint letter, the Education and Justice Departments announced that they had rescinded seven Obama-era policy guidelines on affirmative action, which, the departments said, “advocate policy preferences and positions beyond the requirements of the Constitution.”

“The executive branch cannot circumvent Congress or the courts by creating guidance that goes beyond the law and — in some instances — stays on the books for decades,” said Devin M. O’Malley, a Justice Department spokesman.

Striking a softer tone, Education Secretary Betsy DeVos wrote in a separate statement: “The Supreme Court has determined what affirmative action policies are constitutional, and the court’s written decisions are the best guide for navigating this complex issue. Schools should continue to offer equal opportunities for all students while abiding by the law.”

The Trump administration’s moves come with affirmative action at a crossroads. Hard-liners in the Justice and Education Departments are moving against any use of race as a measurement of diversity in education. And the retirement of Justice Anthony M. Kennedy at the end of this month will leave the Supreme Court without its swing vote on affirmative action while allowing President Trump to nominate a justice opposed to policies that for decades have tried to integrate elite educational institutions.

A highly anticipated case is pitting Harvard against Asian-American students who say one of the nation’s most prestigious institutions has systematically excluded some Asian-American applicants to maintain slots for students of other races. That case is clearly aimed at the Supreme Court.

“The whole issue of using race in education is being looked at with a new eye in light of the fact that it’s not just white students being discriminated against, but Asians and others as well,” said

Roger Clegg, the president and general counsel of the conservative Center for Equal Opportunity. “As the demographics of the country change, it becomes more and more problematic.”

Democrats and civil rights organizations denounced the administration’s decisions. Representative Nancy Pelosi of California, the House Democratic leader, said the “rollback of vital affirmative action guidance offends our nation’s values” and called it “yet another clear Trump administration attack on communities of color.”

Guidance documents like those rescinded on Tuesday do not have the force of law, but they amount to the official view of the federal government. School officials who keep their race-conscious admissions policies intact would do so knowing that they could face a Justice Department investigation or lawsuit, or lose funding from the Education Department.

◦

The Obama administration believed that students benefited from being surrounded by diverse classmates, so in 2011, the administration offered schools a potential road map to establishing affirmative action policies and race-based considerations that could withstand legal scrutiny from an increasingly skeptical Supreme Court.

In a pair of policy guidance documents issued in 2011, the Obama Education and Justice Departments informed elementary and secondary schools and college campuses of “the compelling interests” established by the Supreme Court to achieve diversity. They concluded that the court “has made clear such steps can include taking account of the race of individual students in a narrowly tailored manner.”

But Trump Justice Department officials identified those documents as particularly problematic and full of “hypotheticals” intended to allow schools to skirt the law.

The Trump administration’s decision returned the government’s policies to the George W. Bush era. The administration did not formally reissue the Bush-era guidance but in recent days did repost a Bush administration affirmative action policy document online. That document states, “The Department of Education strongly encourages the use of race-neutral methods for assigning students to elementary and secondary schools.” For several years, that document had been replaced by a note declaring that the policy had been withdrawn.

The Education Department had last reaffirmed its position on affirmative action in schools in 2016 after a Supreme Court ruling said schools could consider race as one factor among many. In that

case, *Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin*, a white woman claimed she was denied admission because of her race.

“It remains an enduring challenge to our nation’s education system to reconcile the pursuit of diversity with the constitutional promise of equal treatment and dignity,” Justice Kennedy wrote for the 4-to-3 majority.

Some colleges, such as Duke and Bucknell universities, said they would wait to see how the Education Department proceeds in issuing new guidance. Other colleges said they would proceed with diversifying their campuses as the Supreme Court intended.

Melodie Jackson, a Harvard spokeswoman, said the university would “continue to vigorously defend its right, and that of all colleges and universities, to consider race as one factor among many in college admissions, which has been upheld by the Supreme Court for more than 40 years.”

A spokeswoman for the University of Michigan, which won a major Supreme Court case in 2003, suggested that the flagship university would like more freedom to consider race, not less. But it is already constrained by state law. After the case, Michigan voters enacted a constitutional ban on race-conscious college admissions policies.

“We believe the U.S. Supreme Court got it right in 2003 when it affirmed our law school’s approach at the time, which allowed consideration of race as one of many factors in the admissions process,” said Kim Broekhuizen, the Michigan spokeswoman. “We still believe that.”

Attorney General Jeff Sessions has indicated that he will take a tough line against such views. Federal prosecutors will investigate and sue universities over discriminatory admissions policies, he said.

But a senior Justice Department official denied that these decisions were rolling back protections for minorities. He said they were instead hewing the department closer to the letter of the law. In the department’s letter, officials wrote that “the protections from discrimination on the basis of race remain in place.”

“The departments are firmly committed to vigorously enforcing these protections on behalf of all students,” the letter said.

Anurima Bhargava, who headed civil rights enforcement in schools for the Justice Department under President Barack Obama and helped write that administration’s guidance, said the withdrawal of the guidelines was timed for brief filings in the Harvard litigation, due at the end of the month.

“This is a wholly political attack,” Ms. Bhargava said. “And our schools are the place where our communities come together, so our schools have to continue to promote diversity and address segregation, as the U.S. Constitution demands.”

Catherine Lhamon, who served as the Education Department’s head of civil rights under Mr. Obama, called the departments’ move confusing.

“There’s no reason to rethink or reconsider this, as the Supreme Court is the highest court in the land and has spoken on this issue,” Ms. Lhamon said.

