### RI.9-10.1

Cite strong and thorough textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/Lesson Suggestions</th>
<th>Assessment FOR Learning Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **The following strategy utilizes a CCSS text exemplar from the 9-10 grade band. This strategy can be adapted to fit a variety of texts with an aligned level of complexity.** | **Statement Starter.** Students partner and provide each other objective feedback on their completed tables. The teacher then presents the class with a statement:  
   “Ladies and gentlemen, Patrick Henry was a pacifist!”  
   or  
   “Margaret Chase Smith believes people should have the right to criticize.”  
   Students then work collaboratively with their partner to generate a cited summary in agreement with or dispute of the statement starter. As students write, they use the following questions to guide their responses:  
   1. Are we interpreting the text correctly?  
   2. Are we citing specific language from the text?  
   3. Is our evidence convincing?  
   Continual objective feedback is evident throughout the exercise which utilizes both discussion and diagnostic questioning techniques. |
| **Close Read.** Students conduct a close read of a text such as Patrick Henry’s “Speech to the Second Virginia Convention”. After reading the text each student obtains a citation table for recording data as they conduct a second read. Within the table, students write specific phrases or sentences from the text and articulate the significance of each. The strategy is modeled prior to beginning the exercise and students are able to “read like a detective” (PARCC, 2011, p. 86) to determine the specific message the author is trying to convey. This activity could also be used to conduct a close read of Margaret Chase Smith’s “Remarks to the Senate in Support of a Declaration of Conscience” or any other text with a level of complexity aligned to this grade band. | |
| **Comparison and Synthesis of Ideas (CSI).** After closely analyzing separate texts, students compare and contrast ideas from each; being certain to cite the specific words each author used. This strategy can also be used to help students recognize thematic content that is common to both texts. Students should be able to generate both differences and similarities among texts, as well as synthesize the information that each text shares. | **Upgrade.** The teacher converts the citation table into a form within Google Docs. Students submit answers online. The following day, in small groups, students study the compiled responses and select a certain number of sentences that combine to outline the author’s intent. Discussions are continually guided to focus on specific words, phrases and sentences the author used to deliver his/her message.  
   **These suggestions can also be adapted to diagnose competency in the following standards:** (W.9-10.4,6) (SL.9-10.1,3,4) (L.9-10.1,2,4,5) |

---
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MR. PRESIDENT: No man thinks more highly than I do of the patriotism, as well as abilities, of the very worthy gentlemen who have just addressed the House. But different men often see the same subject in different lights; and, therefore, I hope it will not be thought disrespectful to those gentlemen if, entertaining as I do, opinions of a character very opposite to theirs, I shall speak my sentiments freely, and without reserve. This is no time for cant. The question before the House is one of awful moment to this country. For my own part, I consider it as nothing less than a question of freedom or slavery; and in proportion to the magnitude of the subject ought to be the freedom of the debate. It is only in this way that we can hope to arrive at truth, and fulfill the great responsibility which we hold to God and our country. Should I keep back my opinions at such a time, through fear of giving offense, I should consider myself as guilty of treason towards my country, and of an act of disloyalty towards the majesty of heaven, which I revere above all earthly kingdoms.

It is natural to man to indulge in the illusions of hope. We are apt to shut our eyes against a painful truth, and listen to the song of that siren till she transforms us into beasts. Is this the part of wise men, engaged in a great and arduous struggle for liberty? Are we disposed to be of the number of those who, having eyes, see not, and, having ears, hear not, the things which so nearly concern their temporal salvation? For my part, whatever anguish of spirit it may cost, I am willing to know the whole truth; to know the worst, and to provide for it.

I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided; and that is the lamp of experience. I know of no way of judging of the future but by the past. And judging by the past, I wish to know what there has been in the conduct of the British ministry for the last ten years, to justify those hopes with which gentlemen have been pleased to solace themselves, and the House? Is it that insidious smile with which our petition has been lately received? Trust it not, sir; it will prove a snare to your feet. Suffer not yourselves to be betrayed with a kiss. Ask yourselves how this gracious reception of our petition comports with these war-like preparations which cover our waters and darken our land. Are fleets and armies necessary to a work of love and conciliation? Have we shown ourselves so unwilling to be reconciled, that force must be called in to win back our love? Let us not deceive ourselves, sir. These are the implements of war and conquest; the last arguments to which kings resort. Ask yourselves what means this martial array, if it’s purpose be not to force us to submission? Can gentlemen assign any other possible motive for it? Has Great Britain any enemy, in this quarter of the world, to call for all this accumulation of navies and armies? No, sir, she has none. They are meant for us; they can be meant for no other. They are sent over to bind and rivet upon us those chains which our ancestors, by the blood of their dying thousands, were so instantly and obligingly ready to lay aside.

Mr. President, it is natural to man to indulge in the illusions of hope. But it is natural also to dislike the illusions of fear. I should consider myself under a obligation to my country, and of an act of loyalty, to keep my friend, my country, through a time, though of liberty, and the responsibilities of debate. It is only in this way that we can hope to arrive at truth, and fulfill the great responsibility which we hold to God and our country. The question before the House is one of awful moment to this country. For my own part, I consider it as nothing less than a question of freedom or slavery; and in proportion to the magnitude of the subject ought to be the freedom of the debate. It is only in this way that we can hope to arrive at truth, and fulfill the great responsibility which we hold to God and our country. The answer of the House is one of the greatest importance. I shall speak my sentiments without reserve. This is no time for cant. The question before the House is one of awful moment to this country. For my own part, I consider it as nothing less than a question of freedom or slavery; and in proportion to the magnitude of the subject ought to be the freedom of the debate.
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Patrick Henry’s “Speech to the Second Virginia Convention

for me, give me liberty or give me death!

They tell us, sir, that we are weak; unable to cope with so formidable an adversary. But will it be the next week, or the next year? Will it be when we are totally disarmed, and when a British guard shall be stationed in every house? Shall we gather strength by irresolution and inaction? Shall we acquire the means of effectual resistance, by lying supinely on our backs, and hugging the delusive phantom of hope, until our enemies shall have bound us hand and foot? Sir, we must fight! An appeal to arms and to the God of hosts is all that is left us.

It is in vain, sir, to extenuate the matter. Gentlemen may cry, Peace, Peace—but there is no peace. The war is actually begun! The next gale that sweeps from the north will bring to our ears the clash of resounding arms! Our brethren are already in the field! Why stand we here idle? What is it that gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is it for freedom? If we wish to be free—if we mean to preserve inviolate those inestimable privileges for which we have been so long contending; and if we mean to be free—it is not for ourselves alone; it is for ourselves, our posterity, our country, and the world. Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent, a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battle-field of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field. The world will little note, nor long remember, what we say here; but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the promise that they made. We, as a nation, in this great conflict, cannot afford to lose the faith that brought our fathers here. We must hold fast to the ideal of Liberty, and to the promise that it makes to our children. We must never abandon that faith, and that ideal, and that promise, for it is our only hope. We must fight, and we must win, or we must perish. For freedom, for Liberty, for the future of our children, for the sake of all that we hold dear.

March 23, 1775

Patrick Henry
**RI.9-10.2** Determine a central idea of a text and analyze its development over the course of the text, including how it emerges and is shaped and refined by specific details; provide an objective summary of the text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/Lesson Suggestions</th>
<th>Assessment FOR Learning Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Magnet Summary.</strong> Students conduct a close read of a short text within the 9-10 grade band text complexity range (e.g., Anna Quindlen’s “A Quilt of a Country”, Learned Hand’s “I am an American Day Address”, ...). While reading, they identify the specific words or phrases (magnets) that drive the text. Students record each magnet on a separate index card and list with them specific supporting words or phrases used by the author to anchor the magnet firmly within the text. The process is modeled with 9th grade students whereas 10th grade students are provided greater independence to complete the task. (Buehl, 1993)</td>
<td><strong>Magnet Summary.</strong> Students use the words on each card to construct a single sentence summary of the text. The teacher emphasizes the need to “use various types of phrases (noun, verb, adjectival, adverbial, participial, prepositional, absolute) and clauses (independent, dependent; noun, relative, adverbial) to convey specific meanings and add variety and interest to (their) writing” (L.9-10.1.b). Upon completion, students trade sentences within small groups. Students highlight the phrases and clauses utilized to communicate each magnet summary and utilize a style guide to provide each other objective feedback with regards to proper usage. The teacher facilitates small group discussions and utilizes student feedback to construct targeted language lessons. Students additionally engage in discussions with regards to accuracy in the interpretation of the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>One Sentence Summations.</strong> Randomly selected members of the class read a selection of the text aloud (when appropriate pre-determine the random readers a day prior to the activity). Student facilitators lead the class in a brief whole group discussion of the section, resulting in a short list of significant ideas conveyed by the author. The student facilitators are then given a short amount of time to quickly transform the list of ideas into an objective, one sentence summary which includes the proper use of a colon or semicolon thus modeling the activity. The remaining text is divided into sections and students repeat the process independently (Santa, Havens and Valdes, 2004).</td>
<td><strong>Formative Assessment Tip.</strong> “Often a single assessment is used for multiple purposes; in general, however, the more purposes a single assessment aims to serve, the more each purpose will be compromised” (Pelligrino, Chudowsky, Glaser, 2001).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Smart Art.</strong> Students utilize a SmartArt Funnel Graphic to construct their one sentence summation.</td>
<td><strong>One Sentence Summations.</strong> Upon completion of the activity, students trade sentences within small groups. Students utilize a style guide to provide specific peer-to-peer feedback regarding proper usage of a colon and semicolon. The teacher listens intently and targets usage clarifications appropriately. Students additionally engage in discussions with regards to accuracy in the interpretation of the text. When finished, students repeat the process by funneling the section summations into an objective one sentence summation of the entire text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**These suggestions can also be adapted to diagnose competency in the following standards;** (W.9-10.4) (SL.9-10.1,3,4) (L.9-10.1,2,4,5,6).

**References:**
Here is my one sentence summation; with a properly placed colon or semi-colon of course.
America is an improbable idea. A mongrel nation built of ever-changing disparate parts, it is held together by a notion, the notion that all men are created equal, though everyone knows that most men consider themselves better than someone. "Of all the nations in the world, the United States was built in nobody's image," the historian Daniel Boorstin wrote. That's because it was built of bits and pieces that seem discordant, like the crazy quilts that have been one of its great folk-art forms, velvet and calico and checks and brocades. Out of many, one. That is the ideal.

The reality is often quite different, a great national striving consisting frequently of failure. Many of the oft-told stories of the most pluralistic nation on earth are stories not of tolerance, but of bigotry. Slavery and sweatshops, the burning of crosses and the ostracism of the other. Children learn in social-studies class and in the news of the lynching of blacks, the denial of rights to women, the murders of gay men. It is difficult to know how to convince them that this amounts to "crown thy good with brotherhood," that amid all the failures is something spectacularly successful. Perhaps they understand it at this moment, when enormous tragedy, as it so often does, demands a time of reflection on enormous blessings.

What is the point of this splintered whole? What is the point of a nation in which Arab cabbies chauffeur Jewish passengers through the streets of New York--and in which Jewish cabbies chauffeur Arab passengers, too, and yet speak in theory of hatred, one for the other? What is the point of the uninflected WASP suburbs of Cheever's characters; they are ghettos, pure and simple. Do the Cambodians and the Mexicans in California coexist less easily today than did the Irish and Italians of Massachusetts a century ago? You know the answer. This is a nation founded on a conundrum, what Mario Cuomo has characterized as "community added to individualism." These two are our defining ideals; they are also in constant conflict. Historians today bemoan the ascendancy of a kind of prideful apartheid in America, saying that the clinging to ethnicity, in background and custom, has undermined the concept of unity. These historians must have forgotten the past, or have glided it. The New York of my father, in which Jewish boys would walk several blocks out of their way to avoid the Irish divide of Chester Avenue, (I was the product of a mixed marriage, across barely bridgable lines: an Italian girl, an Irish boy. How quaint it seems now, how incendiary then.) The Brooklyn of France Nolick's famous tree, the Newark of which Portroy complained, even less so, than the Philadelphia of my father, in which Jewish boys would walk several blocks out of their way to avoid the Irish divide of Chest Avenue. I was the product of a mixed marriage, across barely bridgable lines: an Italian girl, an Irish boy. How quaint it seems now, how incendiary then.

What is the point of this splintered whole? What is the point of a nation in which Arab cabbies chauffeur Jewish passengers through the streets of New York--and in which Jewish cabbies chauffeur Arab passengers, too, and yet speak in theory of hatred, one for the other? What is the point of a nation in which one part seems to be always on the verge of fisticuffs with another, blacks and whites, gays and straights, left and right, Pole and Chinese and Puerto Rican and Slovenian? Other countries with such divisions have in fact divided into new nations with new names, but not this one, impossibly interwoven even in its hostilities. America, in other words, is an impossible idea. A mongrel nation built of ever-changing disparate parts, it is held together by a notion, the notion that all men are created equal, though everyone knows that most men consider themselves better than someone. "Of all the nations in the world, the United States was built in nobody's image," the historian Daniel Boorstin wrote. That's because it was built of bits and pieces that seem discordant, like the crazy quilts that have been one of its great folk-art forms, velvet and calico and checks and brocades. Out of many, one. That is the ideal.
and unity.

Tolerance is the word most often when this kind of coexistence succeeds, but tolerance is a wonder. It's the word used most often when this kind of coexistence succeeds, but tolerance is a wonder.
Analyze how the author unfolds an analysis or series of ideas or events, including the order in which the points are made, how they are introduced and developed, and the connections that are drawn between them.

