

HST 202: History of United States W18 (Escobar Meta 30898 30897)

Home ► My courses ► HST 202 W18 (Escobar Meta 30898 30897) ► Week 8 ► Forum 3 ►
Legacy of Reconstruction

 Search forums

Forum 3

Legacy of Reconstruction

• [Subscribe](#)

◀ [Reconstruction Cartoons](#)

[Reconstruction Cartoons](#) ▶

Display replies in nested form ▼

Move this discussion to ... ▼

Move

Pin



Legacy of Reconstruction

by Joe Escobar - Saturday, February 24, 2018, 12:43 AM

This thread is for discussions on the Legacy of Reconstruction topic.

To make your POSTS, click the reply link in this, MY post. To reply to another student's post, be sure to click the reply link within in THEIR post.

IMPORTANT - SUBJECT LINES

BE SURE to use an informative subject line for your post, something that describes which one of the issues you are addressing . Do NOT simply leave it RE: Legacy of Reconstruction

Sum of ratings: -

[Permalink](#) | [Edit](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



The Birth of Birthright Citizenship

by Chelsea Sheltman - Sunday, February 25, 2018, 2:50 PM

Although birthright citizenship may seem like it has always been a part of the United States, Foner explains that it was created after the civil war, with passing of the fourteenth amendment, because the U.S. had inhabited four million slaves who were immigrants. Therefore, with their freedom, they gained citizenship (rights) and their children born on American soil would gain citizenship as well. The United States is one on a small list of countries that still practices birthright citizenship. Presently, Foner gave out the statistic of twelve million illegal immigrants and their children receiving of citizenship when born in the United States. This is because of the fourteenth amendment that was developed precisely

because of the newly freed population of the 1860s. Its purpose was to serve in that century for reconstruction, in order to bring give equal rights to those formerly enslaved and oppressed. This still did not include white or black women.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: The Birth of Birthright Citizenship

by Brogan Cornish - Thursday, March 1, 2018, 11:22 PM

It's crazy to see how a lot of other countries don't have the birth right citizenship. I agree completely that with the 14th amendment it help to reconstruct our immigrant problem after the civil war. This amendment in which we still follow through with today. Solving the immigration problem for Negroes in the U.S. was problem number one. Great job using also Foner stats about the Negroes it was very enlightening about how many people really gained citizenship.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: The Birth of Birthright Citizenship

by Jordan Lopez - Saturday, March 3, 2018, 9:47 PM

Agreed, the problem with the Amendments is that they were a solution to fix an issue of the time of creation. Our problem as a nation is we try to re-word these Amendments to fit the life we live today. Look at the first amendment, at the time religion had much influence on people even in political position. The second amendment was made when muskets were the superior weapon of choice. So when the 14th amendment was passed for citizenship it was to solve the issues at the time. Look on page 570 of our textbook, it states in section 3 "disqualified a significant number of ex-confederates from holding federal or state office".

Section 4 also states that it "guaranteed the national debt and repudiated the Confederate debt. Today we have an issue with this Amendment. I personally have a father born in Mexico and he was an illegal immigrant at the time of my birth. Now he is a legal resident so I can see obstacles one has to take to not feel threatened of sepreation of their immediate family. I also have a friend who got to share her story on the news when she was separated from her father who had been taken back to Mexico. So yes, our underlying issue is the difficulty to change and add amendments. Conservatives love this whoo aren't being affected by it, but as a liberal I wouldn't oppose clarity in any Amendment.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Johnson's Policy and Secession Stance

by Dylan Castle - Monday, February 26, 2018, 7:04 PM

Although Andrew Johnson was the only senate member who was from a seceding state that did not support the confederacy, he still provided a "blanket amnesty for all except the highest ranking officials and military members..." also including "ex-confederates with taxable property worth \$20,000" (pg 564) who were also known as the "stuck up aristocrats" . The only white confederates to be able to vote during this time period were those who had been granted amnesty and taken an oath of allegiance.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



2nd and 14th Amendments.

by Isaac Anderson - Monday, February 26, 2018, 10:24 PM

After doing some reading and thinking about birthright citizenship, I can't help but compare it to the issues of the second amendment. The second amendment granted people the right to bear arms in order to prevent tyrannical governments. When drafting this amendment James Madison had no idea of the technological advancements that would make the right to bear arms as controversial as it is today, but it was a precaution relevant to the times.

