



I'm not robot



Continue



## Selma movie worksheet answers

TOPICS — UNITED STATES: 1945-1991; The civil rights movement; SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL LEARNING – Leadership, courage, human rights; MORAL-ETHICAL EMPHASIS – Fairness, citizenship. AGE: 12+; MPAA Rating PG-13 disrupts thematic material, including violence, suggestive moment and short strong language; Drama; 2014, 128 minutes; Color. Available Amazon.com. Historically, the selma is a deeply flawed film. However, its historical mistakes are an opportunity to teach students how nonviolent direct action transforms influential politicians from advocates of change. Selma misrepresented the extraordinary role of President Lyndon Baines Johnson (LBJ) in developing and passing the Voting Rights Act of 1965, falsely claiming that LBJ was involved in FBI attempts to sow marital dissent between Dr. King and his wife. The director/screenwriter apparently intended to provide a clear villain for the story of the film and because, as he said, I wasn't interested in making a white savior movie. These errors undercut some of the film's great strengths in its largely accurate portrayal of Selma's protests and its nuanced portrayal of Dr. King. For teachers who want to use the film, this learning guide helps turn its flaws into strengths. In addition, the guide includes materials that enhance the civil rights movement and categories of U.S. history in the 1950s and 1960s. These materials benefit students regardless of whether they watch a movie or not. These include: LBJ grew out of a typical Southern politician who consistently opposed civil rights laws, to a man who did more for racial equality than any other white leader of the 20th century. By 1958, when LBJ began his campaign for the presidency, the civil rights movement had turned much of the nation against segregation. He knew he couldn't be a candidate with a nationwide petition unless he changed his position. However, when he began to promote integration, LBJ realized that the idea of equal rights spoke to his core values. As a result, after 1958, he began taking a political risk to actively support the civil rights movement. LBJ's odyssey is an example of a process in which nonviolent direct action uses both politicians' beliefs and self-interest in a democracy to lead them to change their position and work enthusiastically for reforms. This is the basic principle of Gandhi's Satyagraha. Demonstrating this in Selma is an excellent way to teach nonviolent direct action. The relationship between MLK and LBJ was exceptional because it involved cooperation between an activist and the country's most influential official in the field of large social and political Ensure. The story of Dr. King's extramarital sexual activity is far less important than the abuse of power. Abuse. The FBI, which transcended the agency's correct role in eavesdropping on Dr. King and his associates, presenting selective and misleading information to government officials, leaking derogatory information about Dr. King to the press and others, and taking unauthorized covert actions to neutralize Dr. King as an African-American director. While LBJ may have accepted some derogatory leaks of information about Dr. King, he was not responsible for any covert FBI activity targeting MLK. However, LBJ made a serious mistake by allowing the FBI to gather information about the political activities of Dr. King and other civil rights activists and using the information for his own political advantage. None of the many journalists, politicians and priests offered for details of Dr. King's extramarital sex life took FBI bait and used the information against Dr. King or the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. The result would probably be very different today. Dr. King's extramarital sexual relations were unethical, hypocritical and deplorable. They are jeopardizing the entire civil rights movement and Kennedy and Johnson's legislative agenda aimed at correcting civil rights violations. Fortunately, the scandal didn't pass Dr. King. His contribution to American society was so great that these shortcomings pale in comparison. The learning guide includes information, discussion questions and assignments on the above points and introduces two wonderfully opposed Alabama public figures: Alabama Governor George C. Wallace and U.S. District Judge Frank M. Johnson. Governor Wallace and Judge Johnson were roommates in college. Governor Wallace, however, opposed integration in their public life, while Judge Johnson enthusiastically supported the Constitution to force positive change in Alabama. This film is a description of Selma's suffrage protest, the march between Selma and Montgomery, the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and the 2015 Academy Awards: Best Achievement in Music Written for Motion Pictures, Original Song, 2015 Golden Globe Awards: Best Picture Best Original Song – Movie; 2015 Golden Globe Awards nominations: Best Picture, Best Director, Best Performance by an Actor in a Motion Picture (David Oyelowo) – Drama; 2015 AFI Awards, USA Movie of the Year; and many other awards. Cast: David Oyelowo as Martin Luther King Jr.; Carmen Ejogo as Coretta Scott King; Oprah Winfrey as Annie Lee Cooper; Tom Wilkinson as President Lyndon B. Johnson; André Holland as Andrew Young; Ruben Santiago-Hudson - Bayard Rustin; Colman Domingo as Ralph Abernathy; Omar J. Dorsey as James Orange; Tessa Thompson as Diane Nash; Common as James Vives; Lorraine Toussaint – Boynton; E. Roger Mitchell – Frederick Frederick Dylan Baker as J. Edgar Hoover; Ledisi Anibade Young as Mahalia Jackson; Corey Reynolds .C.T. Vivian; Wendell Pierce as Reverend Hosea Williams; Stephan James as John Lewis John Lavelle as Roy Reed; Trai Byers as James Forman Keith Stanfield as Jimmie Lee Jackson; Stan Houston - Sheriff Jim Clark; Tim Roth as Gov. George Wallace; Stephen Root as Colonel Al Lingio; Brian Kurlander Brian Kurlander - Voice on Recorder (voice) Jeremy Strong - James Reeb; Tara Ochs as Viola Liuzzo; Cuba Gooding Jr. - Fred Gray; Alessandro Nivola as John Doar; Michael Shikany as Archbishop