**Strategy/Lesson Suggestions**

_The following strategy utilizes a CCSS text exemplar from the 9-10 grade band. This strategy can be adapted to fit a variety of texts with an aligned level of complexity._

**Analysis & Connection.** Utilizing Abraham Lincoln’s “Second Inaugural Address” students conduct an analysis of the ideas that led to the Civil War, as outlined by the text. Students can conduct a similar analysis & connection of Martin Luther King’s “Letter from Birmingham Jail” or similar texts with an appropriate level of complexity for this grade band. Students adhere to the following guiding questions as they investigate the text;

1. In what order are the points made?
2. How are the points introduced and developed?
3. How does the author skillfully connect the various points?

While reading the text independently or in small groups, students begin their investigation by documenting the order in which the points are made. Examples of helpful graphic organizers are listed below.

**Graphic Organizers.**

- **Semantic Maps.** Templates such as these can be used to illustrate how an author introduces a point, how he/she develops the point and how the point itself is finally stated. This can also be used to display connections between various points. (Santa, C., Havens, L. & Valdes, B., 2004).
- **Venn Diagrams.** These graphic organizers are used to illustrate the similarities and differences between various points (Santa, C., Havens, L. & Valdes, B., 2004).

**Assessment FOR Learning Suggestions**

- **Think-Pair-Share.** Students independently analyze the text and complete a graphic organizer providing rationale for text placement. At a predetermined interval, students are paired with those working at a similar completion rate. Partners share ideas to complete their individual assignment. Each student completes an objective written analysis of how points were introduced, developed and skillfully connected. Students continually supply each other with objective feedback as they organize the framework for their written analysis.

**Feedback Tip.** “…students prefer to see feedback as forward-looking, helping to address ‘Where to next?’, and related to the success criteria of the lesson. Regardless of their perceptions of achievement level, students see the value and nature of feedback similarly” (Hattie, 2012, p.131).

**Graphic Organizer Tip.** Teachers and students work collaboratively to predetermine a “set” of graphic organizers that will be utilized within the 9-12 grade band. A rubric is developed clearly outlining success criteria when using graphic organizers for textual analysis. Expectations are clear and continually foster a classroom environment that supports the sharing of quality objective peer-to-peer and self-feedback.

These suggestions can also be adapted to diagnose competency in the following standards; (W.9-10.4) (SL.9-10.1,3,4)

**References:**


point1

point2

point3
At this second appearance to take the oath of the presidential office, there is less occasion for an extended address than there was at the first. Then a statement seems what in detail, of a course to be pursued seems as fitting and proper. Now, at the expiration of four years, during which public declarations have been constantly called forth on every point of phase of the great contest which still absorbs the attention and engrosses the energies of the nation little that is new could be presented. The progress of our arms, upon which all else chiefly depends, is as well known to the public as myself, and it is, I trust, reasonably satisfactory and encouraging to all. With high hope for the future, no prediction is necessary to it is certain.

On the occasion corresponding to this four years ago, all thoughts were anxiously directed to an impending civil war. All trembled then all sought to avert it. While the inaugural address was being delivered from the balustrade altogether to saving the Union without war, our agents were in
the city seeking to destroy it neither was seeking to dissolve the Union, and which effects by negotiation. Both parties deprecated war; but one of them would make war rather than let the Union survive; and the other would accept war rather than let it perish. And war came.

One-eighth of the whole population were colored people, not distributed generally over the Union, but localized in the Southern States of it. These slaves constituted a peculiar and powerful interest. All knew that this interest was somehow, the cause of the war. So far as it was realized, the cause of war, to strengthen, perpetuate, and extend this interest was the object for which the insurgents would rend the Union, even by war, while the government claimed the right to do more than to restrict the territorial enlargement of it.

Neither party expected for the war, the magnitude, or the duration, which it has already attained. Neither anticipated that
the cause of the conflict might cease, or even before, the conflict itself should cease, each
looked for an easier triumph, and a result less
fundamental and astounding. Both read the same
Bible, and pray to the same God; and each
invokes His aid against the other. It may seem
strange that any man should dare to ask a just
God’s assistance in wringing their bread from
the sweat of other men’s faces; but let us judge
not that we be not judged. The prayers of
both could not be answered; that of neither
has been answered fully. The Almighty has His
own purposes. “Woe unto the world because
of offences! for it must needs be that offens-
es come: but woe to that man by whom
the offence cometh!” If we shall suppose
that American Slavery is one of those offences
which, in the Providence of God, must needs
come, but which, having continued through
this appointed time, the hour wills to remove,
and that He gives to both North and South
this terrible war, as the war due to those
by whom the offence came, shall we discern there
in any departure from those divine attributes
which the believers in a living God always
attribute to Him? Secondly, do we hope—fervently
do we pray—that this mighty course of
war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God
wills that it continue, until all the wealth
piled by two hundred and
fifty years of unequalled toil shall be sunk,
of
and until every drop of blood drawn with the
lash shall be paid by another drawn with
the sword, as was said three thousand years
ago, so still it must be said “the judgments
of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.”

With malice toward none;
with charity for all; with firmness in the
right, as God gives us to see the right,
let us strive on to finish the work we
are to begin, to bind up the nation’s wounds;
to care for him who shall have borne the bat
tle, and for his widow, and his orphan—
to do all which may achieve and cherish a just
and a lasting peace, among ourselves, and with
foreign our.
Original Manuscript of second Inaugural Address
presented to Major John Hoyt.

April 10, 1865.

Lincoln’s Second Inaugural Address
Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text, including figurative, connotative, and technical meanings; analyze the cumulative impact of specific word choices on meaning and tone (e.g., how the language of a court opinion differs from that of a newspaper).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/Lesson Suggestions</th>
<th>Assessment FOR Learning Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocabulary Overview Guide.</strong> Students record key words from the text on a template that categorizes and provides a contextual clue for each. Include the meaning of the word (Carr, 1985).</td>
<td><strong>Meaning and Tone Table.</strong> Students work individually or in pairs utilizing a variety of resources to define selected words as well as compare and contrast specific language from within the text. They use a graphic organizer such as the meaning and tone table to create word/phrase/sentence alternatives to display an understanding of the cumulative impact word choice has on meaning or tone. Objective feedback is ongoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The following strategy utilizes a CCSS text exemplar from the 9-10 grade band. This strategy can be adapted to fit a variety of texts with an aligned level of complexity.</td>
<td><strong>Color Coded Competency.</strong> A visible timer is used to establish a time limit for completion of the vocabulary overview guide, the meaning and tone table or a similar activity. When time has elapsed, each student puts a colored mark on their paper corresponding with their level of competency (Blue – good to go, Yellow – fairly comfortable, Red – oh boy, I need some help). Papers are turned in. While students complete a related activity, the teacher meets with students individually, in pairs, or small groups for the purpose of sharing objective feedback around the idea of ‘Where to next?’ (Hattie, 2012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Written Comparison and Synthesis of Ideas.</strong> Students conduct a close read of texts such as Martin Luther King’s “Letter from Birmingham Jail” and Elie Wiesel’s “Hope, Despair and Memory”. Words, phrases and sentences which significantly shape the meaning and tone of each text are highlighted as they read. Without the aid of classroom discussion, students independently proceed to complete a written comparison and synthesis of ideas (CSI) between the two pieces of text. Students portray a clear analysis of how the texts are similar and how they differ in terms of meaning and tone.</td>
<td><strong>Written CSI.</strong> Students and teachers work together to develop rubrics which clearly outline expectations and success criteria for a formal written product. Self, peer-to-peer and teacher-to-student feedback continually maintains an objective focus on the two pieces of text; how they are similar and how they contrast in meaning and tone. After breaking down each text, students “synthesize” the meaning of each and construct an original informative/explanatory essay “to examine and convey complex ideas, concepts, and information clearly and accurately through the effective selection, organization, and analysis of content” (W.9-10.2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meaning &amp; Tone Table.</strong> Students work individually or in pairs utilizing a variety of resources to define selected words as well as compare and contrast specific language from within the text. They utilize a graphic organizer such as the meaning and tone table to create word/phrase/sentence alternatives to display an understanding of the cumulative impact word choice has on meaning or tone. Objective feedback is ongoing.</td>
<td>These suggestions can also be adapted to diagnose competency in the following standards; (W.9-10.2,4,5,9,10)(SL.9-10.1,3,4)(L.9-10.1,2,3,4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific sentence from text</th>
<th>Your sentence (underline the word(s), clause(s), and/or phrase(s) you altered)</th>
<th>How do your changes alter the meaning or tone of the text?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from “It Says...I Say...And So” (Zwiers, 2002)
My dear Fellow Clergymen,

While confined here in the Birmingham City Jail, I came across your recent statement calling our present activities "unwise and untimely." Seldom, if ever, do I pause to answer criticism of my work and ideas. If I sought to answer all the criticisms that cross my desk, my secretaries would be engaged in little else in the course of the day and I would have no time for constructive work. But since I feel that you are men of genuine goodwill and your criticisms are sincerely set forth, I would like to answer your statement in what I hope will be patient and reasonable terms.

I think I should give the reason for my being in Birmingham, since you have been influenced by the argument of "outsiders coming in." I have the honor of serving as president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, an organization operating in every Southern state with headquarters in Atlanta, Georgia. We have some eighty-five affiliate organizations all across the South -- one being the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights. Whenever necessary and possible we share staff, educational, and financial resources with our affiliates. Several months ago our local affiliate here in Birmingham invited us to be on call to engage in a nonviolent direct action program if such were deemed necessary. We readily consented and when the hour came we lived up to our promises. So I am here, along with several members of my staff, because we were invited here. I am here because I have basic organizational ties here. Beyond this, I am in Birmingham because injustice is here. Just as the eighth century prophets left their little villages and carried their "thus saith the Lord" far beyond the boundaries of their home town, and just as the Apostle Paul left his little village of Tarsus and carried the gospel of Jesus Christ to practically every hamlet and city of the Graeco-Roman world, I too am compelled to carry the gospel of freedom beyond my particular home town. Like Paul, I must constantly respond to the Macedonian call for aid.

Moreover, I am cognizant of the interrelatedness of all communities and states. I cannot sit idly by in Atlanta and not be concerned about what happens in Birmingham. Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality tied in a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly affects all indirectly. Never again can we afford to live with the narrow, provincial "outside agitator" idea. Anyone who lives inside the United States can never be considered an outsider anywhere in this country.

You deplore the demonstrations that are presently taking place in Birmingham. But I am sorry that your statement did not express a similar concern for the conditions that brought the demonstrations into being. I am sure that each of you would want to go beyond the superficial social analyst who looks merely at effects, and does not grapple with underlying causes. I would not hesitate to say that it is unfortunate that so-called demonstrations are taking place in Birmingham at this time, but I would say in more emphatic terms that it is even more unfortunate that the white power structure of this city left the Negro community with no other alternative.

In any nonviolent campaign there are four basic steps: (1) Collection of the facts to determine whether injustices are alive; (2) Negotiation; (3) Self-purification; and (4) Direct action. We have gone through all of these steps in Birmingham. There can be no gainsaying of the fact that racial injustice
engulfs this community. Birmingham is probably the most thoroughly segregated city in the United States. Its ugly record of police brutality is known in every section of this country. Its unjust treatment of Negroes in the courts is a notorious reality. There have been more unsolved bombings of Negro homes and churches in Birmingham than any city in this nation. These are the hard, brutal, and unbelievable facts. On the basis of these conditions Negro leaders sought to negotiate with the city fathers. But the political leaders consistently refused to engage in good faith negotiation.

Then came the opportunity last September to talk with some of the leaders of the economic community. In these negotiating sessions certain promises were made by the merchants -- such as the promise to remove the humiliating racial signs from the stores. On the basis of these promises Rev. Shuttlesworth and the leaders of the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights agreed to call a moratorium on any type of demonstrations. As the weeks and months unfolded we realized that we were the victims of a broken promise. The signs remained. As in so many experiences of the past we were confronted with blasted hopes, and the dark shadow of a deep disappointment settled upon us. So we had no alternative except that of preparing for direct action, whereby we would present our very bodies as a means of laying our case before the conscience of the local and national community. We were not unmindful of the difficulties involved. So we decided to go through a process of self-purification. We started having workshops on nonviolence and repeatedly asked ourselves the questions, "Are you able to accept blows without retaliating?" "Are you able to endure the ordeals of jail?"

We decided to set our direct-action program around the Easter season, realizing that with the exception of Christmas, this was the largest shopping period of the year. Knowing that a strong economic withdrawal program would be the by-product of direct action, we felt that this was the best time to bring pressure on the merchants for the needed changes. Then it occurred to us that the March election was ahead, and so we speedily decided to postpone action until after election day. When we discovered that Mr. Connor was in the run-off, we decided again to postpone action so that the demonstrations could not be used to cloud the issues. At this time we agreed to begin our nonviolent witness the day after the run-off.

This reveals that we did not move irresponsibly into direct action. We too wanted to see Mr. Connor defeated; so we went through postponement after postponement to aid in this community need. After this we felt that direct action could be delayed no longer.

You may well ask, Why direct action? Why sit-ins, marches, etc.? Isn't negotiation a better path?" You are exactly right in your call for negotiation. Indeed, this is the purpose of direct action. Nonviolent direct action seeks to create such a crisis and establish such creative tension that a community that has constantly refused to negotiate is forced to confront the issue. It seeks so to dramatize the issue that it can no longer be ignored. I just referred to the creation of tension as a part of the work of the nonviolent resister. This may sound rather shocking. But I must confess that I am not afraid of the word tension. I have earnestly worked and preached against violent tension, but there is a type of constructive nonviolent tension that is necessary for growth. Just as Socrates felt that it was necessary to create a tension in the mind so that individuals could rise from the bondage of myths and half-truths to the unfettered realm of creative analysis and objective appraisal, we must see the need of having nonviolent gadflies to create the kind of tension in society that will help men rise from the dark depths of prejudice and racism to the majestic heights of understanding and brotherhood. So the purpose of the direct action is to create a situation so crisis-packed that it will inevitably open the
door to negotiation. We, therefore, concur with you in your call for negotiation. Too long has our beloved Southland been bogged down in the tragic attempt to live in monologue rather than dialogue.