Now, when considering the fourteenth amendment, section 1 "Defined all native born or naturalized persons, including blacks, as American citizens and prohibited the states from abridging the privileges and immunities of citizens, from depriving any person of life, liberty or property without due process of the law, and from denying to any person the equal protection of the laws (Liberty, Equality, Power, pg. 570). Like Foner states in the forum material video, "the struggle to abolish slavery and the debate over what was going to be the status of these people eventually led to the incorporation in the laws and the constitution in the fourteenth amendment of this principle of birthright citizenship (4:30)." I understand section 1 of the fourteenth amendment to be a solution to the "struggle of what was to come of these people" during the reconstruction era. The right to bear arms was created to protect newly gained freedoms and Birthright citizenship for the same reason. Perhaps, like the second amendment, the future issues that the fourteenth amendment would cause, simply weren't considered, or were unable to be considered due to ignorance of future advancements.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: 2nd and 14th Amendments.

by Alex McCall - Thursday, March 1, 2018, 9:31 AM

Great comparison of the two amendments. I was thinking about that as well when I was writing my response about birthright citizenship. At the time, the amendment make perfect sense. However now, with our massive population and economic position, a change to the amendments would make perfect sense in my opinion.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: 2nd and 14th Amendments.

by Camille Titus - Thursday, March 1, 2018, 10:44 PM

I didn't think at all about how different amendments connected or how similar the unintended consequences turned out to be. I'm very glad you brought this up, it's an interesting viewpoint. To me, again, the first thing I thought of was the "zero sum game" that has been playing a prominent role in this time period. First was that by making the african americans citizens gave them the right to bear arms, would this be seen as taking away gun power from the whites? I think it would be treated so. As one of the videos stated in class on tuesday, white people were very scared about the idea that former slaves having

weapons. Which makes sense especially after events like the Nat Turner rebellion, even though it's years after they were still afraid of the african americans turning the guns toward them.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Significance of Birthright Citizenship in the Reconstruction Time Period

by David Garvin - Monday, February 26, 2018, 11:12 PM

Birthright citizenship was very significant in the reconstruction due to the fact that former slaves born in the US lived their lives here and knew the US as their home. The slave trade ended many years before slavery was abolished and many of their ancestors were also born in the US. Birthright citizenship also helped to allow former slaves and free blacks access to more rights that other citizens had. This allowed former slaves to have more choice in their lives and what type of work they wanted to do. Today birthright citizenship raises topics surrounding immigration. If someone from another country comes here and gives birth to a child then that child becomes a US citizen although the parents are not citizens. This raises debates about the original intentions of birthright citizenship in the US and if it applies to children of people that do not legally immigrate to the US and gain citizenship.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Roller coaster ride during reconstruction.

by Jordan Lopez - Monday, February 26, 2018, 11:59 PM

During the civil war, lincoln wanted to preserve the union and abolish slavery. So after the civil war slavery became illegal and reconstruction began. There were its ups and downs, its victories and its loses. Professor foner says that in the eve of the civil war blacks werent citizens, and the 14th amendment was a result of the civil war stating that anyone born in the U.S would be a citizen. He also says that the amendment was ignored for decades. The South wasnt liking these new rules but the Republicans stated that in order to have seats in Congress that states would have to adopt the 14th and 15th amendment. Tennessee was the first to adopt these amendments, not every state jumped to do the same. There were racial protest happening during reconstruction and even the ku klux klan being establish to take down the Republican party. So we can see there was rebellion even during reconstruction and to someone not knowledgable on this time period if I mention that there was a reconstruction period they would think of a positive direction in progress. The book states that it wasnt untill 1870 were the constitution was colorblind. However, eric foner states that there is even issues today that derived from the civil war era. On page 591 of our textbook it says that the end of reconstruction was realized by the compromise of 1877. So why do I today feel like we are still reconstructing our nations history of racial differences?