On Friday, the Education Department began laying the groundwork for the shift, when it restored on its civil rights website the Bush-era guidance. Conservative advocacy groups saw that as promising. Mr. Clegg, of the Center for Equal Opportunity, said that preserving the Obama-era guidance would be akin to “the F.B.I. issuing a document on how you can engage in racial profiling in a way where you won’t get caught.”

Ms. DeVos has seemed hesitant to wade in on the fate of affirmative action policies, which date back to a 57-year-old executive order by President John F. Kennedy, who recognized systemic and discriminatory disadvantages for women and minorities. The Education Department did not partake in the Justice Department’s formal interest in Harvard’s litigation.

“I think this has been a question before the courts and the courts have opined,” Ms. DeVos told The Associated Press.

But Ms. DeVos’s new head of civil rights, Kenneth L. Marcus, may disagree. A vocal opponent of affirmative action, Mr. Marcus was confirmed last month on a party-line Senate vote, and it was Mr. Marcus who signed Tuesday’s letter.

Under Mr. Marcus’s leadership, the Louis D. Brandeis Center, a human rights organization that champions Jewish causes, filed an amicus brief in 2012, the first time the Supreme Court heard *Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin*. In the brief, the organization argued that “race conscious admission standards are unfair to individuals, and unhealthy for society at large.”

The organization argued that Asian-American students were particularly victimized by race “quotas” that were once used to exclude Jewish people.

As the implications for affirmative action for college admissions play out in court, it is unclear what the decision holds for elementary and secondary schools. New York City is embroiled in a debate about whether to change its entrance standard — currently a single test — for its most prestigious high schools to allow for more black and Latino students.

https://www.nytimes.com/2018/07/03/us/politics/trump-affirmative-action-race-schools.html?rref=collection%2Ftimestopic%2FAffirmative%20Action&action=click&contentCollection=timestopics®ion=stream&module=stream_unit&version=latest&contentPlacement=1&pgtype=collection

DOCUMENT 3 – ‘DOES THE NATION STILL NEED AFFIRMATIVE ACTION?’

PRELIMINARY WORK

Make sure you understand the following words and concepts:

To curb ostensible discrimination, colleges/universities, policies

INTRODUCTION

- 1) Present the document (title, date, source, author)
- 2) What is the topic discussed in this document?

ANALYSIS

- 1) What is the decision of the Trump administration as regards affirmative action policies?
- 2) What is the Democrats’ view on the subject?
- 3) What was the Obama administration’s opinion on race? What is the Trump administration’s?
- 4) Do colleges’ decision makers have the same idea on affirmative action? Give examples.

CONCLUSION

Sum up the main ideas discussed above in order to point out the Department of Education’s policies regarding diversity.

Does the nation still need affirmative action?

By Editorial Board

August 6, 2017

Does the nation still need affirmative action? Here is the big picture.

According to Education Department statistics, there has been no dramatic change since the Supreme Court found in 2003 that promoting diversity on college campuses is a compelling national interest. The share of 18- to 24-year-old whites who are enrolled in college stayed about flat between 2003 and 2015, at 42 percent. African American enrollment in that age group changed only a bit, from 32 percent to 35 percent, continuing to lag whites. Though Latinos gained, from 24 percent to 37 percent, they, too, continue to trail whites in the percentage of college-age people enrolled. Over a longer horizon, African Americans' progress looks more substantial: College enrollment among black 18- to 24-year-olds in 2015 was up 19 percentage points from 1970. But white enrollment surged a comparable amount over that period, by 15 percentage points.

The typical college campus in the United States is still very white — and the typical university of higher quality, even whiter. In 2014, whites made up the bulk of students in four-year colleges — 58 percent. Meanwhile, the four-year college population was 13 percent African American, up only a point from a decade before, and 12 percent Latino, up a few points over a decade. Whites are somewhat less dominant at two-year colleges, making up 51 percent of the population attending those schools. African Americans account for 15 percent and Latinos 23 percent, higher than their four-year figures.

This is the context in which to consider last week's news that the Trump Justice Department is preparing to investigate and possibly sue universities with race-conscious admissions policies. The New York Times reported that the goal would be to curb ostensible discrimination against white applicants. A Justice Department spokeswoman indicated that the department was interested in investigating "one admissions complaint" relating to Asian American students.

We hope that is true. Because a wider federal effort challenging affirmative action policies would represent a drastic change in the department's priorities and, if the idea was to protect whites, a perversion of civil rights law meant to protect disadvantaged minority groups. Though the Supreme Court recently reaffirmed that carefully designed affirmative action policies are legal in public university admissions, the court also left some room for lawsuits claiming that colleges' race-conscious admissions practices are not narrow enough. If the weight and resources of the federal

government are devoted to suing universities, schools could be discouraged from using legal methods to build diverse student bodies.

In the long term, Chief Justice John G. Roberts Jr. was right when he wrote, “The way to stop discrimination on the basis of race is to stop discriminating on the basis of race.” We blame no American who feels queasy about any policy, particularly at state-run institutions, that considers race in any formal or informal way. The possibility that high-performing Asian Americans may face implicit quotas is particularly troubling. But the nation has not yet made enough progress in clearing paths of opportunity for historically disadvantaged minorities or in building college communities that reflect its rapidly diversifying character. It is as important for minority students who benefit from affirmative action as it is for their white peers that the nation’s universities prepare all of them for citizenship in a polyglot country. The Justice Department should not impede universities’ efforts to do that.

https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/does-the-nation-still-need-affirmative-action/2017/08/06/bdd56db4-77cb-11e7-9eac-d56bd5568db8_story.html?noredirect=on&utm_term=.c4829a48504e

DOCUMENT 4 – ‘BLACK PEOPLE AREN’T KEEPING WHITE AMERICANS OUT OF COLLEGE. RICH PEOPLE ARE.’