One of the basic points in your statement is that our acts are untimely. Some have asked, "Why didn't you give the new administration time to act?" The only answer that I can give to this inquiry is that the new administration must be prodded about as much as the outgoing one before it acts. We will be sadly mistaken if we feel that the election of Mr. Boutwell will bring the millennium to Birmingham. While Mr. Boutwell is much more articulate and gentle than Mr. Connor, they are both segregationists dedicated to the task of maintaining the status quo. The hope I see in Mr. Boutwell is that he will be reasonable enough to see the futility of massive resistance to desegregation. But he will not see this without pressure from the devotees of civil rights. My friends, I must say to you that we have not made a single gain in civil rights without determined legal and nonviolent pressure. History is the long and tragic story of the fact that privileged groups seldom give up their privileges voluntarily. Individuals may see the moral light and voluntarily give up their unjust posture; but as Reinhold Niebuhr has reminded us, groups are more immoral than individuals.

We know through painful experience that freedom is never voluntarily given by the oppressor; it must be demanded by the oppressed. Frankly I have never yet engaged in a direct action movement that was "well timed," according to the timetable of those who have not suffered unduly from the disease of segregation. For years now I have heard the word "Wait!" It rings in the ear of every Negro with a piercing familiarity. This "wait" has almost always meant "never." It has been a tranquilizing thalidomide, relieving the emotional stress for a moment, only to give birth to an ill-formed infant of frustration. We must come to see with the distinguished jurist of yesterday that "justice too long delayed is justice denied." We have waited for more than three hundred and forty years for our constitutional and God-given rights. The nations of Asia and Africa are moving with jet-like speed toward the goal of political independence, and we still creep at horse and buggy pace toward the gaining of a cup of coffee at a lunch counter.

I guess it is easy for those who have never felt the stinging darts of segregation to say wait. But when you have seen vicious mobs lynch your mothers and fathers at will and drown your sisters and brothers at whim; when you have seen hate filled policemen curse, kick, brutalize, and even kill your black brothers and sisters with impunity; when you see the vast majority of your twenty million Negro brothers smothering in an air-tight cage of poverty in the midst of an affluent society; when you suddenly find your tongue twisted and your speech stammering as you seek to explain to your six-year-old daughter why she can't go to the public amusement park that has just been advertised on television, and see tears welling up in her little eyes when she is told that Funtown is closed to colored children, and see the depressing clouds of inferiority begin to form in her little mental sky, and see her begin to distort her little personality by unconsciously developing a bitterness toward white people; when you have to concoct an answer for a five-year-old son asking in agonizing pathos: "Daddy, why do white people treat colored people so mean?"; when you take a cross-country drive and find it necessary to sleep night after night in the uncomfortable corners of your automobile because no motel will accept you; when you are humiliated day in and day out by nagging signs reading "white" men and "colored"; when your first name becomes "nigger" and your middle name becomes "boy" (however old you are) and your last name becomes "John," and when your wife and mother are never given the respected title "Mrs."; when you are harried by day and haunted by night by the fact that you are a Negro, living constantly at tip-toe stance never quite knowing what to expect next, and
plagued with inner fears and outer resentments; when you are forever fighting a degenerating sense of "nobodiness" -- then you will understand why we find it difficult to wait. There comes a time when the cup of endurance runs over, and men are no longer willing to be plunged into an abyss of injustice where they experience the bleakness of corroding despair. I hope, sirs, you can understand our legitimate and unavoidable impatience.

You express a great deal of anxiety over our willingness to break laws. This is certainly a legitimate concern. Since we so diligently urge people to obey the Supreme Court's decision of 1954 outlawing segregation in the public schools, it is rather strange and paradoxical to find us consciously breaking laws. One may well ask: "How can you advocate breaking some laws and obeying others?" The answer is found in the fact that there are two types of laws: There are just laws and there are unjust laws. I would be the first to advocate obeying just laws. One has not only a legal but moral responsibility to obey just laws. Conversely, one has a moral responsibility to disobey unjust laws. I would agree with Saint Augustine that "An unjust law is no law at all."

Now what is the difference between the two? How does one determine when a law is just or unjust? A just law is a man-made code that squares with the moral law or the law of God. An unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law. To put it in the terms of Saint Thomas Aquinas, an unjust law is a human law that is not rooted in eternal and natural law. Any law that uplifts human personality is just. Any law that degrades human personality is unjust. All segregation statutes are unjust because segregation distorts the soul and damages the personality. It gives the segregator a false sense of superiority and the segregated a false sense of inferiority. To use the words of Martin Buber, the great Jewish philosopher, segregation substitutes an "I-it" relationship for an "I-thou" relationship, and ends up relegating persons to the status of things. So segregation is not only politically, economically, and sociologically unsound, but it is morally wrong and sinful. Paul Tillich has said that sin is separation. Isn't segregation an existential expression of man's tragic separation, an expression of his awful estrangement, his terrible sinfulness? So I can urge men to obey the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court because it is morally right, and I can urge them to disobey segregation ordinances because they are morally wrong.

Let us turn to a more concrete example of just and unjust laws. An unjust law is a code that a majority inflicts on a minority that is not binding on itself. This is difference made legal. On the other hand a just law is a code that a majority compels a minority to follow that it is willing to follow itself. This is sameness made legal.

Let me give another explanation. An unjust law is a code inflicted upon a minority which that minority had no part in enacting or creating because they did not have the unhampered right to vote. Who can say that the legislature of Alabama which set up the segregation laws was democratically elected? Throughout the state of Alabama all types of conniving methods are used to prevent Negroes from becoming registered voters and there are some counties without a single Negro registered to vote despite the fact that the Negro constitutes a majority of the population. Can any law set up in such a state be considered democratically structured?

These are just a few examples of unjust and just laws. There are some instances when a law is just on its face but unjust in its application. For instance, I was arrested Friday on a charge of parading without a permit. Now there is nothing wrong with an ordinance which requires a permit for a parade,
but when the ordinance is used to preserve segregation and to deny citizens the First Amendment privilege of peaceful assembly and peaceful protest, then it becomes unjust.

I hope you can see the distinction I am trying to point out. In no sense do I advocate evading or defy ing the law as the rabid segregationist would do. This would lead to anarchy. One who breaks an unjust law must do it openly, lovingly (not hatefully as the white mothers did in New Orleans when they were seen on television screaming "nigger, nigger, nigger") and with a willingness to accept the penalty. I submit that an individual who breaks a law that conscience tells him is unjust, and willingly accepts the penalty by staying in jail to arouse the conscience of the community over its injustice, is in reality expressing the very highest respect for law.

Of course there is nothing new about this kind of civil disobedience. It was seen sublimely in the refusal of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego to obey the laws of Nebuchadnezzar because a higher moral law was involved. It was practiced superbly by the early Christians who were willing to face hungry lions and the excruciating pain of chopping blocks, before submitting to certain unjust laws of the Roman Empire. To a degree academic freedom is a reality today because Socrates practiced civil disobedience.

We can never forget that everything Hitler did in Germany was "legal" and everything the Hungarian freedom fighters did in Hungary was "illegal." It was "illegal" to aid and comfort a Jew in Hitler's Germany. But I am sure that, if I had lived in Germany during that time, I would have aided and comforted my Jewish brothers even though it was illegal. If I lived in a communist country today where certain principles dear to the Christian faith are suppressed, I believe I would openly advocate disobeying these anti-religious laws.

I must make two honest confessions to you, my Christian and Jewish brothers. First, I must confess that over the last few years I have been gravely disappointed with the white moderate. I have almost reached the regrettable conclusion that the Negroes' great stumbling block in the stride toward freedom is not the White Citizen's "Counsellor" or the Ku Klux Klanner, but the white moderate who is more devoted to "order" than to justice; who prefers a negative peace which is the absence of tension to a positive peace which is the presence of justice; who constantly says "I agree with you in the goal you seek, but I can't agree with your methods of direct action"; who paternalistically feels that he can set the timetable for another man's freedom; who lives by the myth of time and who constantly advises the Negro to wait until a "more convenient season." Shallow understanding from people of good will is more frustrating than absolute misunderstanding from people of ill will. Lukewarm acceptance is much more bewildering than outright rejection.

I had hoped that the white moderate would understand that law and order exist for the purpose of establishing justice, and that when they fail to do this they become dangerously structured dams that block the flow of social progress. I had hoped that the white moderate would understand that the present tension in the South is merely a necessary phase of the transition from an obnoxious negative peace, where the Negro passively accepted his unjust plight, to a substance-filled positive peace, where all men will respect the dignity and worth of human personality. Actually, we who engage in nonviolent direct action are not the creators of tension. We merely bring to the surface the hidden tension that is already alive. We bring it out in the open where it can be seen and dealt with. Like a boil that can never be cured as long as it is covered up but must be opened with all its pus-flowing ugliness to the natural medicines of air and light, injustice must likewise be exposed, with all of the
tension its exposing creates, to the light of human conscience and the air of national opinion before it can be cured.

In your statement you asserted that our actions, even though peaceful, must be condemned because they precipitate violence. But can this assertion be logically made? Isn't this like condemning the robbed man because his possession of money precipitated the evil act of robbery? Isn't this like condemning Socrates because his unswerving commitment to truth and his philosophical delvings precipitated the misguided popular mind to make him drink the hemlock? Isn't this like condemning Jesus because His unique God consciousness and never-ceasing devotion to His will precipitated the evil act of crucifixion? We must come to see, as federal courts have consistently affirmed, that it is immoral to urge an individual to withdraw his efforts to gain his basic constitutional rights because the quest precipitates violence. Society must protect the robbed and punish the robber.

I had also hoped that the white moderate would reject the myth of time. I received a letter this morning from a white brother in Texas which said: "All Christians know that the colored people will receive equal rights eventually, but is it possible that you are in too great of a religious hurry? It has taken Christianity almost 2,000 years to accomplish what it has. The teachings of Christ take time to come to earth." All that is said here grows out of a tragic misconception of time. It is the strangely irrational notion that there is something in the very flow of time that will inevitably cure all ills. Actually time is neutral. It can be used either destructively or constructively. I am coming to feel that the people of ill will have used time much more effectively than the people of good will. We will have to repent in this generation not merely for the vitriolic words and actions of the bad people, but for the appalling silence of the good people. We must come to see that human progress never rolls in on wheels of inevitability. It comes through the tireless efforts and persistent work of men willing to be co-workers with God, and without this hard work time itself becomes an ally of the forces of social stagnation.

We must use time creatively, and forever realize that the time is always ripe to do right. Now is the time to make real the promise of democracy, and transform our pending national elegy into a creative psalm of brotherhood. Now is the time to lift our national policy from the quicksand of racial injustice to the solid rock of human dignity.

You spoke of our activity in Birmingham as extreme. At first I was rather disappointed that fellow clergymen would see my nonviolent efforts as those of the extremist. I started thinking about the fact that I stand in the middle of two opposing forces in the Negro community. One is a force of complacency made up of Negroes who, as a result of long years of oppression, have been so completely drained of self-respect and a sense of "somebodiness" that they have adjusted to segregation, and of a few Negroes in the middle class who, because of a degree of academic and economic security, and because at points they profit by segregation, have unconsciously become insensitive to the problems of the masses. The other force is one of bitterness and hatred and comes perilously close to advocating violence. It is expressed in the various black nationalist groups that are springing up over the nation, the largest and best known being Elijah Muhammad's Muslim movement. This movement is nourished by the contemporary frustration over the continued existence of racial discrimination. It is made up of people who have lost faith in America, who have absolutely repudiated Christianity, and who have concluded that the white man is an incurable "devil." I have tried to stand between these two forces saying that we need not follow the "do-nothingism" of the complacent or the hatred and despair of the black nationalist. There is the more
excellent way of love and nonviolent protest. I'm grateful to God that, through the Negro church, the dimension of nonviolence entered our struggle. If this philosophy had not emerged I am convinced that by now many streets of the South would be flowing with floods of blood. And I am further convinced that if our white brothers dismiss us as "rabble rousers" and "outside agitators" -- those of us who are working through the channels of nonviolent direct action -- and refuse to support our nonviolent efforts, millions of Negroes, out of frustration and despair, will seek solace and security in black-nationalist ideologies, a development that will lead inevitably to a frightening racial nightmare.

Oppressed people cannot remain oppressed forever. The urge for freedom will eventually come. This is what has happened to the American Negro. Something within has reminded him of his birthright of freedom; something without has reminded him that he can gain it. Consciously and unconsciously, he has been swept in by what the Germans call the Zeitgeist, and with his black brothers of Africa, and his brown and yellow brothers of Asia, South America, and the Caribbean, he is moving with a sense of cosmic urgency toward the promised land of racial justice. Recognizing this vital urge that has engulfed the Negro community, one should readily understand public demonstrations. The Negro has many pent-up resentments and latent frustrations. He has to get them out. So let him march sometime; let him have his prayer pilgrimages to the city hall; understand why he must have sit-ins and freedom rides. If his repressed emotions do not come out in these nonviolent ways, they will come out in ominous expressions of violence. This is not a threat; it is a fact of history. So I have not said to my people, "Get rid of your discontent." But I have tried to say that this normal and healthy discontent can be channeled through the creative outlet of nonviolent direct action. Now this approach is being dismissed as extremist. I must admit that I was initially disappointed in being so categorized.

