

1. Weekly Homework (H15): Questions on Debating the 1960s and songs

- a. Answer the following questions **(5-6 sentences per question) *Essay Format*** using specific evidence from the assigned section in *Debating the 1960s*:

1. What were the core arguments raised by the anti-war movement against US policy in Vietnam, and what forms did resistance to the war take?
2. Why was 1968 a significant year in the divide between liberals and the left?
3. What does the author mean by the phrase "assault on liberal cultural authority" and how was that assault expressed regarding sex, the role of women, gays and lesbians, and music?
4. What is the author's conclusion regarding the outcome of battles between the left and others regarding culture and political power--which side triumphed in each area?
5. What are the main themes of "Eve of Destruction" and "The Dawn of Correction?" Identify one part of the lyrics that illustrates a theme in each song. How do these songs reflect the conflict between the left and liberals shown in the reading?

- b. Source:

https://www.google.com/books/edition/Debating_the_1960s/iJKRriJIM4C?hl=en&gbpv=0

PAGES 40-69

- c. Eve Of Destruction Lyrics:

Eve of Destruction, Barry McGuire (1965)

The eastern world it is explodin'
violence flarin', bullets loadin'
You're old enough to kill but not for votin'
You don't believe in war, what's that gun you're totin'
And even the Jordan river has bodies floatin'
But you tell me over and over and over again my friend
Ah, you don't believe we're on the eve of destruction
Don't you understand, what I'm trying to say?
Can't you feel the fear that I'm feeling today?
If the button is pushed, there's no running away
There'll be no one to save with the world in a grave
Take a look around you, boy, it's bound to scare you, boy
But you tell me over and over and over again my friend
Ah, you don't believe we're on the eve of destruction

Yeah, my blood's so mad, feels like coagulin'
I'm sittin' here just contemplatin'
I can't twist the truth, it knows no regulation
Handful of Senators don't pass legislation
And marches alone can't bring integration
When human respect is disintegratin'
This whole crazy world is just too frustratin'
And you tell me over and over and over again my friend
Ah, you don't believe we're on the eve of destruction
Think of all the hate there is in Red China
Then take a look around to Selma, Alabama
Ah, you may leave here for four days in space
But when you return it's the same old place
The poundin' of the drums, the pride and disgrace
You can bury your dead but don't leave a trace
Hate your next door neighbor but don't forget to say grace
And you tell me over and over and over and over again my friend
Ah, you don't believe we're on the eve of destruction.

Note: The voting age in 1965 was 21. The reference to “four days in space” refers to the Gemini space mission in June. The reference to Selma, Alabama refers to the beatings of civil rights protesters there in March.

d. The Dawn Of Correction Lyrics:

The Dawn of Correction, The Spokesmen (1965)

The western world has a common dedication
To keep free people from Red domination
And maybe you can't vote, boy, but man your battle stations
Or there'll be no need for votin in future generations
So over and over again, you keep sayin it's the end
But I say you're wrong, we're just on the dawn of correction
There are buttons to push in two mighty nations
But who's crazy enough to risk annihilation?
The buttons are there to ensure negotiation
So don't be afraid, boy, it's our only salvation
So over and over again, you keep sayin it's the end
But I say you're wrong, we're just on the dawn of correction
You tell me that marches won't bring integration
But look what it's done for the voter registration
Be thankful our country allows demonstrations
Instead of condemnin, make some recommendations
I don't understand the cause of your aggravation
You mean to tell me, boy, it's not a better situation?
So over and over again, you keep sayin it's the end
But I say you're wrong, we're just on the dawn of correction
You missed all the good in your evaluation
What about the things that deserve commendation?
Where there once was no cure, there's vaccination
Where there once was a desert, there's vegetation
Self-governments replacing colonization
What about the Peace Corps organization?
Don't forget the work of the United Nations
So over and over again, you keep sayin it's the end
But I say you're wrong, we're just on the dawn of correction
But I say you're wrong, we're just on the dawn of correction
So over and over again, you keep sayin it's the end
But I say you're wrong, we're just on the dawn of correction

Note: The reference to “vaccination” refers to the vaccine for polio, developed in the United States and shared with the rest of the world and thus removing a fear of polio that had been real for generations.

2. Weekly Homework (H16)--Berkeley in the Sixties

- a. Write a reflection regarding Berkeley in the Sixties.