Iakovos; Martin Sheen - Judge Frank M. Johnson, Jr. Director: Ava DuVernay. Selma shows a pivotal event in modern U.S. history, and with correlations to misin fact about President Johnson, it can improve the unit of the U.S. civil rights movement as well as U.S. history in the 1950s and 1960s. It contains an excellent description of Dr. King. The film provides strong visual images of black Americans' efforts to ensure the right to vote. The additional materials provided by this learning guide improve students' understanding of the era, nonviolent direct action, and the cooperation between Dr. King and LBJ in passing the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Once LBJ's role in the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the civil rights movement is fully explained to students, there are no problems with this film. Watch a movie with your child and describe its great historical flow: President Johnson and Dr. King actually worked together to get the Voting Rights Act of 1965 into effect before Dr. King ever went to Selma. If your child were interested, read the sections of this Learning Guide on nonviolent direct actions and explain how it works to convert influential politicians. LBJ, Civil Rights Hero: Classic example of nonviolent direct actions Transforming the leader of the Oppressive Group into an advocate of change Click this section in a word processing format suitable for printing and share with the class. The campaign for nonviolent direct action aims to create social or political change: 1) by mobilising public opinion, 2) by appealing to the conscience of campaigners, and 3) by exerting economic, legal or other pressure. Methods of non-violent direct action include demonstrations, rallies, petitions, strikes, boycotts, the defence of speeches and peaceful political violations of elected laws. All legitimate rulers can be used as part of a nonviolent campaign for direct action, including legal cases and electoral politics. Often law enforcement overreacts violently to peaceful demonstrations, vigils or rallies that provide publicity for the campaign and Mohandas Gandhi developed a nonviolent direct action in South Africa and India, also known as civil resistance, nonviolent resistance or civil disobedience. It is the greatest political and advocacy innovation of the 20th century. See Learning Guide for more effective power. Since 1947, nonviolent direct action has been responsible for most of the revolutions that led to government changes or, as in the United States, major social and political reform. Examples include the Indian independence movement, which culminated in 1947; the end of apartheid in South Africa in 1984; The revolution in the Philippines in 1986 and the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991. The two main pro-nonviolent supporters of direct action have been Mahatma Gandhi and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Changes in conscience and public pressure in campaigns for nonviolent direct acts can be seen as Lyndon Baines Johnson (LBJ) turns from a typical Southern politician who opposed civil rights laws to a man who both listened to his conscience and looked at his own political interest — and took the black civil rights issue into my heart. Before Johnson, only four political leaders of 20th-century national power had vigorously used black civil rights. Franklin Delano Roosevelt denied discrimination in a federal employment relationship with an executive order. Eleanor Roosevelt was in favour of better treatment of African Americans — Tuskegee airmen, for example. President Harry S. Truman ordered the integration of the armed forces in 1948. President John F. Kennedy addressed the nation in support of the need for black civil rights on 11 September. However, the efforts of Roosevelt and President Truman were limited, and President Kennedy was assassinated before he could get the Civil Rights Act passed. LBJ served in Congress for 28 years, rising to the position of senate majority leader. It wasn't until 1957, after 25 years of opposition to the Civil Rights Act in Congress, that LBJ began to support the civil rights of black Americans. Supreme Court decision brown v. Brown v. The National Board of Education and the Montgomery Bus Boycott had installed the civil rights of black people directly before the nation. When Johnson began running for the presidency, he realized his baby was changing his position on civil rights. When Johnson became vice president, he took the civil rights of African-Americans as his own business. While support for LBJ's civil rights was necessary for him to run for national office, it is also clear that he began to passionately believe in black civil rights and became an effective force for change. LBJ leadership was necessary to enact the country's major civil rights laws: civil rights of 1964 non-discrimination in employment and public accommodation, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the 1968 Law prohibiting discrimination in housing. The Johnson Great Society initiative's anti-poverty programs helped all poor Americans, a disproportionate share of whom were black. Mr Johnson issued an executive order ing that government contractors must take further action in favour of minorities. Johnson also appointed the first African-American to head the federal government department and sit in the president's cabinet (Robert Weaver, HUD, 1966). Perhaps LBJ's clearest statement of his belief in african-American civil rights came in his address to Congress on 15 May. Sometimes history and destiny meet once in one place to shape a turning point in man's unchanging quest for freedom. It was in Lexington and Concord. It's been a century at Appomattox. It was last week in Selma, Alabama. There, long-suffering men and women peacefully protested the denial of their American rights. Many were brutally beaten. One good man, a man of God, was killed. There is no reason for the pride of what happened in Selma. There is no reason for complacency to deny equal rights to millions of Americans. However, there is reason to hope and believe in what is happening here tonight