But as I continued to think about the matter I gradually gained a bit of satisfaction from being considered an extremist. Was not Jesus an extremist in love? "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, pray for them that despitefully use you." Was not Amos an extremist for justice -- "Let justice roll down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream." Was not Paul an extremist for the gospel of Jesus Christ -- "I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus." Was not Martin Luther an extremist -- "Here I stand; I can do none other so help me God." Was not John Bunyan an extremist -- "I will stay in jail to the end of my days before I make a butchery of my conscience." Was not Abraham Lincoln an extremist -- "This nation cannot survive half slave and half free." Was not Thomas Jefferson an extremist -- "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal." So the question is not whether we will be extremist but what kind of extremist will we be. Will we be extremists for hate or will we be extremists for love? Will we be extremists for the preservation of injustice -- or will we be extremists for the cause of justice? In that dramatic scene on Calvary's hill three men were crucified. We must never forget that all three were crucified for the same crime -- the crime of extremism. Two were extremists for immorality, and thus fell below their environment. The other, Jesus Christ, was an extremist for love, truth, and goodness, and thereby rose above His environment. So, after all, maybe the South, the nation, and the world are in dire need of creative extremists.

I had hoped that the white moderate would see this. Maybe I was too optimistic. Maybe I expected too much. I guess I should have realized that few members of a race that has oppressed another race can understand or appreciate the deep groans and passionate yearnings of those that have been oppressed, and still fewer have the vision to see that injustice must be rooted out by strong, persistent, and determined action. I am thankful, however, that some of our white brothers have
grasped the meaning of this social revolution and committed themselves to it. They are still all too small in quantity, but they are big in quality. Some like Ralph McGill, Lillian Smith, Harry Golden, and James Dabbs have written about our struggle in eloquent, prophetic, and understanding terms. Others have marched with us down nameless streets of the South. They have languished in filthy, roach-infested jails, suffering the abuse and brutality of angry policemen who see them as "dirty nigger lovers." They, unlike so many of their moderate brothers and sisters, have recognized the urgency of the moment and sensed the need for powerful "action" antidotes to combat the disease of segregation.

Let me rush on to mention my other disappointment. I have been so greatly disappointed with the white Church and its leadership. Of course there are some notable exceptions. I am not unmindful of the fact that each of you has taken some significant stands on this issue. I commend you, Rev. Stallings, for your Christian stand on this past Sunday, in welcoming Negroes to your worship service on a non-segregated basis. I commend the Catholic leaders of this state for integrating Spring Hill College several years ago.

But despite these notable exceptions I must honestly reiterate that I have been disappointed with the Church. I do not say that as one of those negative critics who can always find something wrong with the Church. I say it as a minister of the gospel, who loves the Church; who was nurtured in its bosom; who has been sustained by its spiritual blessings and who will remain true to it as long as the cord of life shall lengthen.

I had the strange feeling when I was suddenly catapulted into the leadership of the bus protest in Montgomery several years ago that we would have the support of the white Church. I felt that the white ministers, priests, and rabbis of the South would be some of our strongest allies. Instead, some have been outright opponents, refusing to understand the freedom movement and misrepresenting its leaders; all too many others have been more cautious than courageous and have remained silent behind the anesthetizing security of the stained glass windows.

In spite of my shattered dreams of the past, I came to Birmingham with the hope that the white religious leadership of this community would see the justice of our cause and with deep moral concern, serve as the channel through which our just grievances could get to the power structure. I had hoped that each of you would understand. But again I have been disappointed.

I have heard numerous religious leaders of the South call upon their worshippers to comply with a desegregation decision because it is the law, but I have longed to hear white ministers say follow this decree because integration is morally right and the Negro is your brother. In the midst of blatant injustices inflicted upon the Negro, I have watched white churches stand on the sideline and merely mouth pious irrelevancies and sanctimonious trivialities. In the midst of a mighty struggle to rid our nation of racial and economic injustice, I have heard so many ministers say, "Those are social issues with which the gospel has no real concern," and I have watched so many churches commit themselves to a completely other-worldly religion which made a strange distinction between body and soul, the sacred and the secular.

So here we are moving toward the exit of the twentieth century with a religious community largely adjusted to the status quo, standing as a tail-light behind other community agencies rather than a headlight leading men to higher levels of justice.
I have travelled the length and breadth of Alabama, Mississippi and all the other southern states. On sweltering summer days and crisp autumn mornings I have looked at her beautiful churches with their spires pointing heavenward. I have beheld the impressive outlay of her massive religious education buildings. Over and over again I have found myself asking: "Who worships here? Who is their God? Where were their voices when the lips of Governor Barnett dripped with words of interposition and nullification? Where were they when Governor Wallace gave the clarion call for defiance and hatred? Where were their voices of support when tired, bruised, and weary Negro men and women decided to rise from the dark dungeons of complacency to the bright hills of creative protest?"

Yes, these questions are still in my mind. In deep disappointment, I have wept over the laxity of the church. But be assured that my tears have been tears of love. There can be no deep disappointment where there is not deep love. Yes, I love the Church; I love her sacred walls. How could I do otherwise? I am in the rather unique position of being the son, the grandson, and the great-grandson of preachers. Yes, I see the Church as the body of Christ. But, oh! How we have blemished and scarred that body through social neglect and fear of being nonconformist.

There was a time when the Church was very powerful. It was during that period when the early Christians rejoiced when they were deemed worthy to suffer for what they believed. In those days the Church was not merely a thermometer that recorded the ideas and principles of popular opinion; it was a thermostat that transformed the mores of society. Wherever the early Christians entered a town the power structure got disturbed and immediately sought to convict them for being "disturbers of the peace" and "outside agitators." But they went on with the conviction that they were "a colony of heaven" and had to obey God rather than man. They were small in number but big in commitment. They were too God-intoxicated to be "astronomically intimidated." They brought an end to such ancient evils as infanticide and gladiatorial contest.

Things are different now. The contemporary Church is so often a weak, ineffectual voice with an uncertain sound. It is so often the arch-supporter of the status quo. Far from being disturbed by the presence of the Church, the power structure of the average community is consoled by the Church's silent and often vocal sanction of things as they are.

But the judgment of God is upon the Church as never before. If the Church of today does not recapture the sacrificial spirit of the early Church, it will lose its authentic ring, forfeit the loyalty of millions, and be dismissed as an irrelevant social club with no meaning for the twentieth century. I am meeting young people every day whose disappointment with the Church has risen to outright disgust. Maybe again I have been too optimistic. Is organized religion too inextricably bound to the status quo to save our nation and the world? Maybe I must turn my faith to the inner spiritual Church, the church within the Church, as the true ecclesia and the hope of the world. But again I am thankful to God that some noble souls from the ranks of organized religion have broken loose from the paralyzing chains of conformity and joined us as active partners in the struggle for freedom. They have left their secure congregations and walked the streets of Albany, Georgia, with us. They have gone through the highways of the South on torturous rides for freedom. Yes, they have gone to jail with us. Some have been kicked out of their churches and lost the support of their bishops and fellow ministers. But they have gone with the faith that right defeated is stronger than evil triumphant. These men have been the leaven in the lump of the race. Their witness has been the spiritual salt that has preserved the
true meaning of the Gospel in these troubled times. They have carved a tunnel of hope through the
dark mountain of disappointment.

I hope the Church as a whole will meet the challenge of this decisive hour. But even if the Church does
not come to the aid of justice, I have no despair about the future. I have no fear about the outcome of
our struggle in Birmingham, even if our motives are presently misunderstood. We will reach the goal
of freedom in Birmingham and all over the nation, because the goal of America is freedom. Abused
and scorned though we may be, our destiny is tied up with the destiny of America. Before the pilgrims
landed at Plymouth, we were here. Before the pen of Jefferson etched across the pages of history the
majestic words of the Declaration of Independence, we were here. For more than two centuries our
foreparents labored in this country without wages; they made cotton "king"; and they built the homes
of their masters in the midst of brutal injustice and shameful humiliation -- and yet out of a
bottomless vitality they continued to thrive and develop. If the inexpressible cruelties of slavery could
not stop us, the opposition we now face will surely fail. We will win our freedom because the sacred
heritage of our nation and the eternal will of God are embodied in our echoing demands.

I must close now. But before closing I am impelled to mention one other point in your statement that
troubled me profoundly. You warmly commend the Birmingham police force for keeping "order" and
"preventing violence." I don't believe you would have so warmly commended the police force if you
had seen its angry violent dogs literally biting six unarmed, nonviolent Negroes. I don't believe you
would so quickly commend the policemen if you would observe their ugly and inhuman treatment of
Negroes here in the city jail; if you would watch them push and curse old Negro women and young
Negro girls; if you would see them slap and kick old Negro men and young Negro boys; if you will
observe them, as they did on two occasions, refuse to give us food because we wanted to sing our
grace together. I'm sorry that I can't join you in your praise for the police department.

It is true that they have been rather disciplined in their public handling of the demonstrators. In this
sense they have been rather publicly "nonviolent." But for what purpose? To preserve the evil system
of segregation. Over the last few years I have consistently preached that nonviolence demands the
means we use must be as pure as the ends we seek. So I have tried to make it clear that it is wrong to
use immoral means to attain moral ends. But now I must affirm that it is just as wrong or even more
so to use moral means to preserve immoral ends. Maybe Mr. Connor and his policemen have been
rather publicly nonviolent, as Chief Pritchett was in Albany, Georgia, but they have used the moral
means of nonviolence to maintain the immoral end of flagrant injustice. T. S. Eliot has said that there
is no greater treason than to do the right deed for the wrong reason.

I wish you had commended the Negro sit-inners and demonstrators of Birmingham for their sublime
courage, their willingness to suffer, and their amazing discipline in the midst of the most inhuman
provocation. One day the South will recognize its real heroes. They will be the James Merediths,
courageously and with a majestic sense of purpose, facing jeering and hostile mobs and the agonizing
loneliness that characterizes the life of the pioneer. They will be old, oppressed, battered Negro
women, symbolized in a seventy-two year old woman of Montgomery, Alabama, who rose up with a
sense of dignity and with her people decided not to ride the segregated buses, and responded to one
who inquired about her tiredness with ungrammatical profundity: "My feets is tired, but my soul is
rested." They will be the young high school and college students, young ministers of the gospel and a
host of their elders courageously and nonviolently sitting-in at lunch counters and willingly going to
jail for conscience sake. One day the South will know that when these disinherited children of God sat
down at lunch counters they were in reality standing up for the best in the American dream and the most sacred values in our Judaeo-Christian heritage, and thus carrying our whole nation back to great wells of democracy which were dug deep by the founding fathers in the formulation of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence.

Never before have I written a letter this long (or should I say a book?). I'm afraid it is much too long to take your precious time. I can assure you that it would have been much shorter if I had been writing from a comfortable desk, but what else is there to do when you are alone for days in the dull monotony of a narrow jail cell other than write long letters, think strange thoughts, and pray long prayers?

If I have said anything in this letter that is an overstatement of the truth and is indicative of an unreasonable impatience, I beg you to forgive me. If I have said anything in this letter that is an understatement of the truth and is indicative of my having a patience that makes me patient with anything less than brotherhood, I beg God to forgive me.

I hope this letter finds you strong in the faith. I also hope that circumstances will soon make it possible for me to meet each of you, not as an integrationist or a civil rights leader, but as a fellow clergyman and a Christian brother. Let us all hope that the dark clouds of racial prejudice will soon pass away and the deep fog of misunderstanding will be lifted from our fear-drenched communities and in some not too distant tomorrow the radiant stars of love and brotherhood will shine over our great nation with all their scintillating beauty.