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



The problem with Birthright Citizenship

by Alex McCall - Wednesday, February 28, 2018, 10:49 AM

Now I can understand why birthright citizenship could be a nice law to have for an establishing country, or an undeveloped country. Us and Canada are the only developed countries with this law still intact. (www.numbersusa.com) I think for a developed country, this definitely should not be a thing. I mean, in our situation right now, I don't see why people would even want to come here. But if an illegal alien has a baby here and the baby is a citizen but the parents are not, then there is where the problem comes in. It's also common that one or both the parents get deported and then the child has to find a different living situation if they wanted to stay. Or what if a foreign student has a baby in U.S., then they are a U.S. citizen and they will have to go through a huge process to become a citizen in their parents home country. I just think if they want to live in the country, then go through the legal process. It's working for Australia, Sweden, the list goes on. Just one less economic burden to worry about.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Birthright Citizenship/Not enforcing laws

by Alex McCall - Saturday, March 3, 2018, 6:24 PM

Birthright Citizenship can be used as a sub topic for one of the other issues, which is not enforcing passed laws. Birthright citizenship laws defy other laws that we have such as illegal immigration. Why do we say "You have to become a citizen in a lawful way" but then have a law that makes it so you don't have to. This is a prime metaphor for our country right now, they say they're going to do something but in actuality they are doing the opposite. However, this example is super obvious and somewhat silly in my opinion.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



American Hubris?

by Camille Titus - Wednesday, February 28, 2018, 9:18 PM

Durning Professor Forner's speech I found I agree with the points on American progress and freedom. The idea that our progress and freedom is a straight line to greatness is not only funny to me, but also a show of hubris. Before learning more about the reconstruction period I thought that the civil war fixed most of the problems. Now knowing more about this period of American history, I think that the reconstruction period foretold a lot. Such as Professor Forner said it "laid the foundation" for later revolutionaries of the civil rights. Though I am also interested in how this "perfect to beter freedom" mindset has changed. I think that people during this period believed that they were doing the right things, on both sides. Both were trying to make progress for freedom in their own ways. This made me start to think about what our Professor said on Tuesday about the "zero sum game". You can see this in both during the reconstruction period and our time by people being scared about what they lose when others gain. For the white people during the reconstruction period, any gain for the african americans would take away from the whites. These new competitors for jobs and social status were terrifying to many. My mind was blown away by a lot of what Professor Forner said, but the idea of how much we struggle for progress and freedom over our history and still today was the most mind boggling.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Reconstruction Regresses U.S.

by Brogan Cornish - Wednesday, February 28, 2018, 10:20 PM

In the video of, "Legacy of Reconstruction" only this part of legacy didn't look well for the U.S. Before, during, and after the war, "right were gained and sometimes rights were taken away" said Professor Foner. He is talking about how African Americans rights were taken away during the war by the south. Again Foner points out, "the 14th amendment remained part of the constitution but was ignored." He explains about how the south continued to ignore the constitutional rights even though they had been agreed before the war. Also Foner talks about how, "today we have some constitutional rights and they're being violated." He talking about the progress and freedmen of the U.S. aren't always moving in a positive direction in history. In the civil war the South violated a lot of the blacks rights even though they jut gained the right to be free, but the south's economy was built on slaves. The majority of southern farmers had the most money invested within people. What I mean by people is slaves they spent the most money to keep their farms going with slaves. When these amendments were passed it didn't go well with southerners causing U.S. History to stall or even have a negative affect.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1