PRELIMINARY WORK

Make sure you understand the following concepts and words:

An elite institution, college admission, K-12 education

INTRODUCTION

- 1) Present the document (title, date, source, author)
- 2) What is the topic discussed in this document?

ANALYSIS

- 1) Are white students often discriminated in universities?
- 2) Are college admissions selective? Is money an important criterion?
- 3) Do minorities threaten the American workforce?
- 4) What is the real problem preventing minorities from entering top colleges?
- 5) Who gets easy access to top colleges?

CONCLUSION

Sum up the main ideas discussed above in order to analyse diversity or the absence of diversity in some American universities

Black people aren't keeping white Americans out of college. Rich people are.

By Christine Emba

Columnist

August 4, 2017

The 200th day of Donald Trump's presidency draws near, and his legislative failures have become all too apparent. What better time to change the conversation and re-energize the base? And what better way than by raising the lightning rod that is affirmative action?

According to a memo leaked to the New York Times, the Trump administration is planning to redirect Justice Department resources to investigate and potentially sue colleges that use "intentional race-based discrimination" in admissions. The project was quickly understood to be targeting affirmative action policies that many on the right see as "discriminating" against white applicants — in particular, ones that might give black and Latino students an edge. This move comes despite the Supreme Court upholding the use of affirmative action to diversify campuses just last year.

Justice Department officials attempted to play down the initiative after the story broke, stating that they planned to investigate a single complaint involving Asian American applicants, not whites. But it barely mattered. The message was sent.

Affirmative action is a consistent hobbyhorse on the right because it combines real anxieties with compelling falsehoods. College admission — especially to the elite institutions most often hit with affirmative action lawsuits — has become more selective and is an increasingly important factor in the creation and perpetuation of wealth and opportunity. Elite colleges serve as steppingstones into politics, finance, law and Silicon Valley; higher incomes tend to follow. Even so, 80 percent of top students who apply are accepted into at least one elite school, if not their No. 1 choice. But measures that help historically disadvantaged populations to take advantage of the same opportunity are nonetheless characterized as zero-sum.

What is essential to understand is that it's not a vast crowd of black or brown people keeping white Americans out of the colleges of their choice, especially not the working-class white Americans among whom Trump finds his base of support. In fact, income tips the scale much more than race: At 38 top colleges in the United States, more students come from the top 1 percent of income earners than from the bottom 60 percent. Really leveling the admissions playing field, assuming the Trump administration actually cares about doing so, would involve much broader efforts to redistribute wealth and power. A focus on fringe campaigns against affirmative action suggests it does not.

Addressing inequalities in K-12 education, for instance, could help at-risk students of all races increase their chances of attending a top college — or any college at all. Policies such as property-tax-based funding for schools and the curiously slanted allocation of talented teachers (in Louisiana, for instance, a student in the poorest quartile of schools is almost three times as likely to

be taught by an ineffective teacher as a student in the wealthiest quartile is) give a tremendous boost in college admissions to children from high-income families, often at the expense of their lower-income peers.

And right up to the application-writing doorstep, the beneficiaries of the biggest extra edge in admissions are more often than not the children of alumni. At Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Georgetown and Stanford universities, the acceptance rate for legacy applicants is between two and three times higher than the general admissions rate. Pressing universities to drop legacy preferences, following the example of other elite schools such as the University of Oxford and University of Cambridge, could free up spots for those without that built-in advantage. Trump's own wealthy-parent-sponsored education at the University of Pennsylvania, followed by the subsequent admission of three of his four adult children, makes that particular initiative seem unlikely.

In many ways, the Trump Justice Department's proposed attack on affirmative action is a microcosm of how the president won the 2016 election and continues to maintain a base of support. First, Trump taps into a mainstream concern, one tied to how America's economic system is changing and how some individuals are left at the margin: Employment? Immigration? College? Take your pick. Then, instead of addressing the issue in a way that embraces both its complexity and well-established research, officials opt for simplistic talking points known to inflame an already agitated base: Immigrants are sneaking into the country and stealing your jobs! Minorities are pushing you out of college!

The Trump administration assumes that picking race-focused fights is the most successful way to distract from its failures and to pander to a grievance-inspired base. The level of support for this latest attempt may prove it right.

https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/black-people-arent-keeping-white-americans-out-of-college-rich-people-are/2017/08/04/e478952e-794a-11e7-8f39-eeb7d3a2d304_story.html?utm_term=.f0c2a18cf859

DOSSIER 3

THE MELTING POT

DOCUMENT 1 – ‘THE MELTING POT – DEFINITION’

PRELIMINARY WORK

Make sure you understand the following words, concepts and references to people or events:

J. Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur, Israel Zangwill, *Anglo-conformity*, ‘pressure cooker’, cultural pluralism, Immigration Act of 1965

INTRODUCTION

- 1) Present the document (title, date, source, author)
- 2) What is the topic discussed in this document?

ANALYSIS

- 1) How did J. Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur describe America?
- 2) What was the norm?
- 3) What does cultural pluralism mean?
- 4) What about the post-1965 immigration? Why is post-1965 seen as a turning point? Explain.
- 5) In post-1965 immigration, do all immigrants have the same pattern of inclusion? If not, why?

CONCLUSION

Sum up the main ideas discussed above in order to interpret the definition of Melting Pot.