Yours for the cause of

Peace and Brotherhood,

Martin Luther King, Jr.
### 6-12 Reading Informational Text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RI.9-10.5</th>
<th>Analyze in detail how an author’s ideas or claims are developed and refined by particular sentences, paragraphs, or larger portions of a text (e.g., a section or chapter).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy/Lesson Suggestions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assessment FOR Learning Suggestions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Close Read.</strong> Students read an appropriately complex text with varying levels of independence and support. Expectations are such that 9th grade students receive more support as they stretch their literacy levels toward independent reading and analysis of complex texts within this grade band by the completion of 10th grade. As students finish reading they are introduced to a focus question related to a text. Students return to the text for further study. Through text analysis, students develop viewpoints as to how the text explicitly responds to the focus question as well as inferences which may be drawn.</td>
<td><strong>Formative Assessment Tip.</strong> “Feedback is most effective when students do not have proficiency or mastery – and thus it thrives when there is error or incomplete knowing and understanding...Errors invite opportunities...They should not be seen as embarrassment, signs of failure, or something to be avoided...They are exciting, because they indicate a tension between what we now know and what we could know; they are signs of opportunities to learn and they are to be embraced” (Hattie, 2012, p.124).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussion Web.</strong> Students discuss a text analysis in small groups. Each group draws a conclusion about what the text says explicitly, what inferences can be made and what particular sentences, paragraphs, or larger portions of text support their conclusion (Alvermann, 1991).</td>
<td><strong>Discussion Web.</strong> The teacher listens intently so as to support and enhance a discussion environment in which “new connections” are continually made. At the conclusion of the discussion web, students show comprehension competency by writing a summary in response to the focus question in which they cite specific portions of the text to support their conclusion. The classroom environment fosters quality self and peer-to-peer feedback continually inspiring students to “produce clear and coherent writing in which the development, organization, and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience” (W.9-10.4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online Discussion Forum.</strong> Students utilize an online discussion forum to engage in the discussion web. For example, a blog is created for an assigned text. Student “blog facilitators” post specific sentences, paragraphs, or larger portions of text within the blog and the remaining students add comments to each post as a way to engage in an online text analysis.</td>
<td><strong>Online Discussion Forum.</strong> Prior to using an online discussion forum, students and staff work collaboratively within the 9-12 grade band to develop a rubric that clearly outlines expectations and success criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **These suggestions can also be adapted to diagnose competency in the following standards;** (W.9-10.4,9,10) (SL.9-10.1-6) (L.9-10.1-5) | References:  
**RI.9-10.6** Determine an author’s point of view or purpose in a text and analyze how an author uses rhetoric to advance that point of view or purpose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/Lesson Suggestions</th>
<th>Assessment FOR Learning Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior to the activity, students are competent in the key differences between argumentative, informative/explanatory and narrative writing. Students are given access to a text exemplar of appropriate complexity within each style of writing; one for each style. <strong>Read-Only, Purpose Statement, Support.</strong> Students begin the activity by deliberately reading one of the texts start to finish without highlighting or note-taking. After completing a deliberate read, students author a single sentence narrative highlighting the author’s purpose of the text. Students clearly acknowledge that a quality “purpose sentence” includes appropriate clauses and phrases. When the purpose sentence is complete, students utilize sticky notes to cite specific words, phrases and clauses from the text the author used to advance their intent. Over a period of several days, students repeat the process with each text exemplar. Students conclude the unit by conducting a comparison and synthesis of ideas (CSI) amongst the texts. Each student constructs a list of distinguishing features from one style to the next and draws conclusions regarding author’s point of view as it relates to overall purpose. <strong>Questioning the Author.</strong> After developing an understanding of authorship, students read a complex text and engage in objective discussions at pre-determined intervals. Students utilize Questioning the Author strategies to enrich and advance the discussion (Beck, McKeown, Hamilton and Kucan, 1997).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier Two Words. “…many Tier Two words are far less well defined by contextual clues in the texts in which they appear and are far less likely to be defined explicitly within a text than are Tier Three words. Yet Tier Two words are frequently encountered in complex written texts and are particularly powerful because of their wide applicability to many sorts of reading” (CCSS ELA &amp; Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects Appendix A, p.33). <strong>Read-Only, Purpose Statement, Support.</strong> As students read, the teacher navigates the room and utilizes diagnostic questioning to determine competency with regards to Tier Two vocabulary appearing within the text. Feedback is provided that “models, cues, or hints to support improvements in learning...operating as an instructional scaffold” (Heritage, 2010, p.84). Through strategic text selection, this activity could be adapted so that students display competency in conducting a “sustained research project to answer a question (including a self-generated question) or solve a problem” (W.9-10.7). <strong>Questioning the Author.</strong> During the discussion, students provide objective peer-to-peer feedback to keep the dialog centered on “evaluat(ing) a speaker’s point of view, reasoning and use of evidence and rhetoric, identifying any fallacious reasoning or exaggerated or distorted evidence” (SL.9-10.3). <strong>These suggestions can also be adapted to diagnose competency in the following standards;</strong> (W.9-10.1,3-5,7-10) (SL.9-10.1-4,6) (L.9-10.1-6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**References:**
## RI.9-10.7

Analyze various accounts of a subject told in different mediums (e.g., a person’s life story in both print and multimedia), determining which details are emphasized in each account.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/Lesson Suggestions</th>
<th>Assessment FOR Learning Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Close Read and Comparison.** Students read an appropriately complex text with varying levels of independence and support. Expectations are such that 9th grade students receive more support as they stretch their literacy levels toward independent reading and analysis of complex texts within this grade band by the completion of 10th grade. After a text is closely analyzed, students will view a video or theatrical interpretation of the same subject matter in order to compare the subject matter in both mediums.  

*The following strategy utilizes a CCSS text exemplar from the 9-10 grade band. This strategy can be adapted to fit a variety of texts with an aligned level of complexity.*  

**Comparison and Synthesis of Ideas.** Students begin by conducting a close read of a text such as Ronald Reagan’s “Address to Students at Moscow State University” or a text of similar complexity. After reading, students complete a written summary of the major points of Reagan’s address. Within their written summary, students place special emphasis on how they anticipate the text of the address will be received by the audience. Upon completion of the summary, students watch the full video of the address and note audience reaction during delivery and contrast participant reaction with their predicted response. At this point students read an edited version of the text from one of the top resources retrieved via an online search engine, as well as an abbreviated Youtube clip of the same event. Students conduct an analysis of which details are emphasized and which are absent in each account. Success criteria centers around the ability to “determine which details are emphasized in each account”.

**Scaffolding Suggestion.** Texts and videos can be segmented for students who struggle to determine which details are emphasized in each account of the same subject or event.

**EXPLANATION - Tier Two words** (what the Standards refer to as *general academic* words)... appear in all sorts of text: informational texts (words such as *relative, vary, formulate, specificity, and accumulate*). Tier Two words often represent subtle ways to say relatively simple things — *saunter* instead of *walk* for example” (CCSS ELA & Literacy Appendix A: 33).

**Tier Two words formative assessment tip.** Students start a spreadsheet within Google Docs (a “Vocabulary Guide”) that contains a variety of Tier Two words, clues, definitions and the specific text in which it was found. Each time a student encounters an unfamiliar or unrecognized word they check the online “Vocabulary Guide” for assistance. If the word is not on the list, it is added. The teacher and students continually acknowledge and inspire the use of Tier Two words within daily dialog.

**Formative Assessment Tip.** “Formative assessment is not a test but a process—a *planned* process involving a number of different activities” (Popham, 2008).

**Enhancement Suggestion.** Students displaying competence can sharpen their skills by conducting further analysis of search engine results. Guiding questions can be used such as:  
1. How does this information compare with the original text/source?  
2. How was the original edited?  
3. As you analyze the editions, what can you infer with regards to author intent?

**These suggestions can also be adapted to diagnose competency in the following standards;** (W.9-10.1,2,4,5,7,9,10) (SL.9-10.1-6) (L.9-10.1-6)

---

**References:**
### 6-12 Reading Informational Text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RI.9-10.8</strong></th>
<th>Delineate and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text, assessing whether the reasoning is valid and the evidence is relevant and sufficient; identify false statements and fallacious reasoning.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy/Lesson Suggestions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assessment FOR Learning Suggestions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The following strategy utilizes a CCSS text exemplar from the 9-10 grade band. This strategy can be adapted to fit a variety of texts with an aligned level of complexity.</td>
<td>Exit Slip. Students analyze specific excerpts from the texts they have been reading closely. Students are given a certain amount of time to complete a brief summary explaining how the excerpts compare and contrast. For example, students are presented with a sentence from both Washington’s and FDR’s address;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Comparison and Synthesis of Ideas. Students closely read and conduct an analysis of texts such as George Washington’s “Farewell Address” and Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s “State of the Union Address”. Students evaluate each text with the purpose of conducting a comparison and synthesis of ideas. Particular emphasis can be placed upon tone, purpose or how each text outlines the author’s vision of America’s place in the world.</td>
<td>Washington - “Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow-citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government.” FDR - “We have joined with like-minded people in order to defend ourselves in a world that has been gravely threatened with gangster rule.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save the Last Word for Me. Students are given a specific amount of time to read through a text. While reading, students highlight specific claims made by the author. When time has expired, students record a certain number of sentences from their collection of highlighted claims. As this task is completed, students organize into predetermined small groups and discuss their recorded claims. Each student reads one of the sentences that he or she selected aloud, then listens to the other student’s responses to that sentence, and then explains his or her own response. This strategy can be adapted so that students record and discuss valid reasoning, relevant evidence, false statements and fallacious reasoning. (Vaughan &amp; Estes, 1986).</td>
<td>Prior to leaving the class, students turn in a brief comparison of the specific claims or arguments the authors attempt to make.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade. Students submit their exit slip in digital form (e.g., blog post comment, Google+ comment, Tweet, Google Doc form). The teacher studies and organizes the exit slips for diagnostic purposes providing quality feedback that moves learning forward. A “hinge-point question” is crafted from the responses and utilized to start a lesson the following day.</td>
<td>Hinge-point questions. A hinge-point question is a quick check on understanding (Wiliam, 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Ideally it takes less than a minute for all students to respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Ideally it takes less than 30 seconds for the teacher to view and interpret the responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These suggestions can also be adapted to diagnose competency in the following standards; (W.9-10.1,2,4,5,7,9,10) (SL.9-10.1,3-6) (L.9-10.1,2,4-6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**References:**


Washington’s Farewell Speech

Friends and Fellow Citizens:

The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured that this resolution has not been taken without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that in withdrawing the tender of service, which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest, no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness, but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in, the office to which your suffrages have twice called me have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety, and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that, in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and every day the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services, they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is intended to terminate the career of my public life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions,
agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead, amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging, in situations in which not unfrequently want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism, the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence; that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual; that the free Constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained; that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue; that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these States, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation and so prudent a use of this blessing as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection, and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all-important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people is also now dear to you. It is justly so, for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence, the support of your tranquility at home, your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters, much pains will be taken, many artifices employed to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed, it is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens, by birth or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have in a common cause fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts of common dangers, sufferings, and successes.
But these considerations, however powerfully they address themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest. Here every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The North, in an unrestrained intercourse with the South, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise and precious materials of manufacturing industry. The South, in the same intercourse, benefiting by the agency of the North, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the North, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and, while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The East, in a like intercourse with the West, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The West derives from the East supplies requisite to its growth and comfort, and, what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the secure enjoyment of indispensable outlets for its own productions to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as one nation. Any other tenure by which the West can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength, or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While, then, every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same governments, which their own rival ships alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues would stimulate and embitter. Hence, likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments which, under any form of government, are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind, and exhibit the continuance of the Union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? Let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who in any quarter may endeavor to weaken its bands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by geographical discriminations, Northern and Southern, Atlantic and Western; whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is
a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heartburnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our Western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the Executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the Senate, of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at that event, throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the General Government and in the Atlantic States unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi; they have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain, and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the Union by which they were procured? Will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such there are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliance, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances in all times have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government better calculated than your former for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government. But the Constitution which at any time exists, till changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacreddly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations, under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberation and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency. They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force; to put, in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of a party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill-concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common counsels and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men will be enabled to subvert the power of the people and to usurp for themselves the reins of government, destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.
Towards the preservation of your government, and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular oppositions to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretexts. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the Constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system, and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments as of other human institutions; that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country; that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change, from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion; and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests, in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the State, with particular reference to the founding of them on geographical discriminations. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind. It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but, in those of the popular form, it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge, natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and sooner or later the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purposes of his own elevation, on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight), the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill-founded jealousies and false alarms, kindles the animosity of one part against another, foments occasionally riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.
There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent its bursting into a flame, lest, instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power, and proneness to abuse it, which predominates in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositaries, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions by the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit, which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked: Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering
also that timely disbursements to prepare for danger frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it, avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertion in time of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should co-operate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes; that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment, inseparable from the selection of the proper objects (which is always a choice of difficulties), ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct; and can it be, that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt that, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it? Can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least, is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations, and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another a habitual hatred or a habitual fondness is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable, when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill-will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty, of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter without adequate inducement or justification. It leads also to concessions to the favorite nation of privileges denied to others which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions; by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill-will, and a disposition to retaliate, in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld. And it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens (who devote themselves to the favorite nation), facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding, with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a
commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils? Such an attachment of a small or weak towards a great and powerful nation dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow-citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy to be useful must be impartial; else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike of another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots who may resist the intrigues of the favorite are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop. Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none; or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people under an efficient government. the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than to private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But, in my opinion, it is unnecessary and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.
Harmony, liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing (with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them) conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied, as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that, by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion, which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations. But, if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare, by which they have been dictated.

How far in the discharge of my official duties I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have at least believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe, my proclamation of the twenty-second of April, 1793, is the index of my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of Congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest to take, a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it, with moderation, perseverance, and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without anything more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.
The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress without interruption to that degree of strength and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though, in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty five years of my life dedicated to its service with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations, I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize, without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow-citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government, the ever-favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors, and dangers.

United States
19th September, 1796

Geo. Washington

Transcription courtesy of the Avalon Project at Yale Law School.
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To the Congress:

This Nation in the past two years has become an active partner in the world's greatest war against human slavery.

We have joined with like-minded people in order to defend ourselves in a world that has been gravely threatened with gangster rule.

But I do not think that any of us Americans can be content with mere survival. Sacrifices that we and our allies are making impose upon us all a sacred obligation to see to it that out of this war we and our children will gain something better than mere survival.

We are united in determination that this war shall not be followed by another interim which leads to new disaster— that we shall not repeat the tragic errors of ostrich isolationism—that we shall not repeat the excesses of the wild twenties when this Nation went for a joy ride on a roller coaster which ended in a tragic crash.

When Mr. Hull went to Moscow in October, and when I went to Cairo and Teheran in November, we knew that we were in agreement with our allies in our common determination to fight and win this war. But there were many vital questions concerning the future peace, and they were discussed in an atmosphere of complete candor and harmony.

In the last war such discussions, such meetings, did not even begin until the shooting had stopped and the delegates began to assemble at the peace table. There had been no previous opportunities for man-to-man discussions which lead to meetings of minds. The result was a peace which was not a peace. That was a mistake which we are not repeating in this war.

And right here I want to address a word or two to some suspicious souls who are fearful that Mr. Hull or I have made "commitments" for the future which might pledge this Nation to secret treaties, or to enacting the role of Santa Claus.