[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Reconstruction Regresses U.S.

by Jordan Lopez - Saturday, March 3, 2018, 4:00 AM

I don't necessarily believe in regression during this time period. To me it was a constant battle back and forth between progress and regression but mainly leading to progress in the end. This constant back and forth battle took place between many different groups. Such as the battle between Republicans and The Democratic Party, whites vs blacks, North vs South, Grant vs Lee, Sherman vs Johnston, Davis vs Lincoln, Congress vs Johnson, Lee vs McClellan, Richmond vs Washington, The Monitor vs The Alabama, and even Stonewall Jackson vs his own men who attacked him on mistake, leading to his death days later. Due to the very regression came opposition that led to progress. Even groups forming like The American Equal Rights Association with Elizabeth Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, eventually leaving that to create National Women's Suffrage Association Mentioned on page 574. Such associations layed the foundation and path to women being able to vote in 1920. The freedmens Bureau which was created by Congress had helped oversee relations between freedmen and old slave owners And issued food rations to 150,000 people. Yeah there was a strong fight back from the south, especially Southern Democrats. State conventions in the south didnt enfranchise a single black. Slave codes being passed to prevent black men from things like voting and participating in juries. Burning of black schools in the south. Ignoring the 14th and 15th amendment and a huge obstacle to me that made progress slow is Lincolns death and that darn Andrew Johnson becoming President. Now with a Democratic president during this crucial era of reconstruction it made it harder to progress. Johnson kept vetoeing bills left and right passed by Congress and refused to work with them in implementing a progressive reconstruction policy. I now know why after reading about him mainly in chapter 17 that he is one of the worst presidents we have learned so far. It wasnt untill after the impeachment period by Congress for violated the Tenure Of Office Act where he quieted down and just served the rest of his term. When Grant took office there was some better changes that took place since he opposed Johnsons reconstruction plan. Grant was also a Republican and had fought with the Union Army and a favorite of Lincoln with Lincoln even saying " Grant is my man" read on p.540. However, many said his administration was looked down upon due to corruption

and the lack of qualified cabinet members but atleast that darn Johnson wasnt President anymore. So I do think progress was at play. Just not always in a good way. As the book says on page 572, it mentions how a french journalist described the emancipation and enfranchisement era. He says " one of the most radical revolutions known in history". So my argument is that there is regression but progress comes with that. Even with today when it comes to people drinking and driving. There was a highly amount of drinking and driving incidents and MADD was founded to fight it. So with every curve down in progress there is something fighting for a curve up.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Progress and Freedom in U.S. History

by David Garvin - Friday, March 2, 2018, 3:40 PM

After learning more about the reconstruction time period through class lectures and the text book it becomes very obvious that progress to equal rights is very up and down. After slavery was abolished freedman were subject to harsh discrimination under Black Codes. In chapter 17 they state, "...states excluded black people from juries and the ballot box, did not permit them to testify against whites in court, banned interracial marriage, and punished blacks more severely than whites for certain crimes. Some states defined any unemployed black person as a vagrant and hired him out to a planter, forbade blacks to lease land, and provided for the apprenticing to whites of black youth." (Pg 566) These laws kept freedman in a form of slavery and allowed whites to continue to be the influencing factor in elections.

Freedman were also subject to violence and murder by whites who resisted the idea of equal rights for black. The Ku Klux Klan was formed and had a lot of ex-confederate soldiers in it. "Part of the Klan's purpose was social control of the black population. Share croppers who tried to extract better terms from landowners, or black people who were considered too "uppity," were likely to receive a midnight whipping-or worse- from white-sheeted Klansmen." This violence and murder towards blacks was not a linear direction to equal rights like many think it was after the Civil War. The violence only dropped after congress enacted three laws to protect blacks and enforce the 14th and 15th amendments. Federal troop and marshals were also sent in to arrest thousands of Klan member.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Progress and Freedom in U.S. History