The Melting Pot – Definition

Dictionary of American History

COPYRIGHT 2003 The Gale Group Inc.

By Victor Nee and Richard Alba

Amalgamation of settlers of diverse national origin has long been linked with the idealistic self-image of America as a new type of nation-state. The French-born immigrant J. Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur (1735–1813), in *Letters from an American Farmer* (1782), described America as a country where “individuals of all nations are melted into a new race of men.” Though the nationalities included in the early expression of the melting pot ideal were largely limited to northwestern Europe, the vision of American national identity as based on cross-ethnic amalgamation eventually came to include nearly all European nationalities. British writer Israel Zangwill’s (1864–1926) early twentieth-century play *The Melting Pot* was the first to use the term as a metaphor of assimilation in the American context of mass immigration from Europe. The melting pot ideal was depicted in an illustration featured on the play’s theater program, which shows many strands of people walking past the Statue of Liberty into a huge boiling pot. As an ideology of immigrant assimilation, the melting pot has persisted as an idealistic vision of the inclusive nature of assimilation in America.

The melting pot ideal is often referred to as an alternative conception of immigrant incorporation in a continuum of idealized conception of assimilation as a cultural belief. At one end of the continuum is *Anglo-conformity*, a belief associated with the normative requirement that individual members of immigrant groups adapt to the culture and institutions established by the early Anglo-Saxon settlers of colonial America. Milton Gordon in *Assimilation in American Life* (1964) interpreted *Angloconformity* to mean that immigrants and their descendants adopt the beliefs and norms of middle-class Anglo-American culture, which he maintained remained largely unchanged despite successive waves of immigration from Europe, except for minor changes in cuisine and place names. Anglo-conformity tacitly rules out the viability of intact Old World identities and cultural practices outside of the Anglo-American mold. It emphasizes the need for immigrants to “unlearn” their cultural traits in order to learn the new social practices necessary for acceptance. In the Anglo-conformity formulation, critics underline that this approach to assimilation tacitly assumes the superiority of Anglo-American culture. Anglo-conformity is often associated with the

public policy of “pressure-cooker” Americanization during and immediately after World War I (1914–1918).

At the other end of the continuum is *cultural pluralism*, an ideology that conceives of American society as a quiltlike mosaic of diverse cultural traditions and ethnic identities that coexist as subcultures alongside a dominant Anglo-American mainstream. According to cultural pluralism, an ideology of immigrant incorporation first espoused by the philosopher Horace Kallen (1882–1974) in the early twentieth century, the strength and durability of American democracy stems from extending equality of rights, religious belief, and cultural expression to all citizens. The basic idea was that a society benefited when the ethnic groups retained cultural distinctiveness, contributing to the cultural richness and diversity of American society. Multiculturalism is the contemporary expression of this vision of civil society.

Sociological studies by Stanley Lieberson, Herbert Gans, Richard Alba, and Mary Waters of the “twilight of ethnicity” of descendants of mass immigration from eastern and southern Europe document that the melting pot ideal of amalgamation has conformed broadly to the historical experiences of white ethnics. Old World identities and cultural practices have become mostly a symbolic attachment for white ethnics as cross-ethnic social life increasingly blurred ethnic boundaries and identities. Cross-ethnic marriages among white ethnics have become so commonplace that many identify as “American” in ethnicity and no longer list the Old World ethnic identities in response to the decennial census questionnaire item on ethnic origin.

Whether conceived as the effects of the beliefs and norms of Anglo-conformity or the melting pot, assimilation has been the primary pattern of incorporation for the European groups that migrated to America. For the descendants of mass immigration from Europe in the late nineteenth century, however, it is likely that the social process of assimilation was a protracted process taking place through incremental changes across generations. The pattern of increasing cross-ethnic marriage within religious boundaries was first identified in analysis of quantitative evidence for the 1940s. Since the historic passage of the Immigration Act of 1965, more than twenty-five million immigrants have settled in expansive immigrant metropolises, greatly increasing the ethnic diversity of American cities. Nearly one out of five Americans are now either foreign-born or children of immigrant parents. The new immigration, largely from Latin America and Asia, has driven a rapid demographic transformation of major urban centers.

Skeptics of the applicability of the melting pot ideal to post-1965 immigrants have justifiably pointed to serious problems in the assumption of assimilation of new immigrants and their children.

Although the post-1965 immigrants have often settled in mixed neighborhoods and established ongoing social relationships not only with members of their own ethnic group but also with individuals outside of their ethnic group, the sheer numbers of immigrants concentrated in inner cities suggests that much of the cross-ethnic social interactions are with members of other ethnic groups that are also part of the new immigration.

Post-1965 immigration is more diverse than that of the past, in terms of human and financial capital, race, and legal status. Members of some ethnic groups enter American society at a high level almost from the start because they bring wealth or educational and professional credentials that provide an initial advantage. These immigrants and their children are in a position to benefit from the opportunities open to minorities in the wake of the civil rights movement of the 1960s. It is not uncommon for the families of immigrant professionals and entrepreneurs to establish domicile in middle-class suburban communities and for their children to attend selective American schools and pursue professional occupations themselves. The melting pot ideal remains a compelling metaphor of assimilation for the children of immigrants from professional and entrepreneurial backgrounds. But intermarriage often takes place among native-born children of immigrant parents, similar to the pattern of intermarriage within religious groups observed for European Americans in the twentieth century.