To such suspicious souls—using a polite terminology—I wish to say that Mr. Churchill, and Marshal Stalin, and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek are all thoroughly conversant with the provisions of our Constitution. And so is Mr. Hull. And so am I.

Of course we made some commitments. We most certainly committed ourselves to very large and very specific military plans which require the use of all Allied forces to bring about the defeat of our enemies at the earliest possible time.

But there were no secret treaties or political or financial commitments.

The one supreme objective for the future, which we discussed for each Nation individually, and for all the United Nations, can be summed up in one word: Security.

And that means not only physical security which provides safety from attacks by aggressors. It means also economic security, social security, moral security—in a family of Nations.

In the plain down-to-earth talks that I had with the Generalissimo and Marshal Stalin and Prime Minister Churchill, it was abundantly clear that they are all most deeply interested in the resumption of peaceful progress by their own peoples—progress toward a better life. All our allies want freedom.
to develop their lands and resources, to build up industry, to increase education and individual opportunity, and to raise standards of living.

All our allies have learned by bitter experience that real development will not be possible if they are to be diverted from their purpose by repeated wars—or even threats of war.

China and Russia are truly united with Britain and America in recognition of this essential fact: The best interests of each Nation, large and small, demand that all freedom-loving Nations shall join together in a just and durable system of peace. In the present world situation, evidenced by the actions of Germany, Italy, and Japan, unquestioned military control over disturbers of the peace is as necessary among Nations as it is among citizens in a community. And an equally basic essential to peace is a decent standard of living for all individual men and women and children in all Nations. Freedom from fear is eternally linked with freedom from want.

There are people who burrow through our Nation like unseeing moles, and attempt to spread the suspicion that if other Nations are encouraged to raise their standards of living, our own American standard of living must of necessity be depressed.

The fact is the very contrary. It has been shown time and again that if the standard of living of any country goes up, so does its purchasing power and that such a rise encourages a better standard of living in neighboring countries with whom it trades. That is just plain common sense—and it is the kind of plain common sense that provided the basis for our discussions at Moscow, Cairo, and Teheran.

Returning from my journeyings, I must confess to a sense of "let-down" when I found many evidences of faulty perspective here in Washington. The faulty perspective consists in overemphasizing lesser problems and thereby underemphasizing the first and greatest problem.

The overwhelming majority of our people have met the demands of this war with magnificent courage and understanding. They have accepted inconveniences; they have accepted hardships; they have accepted tragic sacrifices. And they are ready and eager to make whatever further contributions are needed to win the war as quickly as possible— if only they are given the chance to know what is required of them.

However, while the majority goes on about its great work without complaint, a noisy minority maintains an uproar of demands for special favors for special groups. There are pests who swarm through the lobbies of the Congress and the cocktail bars of Washington, representing these special groups as opposed to the basic interests of the Nation as a whole. They have come to look upon the war primarily as a chance to make profits for themselves at the expense of their neighbors—profits in money or in terms of political or social preferment.

Such selfish agitation can be highly dangerous in wartime. It creates confusion. It damages morale. It hampers our national effort. It muddies the waters and therefore prolongs the war.

If we analyze American history impartially, we cannot escape the fact that in our past we have not always forgotten individual and selfish and partisan interests in time of war—we have not always been united in purpose and direction. We cannot overlook the serious dissensions and the lack of unity in our war of the Revolution, in our War of 1812, or in our War Between the States, when the survival of the Union itself was at stake.

In the first World War we came closer to national unity than in any previous war. But that war lasted only a year and a half, and increasing signs of disunity began to appear during the final months of the conflict.
In this war, we have been compelled to learn how interdependent upon each other are all groups and sections of the population of America.

Increased food costs, for example, will bring new demands for wage increases from all war workers, which will in turn raise all prices of all things including those things which the farmers themselves have to buy. Increased wages or prices will each in turn produce the same results. They all have a particularly disastrous result on all fixed income groups.

And I hope you will remember that all of us in this Government represent the fixed income group just as much as we represent business owners, workers, and farmers. This group of fixed income people includes: teachers, clergy, policemen, firemen, widows and minors on fixed incomes, wives and dependents of our soldiers and sailors, and old-age pensioners. They and their families add up to one-quarter of our one hundred and thirty million people. They have few or no high pressure representatives at the Capitol. In a period of gross inflation they would be the worst sufferers.

If ever there was a time to subordinate individual or group selfishness to the national good, that time is now. Disunity at home—bickerings, self-seeking partisanship, stoppages of work, inflation, business as usual, politics as usual, luxury as usual these are the influences which can undermine the morale of the brave men ready to die at the front for us here.

Those who are doing most of the complaining are not deliberately striving to sabotage the national war effort. They are laboring under the delusion that the time is past when we must make prodigious sacrifices- that the war is already won and we can begin to slacken off. But the dangerous folly of that point of view can be measured by the distance that separates our troops from their ultimate objectives in Berlin and Tokyo—and by the sum of all the perils that lie along the way.

Overconfidence and complacency are among our deadliest enemies. Last spring—after notable victories at Stalingrad and in Tunisia and against the U-boats on the high seas—overconfidence became so pronounced that war production fell off. In two months, June and July, 1943, more than a thousand airplanes that could have been made and should have been made were not made. Those who failed to make them were not on strike. They were merely saying, "The war's in the bag- so let's relax."

That attitude on the part of anyone—Government or management or labor—can lengthen this war. It can kill American boys.

Let us remember the lessons of 1918. In the summer of that year the tide turned in favor of the allies. But this Government did not relax. In fact, our national effort was stepped up. In August, 1918, the draft age limits were broadened from 21-31 to 18-45. The President called for "force to the utmost," and his call was heeded. And in November, only three months later, Germany surrendered.

That is the way to fight and win a war—all out—and not with half-an-eye on the battlefronts abroad and the other eye-and-a-half on personal, selfish, or political interests here at home.

Therefore, in order to concentrate all our energies and resources on winning the war, and to maintain a fair and stable economy at home, I recommend that the Congress adopt:

(1) A realistic tax law—which will tax all unreasonable profits, both individual and corporate, and reduce the ultimate cost of the war to our sons and daughters. The tax bill now under consideration by the Congress does not begin to meet this test.

(2) A continuation of the law for the renegotiation of war contracts—which will prevent exorbitant profits and assure fair prices to the Government. For two long years I have pleaded with the Congress to take undue profits out of war.
(3) A cost of food law—which will enable the Government (a) to place a reasonable floor under the prices the farmer may expect for his production; and (b) to place a ceiling on the prices a consumer will have to pay for the food he buys. This should apply to necessities only; and will require public funds to carry out. It will cost in appropriations about one percent of the present annual cost of the war.

(4) Early reenactment of the stabilization statute of October, 1942. This expires June 30, 1944, and if it is not extended well in advance, the country might just as well expect price chaos by summer.

We cannot have stabilization by wishful thinking. We must take positive action to maintain the integrity of the American dollar.

(5) A national service law—which, for the duration of the war, will prevent strikes, and, with certain appropriate exceptions, will make available for war production or for any other essential services every able-bodied adult in this Nation.

These five measures together form a just and equitable whole. I would not recommend a national service law unless the other laws were passed to keep down the cost of living, to share equitably the burdens of taxation, to hold the stabilization line, and to prevent undue profits.

The Federal Government already has the basic power to draft capital and property of all kinds for war purposes on a basis of just compensation.

As you know, I have for three years hesitated to recommend a national service act. Today, however, I am convinced of its necessity. Although I believe that we and our allies can win the war without such a measure, I am certain that nothing less than total mobilization of all our resources of manpower and capital will guarantee an earlier victory, and reduce the toll of suffering and sorrow and blood.

I have received a joint recommendation for this law from the heads of the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission. These are the men who bear responsibility for the procurement of the necessary arms and equipment, and for the successful prosecution of the war in the field. They say:

"When the very life of the Nation is in peril the responsibility for service is common to all men and women. In such a time there can be no discrimination between the men and women who are assigned by the Government to its defense at the battlefront and the men and women assigned to producing the vital materials essential to successful military operations. A prompt enactment of a National Service Law would be merely an expression of the universality of this responsibility."

I believe the country will agree that those statements are the solemn truth.

National service is the most democratic way to wage a war. Like selective service for the armed forces, it rests on the obligation of each citizen to serve his Nation to his utmost where he is best qualified. It does not mean reduction in wages. It does not mean loss of retirement and seniority rights and benefits. It does not mean that any substantial numbers of war workers will be disturbed in their present jobs. Let these facts be wholly clear.

Experience in other democratic Nations at war—Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand—has shown that the very existence of national service makes unnecessary the widespread use of compulsory power. National service has proven to be a unifying moral force based on an equal and comprehensive legal obligation of all people in a Nation at war.

There are millions of American men and women who are not in this war at all. It is not because they do not want to be in it. But they want to know where they can best do their share. National service
provides that direction. It will be a means by which every man and woman can find that inner satisfaction which comes from making the fullest possible contribution to victory.

I know that all civilian war workers will be glad to be able to say many years hence to their grandchildren: "Yes, I, too, was in service in the great war. I was on duty in an airplane factory, and I helped make hundreds of fighting planes. The Government told me that in doing that I was performing my most useful work in the service of my country."

It is argued that we have passed the stage in the war where national service is necessary. But our soldiers and sailors know that this is not true. We are going forward on a long, rough road- and, in all journeys, the last miles are the hardest. And it is for that final effort—for the total defeat of our enemies—that we must mobilize our total resources. The national war program calls for the employment of more people in 1944 than in 1943.

It is my conviction that the American people will welcome this win-the-war measure which is based on the eternally just principle of "fair for one, fair for all."

It will give our people at home the assurance that they are standing four-square behind our soldiers and sailors. And it will give our enemies demoralizing assurance that we mean business -that we, 130,000,000 Americans, are on the march to Rome, Berlin, and Tokyo.

I hope that the Congress will recognize that, although this is a political year, national service is an issue which transcends politics. Great power must be used for great purposes.

As to the machinery for this measure, the Congress itself should determine its nature—but it should be wholly nonpartisan in its make-up.

Our armed forces are valiantly fulfilling their responsibilities to our country and our people. Now the Congress faces the responsibility for taking those measures which are essential to national security in this the most decisive phase of the Nation's greatest war.

Several alleged reasons have prevented the enactment of legislation which would preserve for our soldiers and sailors and marines the fundamental prerogative of citizenship—the right to vote. No amount of legalistic argument can becloud this issue in the eyes of these ten million American citizens. Surely the signers of the Constitution did not intend a document which, even in wartime, would be construed to take away the franchise of any of those who are fighting to preserve the Constitution itself.

Our soldiers and sailors and marines know that the overwhelming majority of them will be deprived of the opportunity to vote, if the voting machinery is left exclusively to the States under existing State laws—and that there is no likelihood of these laws being changed in time to enable them to vote at the next election. The Army and Navy have reported that it will be impossible effectively to administer forty-eight different soldier voting laws. It is the duty of the Congress to remove this unjustifiable discrimination against the men and women in our armed forces- and to do it as quickly as possible.

It is our duty now to begin to lay the plans and determine the strategy for the winning of a lasting peace and the establishment of an American standard of living higher than ever before known. We cannot be content, no matter how high that general standard of living may be, if some fraction of our people—whether it be one-third or one-fifth or one-tenth- is ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill housed, and insecure.

This Republic had its beginning, and grew to its present strength, under the protection of certain inalienable political rights—among them the right of free speech, free press, free worship, trial by jury, freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures. They were our rights to life and liberty.
As our Nation has grown in size and stature, however—as our industrial economy expanded—these political rights proved inadequate to assure us equality in the pursuit of happiness.

We have come to a clear realization of the fact that true individual freedom cannot exist without economic security and independence. "Necessitous men are not free men." People who are hungry and out of a job are the stuff of which dictatorships are made.

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

Among these are:

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

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

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

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

The right of every family to a decent home;

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

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

The right to a good education.

All of these rights spell security. And after this war is won we must be prepared to move forward, in the implementation of these rights, to new goals of human happiness and well-being.

America's own rightful place in the world depends in large part upon how fully these and similar rights have been carried into practice for our citizens. For unless there is security here at home there cannot be lasting peace in the world.

One of the great American industrialists of our day—a man who has rendered yeoman service to his country in this crisis-recently emphasized the grave dangers of "rightist reaction" in this Nation. All clear-thinking businessmen share his concern. Indeed, if such reaction should develop—if history were to repeat itself and we were to return to the so-called "normalcy" of the 1920's—then it is certain that even though we shall have conquered our enemies on the battlefields abroad, we shall have yielded to the spirit of Fascism here at home.

I ask the Congress to explore the means for implementing this economic bill of rights— for it is definitely the responsibility of the Congress so to do. Many of these problems are already before committees of the Congress in the form of proposed legislation. I shall from time to time communicate with the Congress with respect to these and further proposals. In the event that no adequate program of progress is evolved, I am certain that the Nation will be conscious of the fact.

Our fighting men abroad and their families at home expect such a program and have the right to insist upon it. It is to their demands that this Government should pay heed rather than to the whining demands of selfish pressure groups who seek to feather their nests while young Americans are dying.

The foreign policy that we have been following—the policy that guided us at Moscow, Cairo, and Teheran—is based on the common sense principle which was best expressed by Benjamin Franklin on July 4, 1776: "We must all hang together, or assuredly we shall all hang separately."
I have often said that there are no two fronts for America in this war. There is only one front. There is one line of unity which extends from the hearts of the people at home to the men of our attacking forces in our farthest outposts. When we speak of our total effort, we speak of the factory and the field, and the mine as well as of the battleground -- we speak of the soldier and the civilian, the citizen and his Government.