Reflections must include a one paragraph summary of the main ideas of the source, followed by your reaction to what the material makes you think about. You can write about anything you want, provided it relates to the source. You can, for example, write about something that moved you in a particular way, something that strikes you as familiar to/different from the present, something that connects to other material you've encountered in the class, or something from your personal life. Or, it could be something else. You have a lot of freedom here. ***ESSAY STYLE***

- b. Source:

<https://video-alexanderstreet-com.proxy.library.vcu.edu/watch/berkeley-in-the-sixties-2>

- c. READ AFTER THE VIDEO:

Editorial, February 1965. California Monthly (Dick Erickson)

THE TRAGIC EVENTS of the past few months here at Berkeley seriously jeopardize the effectiveness of this University as an educational institution. What began as a protest involving less than 200 agitating students and non-students over two long-standing regulations has developed into a virtual civil war without arms.

This entire issue of *California Monthly* is devoted to a thorough exploration of the subject. This issue includes background and historical information as well as a sequence of events up to January 4, 1965, when Dr. Martin Meyerson assumed responsibility as Acting Chancellor.

As you would expect from a "civil war," much bitterness was produced between student and student, student and faculty, student and administrator, faculty and administrator, administrator and administrator. What started as one issue has now become a multitude of problems. Grievances of long standing, petty jealousies and completely extraneous matters have all been heaped into the "pot" which has certainly helped to raise the temperature and almost obliterate the original issue.

Rumors, charges and counter charges, emotion-packed rallies and sit-ins have punctuated this period with frightening rapidity. Allow me to give you a glimpse of some of the in-fighting which is known to me first hand or for which I have documentation.

Students were telephoned and urged to boycott their classes.

Students who attended their classes were called "scabs."

The mother of a student, who had served as an usher at the Greek Theatre on the occasion of the University Meeting with President Kerr and the Department Chairmen, was anonymously telephoned late at night and told her son was in great difficulty on the campus.

Telephone threats from unidentified callers have been received by students and at least one administrator.

One teaching assistant who held classes as scheduled received an anonymous call defaming him as a teacher in a profane way and labeling him to his department as a "subversive."

Some of the teaching staff intentionally cancelled classes and examinations in sympathy to the demonstrators.

Classes in at least one department were cancelled for an afternoon to "meet and discuss" the situation.

Rights? Freedom? Whose rights and whose freedoms? Unfortunately, too many of these idealistic students and sympathizers have felt that their opinions were the only correct ones and, if necessary to achieve an immediate acceptance of their opinions, intimidation and the use of force were fully justified.

The reaction of alumni and citizens to this series of crises has been immediate, vociferous, and continuous. The overwhelming opinion is that rules, regulations and laws must be obeyed and there must be respect for legally constituted authority.

Over 95 per cent of the thousands of letters and telegrams received by the Chancellor's office have reflected this opinion. On the issues involved, alumni opinions are varied. Most alumni question the forming of an opinion without more complete and factual information. Most alumni recognize the existence of student, faculty, administrative and Regent committees composed of reasonable and honorable persons fully capable of discussing issues and, where warranted, recommending and effecting changes in policies, rules and regulations. The vast majority of alumni and citizens of this State, however, will not countenance the disruption of educational activity on this campus.

As one reflects on these past difficulties, it is quite frightening to realize that force, intimidation and deliberate violations of rules all occurred on the campus of one of this country's most distinguished educational institutions. Time and time again education has been held up as the only real solution to the problems of the world. Theoretically, the students, faculty and administrators of this campus are among the finest in the world. If this is all correct, there have been some miserable failures along the line if force, intimidation and law-breaking are resorted to rather than reason, understanding and an appreciation for justice and fair play. As a matter of fact, one might seriously question our ability to solve peacefully our critical world problems if we are inept in handling campus problems. Academic life almost by definition suggests review, discussion, give and take, and above all the recognition of and respect for the rights of others. All of these processes for dealing with one's problems seem to have been forgotten or at least set aside during this period of crisis.

Frankly, I am very concerned about the future of our University. A great educational institution is definitely dependent upon the mutual respect of all individuals who are a part of it. Not only does this respect seem to be lacking but there also seems to be lacking the willingness to accept peacefully differences of opinion. Missing also are constructive efforts toward their ultimate solution. If we are to retain a position among the elite universities of this country, definite action is required.

First and foremost, we must have a faith in the honor and dignity of man. Badly needed also is a healthy respect for law and order and legally constituted authority.