by Jordan Lopez - Saturday, March 3, 2018, 4:43 AM

When you mention Black Codes being a down factor in the form of progression. I necessary dont think so, Black Codes were preventing blacks from civil rights but not in every state. Also, blacks were already use to not having these privileges so they werent loosing anything. During reconstruction period there was a lot of privileges black men had that they didnt have before the war. They held 10-15% of Political Office positions in the south especially in South Carolina which was the starter of southern succession and huge in the slave industry, some bought land, others went to school reducing illiteracy rates, some southern republican freedmen got the chance to vote. All privileges that wasnt given in the antebellum south. Black Codes, whites refusing to sale land to blacks, southern states opposition to ratifying the new Amendments. All these things were obstacles to

many freedmen but there defiantly was a small upward curve in progress. And yes, they did send in federal troops to crush the KKK, but if you read on you will find that this “ bayonet rule” was going to be used against republicans during elections. To give you an example, during the Mississippi elections of 1875, Democrats inflicted violence during Republican rallies. Federal troops were to be sent in but Grant was advised not to since Democrats might use the Bayonet rule against them since it was negatively brought up previously. A Republican majority took place in the legislative and Governor Offices in Mississippi untill this election where it turned toward the majority of the Democratic party. Even during the Compromise of 1877 which was a result of the election of 1876. A behind the scenes compromise had been taking place where Rutherford Hayes promised to rebuild war destroyed levees in the south and was advised to appoint a southern Postmaster General. Southerners then asked Hayes about South Carolina and Louisiana where federal troops have been present. Hayes then got rid of the bayonet rule and fulfilled the other parts of the compromise when he was elected which marked the end of the 12 year post-war reconstruction period.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



14th Amendment

by Rodrigo Santiago-Corona - Friday, March 2, 2018, 4:05 PM

"We are still living today with the legacy, and consequences of change that took place in American society in that era" (Eric Foner).

Every year in the United States, thousands of children are born to illegal immigrants. Although these children's parents are illegal, they are automatically considered American citizens. Going back to the eighteenth century, in 1857 the supreme court ruled in the Dread Scott decision that; no black person could be a citizen of the United States, and that citizenship was for whites only. Although Blacks were born in the United States, and resided in the states, they were not considered legal citizens. The Fourteenth Amendment as stated on page 570 of the text book, "section 1 defined all native born or naturalized persons, including blacks, as American citizens and prohibited the states from abridging the "privileges and immunities" of citizens, from depriving "any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law." Section One of the Fourteenth Amendment has become the most important provision in the Constitution for defining and enforcing civil rights.

The United States represents a concept of civic nationals, which meant anyone could become a citizen. The United states was considered of ethnic nationalism prior to the Civil War, which was grounded on the racial boundaries of slavery. Today the United states is one of few countries that allows those born from non natives to receive citizenship.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Passing Laws or "Having Rights"

by David Garvin - Friday, March 2, 2018, 4:21 PM

Just because a law is passed or people gain rights does not mean it will be enforced or you will gain any protection from the government. The 14th amendment in article one states, "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." This amendment was ratified in 1868 yet black still faced discrimination for many decades to come. They became second class citizens and were segregated. Racism still persisted at the government level and people of color would not be treated the same as whites were.

In modern times the 14th amendment is used to provide equal rights to all citizens of the United States. In *Brown vs. The board of Education* the supreme court ruled that laws segregating public schools is unconstitutional. This is a great example of how an amendment passed decades before this court ruling still wasn't enforced to provide equal rights to all. The supreme court also ruled in *Obergefell vs. Hodges* that the right to marry is guaranteed to same-sex couples by the 14th amendment.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Passing Laws or "Having Rights"