Each and every one of us has a solemn obligation under God to serve this Nation in its most critical hour—to keep this Nation great -- to make this Nation greater in a better world.
We have come to a clear realization of the fact, however, that true individual freedom cannot exist without economic security and independence. 'Necessitous men are not free men'. People who are hungry and out of a job are the stuff of which dictatorships are made.

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

Among these are:

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

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

The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living;
The right of every business man, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad;

The right of every family to a decent home;

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

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

The right to a good education.

All of these rights spell security. And after this war is won we must be prepared to move forward, in the implementation of these rights, to new goals of human happiness and well-being.

America's own rightful place in the world depends in large part upon how fully these and similar rights have been carried into practice for our citizens. For unless there is security here at home there cannot be lasting peace in the world.
Analyze seminal U.S. documents of historical and literary significance (e.g., Washington’s Farewell Address, the Gettysburg Address, Roosevelt’s Four Freedoms speech, King’s “Letter from Birmingham Jail”), including how they address related themes and concepts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/Lesson Suggestions</th>
<th>Assessment FOR Learning Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The following strategy utilizes a CCSS text exemplar from the 9-10 grade band. This strategy can be adapted to fit a variety of texts with an aligned level of complexity.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Written Comparison and Synthesis of Ideas.</strong> Students conduct a CSI between texts such as The Declaration of Independence, Abraham Lincoln’s “Gettysburg Address”, Martin Luther King’s “I Have a Dream” Address, The Warren opinion of Brown vs. Board. As students analyze each text, the following guiding questions can be used; What does this word or phrase mean? What tone does this word usage convey? Why did the author write in this particular style?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change Frame.</strong> Students read a text and then organize the information in a change frame table which provides for relationships to be represented as well as comparisons to be made. Students work collaboratively with the teacher to create headings for each column. For example, when applied to history, headings can include; problems people faced, the causes of the problems and the solutions to the problems. When the template is complete students use the information to write an objective summary of their comparison and synthesis of ideas. (Buehl, 1992)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recognizing Concepts and Themes.</strong> Students dissect portions of extracted text in an effort to analyze similarities and differences in concepts and themes. For example, students analyze the language used within this passage of Warren’s opinion; “The plaintiffs contend that segregated public schools are not &quot;equal&quot; and cannot be made &quot;equal,&quot; and that hence they are deprived of the equal protection of the laws.” Students compare and contrast the language from Warren’s opinion with this excerpt from Martin Luther King’s “Letter from Birmingham Jail”; “Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny.” Objective feedback is continually shared to diagnose competency in recognizing key concepts and themes. Students work individually or in pairs, using a variety of resources to define selected words (including a student constructed “Vocabulary Guide” for Tier Two words). Students compare and contrast selected language and/or create word/sentence alternatives as a way to alter tone. Feedback is continually shared in an effort to move learning forward.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Project.</strong> Students utilize strategies within this template to progressively complete a sustained research project. The teacher listens intently and continually provides objective feedback in an effort to move learning forward.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>These suggestions can also be adapted to diagnose competency in the following standards:</strong> (W.9-10.1,2,4,5,7-10) (SL.9-10.2-4,6) (L.9-10.1-6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**References:**
When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident:

That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights; that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness; that to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness.  Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed.

But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their Right, it is their Duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their Future Security.  Such has been the Patient Sufferance of these Colonies, and such is now the Necessity which constrains them to alter their former Systems of Government.

The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated Injuries and Usurpations, all having in direct Object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States.  To prove this, let Facts be submitted to a candid World.

He has refused his Assent to Laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

He has forbidden his Governors to pass Laws of immediate and pressing Importance, unless suspended in their operation till his Assent should be obtained; and, when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.

He has refused to pass other Laws for the Accommodation of large Districts of People, unless those People would relinquish the Right of Representation in the Legislature, a Right inestimable to them, and formidable to Tyrants only.

He has called together Legislative Bodies at places inconvenient, and distant from the Depository of their Public Records, for the sole Purpose of fatiguing them into Compliance with his Demands.

He has dissolved Representative Houses repeatedly, for opposing with Manly Firmness, the Invasion of their Rights of the People.

He has refused his Assent to Laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

He has refused to pass other Laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the Right of Representation in the Legislature; a Right inestimable to them, and formidable to tyrants only.

He has dissolved Representative Houses repeatedly, for opposing with Manly Firmness the Invasion of their Rights of the People.

He has refused for a long time, after such Dissolutions, to cause others to be elected; whereby the Legislative Powers, incapable of Annihilation, have returned to the People at large for their exercise; the State remaining in the Mean Time exposed to all the dangers of Invasion from without and Convulsions within.

He has endeavored to prevent the Population of these States; for that Purpose obstructing the Laws for Naturalization of Foreigners; Refusing to pass Laws for Establishing establishments, and raising the conditions of new Appropriations of Lands.

He has obstructed the Administration of Justice, by refusing his Assent to Laws for establishing Judicial powers.

He has made Judges dependent on his Will alone, for the Tenure of their Offices, and the Amount and Payment of their Salaries.

We hold these Truths to be self-evident:

That all Men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights; that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness.
He has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance.

He has kept among us, in times of peace, standing armies, without the consent of our legislatures.

He has affected to render the military independent of, and superior to, the civil power.

He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our Constitution and unacknowledged by our laws, giving his assent to their acts of pretended legislation:

For quartering large bodies of armed troops among us;

For protecting them, by a mock trial, from punishment for any murders which they should commit on the inhabitants of these states;

For cutting off our trade with all parts of the world;

For imposing taxes on us without our consent;

For depriving us, in many cases, of the benefits of trial by jury;

For transporting us beyond seas, to be tried for pretended offenses;

For abolishing the free system of English laws in a neighboring province, establishing therein an arbitrary government, and enlarging its boundaries, so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these colonies;

For taking away our charters, abolishing our most valuable laws, and altering fundamentally the forms of our governments;

For suspending our own legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.

For abolishing the free system of English laws, in a neighboring province, establishing therein an arbitrary government, and enlarging its boundaries, so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these colonies;

For transporting us beyond seas, to be tried for pretended offenses;

For depriving us, in many cases, of the benefits of trial by jury;

For imposing taxes on us without our consent;

For cutting off our trade with all parts of the world;

For abolishing of these states;

For quartering large bodies of armed troops among us;

For giving his assent to the most detestable and odious acts of pretended legislation:

He has affected to render the military independent of, and superior to, the civil power.

He has kept among us, in times of peace, standing armies, without the consent of our legislatures.

He has afforded a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance.

He has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance.

Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776
North have we been wanting in our attentions to our British brethren. We have warned them, from time to time, of attempts by their legislature to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us. We have reminded them of the circumstances of our emigration and settlement here. We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity; and we have conjured them, by the ties of our common kindred, to disavow these usurpations which would inevitably interrupt our connections and correspondence. They too, have been deaf to the voice of justice and of consanguinity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity which denounces our separation, and hold them as our enemies in war, in peace friends.

We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the name and by the authority of the good people of these colonies solemnly publish and declare, that these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, FREE AND INDEPENDENT STATES; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British crown and that all political connection between them and the state of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dissolved; and that, as free and independent states, they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and do all other acts and things which independent states may of right do. And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

[Signed by] JOHN HANCOCK [President]

New Hampshire

JOSIAH BARTLETT,
WM. WHIPPLE,
MATTHEW THORNTON.

Massachusetts

SAML. ADAMS,
JOHN ADAMS,
ROBT. TREAT PAINE,
ELBRIDGE GERRY

New York

WM. FLOYD,
PHIL. LIVINGSTON,
FRANS. LEWIS,
LEWIS MORRIS.

New Jersey

RICHD. STOCKTON,
JOHN WITHERSPOON,
FRAS. HOPKINSON,
ABRA. CLARK.

Pennsylvania

ROBT. MORRIS
BENJAMIN FRANKLIN,
BENJAMIN RUSH,
GEO. THOMAS.

Delaware

GEO. ROSS,
JAMES WILSON,
GEO. TAYLOR,
JAS. SMITH,
GEO. CLOVER,
JHN. MOTONON,
BENJAMIN FRANKLIN,
BENJAMIN RUSH,
GEO. THOMAS.

Maryland

SAM. HUNTONTON,
ROGER SHEPHERD,
CONNECTICUT

WILLIAM ELERY,
STEP. HOPKINS,
Rhode Island

ELBRIDGE GERRY
ROBT. TREAT PAINE,
JOHN ADAMS,
SAM. ADAMS
Massachusetts Bay

MATTHEW THOMTON,
WM. WHITFLE,
JOSEAH BARTLETT,
New Hamphire

The representation of the United States of America, in General Congress assembled, appeal[ing] to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions. In the name and by the authority of the good people of these colonies, free and independent states, we have, therefore, pledged to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.
FRANCIS LIGHTFOOT LEE, 
CARTER BRAXTON.
North Carolina

WM. HOOPER, 
JOSEPH HEWES, 
JOHN PENN.
South Carolina

EDWARD RUTLEDGE, 
THOS. HAYWARD, JUNR., 
THOMAS LYNCH, JUNR., 
ARTHUR MIDDLETON.
Georgia

BUTTON GWINNETT, 
LYMAN HALL, 
GEO. WALTON.
Georgia

NOTE.—Mr. Ferdinand Jefferson, Keeper of the Rolls in the Department of State, at Washington, says: „The names of the
signers are spelt above as in the facsimile of the original, but the punctuation of them is not always the same; neither
the names of the States appear in the facsimile of the original. The names of the signers of each State are grouped
together in the facsimile of the original, except the name of Matthew Thornton, which follows that of Oliver Wolcott.„
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Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776
Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth upon this continent, a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that "all men are created equal."

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived, and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battle-field of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of it, as a final resting place for those who died here, that the nation might live. This we may, in all propriety do. But, in a larger sense, we can not dedicate—we can not consecrate—we can not hallow, this ground—The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have hallowed it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here; while it can never forget what they did here.

It is rather for us, the living, we here be dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that, from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they here gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve these dead shall not have died in vain; that the nation, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.
I Have A Dream
by Martin Luther King, Jr.

Delivered on the steps at the Lincoln Memorial in Washington D.C. on August 28, 1963.

Go back to Mississippi, go back to Alabama, go back to Georgia, go back to Louisiana, go back to Georgia, go back to Junior. I say to you today, my friends, that in spite of the difficulties and frustrations of the moment I still have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream.

I am not unmindful that some of you have come out of great trials and tribulations. Some of you have come fresh from narrow cells. Some of you have come from areas where your quest for freedom has been the quest of the freedom of your fathers who were not able to finish the journey, whose legs they were too short to walk the final mile. As I look back today upon theich-mile journey, I am filled with a sense of great hope. I say to you today, my friends, that in spite of the difficulties and frustrations of the moment I still have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream.

Go back to Mississippi, go back to Alabama, go back to Georgia, go back to Louisiana, go back to Georgia, go back to Junior. I say to you today, my friends, that in spite of the difficulties and frustrations of the moment I still have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream.

I am not unmindful that some of you have come out of great trials and tribulations. Some of you have come fresh from narrow cells. Some of you have come from areas where your quest for freedom has been the quest of the freedom of your fathers who were not able to finish the journey, whose legs they were too short to walk the final mile. As I look back today upon theich-mile journey, I am filled with a sense of great hope. I say to you today, my friends, that in spite of the difficulties and frustrations of the moment I still have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream.

Go back to Mississippi, go back to Alabama, go back to Georgia, go back to Louisiana, go back to Georgia, go back to Junior. I say to you today, my friends, that in spite of the difficulties and frustrations of the moment I still have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream.

I am not unmindful that some of you have come out of great trials and tribulations. Some of you have come fresh from narrow cells. Some of you have come from areas where your quest for freedom has been the quest of the freedom of your fathers who were not able to finish the journey, whose legs they were too short to walk the final mile. As I look back today upon theich-mile journey, I am filled with a sense of great hope. I say to you today, my friends, that in spite of the difficulties and frustrations of the moment I still have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream.

Go back to Mississippi, go back to Alabama, go back to Georgia, go back to Louisiana, go back to Georgia, go back to Junior. I say to you today, my friends, that in spite of the difficulties and frustrations of the moment I still have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream.

I am not unmindful that some of you have come out of great trials and tribulations. Some of you have come fresh from narrow cells. Some of you have come from areas where your quest for freedom has been the quest of the freedom of your fathers who were not able to finish the journey, whose legs they were too short to walk the final mile. As I look back today upon theich-mile journey, I am filled with a sense of great hope. I say to you today, my friends, that in spite of the difficulties and frustrations of the moment I still have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream.
I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal." I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slaveowners will be able to sit down together at a table of brotherhood. I have a dream that one day even the state of Mississippi, a desert state, sweltering with the heat of injustice and oppression, will be transformed into an oasis of freedom and justice. I have a dream that my four children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character. I have a dream today.

I have a dream that one day the state of Alabama, whose governor's lips are presently dripping with the words of interposition and nullification, will be transformed into a situation where little black boys and black girls will be able to join hands with little white boys and white girls and walk together as sisters and brothers. I have a dream today. I have a dream that one day every valley shall be exalted, every hill and mountain shall be made low, the rough places will be made plain, and the crooked places will be made straight, and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together. This is our hope. This is the faith with which I return to the South. With this faith we will be able to hew out of the mountain of despair a stone of hope. With this faith we will be able to transform the jangling discords of our nation into a beautiful symphony of brotherhood. With this faith we will be able to work together, to pray together, to struggle together, to go to jail together, to stand up for freedom together, knowing that that will be free one day.

With this faith we will be able to work together to stand up for freedom. With this faith we will be able to work together to stand up for freedom. With this faith we will be able to work together to stand up for freedom.