Operating rules and regulations as well as basic policies are always subject to review and possible change or adjustment. An appreciation of this as an administrative philosophy is obviously required. Within such a framework of personal relationships, reasonable, sound and understandable regulations must be found. Then there must be firm and consistent enforcement of these regulations. Imperative throughout is an effective system of two-way communication involving all persons interested in or related to the University.

Although it is my strong conviction that all persons who have willfully and knowingly violated rules, regulations or laws and legally constituted authority should suffer appropriate disciplinary action, it is also my belief that all of us must share a portion of the responsibility for this entire affair. In a sense, what has happened at Berkeley is a concentrated reflection of our society today. Few if any of us would consider any institution, organization or government as being perfect. There are many areas within our social, political and business structure that fall considerably short of desired perfection. Many idealistic youths, as well as adults, are impatient with what seems to be a lack of progress. Although progress is certainly to be desired, rejection of respect for law and order and legally constituted authority is hardly a welcome alternative. Unfortunately, too many of our college students seem convinced that it is all right to follow this alternative route in seeking solutions to virtually any problem facing them. Rather obviously, parents, teachers and the communities in which these young people have been raised must share responsibility for what we now have on our hands.

As frightening and disturbing as our present situation is, there are some bright spots if you examine it closely. Administrative consultation and communication will be improved. As very careful attention has been given to the extensive growth of our University, similar attention must now be given to our intensive growth. With an already over-burdened administrative and teaching staff, this will only be accomplished with additional personnel.

Too many faculty members have ignored their responsibilities to their students. Overemphasis on research at the expense of teaching has been tolerated by departments and colleges for too long. Some encouraging signs of a more healthy faculty-student climate are already apparent.

This Alumni Association must do a far better job of communicating with you. If we are to fulfill properly our responsibility of service to the University, we must also relate ourselves much more closely to the students. Your Alumni Council is now studying ways and means of accomplishing these objectives.

Finally, the interested and concerned voice of alumni and tax-paying citizens of the State must be heard. This is your University. If it is to remain among the outstanding educational institutions of the world, your informed counsel and advice are required. Certainly it behooves us here at Alumni House to assist you in the communication process, but initiative is required on your part. The University needs you now as never before. The challenge is great and the rewards even greater. We look forward to your dynamic participation with us in the worthwhile endeavor of making the University of California pre-eminent.

Dick Erickson '49

<http://www.calisphere.universityofcalifornia.edu/>

3. Supplemental Work (S21): Gloria Steinem, What Would it Be Like if Women Win

a. Write a reflection (**375 words**) on the Steinem essay ***ESSAY FORMAT***

- b. Reflections must include a one paragraph summary of the main ideas of the source, followed by your reaction to what the material makes you think about. You can write about anything you want, provided it relates to the source. You can, for example, write about something that moved you in a particular way, something that strikes you as familiar to/different from the present, something that connects to other material you've encountered in the class, or something from your personal life. Or, it could be something else. You have a lot of freedom here.

c. Source:

Gloria Steinem, What it Would be Like if Women Win (1970)

Any change is fearful, especially one affecting both politics and sex roles, so let me begin these Utopian speculations with a fact. To break the ice.

Women don't want to exchange places with men. Male chauvinists, science-fiction writers and comedians may favor that idea for its shock value, but psychologists say it is a fantasy based on ruling-class ego and guilt.

That is not our goal. But we do want to change the economic system to one more based on merit. In Women's Lib Utopia, there will be free access to good jobs—and decent pay for the bad ones women have been performing all along, including housework. Increased skilled labor might lead to a four-hour workday, and higher wages would encourage further mechanization of repetitive jobs now kept alive by cheap labor.

With women as half the country's elected representatives, and a woman President once in a while, the country's *machismo* problems would be greatly reduced. The old-fashioned idea that manhood depends on violence and victory is, after all, an important part of our troubles in the streets, and in Vietnam. I'm not saying that women leaders would eliminate violence. We are not more moral than men: we are only uncorrupted by power so far. When we do acquire power, we might turn out to have an equal impulse toward aggression. Even now, Margaret Mead believes that women fight less often but more fiercely than men, because women are not taught the rules of the war game and fight only when cornered. But for the next 50 years or so, women in politics will be very valuable by tempering the idea of manhood into something less aggressive and better suited to this crowded, post-atomic planet. Consumer protection and children's rights, for instance, might get more legislative attention.