The pattern of incorporation is different for the native-born children of labor migrants from the Caribbean and Central America. With low levels of formal schooling, labor migrants compete for positional advantage at the bottom rungs of the labor market. The reliance of labor migrants on ethnic-based social capital, moreover, leads to incorporation within immigrant ethnic enclaves where initial disadvantages in human capital are likely to be passed on to the second generation, increasing the risk of a melting pot experience that results in amalgamation with downtrodden domestic minorities in the inner cities. This bifurcation of the melting pot experience of children of advantaged human-capital immigrants and disadvantaged labor migrants is the focus of studies of *segmented assimilation*. However, the extent of downward mobility may be overstated in the segmented assimilation literature, as horizontal mobility even within the same occupational groups often leads to substantial socioeconomic gains for the second generation.

In conclusion, the melting pot ideal has a long history as a cultural belief in the viability of the amalgamation of diverse ethnic groups in the making of the American nation-state. With successive waves of immigration, the ideology of the melting pot has emphasized a hybrid vision of American

society and culture stemming from intermarriage across ethnic groups and cultural mixing resulting from structural assimilation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alba, Richard, and Victor Nee. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Glazer, Nathan, and Daniel Patrick Moynihan. 1963. *Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Gordon, Milton M. 1964. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lieberson, Stanley, and Mary C. Waters. 1988. *From Many Strands: Ethnic and Racial Groups in Contemporary America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

St. John de Crèvecoeur, J. Hector. 1782. Letter III: What Is an American. In *Letters from an American Farmer*. London: T. Davies.

http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/treatise/american_farmer/letters.htm.

<https://www.encyclopedia.com/history/united-states-and-canada/us-history/melting-pot>

DOCUMENT 2 – ‘THE RISE AND FALL OF THE ‘AMERICAN MELTING POT’’

PRELIMINARY WORK

Make sure you understand the following words, concepts and references to people or events:

The story of David Quixano, the Puritans, the Pilgrims, the French Revolution, nativist partisans, Teddy Roosevelt, Jim Crow, ‘cultural mosaic’

INTRODUCTION

- 1) Present the document (title, date, source, author)
- 2) What is the topic discussed in this document?

ANALYSIS

- 1) Who did Israel Zangwill describe in his play?
- 2) What about immigration waves before the 20th century?
- 3) Who were the nativist partisans? What kind of ideas did the nativist partisans have?
- 4) Can you explain the “process of Americanization”?
- 5) What are the two interpretations of Zandwill’s play?
- 6) Can you explain the expression “salad bow”? What is its contrary?

CONCLUSION

Sum up the main ideas discussed above in order to analyse how the concept of the “American melting pot” has evolved.

The Rise and Fall of the ‘American Melting Pot’

By Julia Higgins

Dec 2015

In 1908, British writer Israel Zangwill wrote a stage play, the title of which popularized a term that came to be used as a metaphor for America itself: *The Melting Pot*. Debuting before U.S. audiences in 1909, Zangwill’s play told the story of David Quixano, a fictional Russian-Jewish immigrant who is intent on moving to the United States after his family dies in a violent anti-Semitic riot in Russia. For Quixano (and many actual immigrants at the time), America, in all of its culturally “blended” glory, stood as a beacon of light visible from the darkest and most oppressed corners of the world, offering promise, possibility, and maybe even acceptance.

Well before Zangwill put the “melting pot” label into the global lexicon, the United States had already earned a reputation as an immigrant haven. New England’s first immigrant settlers, the Puritans and the Pilgrims, left their native England in the early 1600s in order to practice their respective religions more freely, without antagonistic meddling from the Church of England. In the early 1800s, the French Revolution saw thousands of rural Europeans flee to America, to escape the war-torn countryside and a government in shambles. As a result of the great famine that struck Ireland in the first half of the nineteenth century, millions of Irish Catholic immigrants crossed the Atlantic, settling into various pockets of the East Coast. The next wave came from Asia, with Chinese and Japanese immigrants arriving to California in droves, working throughout the West as the Gold Rush and the railroad stirred dreams of vast riches.

The arrival of these immigrants, and with them their varied cultural backgrounds, was essential in molding America’s public identity. And it fed into America’s self-history, enshrining the United States as a refuge for all those suffering persecution for political or personal beliefs; a shelter that accepts a wide variety of faiths and ideologies.

This widely publicized version of America as a wholly inclusive land was not in touch with reality, with a widespread desire to strip immigrants of their individual customs, and force them into a

version of whiteness that permeates society to this, lurking right beneath the surface. There is a rich American tradition of rejecting immigrants and refugees, and those who do make it through often face calls to assimilate and deny their cultural roots.

Prior to the late 1800s, the federal government did little to control the flow of immigration. Naturalization guidelines were put in place in the late eighteenth century, and starting in 1819, immigrants were required to report their arrival to the U.S. government. The weak enforcement of this provision allowed for a high number of undocumented immigrants. State governments attempted to pass their own immigration laws, and the chaos that ensued across state borders finally led the federal government to take control of the issue in the late 1800s. With anti-immigration heightening throughout the native-born public, immigration laws were introduced as a means of placating an upset public.

Nativist partisans have a long history in America, but began to emerge as a major national political force in the 1850s, becoming major opponents to immigration as they stressed the importance of pure “American values.” Though Irish immigrants adapted easily to many facets of American life, for example, nativists denounced their Catholic religion as un-American, put up store-window signs reading “No Irish Need Apply” blocking them from prospective jobs, and tried to stem the flow of immigration from Ireland. Many immigrants — especially those with Italian and Irish roots — were plainly seen as inferior, and depicted as ape-like in media from the era. For these immigrants, gaining acceptance often required them to ostracize the next wave of immigrants; you became white by opposing those who weren’t.