by Miriel Orhai - Saturday, March 3, 2018, 3:38 PM

I found it interesting what Foner said about how the Reconstruction amendments, though not enforced during the time they were first enstated, formed the basis for the Civil Rights movement in the 1960s. The divide is so clearly shown in that example-- in order for Black people to live in equality with whites, no new amendments had to be drawn up, the old ones just had to be enforced. Our Constitution is constantly under examination. So often I hear of Supreme Court cases that set new standards-- all based on the same articles and amendments, phrased in the exact same way as when they were written. The job of interpreting our Constitution is fascinating to me-- that what is judged as right or wrong in our country is based so solely on these exact words, and that sometimes things are simply ignored.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Passing Laws or "Having Rights"

by Jordan Lopez - Saturday, March 3, 2018, 9:19 PM

Enforcing the admendments have been an issue of its own, even for today. In the book on page 587 it states how "the Supreme Court handed down to decisions that declared parts of the 1870 and 1871 laws for enforcement of the 14th and 15th amendments unconstitutional". To sum it all up it says that "No State".. shall interfere with the civil rights stated in the Amendments . It does not mention individuals interfering. Therefore, the laws empowering the federal government to prosecute individuals were declared unconstitutional. Watching the 2 minute video about the Amendments I learned further more that the first to ratify the 15th amendment was Nevada in 1869 which is good. However, Tennessee didnt ratify the 15th amendment untill 1997. mostly everyone in the class is born before or during that time period. Now Congress had made the last states

who didnt want to ratify the 14th amendment, also ratify the 15th amendment. However Tennessee was the first state to join the Union so they weren't required to ratify the 15th amendment. Now your right when you said the Amendments weren't being enforced. The 15th Amendment didnt allow people to vote. It just prevented States from discriminating them based off race and other factors. So States created poll taxes and literacy test in order to prevent blacks from voting in the south. It wasnt untill the Voting Rights Act of 1965 where the majority of blacks in the south had the rights to vote. This time period does seem long ago today, seeing that Kennedy was killed in 1963 and Martin Luther King in 1968. So even 100 years after the civil war the battle of equality was still being fought. Even today for that matter with the " Black lives Matter" and the election of Obama bringing up ties from the past.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Birthright Citizenship

by Decker Robinson - Friday, March 2, 2018, 4:49 PM

Birthright citizenship in the United States had much stronger validity in the 19th century than it does today. In the Reconstruction era when the 14th amendment was drafted, birthright citizenship was so important in answering the role freed slaves would play in the country. The reason they decided they added birthright citizenship was because they wanted to given the country a clear understanding that freedmen would be citizens as long as they were born in the country. After the Civil War, the drafters of the 14th amendment decided to finally allow former slaves,that were obviously denied citizenship before the war, as citizens.Due to the reconstruction of the country, people weren't flocking into the country nearly as they do in today's day and age. Today, illegal immigrants use the loophole in the outdated birthright citizenship to give birth in the U.S. so their child can become a U.S. citizen. I am not discrediting the significance it played during the Reconstruction era because it was very much needed; however, the circumstances that played the main role for birthright citizenship in the 19th century do not apply today.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Birthright Citizenship

by Isaac Anderson - Saturday, March 3, 2018, 6:54 PM

I think you are correct. Birthright citizenship definitely had much more validity in the time after the civil war than it does now. After slavery had been abolished "the Republicans feared that white supremacy would reduce the newly freed people to a condition close to slavery," and that is precisely what happened when several state governments enacted the black codes (Liberty, equality, power. Pg. 566). Although these newly freed people were no longer slaves, they were still the target of extreme violence and racism. Formerly moderate Republicans were forced to become more radical (class notes), and after passing the "Freedmens Bureau and Civil Rights Bills over president Johnsons vetoes, the fourteenth amendment received the required majority in Congress and soon went to the states for ratification. (Liberty, Equality, Power. Pg.570). This gave the newly Freedmen citizenship which qualified them to receive equal protection of the law. The clause in section 1 of the fourteenth amendment that "defined all native born or naturalized persons, including blacks, as American citizens" (Pg. 570) is worded in such a way that it is easily