in our democracy. The cries of pain and the hymns and protests of oppressed people have summoned [at this joint session of Congress] the majesty of this great government — the government of the world's largest nation. Our mission is immediately the oldest and most basic of this country: to justify injustice, to justice, to serve man.... Rarely do we face challenges, not for our growth or abundance, well-being or security, but rather for the values, purposes and meanings of our beloved nation. The question of equal rights for American is such an issue. And if we defeat every enemy, if we double our wealth and conquer the stars and remain unequal on this issue, we will have failed as a people and as a nation. For when you have a country, like with a human, what is a man who will benefit if he wins the whole world and loses his own soul? . . . This was the first nation in the history of the world to be established on purpose. The great phrases of its purpose still sound in every American heart, north and south: All men are created equal. The Board of Directors, with the agreement of the Board of Directors. Give me freedom or death. They're not just clever words, and they're not just empty theories. In their name, the Americans have fought and died . . . Those words are promises to every citizen he shares with human dignity. This dignity is not found in a man's possessions. It's not, or in his position. Indeed, it rests on his very own man, equal to opportunity, than everyone else. It says he shares freedom. He chooses his leaders, educates his children, supports his family on the merits of talent and man. If you want to apply any other test, denying a man his wish because of his color or race or religion or place of birth is . . . to do an injustice . . . The real hero of this battle is an American. His actions and protests, his courage to endanger security and even to risk his life have aroused the dignity of this nation. His demonstrations are aimed at drawing attention to injustice aimed at causing change, designed to fuel reforms. He's been called to make a promise about America. Historical data show Johnson's political courage to support his pro-civil rights stance, including when, as vice president, he integrated a separate eating facility in St. Augustine, Florida at the height of racial statelets. Another example is Johnson's speech in front of Louisiana's power elite at the Jung Hotel in New Orleans just before the 1964 presidential election, in which he told his audience that he was fully implementing the recently passed Civil Rights Act, which prohibits segregation in public accommodations. Historians and commentators speculated as to why LBJ changed his position on civil rights. Some point to his roots as a child of a poor family who had to work hard to succeed. They also point to his experience as a teacher in a poor Latin American school district and his belief that the government should actively serve the people. As LBJ said in his March 1965 address to Congress, the protests aroused his conscience. Others argue that by 1957, due to demonstrations by the civil rights movement, the non-Southern nation had already changed to support the end of segregation, and that LBJ changed its position on black civil rights to improve its chances of winning national office. The real reasons for LBJ's installation of civil rights were probably a combination of background, government philosophy, self-indigestion and political necessity. The point is that while Johnson's background and his belief that the government should act to help the people may have made him vulnerable to the efforts of the civil rights movement to awaken his conscience, only nonviolent direct action is designed to work on such a personal level. Moreover, in so far as LBJ opposed segregation in order to broaden its political base beyond the South, the basic strategy of the campaign for nonviolent direct action is to change public opinion thus changing the political reality so that it is in the interests of the country's leaders to support the objectives of the campaign. Consequently, LBJ's LBJ civil rights is a classic example of how non-violent direct action works with an influential political leader. After years of censure, the suffrage campaign in Sma began in 1963. In January 1965, a major escalation was to begin. Selma's campaign was seen as a way to build public support throughout the North and West for the Voting Rights Law and also as a way to force Lyndon Johnson's hand on the federal voting law. Garrow, cross-carrying, p. 380. On December 18, 1964, when Dr. King returned home from Norway after receiving the Nobel Peace Prize, President Johnson invited King and his family to the White House. That's when Dr. King and the president had a private conversation. The president talked about how useful his work on poverty would be for American blacks and how they should play a leading role in the program. King reminded Johnson that there are still serious civil rights problems in the South and that federal legislation is needed to ensure blacks have the right to vote. Martin, you're right. I'm going to do it eventually, but I can't get the Voting Rights Bill through this congressional session, King later recalled Johnson telling him. It was less than six months since the Civil Rights Act [1964] became law, the president pointed out, and he would need the votes of Southern congressmen for other initiatives of the Great Society. He would lose these votes if he insisted on a voting rights measure. The time would come, Johnson said, but not in 1965. Garrow, cross-carrying, p. 368. At the same time, there was at least one other meeting, this time with Dr. King and other civil rights leaders, in which the president reiterated his hesitation to push forward the Voting Rights Act at the time. Conversations come together and dramatize in the movie. According to TWM investigations, the only other scenes in which Johnson appears to be in any way related to the historical record are Johnson's interview with Governor Wallace and his address to Congress. The other scenes in which the president appears either didn't happen