This dynamic contributed to the demonization of Asian immigrants in the 1870s and 1880s. The Page Act of 1875 specifically targeted Asian laborers, convicts, and prostitutes by denying them entry to the United States, though its primary mission was to make immigration harder for all Asians. The Chinese Exclusion Act followed in 1882, and effectively banned Chinese immigrants from entry into the United States. Though these laws were specific to Asian immigrants, broader immigration laws soon succeeded them, enacted with the intention of tightening border security and making it harder for immigrants to enter legally.

Despite these new laws and bouts of anti-immigrant fervor, foreigners continued to flock to America. The third major wave of immigration in the United States occurred around the turn of the

twentieth century, and brought with it immigrants from previously unrepresented regions (Eastern Europe and Russia, among others). The cycle — immigrate, and then turn against those who come after — began anew, and a new assimilation movement arose.

The government and the public encouraged newly minted American citizens to absorb a new culture almost immediately upon arrival, a process dubbed “Americanization.” In an oft-quoted passage, President Teddy Roosevelt called for assimilation, exclaiming, “We have room for but one language here [in America], and that is the English language.” Citizenship programs were established across the country, and free English lessons were available in most major cities and towns. The Ford Motor Company, among other major businesses, kept immigrant laborers after working hours for mandatory courses to teach them English and instill American values. The Young Men’s Christian Association also offered classes that taught immigrants the “American way,” educating them on American hobbies, hygiene practices, family life, and more.

Zangwill’s play debuted just as the Americanization movement took off, receiving mixed reviews from both the public and critics. In his article, “How The Melting Pot Stirred America,” author Joe Kraus notes that fans of the play saw it as a “powerful articulation of the promise of America.” Those who disliked the production, however, saw it as a representation of the mounting cultural hierarchy in America. “The Melting Pot, which celebrated America’s capacity to accommodate difference,” writes Kraus, “appeared on the scene at a moment when the American theater world ceased to accept heterogeneity in its productions and, more subtly, ceased to accommodate difference in its audience.” Thus, *The Melting Pot*, for all of its insistence that America was a joyful marriage of diverse cultures, actually symbolized the end of cultural acceptance in the United States.

Even so, many immigrants continued viewing America in something like the spirit of Zangwill’s *Quixano*: “America is God’s Crucible, the great Melting-Pot where all the races of Europe are melting and reforming ... Germans and Frenchmen, Irishmen and Englishmen, Jews and Russians — into the Crucible with you all! God is making the American.”

Despite its shortcomings, the great melting pot was the face of America for decades after Zangwill’s play. Even as Asian immigrants were forced into Chinatowns (the first of which was formed in response to rising racial tensions), Japanese-Americans were interned, and Jim Crow reigned,

America proudly viewed itself as a cornucopia of ideas and ethnicities. In the mid-twentieth century, however, the melting pot concept began receiving more critical examination, just as a fourth wave of immigration crested in the United States.

Unlike the episodes of major immigration that came before it, the fourth wave was comprised predominantly of Spanish-speaking immigrants from Central and South America. Like many of their predecessors, they were met with distrust and dislike by the American public. Though many tried to assimilate into American daily life, they were seen as cultural and economic threats. Nonetheless, aspects of Hispanic culture leaked into American life.

With so many ethnic groups a part of twentieth century America, calls for assimilation began to see opposition in the form of multiculturalism, a school of thought that stresses the importance of recognizing individual ethnicities. It's in direct contrast to the concept of a melting pot, and has earned catchphrase metaphors of its own, like "salad bowl" and "cultural mosaic." With the introduction of this ideology, Zangwill's grand melting pot theory was aggressively called into question.

Even now, multiculturalism is but one of the terms used in an ongoing debate of how best to describe America's diverse and growing population. Though Zangwill's play advocated for America as the great equalizer, the melting pot was no more than a myth, albeit one cherished by many Americans. The great number of ethnic backgrounds that dwell in the United States make it difficult to assign but one name to the country, and one that adequately describes the mixture of many at that.

<https://wilsonquarterly.com/search/?byline=Julia+Higgins>

DOCUMENT 3 – ‘MELTING POTS AND SALAD BOWLS’

PRELIMINARY WORK

Make sure you understand the following words, concepts and references to people or events:

Ralph Waldo Emerson, ‘the fusing process’, civil society

INTRODUCTION

- 1) Present the document (title, date, source, author)
- 2) What is the topic discussed in this document?

ANALYSIS

- 1) Why did Ralph Waldo Emerson use the melting pot theory?
- 2) What did the immigrants have to do to become American?
- 3) What about the notion of melting pot after the 1960s?
- 4) According to the author, what are the shortcomings of multiculturalism?
- 5) What is his conclusion about the “American common identity”?

CONCLUSION

Sum up the main ideas discussed above to underline the arguments the author uses to support his vision of immigration.

Melting Pots and Salad Bowls

by Bruce Thornton

Friday, October 26, 2012

For people in the United States, immigration has particular resonance. We continually hear that we are a nation of immigrants. Many people see the laws that try to control illegal immigration and its social and economic costs as a repudiation of this heritage—an ethnocentric or even racist attempt to impose and monitor an exclusive notion of American identity and culture. Opponents also charge that these laws invite the police to practice discriminatory racial profiling, creating the possibility that legal immigrants and U.S. citizens will be unjustly detained and questioned.

President Obama stated in 2010 that tough immigration-control laws like Arizona’s—which was stripped of several provisions during the most recent Supreme Court term—“threaten to undermine basic notions of fairness that we cherish as Americans.” The greater significance of such laws, however, is the way they touch on deeply held and frequently conflicting beliefs about the role of immigration in American history and national identity. These beliefs have generated two popular metaphors: the melting pot and the salad bowl.