Men will have to give up ruling-class privileges, but in return they will no longer be the only ones to support the family, get drafted, bear the strain of power and responsibility. Freud to the contrary, anatomy is not destiny, at least not for more than nine months at a time. In this country, come Utopia, men and women won't reverse roles; they will be free to choose according to individual talents and preferences.

If role reform sounds sexually unsettling, think how it will change the sexual hypocrisy we have now. No more sex arranged on the barter system, with women pretending interest, and men never sure whether they are loved for themselves or for the security few women can get any other way. No more unequal partnerships that eventually doom love and sex; men who are encouraged to spend a lifetime living with inferiors; with housekeepers, or dependent creatures who are still children.

In order to produce that kind of confidence and individuality, child-rearing will train according to talent. Little girls will no longer be surrounded by airtight, self-fulfilling prophecies of natural passivity, lack of ambition and objectivity, inability to exercise power, and dexterity (so long as special aptitude for jobs requiring patience and dexterity is confined to poorly paid jobs; brain surgery is for males).

Schools and universities will help to break down traditional sex roles, even when parents will not. Half the teachers will be men, a rarity now at preschool and elementary levels; girls will not necessarily serve cookies or boys hoist up the flag. Athletic teams will be picked only by strength and skill. Sexually segregated courses like auto mechanics and home economics will be taken by boys and girls together. New courses in sexual politics will explore female subjugation as the model for political oppression, and women's history will be an academic staple, along with black history, at least until the white-male-oriented textbooks are integrated and rewritten.

As for the American child's classic problem—too much mother, too little father—that would be cured by an equalization of parental responsibility. Free nurseries, school lunches, family cafeterias built into every housing complex, service companies that will do household cleaning chores in a regular, businesslike way, and more responsibility by the entire community for the children: all these will make it possible for both mother and father to work, and to have equal leisure time with the children at home. For parents of very young children, however, a special job category, created by government and unions, would allow such parents a shorter workday.

The revolution would not take away the option of being a housewife. A woman who prefers to be her husband's housekeeper and/or hostess would receive a percentage of his pay determined by the pension fund, and for a job-training allowance. Or a divorce could be treated the same way that the dissolution of a business partnership is now.

Our marriage laws, for instance, are so reactionary that women's lib groups want couples to take a compulsory written exam on the law, as for a driver's license, before going through with the wedding. A man has alimony and wifely debts to worry about,

but a woman may lose so many of her civil rights that in the U.S. now, in important legal ways, she becomes a child again. In some states, she cannot sign credit agreements, use her maiden name, incorporate a business, or establish a legal residence of her own. Being a wife, according to most social and legal definitions, is still a nineteenth-century thing.

Assuming, however, that these blatantly sexist laws are abolished or reformed, that job discrimination is forbidden, that parents share financial responsibility for each other and the children, and that sexual relationships become partnerships of equal adults, then marriage will probably go right on. Men and women are, after all, physically complementary. When society stops encouraging men to be exploiters and women to be parasites, they may turn out to be more complementary in emotion as well. Women's lib is not trying to destroy the American family. A look at the statistics on divorce—plus the way in which old people are farmed out with strangers and young people flee the home—shows the destruction that has already been done. Liberated women are just trying to point out the disaster, and build compassionate and practical alternatives from the ruins.

What will exist is a variety of alternative life-styles. Since the population explosion dictates that childbearing be kept to a minimum, parents-and-children will be only one of many "families": couples, age groups, working groups, mixed communes, blood-related clans, class groups, creative groups. Single women will have the right to stay single without ridicule, without the attitudes now betrayed by "spinster" and "bachelor." Lesbians or homosexuals will no longer be denied legally binding marriages, complete with mutual-support agreements and inheritance rights.

Men's Lib. Men now suffer from more diseases due to stress, heart attacks, ulcers, a higher suicide rate, greater difficulty living alone, less adaptability to change and, in general, a shorter life-span than women. There is some scientific evidence that what produces physical problems is not work itself, but the inability to choose which work, and how much. With women bearing half the financial responsibility, and with the idea of "masculine" jobs gone, men might well feel freer and live longer.

Religion. Protestant women are already becoming ordained ministers; radical nuns are carrying out liturgical functions that were once the exclusive property of priests; Jewish women are rewriting prayers—particularly those that Orthodox Jews recite every morning thanking God they are not female. In the future, the church will become an area of equal participation by women. This means, of course, that organized religion will have to give up one of its great historical weapons: sexual repression. In most structured faiths, from Hinduism through Roman Catholicism, the status of women went down as the position of priests ascended. Male clergy implied, if they did not teach, that women were unclean, unworthy and sources of ungodly temptation, in order to remove them as rivals for the emotional forces of men. Full participation of women in ecclesiastical life might involve certain changes in theology, such as, for instance, a radical redefinition of sin.