at all or didn't happen as shown in the film. President Johnson was a complicated man and often did not tell others his true intentions. For example, before these debates, on 14 December 2005, the European Parliament and the Council of 15 it is clear, however, that within days of the discussions advising him to delay, the President came out in full support of the passage of the Voting Rights Act in 1965. This is reflected in LBJ's promise in his State of the Union address on 4 January 1965 that he would receive detailed voting rights proposals to Congress within six weeks . . . In fact, by January 1965, just a few weeks after advising him to delay, LBJ Dr. King worked together to get the Voting Rights Act passed in 1965. This is evident from the phone call between the President and Dr. King on 15 January 1965. In a debate recorded, LBJ asked Dr. King to mobilize public support for the voting rights bill to help LBJ convince a reluctant Congress to pass the legislation. The president told Dr. King that the Voting Rights Act would be my administration's greatest achievement. This call was before the large demonstrations in Selma, the first of which took place on 18 March 2005. It was before Dr King's arrest while leading the demonstrations in Selma and almost two months before bloody Sunday 7 May. Between March 1965 and the following August, when he signed the bill, LBJ successfully shepherded the Voting Rights Act through Congress. King and Johnson were later scheduled to play their part when Johnson committed the U.S. to the Vietnam War, which Dr. King opposed, and Dr. King's search for a radical restructuring of economic power in the United States. However, as far as the Voting Rights Act is concerned, they cooperated. It has never been a crime in the United States to belong to, support or cooperate with the CPUSA. Moreover, a U.S. citizen does not lose his or her civil rights because he or she has previously been associated with a subversive organization or because he or she has taken the Fifth Amendment when asked about his political associations. Criminals include activities prohibited by law, such as spying on a foreign power or supporting and supporting a foreign power, destroying property or conspiring to carry out these activities. In a modern situation, it is not illegal to support the interpretation of the Koran, supported by the so-called Islamic State. However, it is illegal to help men and women travel to Iraq or Syria to fight for Isis. J. Edgar Hoover made a career out of studying unversible and radical and later organized crime figures. In 1924, President Calvin Coolidge appointed him head of the U.S. Department of Justice's Bureau of Investigation. Hoover was regularly reappointed FBI director and its successor, the FBI, according to the next eight US presidents. Hoover turned the FBI into a professional and scientific crime prevention organization. LBJ waived the mandatory retirement age for U.S. officials and allowed Hoover to remain in power at the FBI until his death at the age of 72. By then, Hoover had been in charge of the FBI for 37 years. During this time, most Americans considered J. Edgar Hoover a hero. But the FBI and its longtime director had a dark side. Hoover kept classified files on political individuals and used the threat to release information about his personal life to intimidate Congress and the executive branch. Every president after Franklin Roosevelt (Truman, Eisenhower, Johnson and Nixon) kept Hoover in office because the information in Hoover's files could incur political costs for themselves or their allies. Hoover died in office in 1972 while Nixon was president. Another problem with Hoover's FBI administration was that he ordered the FBI to wiretap and cover up punitive actions against individuals he considered subversive or unwanted. Covert actions included break-ins, planting forged documents, leaking classified information from government files and spreading false rumours. Hoover felt that the FBI was targeting threats to national security. The Fourth Amendment prohibits government searches, such as wiretapping or bugs without permission, and the Fifth Amendment prohibits the government from taking punitive action against individuals without due process of law, i.e. without a court judgment or the administration's finding of procedural guarantees to protect individual rights. The FBI's efforts to destroy Martin Luther King's career and family life are the most blatant example of the FBI's cover-up of the leader of an important social reform movement. The FBI's actions related to Dr. King can be divided into three parts. Part 1 – Reckless allegations that Dr. King and the civil rights movement were linked to the Communists several years before 1957, Stanley Levison, a New York lawyer and businessman, was a key player in the Communist Party-USA (CPUSA) economy. Levison first met Dr. King in 1956 and from 1957 to Dr. King's death in 1968, Mr. Levison was a close adviser to Dr. King, ghostwritter, Dr. King's books, raised money for the SCLC and other civil rights organizations, and advised Dr. King on strategy. Mr. Levison was Dr. King's closest white counselor. Levison's relationship with King took place during the Cold War, when the Soviet Union was an enemy of the United States and the CPUSA was closely linked to the Soviet Union. CPUSA, for example, had so few supporters since 1957 that it could not support itself, and until 1969 the Russian Communist Party gave it millions of dollars. The financial support was supposed to be secret; However, the FBI had passed the CPUSA thoroughly and the US government knew exactly what was going on. In addition, Dr. King unwittingly stoked the government's fears about his relationship with Levison. In 1963 and later, senior U.S. officials repeatedly warned Dr. King because they believed FBI reports that Levison was a Communist, including President John F. Kennedy, that if his friendship with Levison was made public, it would be a danger to both the civil rights movement and President Kennedy's. Tohtori King, King, he first refused to break off his relationship with Levison, lying that he had