FUSED INTO INCLUSION AND TOLERANCE

The melting pot metaphor arose in the eighteenth century, sometimes appearing as the smelting pot or crucible, and it described the fusion of various religious sects, nationalities, and ethnic groups into one distinct people: *E pluribus unum*. In 1782, French immigrant J. Hector St. John de Crevecoeur wrote that in America, “individuals of all nations are melted into a new race of men, whose labors and posterity will one day cause great changes in the world.”

The image of the melting pot drew its strength from the idea of unity fostered by beliefs and ideals—not race, blood, or sect.

A century later, Ralph Waldo Emerson used the melting pot image to describe “the fusing process” that “transforms the English, the German, the Irish emigrant into an American. . . . The individuality of the immigrant, almost even his traits of race and religion, fuse down in the democratic alembic like chips of brass thrown into the melting pot.” The phrase gained wider currency in 1908, during the great wave of Slavic, Jewish, and Italian immigration, when Israel Zangwill’s play *The Melting Pot* was produced. In it, a character says with enthusiasm, “America is God’s crucible, the great melting-pot where all the races of Europe are melting and re-forming!”

This image, then, communicated the historically exceptional notion of American identity as one formed not by the accidents of blood, sect, or race, but by the unifying beliefs and political ideals

enshrined in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution: the notion of individual, inalienable human rights that transcend group identity. Of course, over the centuries this ideal was violated in American history by racism, ethnocentrism, xenophobia, and other ignorant prejudices. But in time laws and social mores changed, making the United States today the most inclusive and tolerant nation in the world, the destination of choice for millions desiring greater freedom and opportunity.

Of course, this process of assimilation also entailed costs and sacrifice. Having voted with his feet for the superiority of America, the immigrant was required to become American: to learn the language, history, political principles, and civic customs that identified one as an American. This demand was necessarily in conflict with the immigrants' old culture and its values, and, at times, led to a painful loss of old ways and customs. But how immigrants negotiated the conflicts and trade-offs between their new and old identities was up to them. Moreover, they remained free in civil society to celebrate and retain those cultures through fraternal organizations, ethnic festivals, language schools, and religious guilds.

Ultimately, though, they had to make their first loyalty to America and its ideals. If some custom, value, or belief from the old country conflicted with those core American values, then the old way had to be modified or discarded if the immigrant wanted to participate fully in American social, economic, and political life. The immigrant had to adjust. No one expected the majority culture to modify its values to accommodate the immigrant; this would have been impossible, at any rate, because there were so many immigrants from so many lands that it would have fragmented American culture. No matter the costs, assimilation was the only way to forge an unum from so many pluribus.

A TAINTED SALAD

Starting in the 1960s, however, another vision of American pluralism arose, captured in the metaphor of the salad bowl. Rather than assimilating, different ethnic groups now would coexist in their separate identities like the ingredients in a salad, bound together only by the "dressing" of law and the market. This view expresses the ideology of multiculturalism, which goes far beyond the demand that ethnic differences be acknowledged rather than disparaged.

Multiculturalism, not content to respect or celebrate diversity, seeks to indict American civilization for its imperial, colonial, xenophobic, and racist sins.

Long before multiculturalism came along, Americans wrestled with the conflicts and clashes that immigrants experienced. A book from the 1940s on "intercultural education" announced its intent "to help our schools to deal constructively with the problem of intercultural and interracial tensions among our people" and to alleviate "the hurtful discrimination against some of the minority groups which compose our people." One recommendation was to create school curricula that would "help

build respect for groups not otherwise sufficiently esteemed.” Modern multiculturalism takes that idea but goes much farther, endorsing a species of identity politics predicated on victimization.

Multiculturalism as we know it is not about respecting or celebrating the salad bowl of cultural or ethnic diversity, but about indicting American civilization for its imperial, colonial, xenophobic, and racist sins. Multiculturalism idealizes immigrant cultures and ignores their various dysfunctional practices and values. At the same time, it relentlessly attacks America as a predatory, soulless, exploitative, warmongering villain responsible for all the world’s ills.

Multiculturalism confines the individual in the box of his race or culture, despite his own wishes or chosen identity.

Worse still, the identity politics at the heart of multiculturalism directly contradict the core assumption of our liberal democracy: the principle of individual and inalienable rights that each of us possess no matter what group or sect we belong to. Multiculturalism confines the individual in the box of his race or culture—the latter often simplistically defined in clichés and stereotypes—and then demands rights and considerations for that group, a special treatment usually based on the assumption that the group has been victimized in the past and so deserves some form of reparations. The immigrant “other” (excluding, of course, immigrants from Europe) is now a privileged victim entitled to public acknowledgement of his victim status and the superiority of his native culture.

FOR WANT OF A SHARED DESTINY

And so the common identity shaped by the Constitution, the English language, and the history, mores, and heroes of America gives way to multifarious, increasingly fragmented micro-identities. But without loyalty to the common core values and ideals upon which national identity is founded, without a commitment to the non-negotiable foundational beliefs that transcend special interests, without the sense of a shared destiny and goals, a nation starts to weaken as its people see no goods beyond their own groups’ interests and successes.