Literary Problems. A boomlet of children's books about mothers who work has already begun, and liberated parents and editors are beginning to pressure for change in the textbook industry. Fiction writing will change more gradually, but romantic novels with wilting heroines and swashbuckling heroes will be reduced to historical value.

Manners and Fashion. Dress will be more androgynous, with class symbols becoming more important than sexual ones. Pro-or anti-Establishment styles may already be more vital than who is wearing them. Hardhats are just as likely to rough up antiwar girls as antiwar men in the street, and police understand that women are just as likely to be pushers or bombers. Dances haven't required that one partner lead the other for years, anyway. Chivalry will transfer itself to those who need it, or deserve respect: old people, admired people, anyone with an armload of packages. Women with normal work identities will be less likely to attach their whole sense of self to youth and appearance; thus there will be fewer nervous breakdowns when the first wrinkles appear.

Thus women's lib may achieve a more peaceful society on the way toward its other goals. That is why the Swedish government considers reform to bring about greater equality in the sex roles one of its most important concerns. As Prime Minister Olaf Palme explained in a widely ignored speech delivered in Washington this spring [1970]: "It is *human beings* we shall emancipate. In Sweden today, if a politician should declare that the woman ought to have a different role from man's, he would be regarded as something from the Stone Age." In other words, the most radical goal of the movement is egalitarianism.

If women's lib wins, perhaps we all do.

4. Supplemental Work (S22): Country Joe and the Fish

a. Song Analysis:

Answer the following questions (three sentences per question): *ESSAY STYLE*

- i. Describe what you hear—the music and vocal style. What is the mood of the song?
- ii. Look at the lyrics. What is the overall theme of the song? Identify one part of the lyrics that leads you to this conclusion.
- iii. What does this song reveal about the time in which it was produced?
- iv. What does this song lead you to think about regarding this moment in history?

b. SONG LYRICS:

"I Feel Like I'm Fixin' To Die Rag"

Country Joe and the Fish

Well, come on all of you, big strong men
Uncle Sam needs your help again
He's got himself in a terrible jam
Way down yonder in Vietnam
So put down your books and pick up a gun
We're gonna have a whole lotta fun
And it's one, two, three
What are we fighting for?
Don't ask me, I don't give a damn
Next stop is Vietnam
And it's five, six, seven
Open up the pearly gates
Well there ain't no time to wonder why
Whoopee! we're all gonna die
Well, come on generals, let's move fast
Your big chance has come at last
Now you can go out and get those reds
'Cause the only good commie is the one that's dead
And you know that peace can only be won
When we've blown 'em all to kingdom come
And it's one, two, three
What are we fighting for?
Don't ask me, I don't give a damn
Next stop is Vietnam
And it's five, six, seven
Open up the pearly gates
Well there ain't no time to wonder why
Whoopee! we're all gonna die
Come on Wall Street, don't be slow
Why man, this is war au-go-go
There's plenty good money to be made
By supplying the Army with the tools of its trade
But just hope and pray that if they drop the bomb
They drop it on the Viet Cong
And it's one, two, three
What are we fighting for?
Don't ask me, I don't give a damn
Next stop is Vietnam
And it's five, six, seven
Open up the pearly gates
Well there ain't no time to wonder why
Whoopee! we're all gonna die
Come on mothers throughout the land
Pack your boys off to Vietnam
Come on fathers, and don't hesitate
To send your sons off before it's too late
And you can be the first ones in your block
To have your boy come home in a box
And it's one, two, three
What are we fighting for?
Don't ask me, I don't give a damn
Next stop is Vietnam
And it's five, six, seven
Open up the pearly gates
Well there ain't no time to wonder why
Whoopee! we're all gonna die

5. Art Essay:

a. ESSAY TOPIC: *ESSAY FORM LONG*

- b. Compare Cimabue's and Giotto's *Virgin and Child Enthroned*. Identify the style. How are they similar? How are they different? Be specific. (300 word min.)
- c. Use your book and the online lecture.
-

6. QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED:

- a. Briefly outline the main differences between the Roman Catholic Church and the Eastern Orthodox Church. Please address the difference between papal and church council infallibility.
- b. In a paragraph, please discuss the connection between Judaism and Christianity.