I have a dream today. I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal." I have a dream that all men are created equal. I have a dream today.
MR. CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN delivered the opinion of the Court.


APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka

347 U.S. 483
In the instant cases, the question is directly presented. Here, unlike Swift v. Pannier, there are findings below that the Negro and white schools involved have been equalized, or are being equalized, with respect to buildings, equipment, curricula, qualifications and salaries of teachers, and other educational aspects. With respect to buildings, equipment, qualifications and salaries of teachers, and other educational aspects, the question is directly presented. Here, unlike Swift v. Pannier, there are findings below that the Negro and white schools involved have been equalized, or are being equalized, with respect to buildings, equipment, curricula, qualifications and salaries of teachers, and other educational aspects.

In the instant cases, the question is directly presented. Here, unlike Swift v. Pannier, the Court expressly reserved decision on the question. In Swift v. Pannier, supra, the Court expressly reserved decision on the question of whether the Amendment should be held to public education. In the present cases, the question is directly presented. Here, unlike Swift v. Pannier, there are findings below that the Negro and white schools involved have been equalized, or are being equalized, with respect to buildings, equipment, curricula, qualifications and salaries of teachers, and other educational aspects.

In the instant cases, the question is directly presented. Here, unlike Swift v. Pannier, the Court expressly reserved decision on the question. In Swift v. Pannier, supra, the Court expressly reserved decision on the question of whether the Amendment should be held to public education. In the present cases, the question is directly presented. Here, unlike Swift v. Pannier, there are findings below that the Negro and white schools involved have been equalized, or are being equalized, with respect to buildings, equipment, curricula, qualifications and salaries of teachers, and other educational aspects.

In the instant cases, the question is directly presented. Here, unlike Swift v. Pannier, the Court expressly reserved decision on the question. In Swift v. Pannier, supra, the Court expressly reserved decision on the question of whether the Amendment should be held to public education. In the present cases, the question is directly presented. Here, unlike Swift v. Pannier, there are findings below that the Negro and white schools involved have been equalized, or are being equalized, with respect to buildings, equipment, curricula, qualifications and salaries of teachers, and other educational aspects.
In approaching this problem, we cannot turn the clock back to 1868, when the Amendment was adopted, or even to 1896, when *Plessy v. Ferguson* was written. We must consider public education in the light of its full development and its present place in American life throughout the Nation. Only in this way can it be determined if segregation in public schools deprives these plaintiffs of the equal protection of the laws.

Today, education is perhaps the most important function of state and local governments. Compulsory school attendance laws and the great expenditures for education both demonstrate our recognition of the importance of education to our democratic society. It is required in the performance of our most basic public responsibilities, even service in the armed forces. It is the very foundation of good citizenship. Today it is a principal instrument in awakening the child to cultural values, in preparing him for later professional training, and in helping him to adjust normally to his environment. In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms.

We come then to the question presented: Does segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the physical facilities and other "tangible" factors may be equal, deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities? We believe that it does.

In *Sweatt v. Painter*, supra, in finding that a segregated law school for Negroes could not provide the equal educational opportunities, this Court, relying on "those qualities which are incapable of objective measurement but which make for greatness in a law school." In *McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents*, supra, the Court, in requiring that a Negro admitted to a white graduate school be treated like all other students, again resorted to intangible considerations: "... his ability to study, to engage in discussions and exchange views with other students, and, in general, to learn his profession." Such considerations apply with added force to children in grade and high schools. To separate them from others of similar age and force to children in grade and high schools. To separate them from others of similar age and background because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone. The impact is greater when it has the sanction of the law, for the policy of separating the races is usually interpreted as denoting the inferiority of the negro group. A sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn. Segregation with the sanction of law, therefore, has a tendency to retard the educational and mental development of negro children and to deprive them of some of the benefits they would receive in a racial[ly] integrated school system. Whatever may have been the extent of psychological knowledge at the time *Brown v. Board of Education* was decided, it is evident to us now that the case requires consideration of these effects in the field of public education.

Warren Opinion Brown v. Board of Education
The time of *Plessy v. Ferguson* contrarily to this finding is rejected. Any language in *Plessy v. Ferguson* contrary to this finding is rejected. We conclude that, in the field of public education, the doctrine of "separate but equal" has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. Therefore, we hold that the plaintiffs and others similarly situated for whom the actions have been brought are, by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment. This disposition makes unnecessary any discussion whether such segregation also violates the due process clause of the *Fourteenth Amendment*.

The *Fourteenth Amendment* was adopted under the Constitution of the United States, and the plenary power of *Plessy v. Ferguson* contrarily to this finding is rejected. Any language in *Plessy v. Ferguson* contrarily to this finding is rejected. We conclude that, in the field of public education, the doctrine of "separate but equal" has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. Therefore, we hold that the
In the South Carolina case, *Briggs v. Elliott*, the plaintiffs are Negro children of both elementary and high school age residing in Clarendon County. They brought this action in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to enjoin enforcement of provisions in the state constitution and statutory code which require the segregation of Negroes and whites in public schools. S.C.Const., Art. XI, § 7; S.C.Code § 5377 (1942). The three-judge District Court, convened under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2281 and 2284, denied the requested relief. The court found that the Negro schools were inferior to the white schools, and ordered the defendants to begin immediately to equalize the facilities. But the court sustained the validity of the contested provisions and denied the plaintiffs admission to the white schools during the equalization program. 98 F.Supp. 529. This Court vacated the District Court's judgment and remanded the case for the purpose of obtaining the court's views on a report filed by the defendants concerning the progress made in the equalization program. 342 U.S. 350. On remand, the District Court found that substantial equality had been achieved in the schools, but did not rest this decision on that ground. The defendants were ordered to begin making additional expenditures to achieve further equalization of the Negro and white schools. The District Court's decree was affirmed by the Supreme Court of South Carolina, which held that the Negro schools were inferior to the white schools with respect to teacher-pupil ratios, extracurricular activities, physical plant, and time and distance involved in travel. 87 A.2d 767.

In the Virginia case, *Davis v. County School Board*, the plaintiffs are Negro children of high school age residing in Prince Edward County. They brought this action in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to enjoin enforcement of provisions in the state constitution and statutory code which require the segregation of Negroes and whites in public schools. Va.Const., § 140; Va.Code § 22-221 (1950). The three-judge District Court, convened under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2281 and 2284, denied the requested relief. The court found the Negro school inferior in physical plant, curricula, and transportation, and ordered the defendants to provide substantially equal curricula and transportation and to proceed with all reasonable dispatch to remove the inequality in physical plant. The court found that the Negro schools were inferior with respect to teacher-pupil ratios, extracurricular activities, and transportation, and ordered the defendants to provide substantially equal curricula and transportation and to proceed with all reasonable dispatch to remove the inequality in physical plant. The court found that the Negro schools were inferior in physical plant, curricula, and transportation, and ordered the defendants to provide substantially equal curricula and transportation and to proceed with all reasonable dispatch to remove the inequality in physical plant.

In the Delaware case, *Gebhart v. Belton*, the plaintiffs are Negro children of both elementary and high school age residing in New Castle County. They brought this action in the Delaware Court of Chancery to enjoin enforcement of provisions in the state constitution and statutory code which require the segregation of Negroes and whites in public schools. Del.Const., Art. X, § 2; Del.Rev.Code § 2631 (1935). The Chancellor gave judgment for the plaintiffs and ordered the defendants to provide substantially equal curricula and transportation and to proceed with all reasonable dispatch to remove the inequality in physical plant. The Chancellor's decree was affirmed by the Supreme Court of Delaware, which held that the Negro schools were inferior with respect to teacher-pupil ratios, extracurricular activities, and transportation, and ordered the defendants to provide substantially equal curricula and transportation and to proceed with all reasonable dispatch to remove the inequality in physical plant.
but elsewhere in the North, segregation in public education has persisted in some communities.

Warren Opinion Brown v. Board of Education
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granted, 344 U.S. 891. The plaintiffs, who were successful below, did not submit a cross-petition.

2.

344 U.S. 1, 141, 891.

3.

345 U.S. 972. The Attorney General of the United States participated both Terms as amicus curiae.

4.

For a general study of the development of public education prior to the Amendment, see Butts and Cremin, A History of Education in American Culture (1953), Pts. I, II; Cubberley, Public Education in the United States (1934 ed.), cc. II-XII. School practices current at the time of the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment are described in Butts and Cremin, supra, at 269-275; Cubberley, supra, at 288-329, 408-431; Knight, Public Education in the South (1922), cc. VIII, IX. See also H. Ex.Doc. No. 315, 41st Cong., 2d Sess. (1871).

5.

Slaughter-House Cases, 16 Wall. 36, 67-72 (1873); Strauder v. West Virginia, 100 U.S. 303, 307-308 (1880). It ordains that no State shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, or deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. What is this but declaring that the law in the States shall be the same for the black as for the white; that all persons, whether colored or white, shall stand equal before the laws of the white; that all persons, whether colored or white, shall stand equal before the laws, and that the Negro is entitled to all the rights and privileges enjoyed by the white race? The words of the Amendment, it is true, are prohibitory, but they contain a necessary implication of a positive immunity, or right, most valuable to the colored race -- the right to be exempted from all the disabilities that no discrimination shall make against them by law because of their color.

6.

The doctrine apparently originated in Roberts v. City of Boston, 59 Mass. 198, 206 (1850), upholding school segregation against attack as being violative of a state constitutional guarantee.

70
It is apparent that such segregation has long been a nationwide problem, not merely one of sectional concern.

Until recent years, it is apparent that such segregation has long been a nationwide problem, not merely one of sectional concern.

In the Cummin case, Negro taxpayers sought an injunction requiring the defendant school board to discontinue the operation of a high school for white children until the board resumed operation of a high school for Negro children. Similarly, in the Gong Lum case, the plaintiff, a child of Chinese descent, contended only that state authorities had misapplied the doctrine of equality of educational opportunity to education itself, as a class, receiving educational opportunities which are substantially inferior to those available to white children, other children, or Negro children. In the Kansas case, the court below found substantial equality as to all such factors. 98 F.Supp. 797, 798. In the South Carolina case, the court below found that the defendants were proceeding "promptly and in good faith to comply with the court's decree." 103 F.Supp. 920, 921. In the Virginia case, the court below noted that the equalization program was already "afoot and progressing" (103 F.Supp. 337, 341); since then, we have been advised, in the Virginia Attorney General's brief on reargument, that the program has now been completed. In the Delaware case, the court below similarly noted that the state's equalization program was well under way. 91 A.2d 137, 149.

A similar finding was made in the Delaware case:...
recommending specific terms for such decrees; (d) should this Court remand to the courts of first instance with directions to frame decrees in these cases and, if so, what general directions should the decrees of this Court include and what procedures should the courts of first instance follow in arriving at the specific terms of more detailed decrees? 14.

See Rule 42, Revised Rules of this Court (effective July 1, 1954).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Declaration of Independence</th>
<th>Gettysburg Address</th>
<th>I Have A Dream</th>
<th>Warren Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What does it say about equality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarities with other texts?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What makes this text unique?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What problems did they face?</td>
<td>What problems did they face?</td>
<td>What problems did they face?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes caused these</td>
<td>What changes caused these</td>
<td>What changes caused these</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problems?</td>
<td>problems?</td>
<td>problems?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group?</td>
<td>Group?</td>
<td>Group?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**History Change Frame Graphic Organizer**
By the end of grade 9, read and comprehend literary nonfiction in the grades 9–10 text complexity band proficiently, with scaffolding as needed at the high end of the range.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/Lesson Suggestions</th>
<th>Assessment FOR Learning Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparative Analysis of Literary Nonfiction.</strong> Similar to other standards, scaffolding is targeted to move learning forward so students are able to independently and draw cross textual connections among multiple texts with proficiency by the end of grade ten. The following guiding questions can be used as scaffolding as students build competency within this standard;</td>
<td><strong>Formative Assessment Tip.</strong> Feedback is provided and recorded on these suggested artifacts in order to regroup students for targeted learning opportunities. Teachers are encouraged to strategically score progress with a watchful eye on the formative assessment process. It is important to keep in mind that a “final grade” represents a summative score.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How does word choice and text structure compare/contrast between texts of similar topic written in different eras?</td>
<td>1. Students write a summary or essay that cites the textual evidence that most strongly supports an analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text. Aligned assessment and feedback of writing products can move learning forward with regards to writing skill, language acquisition, and reading comprehension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How does word choice and text structure compare/contrast between texts of similar topic written for different audiences?</td>
<td>2. Students answer and receive feedback on text dependent questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What symbols and/or images appear frequently in one or more texts?</td>
<td>3. Students engage in a variety of discussions &amp;/or Socratic questioning to display competency with regards to this standards. Aligned assessment and feedback of speaking and listening skills also promote growth is this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How does each author view an important historical/cultural issue differently or the same?</td>
<td>4. Students prepare a visual representation illustrating and citing the textual evidence that most strongly supports an analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences that may be drawn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How does each work use a particular meaning or tone to illustrate a point or support an argument?</td>
<td>5. Students engage in formal and informal presentations of a variety of products outlined above. Aligned assessment and feedback of speaking and listening skills during presentations also promote growth is this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How does the historical context of each work influence its meaning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How does a specific social movement influence each work?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Close Read.** Students read an appropriately complex text with varying levels of independence and support. Expectations are such that 9th grade students receive more support as they stretch their literacy levels toward independent reading and analysis of complex texts within this grade band by the completion of 10th grade. As students finish reading they are introduced to a focus question related to a text. Students return to the text for further study. Through text analysis, students develop viewpoints as to how the text explicitly responds to the focus question as well as inferences which may be drawn
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