asked Levison about his CPUSA connections and that Levison was convinced that he was not a member of the CPUSA. Dr. King said he ignored the past political affiliations of his supporters as long as they were committed to the civil rights movement. Later, under increasing pressure, Dr. King claimed to have disassociated him from Levison. However, Dr. King kept the secret channel open to Levison through a partner. Dr. King sought Levison's advice by asking a partner to ask what our friend had to say about the issues Dr. King and the movement were facing. Although Dr. King considered this communication with Levison to be classified, he was wrong. The FBI was eavesdropping on Levison and his partner. Moreover, when Levison was called to testify before a congressional committee in April 1962 and asked about his CPUSA contacts, he issued an introductory statement denying that he was ever a member of the CPUSA. Then he took 5. It turned out that Mr. Levison had ended his relationship with the CPUSA long before 1962. Levison's years of surveillance only revealed that he served as Dr. King's loyal advisor. Wiretapping or other evidence of FBI intrusion into CPUSA revealed no evidence that Levison participated in CPUSA activities since 1957. On the contrary, the F.B.I. knew that Mr. Levison had resigned from the CPUSA and that its leaders did not trust him. Yes, in his repeated leaks and memos to government officials that Dr. King had contacts with CPUSA members. Hoover and the FBI knew they were playing fast and loose with the truth. This is the story of two failures. One is that the CPUSA's 50-year campaign to attract African-Americans to its case yielded few results. The second was Hoover's and the FBI's inability to prevent LBJ from working with Dr. King, despite memos that Dr. King had ties to the CPUSA. LBJ and Hoover had been friends for years. One can only assume that LBJ, a committed opponent of communism and the Cold Warrior, knew that the FBI director hated Dr. King and that the FBI's claims about King's communist connections could not be trusted. Part two – FBI covert action against Dr. King, dr. King's wiretapping and the tapping of his hotel rooms began in November 1963. Although the wiretapping revealed no significant evidence of the CPUSA's impact on Dr. King, they testified that Dr. King was having extramarital sex with women. The FBI's attention shifted to Dr. King's moral weakness. J. Edgar Hoover's personal dislike of Dr. King is summed up, according to CNN's Ben Christensen: Hoover despised King's private behavior Clear from the memos he kept in his personal files. His slipping at the bottom of the positive news about King's success oozed disgust. To the story of the king who received the St. Francis Peace Medal from the Catholic Church, he wrote this is disgusting. In the story of the King, the Pope to talk about race, he wrote amazingly. In the story of King's meeting with the Pope: I am amazed that the Pope gave the audience to such a degenerate one. In the story of King, a fierce favourite to win the Nobel Prize, he wrote: The King could well get a top alley cat award! Hoover hated Dr. King because Dr. King had dared to criticize the FBI's inaction in investigating the murders of black and white civil rights activists. While the criticism was justified, Hoover didn't like anyone who criticized him or his beloved agency. In the end, President Johnson made a personal plea to Hoover after killing three civil rights workers, Schwerner, Goodman and Chaney, two of whom were white, and the FBI took action against the KKK and others who tried to use violence to oppose the civil rights movement. As for Dr. King, the FBI's goal, according to a December 1963 FBI memo, was to neutralize King as an effective Negro leader and destabilize the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) he led. The US Senate Investigative Committee later concluded: The FBI's efforts to disrepute Dr. King and undermine the SCLC concerned plans for virtually every aspect of Dr. King's life. The FBI reviewed Dr. King's tax returns, oversaw his financial affairs, and even tried to determine that he had a secret foreign bank account. Religious leaders and institutions were contacted to undermine their support for him, and unfavorable material was leaked to the press. FBI officials contacted members of Congress, and a special offer of the record testimony was prepared for the director's use by the House Appropriations Committee. Over the White House and Justice Department officials, unfavorable reports were denied and, according to one witness, even offered to call official White House recordings that the FBI found embarrassing for King. Martin Luther King, Jr., Case Study, CONTELPRO, Docs, Church Committee, Final Report — Book III, 23 April 1976. The Senate report also referred to anonymous letters, planted newspaper articles and the suspension of SCLC fundraising. Both Hoover and LBJ were fascinated by details of Dr. King's sexual encounters captured by bugs planted in Dr. King's hotel rooms, and there was sexual voyeurism about their interest. Johnson would say to people privately, if it, if you could just hear me. A hypocrisy preacher is sexual. Most significantly, almost everyone who provided information about Dr. King's extramarital sexual activity refuses to take the bait and use the information to destroy Dr. King's leadership. There were two probable reasons for this. Firstly, in American politics for many decades, including in the 1960s, the press and many political institutions understood that the personal and sexual lives of civil servants were their own business and were not to be made public. This changed in the 1980s, when Senator Gary Hart's presidential campaign was torpedoed by accusations that he was a ladies' man. Since then, the private lives of civil servants have been fair game for public comment. Moreover, it is likely that the people to whom the FBI tried to leak the story, almost all were white, realized that Dr. King's value to American society was so great that his personal failures would have been ignored. However, the FBI's continued efforts over four years to