Multicultural identity politics worsen the problems of illegal immigration. Many immigrants, legal or otherwise, are now encouraged to celebrate the cultures they have fled and to prefer them to the one that gave them greater freedom and opportunity. Our schools and popular culture reinforce this separatism, encouraging Americans to relate to those outside their identity group not as fellow citizens, but as either rivals for power and influence or oppressors (from whom one is owed reparations in the form of government transfers or preferential policies). The essence of being an American has been reduced to a flabby “tolerance,” which in fact masks a profound intolerance and anti-Americanism because the groups that multiculturalism celebrates are defined in terms of their victimization by a sinful America.

No matter how the laws of Arizona and other states fare, this problem of assimilation will remain. Millions of the illegal immigrants in this country are no doubt striving to become Americans despite the obstacles multiculturalism has put in their path. Many others have not developed that sense of American identity, nor have they been compelled, as immigrants were in the past, to acknowledge the civic demands of America and give her their loyalty. Their relation to this country is merely economic or parasitic. Figuring out how to determine which immigrants are which, and what to do with those who prefer not to be Americans, will be the challenge of the years ahead.

Adapted from Defining Ideas (www.hoover.org/publications/defining-ideas).

<https://www.hoover.org/research/melting-pots-and-salad-bowls>

DOCUMENT 4 – ‘THE GREAT MELTING POT’

PRELIMINARY WORK

Make sure you understand the following words, concepts and references to people or events:

The American myths, the Manifest Destiny, ‘patriots’, the Know Nothing movement, Prohibition laws, Horace Greeley, the green card, quotas for immigrants, Harry Truman

INTRODUCTION

- 1) Present the document (title, date, source, author)
- 2) What is the topic discussed in this document?

ANALYSIS

- 1) What are the American myths?
- 2) What is the conflict about immigration that The United States has always had?
- 3) What is ‘nativism’ for scholars?
- 4) What are the secret societies?

CONCLUSION

Sum up the main ideas discussed above and define the author’s ideas about immigration in America

The Great Melting Pot

By Rev. Kevin Wm. Wildes, April 10th 2016

Like any great nation, America has a number of myths about itself. There are myths about the possibility of achievement where “anyone can grow up to be president.” And there are myths about opportunity that were epitomized in author and newspaper editor Horace Greeley’s famous line: “Go West, young man, go West,” stated in 1871, as America expanded westward holding tight to a belief of Manifest Destiny. Another great American myth portrays America as “the great melting pot,” a gumbo of sorts, in which people come from all over the world, from different nations, ethnicities, and cultures, to become one.

Any enduring myth is anchored in an element of truth. But there is usually more to the story. The current debates about immigration in the United States are not new to American life. Historically, the United States has often found itself conflicted on the issue of immigration. On the one hand, part of American’s self-understanding lies in being a nation of immigrants. But, at the same time, we often have been deeply hostile and fearful of immigrants to this country. And the underlying causes of those fears and hostilities are not new and generally are born of ignorance.

The 19th century and early 20th century were times of an influx of immigrants both from Asia (mostly Chinese) and from southern Europe (Italians and Greeks). Many of these new immigrants looked different from the Anglo-Saxon immigrants who had come before. And they worshipped differently than most Americans. In the 19th century, more than 4 million Irish - among them, my ancestors — immigrated to America to pursue the “American Dream.” Yet they were greeted with hostility and suspicion.

The Irish were widely seen as alcoholics, and they were, by and large, Catholic, which caused fears about allegiance to a foreign pope. This prejudice remained vibrant through

the 1960 presidential election! The new immigrants' culture of drinking and their use of pubs and bars as gathering places collided with some Yankees' Puritan strain. They arrived at a time of economic unrest. Artisans were losing their jobs to mass production while immigrants were willing to work hard, for little money, in factories.

Scholars often use the term "nativism" as a general term for "opposition to immigration." Nativism is often based on fears that the immigrants will distort or spoil existing cultural values. However, it has been observed that nativists usually do not consider themselves nativists. Rather they see themselves as "patriots" or "law-abiding citizens."

Contemporary Americans are often surprised when they learn that before World War I there were no green cards, no visas, and no quotas for immigrants. Immigrants just arrived. The American government did use, to some extent, health criteria for admitting people. Mae Ngai, a legal and political historian at Columbia University who studies American immigration, said that "... if you could walk without a limp, and you had \$30 in your pocket, you walked right in." And so they came — with no paperwork issues or quotas or restrictions or immigration courts. Political backlash followed, in the form of secret societies that coalesced into the Know Nothing movement. The Know Nothings grew so popular that, in 1854, they overwhelmingly took over the Massachusetts Legislature — where they pushed for Prohibition laws, aimed squarely at Irish and German cultures. The Know Nothings also supported an effort to extend the naturalization period to 21 years. At the time, the debate centered not on sending immigrants back but on denying them the right to vote.

As we head toward the presidential elections in November, immigration remains a central, and often divisive, issue. Presidential debates and campaign speeches stir up controversies that are repeated and expounded upon at modern-day kitchen tables - social media.

Our past can help us to be better today. President Harry Truman challenged Americans not to live within but to live outside of our fears. He reminded Americans that: “America was not built on fear. America was built on courage, on imagination, and unbeatable determination to do the job at hand.” Our past reminds us that, in spite of our fears, past and present, our differences are part of what makes the United States a richer, stronger nation made up of many cultures. Our past reminds us that we are a nation of immigrants and that many of those immigrants came to the U.S. without green cards or visas. And, in spite of hostility, stereotypes, and prejudice, immigrants became part of the rich, diverse fabric that makes America today. We must look past our own fear, to seek mutual understanding and acceptance.

https://www.huffingtonpost.com/rev-kevin-wm-wildes-sj-phd/the-great-melting-pot_b_12340856.html