misinterpreted without having a sufficient understanding of the time period that it was created in. It was intended to be an immediate solution to the problems the newly freed people were facing. The urgency in which the fourteenth amendment was constructed may have had led its drafters to overlook the possibility of future misconceptions. They needed an immediate solution for the time being and the wording that was used was necessary in pushing forward the central ideology of the victorious Union.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Moving Backwards

by Miriel Orhai - Friday, March 2, 2018, 10:59 PM

What seems to be, from the national perspective, a gigantic civil rights “revolution”— the Reconstruction era and its amendments— did not in reality elevate the status of African Americans as much as it claimed it appears on paper. The pushback from society and the pent-up hatred felt by those who still supported slavery and resented African Americans for having the nerve to claim the rights that they were given by Congress in the Reconstruction amendments created an incredibly violent and discriminatory atmosphere. There was enormous reluctance nationwide to enfranchise Freedmen, up until many Southern states were forced into it come the 15th Amendment (and continued among several Northern states who slipped past this requirement for a time). Black Codes guaranteed African American’s places at the very, very bottom of the pecking order, still regarded by most Southerners as less than human (text 566).

Resistance against racism on a federal level pushed the dedicated racist— the emphatic Confederate supporter, the “robbed” slaveowner— once accepted as the normal white man, into a place perceived more and more as a radical minority — enraging these people (generally Southerners) and causing them to rally into groups and militias such as the Ku Klux Klan. These smaller groups raged with a passion they had not needed before, when their mindsets were more normalized, and so caused an incredible amount of damage. Becoming radicals, though, activated the anti-radical strain of American nativism and framed them as a problem to be dealt with— same as when they were demanding secession and had to be crushed by the force of the Union, their demands of racist legislation and unwillingness to conform to the new standards of the Union cemented their place in the national conscious as rebels.

One way to look at this is with the stance that when your most violent and staunchly conservative social group is a radical minority such as the KKK, the nation is therefore moving forward and becoming more progressive. But when this radical minority still holds a relatively gigantic amount of power in the South, further provoking them brings on a violent and unstable society (text 567)— moving backwards.

Further, the 15th amendment, though incredibly progressive in granting African Americans the right to vote, failed to enfranchise women. Many women’s suffrage advocates were offended by the notion that illiterate Southern African American men should be allowed to vote before educated and politically-minded Northern white women (text 575). This was hardly a step in the right direction for women’s rights.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2



[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Legacy of Reconstruction - Birthright Citizenship

by Justin Oljace - Saturday, March 3, 2018, 10:09 PM

In the video Professor Eric Foner talks about birthright citizenship defined in the 19th Century as it applies to illegal immigration issues today. It makes sense that it was put in the 14th Amendment in 1868 after the end of slavery because all of the blacks were born and raised in America. They had to get birthright citizenship because they couldn't be discriminated based on the color of their skin any longer. The United States no longer had an ethnic nationalism so when slavery was gone it went with it. He asks the question "Why is the child of an illegal immigrant a citizen of the United States?" Times are so different from today than the 19th Century that it makes it difficult to apply this concept of birthright citizenship to modern times. Since so few countries still practice birthright citizenship, maybe the United States should abandon it also.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



racial nationalism vs civic nationalism

by Justin Oljace - Saturday, March 3, 2018, 11:20 PM

Before the 14th Amendment was passed in 1868 the United States practiced racial nationalism. Racial nationalism is defined by language, religion, customs, and tradition. It seeks to preserve a certain race through harsh policies. During slavery times African Americans suffered from racial nationalism. Civic nationalism is where a nation has common citizenship regardless of race, religion, or gender.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

◀ Reconstruction Cartoons

Reconstruction Cartoons ▶

Moodle Docs for this page

Accessibility at Lane

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Log out)

HST 202 W18 (Escobar Meta 30898 30897)