damage Dr. King's reputation and movement with accusations of links to communism and details of Dr. King's extramarital sexual activity took its toll. It distracted and worried Dr. King and his advisers and prevented influential people from supporting the movement and made fundraising more difficult. Perhaps the worst FBI covert operation against Dr. King was a letter written in the fall of 1964 by The FBI's Director of Intelligence Operations, William C. Sullivan. The letter was alleged to be from an anonymous, disappointed admirer of Dr. King. The letter had deliberate spelling errors and tricky builds to make it look real. It was accompanied by FBI tape containing recordings of Dr. King's intercourse with an unidentified woman and sent to SCLC headquarters in Atlanta. The letter said Dr. King would be exposed, and it was implied that the only way out of him was suicide. People often sent SCLC tapes of Dr. King's speeches and Dr. King's wife, Coretta Scott King, listened to them. The package was delivered unopened to Mrs. King. When Coretta King opened the package in January 1965, she found a tape and a letter. Some excerpts from the letter are below: Lend your sexually psychotic ear to the enclosure... On the record of all times you will find your dirty, dirty, evil companions, men and women embodying your hidden [sic] anomalies with you... It's all there, your sexual. Listen to yourself, you ed [stained, abnormal animal]... You're on the same record. You've been on the record — all your adultery, sexual go back a long way. This is just a very small sample.... I'm sure you understand... King, you're ready... There's only one way out for you. You'd better take it before your ed, abnormally deceitful self is bared for the nation. The tapes contained excerpts from conversations that took place in several different hotel rooms that Dr. King had occupied in various cities. When Dr. King and his advisors listened to the tapes, it was clear that it could only have been created by the FBI. In fact, the letter accompanying the tape was written with the apparent knowledge and approval of J. Edgar Hoover. Contrary to what the film describes, there is no evidence that President Johnson knew or accepted FBI cover-ups and efforts to disrupt Dr. King's family life. There is evidence that Walter Jenkins, LBJ's closest aide, accepted leaks to the press of information degrading Dr. King, but on top of that, these have been illegal activities known only to the FBI at the behest of J. Edgar Hoover. Part 3 – Providing President Johnson with information about the political plans of Dr. King and his political allies eavesdropping on Dr. King, the SCLC and their associates also revealed information about their political intentions and strategies. This information was passed on to the White House, as well as information about Dr. King's extramarital sexual activity and the fact that there was no information about the CPUSA intrusion into the civil rights movement. In due time, eavesdropping was stepped up specifically to determine the political purpose of Dr. King and his allies. President Johnson used this information against his political opponents, such as the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. Governor George C. Wallace — Demagogue George Corley Wallace was the four-year governor of Alabama (1963–67, 1971–1979 k&mp; 1983–1987). Wallace dominated Alabama politics so thoroughly that when the state constitution prohibited him from running for a second consecutive term in 1967, he chose his wife. Unfortunately, he died in office. Wallace claimed to be a populist, but did little for the people of Alabama. Wallace used racial hatred as an easy way to stand out as a politician. After losing his first race for governor in 1958, Wallace told an aide: Do you know why I lost the governor's race? ... John Patterson [his opponent] snined me. And I say to you here and now that I will never get drunk again! Wallace explained to another supporter: I tried to talk about good roads and good schools and all these things that have been part of my career and no one listened. Then I started talking about, and they stomped on the floor. When Wallace was inaugurated as governor, he stood in the Alabama Congress with a bronze star marking the place where Jefferson Davis had been sworn in as President of the Confederacy. Wallace said in the name of the biggest. Who are ever on earth, I draw the line in the dust and you throw the challenge before the feet of tyranny, and I say segregation now, segregation tomorrow, segregation forever! Wallace opposed integration until 1972, when he declared himself moderate on racial issues. In the later elections, he won with the help of black voters. Note also that by 1972, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, opposed by Wallace, had dramatically increased the number of black voters. Wallace ran for president in 1966, 1972 and 1976 at the Forum for Citizens' Rights, a thinly veiled racist message to him. In 1966, as a third-party candidate, Wallace received nearly 10 million popular votes and won in five southern states, garnering 46 votes. In 1972, he ran in the Democratic primary and his campaign was good, but the assassin shot him five times, paralyzing Wallace from the waist down. Wallace spent the rest of his life in a wheelchair, completing his term as governor and winning and serving two more terms. In the 1976 Democratic primary, Wallace won only three Southern states and lost the rest to Jimmy Carter, who won the nomination and the presidency. Wallace was a demagogue, good at winning elections and willing to use hatred, fear and dissenting opinion of labour to do so. He was a bad administrator. The Alabama State Government before Wallace had not been good at providing services to its citizens. At a time when Wallace controlled Alabama politics, state schools, prisons, mental hospitals and other key institutions were acting so badly that circumstances violated the constitutional rights of Alabama citizens. Federal courts were repeatedly required to intervene to rectify these violations. Fortunately for Alabama, the U.S. District Judge sitting in Montgomery was a prominent man named Frank M. Johnson, Jr. Judge Frank M. Johnson, Jr. — U.S. District Court Judge, who in the film approved a march on Selma to Montgomery and ordered the government to protect the marchers, was U.S. District Judge Frank M. Johnson, Jr., who was widely considered one of the best judges in U.S. history. Judge Johnson served as a judge in the U.S. District Court in Alabama from 1955 to 1979. He was then appointed to the Court of Appeal and acted there from 1979 to 1999. Alabama's history in the 1950s and 1960s is largely the story of the struggle between Judge Johnson and the state of Alabama, where a judge sought to require the state to comply with constitutional requirements in its schools, prisons, voter registration offices and mental hospitals. There was a lot of struggle between Judge Johnson and his former friend George C. Wallace. Frank Johnson was born and raised in Winston County, Alabama, in the rough hills of the state Winston County was known. Formerly known as Independence. Unlike the rest of Alabama, Winston County supported the Union during the Civil War. It was the center of a guerrilla war against the Confederacy and a haven for tens of thousands of Confederate army fugitives. After the Civil War, Winston County was reliably Republican, while the rest of the state voted solidly for Democrats. George Wallace and Frank Johnson went to law school together and were friends. One story is that Johnson took careful notes on cases students had to read. Wallace never broke a book outside the classroom. Johnson forwarded his notes to Wallace and another friend for reading during the course so they could answer questions intelligently if necessary. Johnson and Wallace's friendship didn't last long after law school. After returning from service in the armed forces during World War II, Frank Johnson was politically active in a very small Republican Party in Alabama. In 1955, when Johnson was 35, he was appointed to office by President Dwight Eisenhower. At the time, he was the youngest federal judge ever appointed. Before 1965, Judge Johnson had several cases of voting rights in his court. He often found patterns and practices of discrimination and strictly enforced the law. He was described as a champion of the right to vote in the front row of the South. Unfortunately, most federal judges in the South were not made on the same matters as Judge Johnson, and despite attempts by the Justice Department to enforce voting rights before 1965 in force in 2005, in force in 2005 2005. As the film shows, Judge Johnson led a protesters who approved the march between Selma and Montgomery. He shook Dr. King's hands and protesters marching before the hearing. After the hearing, he allowed the march. Unfortunately, First Amendment protections have been weakened by court rulings since 1965. Today's march probably wouldn't have been allowed to proceed. In the state of Alabama, Judge Johnson made important decisions that corrected unconstitutional conditions that included the following: the disassembling of the Alabama legislature; school degrading; mental hospitals (which are the first to discover that a mental health hospital against their will and without being convicted of a crime was entitled to treatment and should not only be stored by the state, the right to treatment cases soon spread across the country and led to reforms by guaranteeing that the mentally ill and mentally disabled were treated.) Below are excerpts from a telephone conversation between LBJ and Dr. King on January 15, 2015. It should be noted that the Civil Rights Act of 1964, to which the President referred in this debate, prohibits: colour, religion, gender or national origin at the workplace, in schools and institutions open to the public. It is a major civil rights law of the 1960s. I think you can give a lot by getting your leader and yourself, taking very simple examples of discrimination where a man has to learn [Henry Wadsworth] Longfellow, or whether he needs to quote the first 10 amendments, or he has to tell you what Amendment Nos 15 and 16 and 17 are, and ask them if they know and show what is happening. Some people don't have to do it, but when a comes, he has to do it. And if we can just repeat, repeat and repeat - I don't want to follow [Adolf] Hitler, but he had an idea: King: yes. President Johnson: — That if you take a simple thing and repeat it often enough, even if it's not true, why would people accept it. Well, this is true, and if you find the worst state you come across in Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana or South Carolina, where I think one of the worst I've ever heard is the head of tuskegee school or the head of a government department or something that's been denied the right to vote, , and if you take that one picture and take it on the radio, you take it on TV and get it on... In the pulpit, and take it to meetings, get it from everything you can, pretty soon a guy who did nothing but follow - drive a tractor, he says, well, that's not right, it's not fair. Yes, thank you. And then it helps us with what we end up going through. Yes, thank you. You're absolutely right. President Johnson: And if we do that, we'll break through because it's the biggest breakthrough of anything, not even with the exception of this '64 act. I think the greatest achievement in my administration. I believe that the greatest achievement in foreign policy — I said to the group yesterday — was the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. But I think this is going to be bigger because it does things that even the '64 law couldn't do... [End of conversation] The Selma film's analysis of historical fiction's work the genre of historical fiction presents past events in fictional form. Most Americans get their after-school history of films that are works of historical fiction. Responsible leaders who try to present a reasonably accurate picture of historical events sometimes change certain facts or sequences of events to make their stories more interesting or simply complex situations. As long as important historical facts are preserved, these changes will be a legal poetic licence. Unfortunately, some leaders are distorting the historical background because of their ignorance or support for their own agenda. Director who also wrote part of the script claims to be a student of the history of the period covered by the film. In addition, Selma producers distribute it free of charge to high schools through the Selma for Students' Initiative, arguing that the film is responsible for historical fiction that is suitable for display to students. TWM's research, including both primary and secondary sources, shows that presenting what happened at the protests, portraying Dr. King and other leaders of the civil rights movement, and a description of the resistance they met in Alabama are all reasonably accurate and useful. Actor David Oyelowo's portrayal of Dr. King is excellent [This reviewer was privileged to attend Dr. King's speech in Tallahassee, Florida, a few weeks after the Birmingham bombing that killed four little girls. At the time, white people who attended civil rights demonstrations or meetings were always placed in the front row to increase their visibility, so Dr. King was only about 15 feet away. He could be closely watched by this reviewer, and even now, some 50 years later, the event is clear in his mind.] However, as discussed in a section or learning guide called President Lyndon Baines Johnson, hero of the civil rights movement, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, only a few of the scenes in the film in which LBJ appears are reasonably accurate, and some show the opposite of what really happened. In fact, contrary to the impression left in the film, LBJ committed itself in 1965 to passing the Voting Rights Act. He and Dr. King worked together to get the law passed; LBJ's role was one of the necessary parts of this effort. Thus, in his portrayal of the role of President Lyndon Johnson, the overall historical accuracy of the film falls on director/screenwriter Ava Duvernay's desire for a clear villain and her insistence that I was not interested in making a white savior's film. What is it to show how much LBJ did to black Americans? It is a sad irony that LBJ is portrayed as opposed to the civil rights of African-Americans in a film that sells itself as a reasonably accurate portrayal of a crucial event in the fight for equal rights. The suppression of LBJ's defence of civil rights also loses the opportunity to demonstrate the power of nonviolent direct action to motivate leaders to do the right thing. The most unfortunate fact in director/screenwriter Duvernay's false portrayal



of LBJ as Dr. King's southern white adversary and anti-reform, however, is that the film misses the opportunity to promote social cohesion in U.S. cohesion in multi-ethnic, multi-race societies. It's easy to separate people from others and motivate them with anger. One U.S. the glory is our ability to resist their challenges. Challenges, seek to break with the group and our ability to achieve social cohesion in a society of many races, ethnic groups and religions. That is why it is important to highlight the events at which people gather to do the right thing. Many white Americans have a lot to answer for in their treatment of African-Americans. However, there have been situations where white people have done the right thing. Good behaviour should be encouraged and measures to promote social cohesion should be celebrated. This is an important part of nonviolent direct action. Indeed, he should not be misrepresented as an opposition to the civil rights movement when he was president. Why director/screenwriter Ava DuVernay wanted to stifle LBJ's role in the civil rights movement Ava DuVernay, the first black female director to make a successful film, gave her opinion on the controversy over how LBJ is treated in an interview with rolling stone magazine's January 5, 2015 edition. Rolling Stone: Let's talk about reducing LBJ's role from what you shot in the movie. DuVernay: Each filmmaker immortalized the film with his own perspective. [The draft of the script obtained from screenwriter Paul Webb] was an LBJ/King thing, but originally it was much more oblique to Johnson. I wasn't interested in making a white savior movie. I was interested in making a film focused on the people of Selma... This is dramatization of events. But for me, as a student of this time in history, it's important not to adore what the president did. Johnson has been called the hero of the time, and he was, but we're talking about a reluctant hero. He was irritated and pushed, he protected the legacy - he didn't do things about the goodness of his heart. Does it make it worse or better? I don't believe it. History is history, and he did it in the end. But there was some process that was important to show. A lot of presidents couldn't have done that. DuVernay: Absolutely. Well, it wouldn't be, even if he could have. It sounds like the director came into the film with an agenda and that he set the agenda for the real reals by refusing to acknowledge President Johnson's role as the hero of that time. There are some arguments that support the leader. It was not until 1957, seven years before the Selma march, that LBJ supported for the first time legislation protecting the civil rights of African-Americans. The timeline of the film for LBJ's conversion from opponent of civil rights law to a politician who did more for black civil rights than any other white leader of the 20th century is therefore only about eight. Off. The authors of historical fiction often telescope timelines show important facts about history; This is a legitimate technique for writing historical fiction. Moreover, one of the traditional flaws in the history of Black America in Hollywood movies is that movies focus on white heroes who help black people, ignoring the fact that the civil rights movement was led by African-Americans and its victories were won mostly by black protesters, and whites played a relatively small but still useful role. Films focusing on the white-focused civil rights movement include The Help and The Long Walk Home. Even films about the significant contribution of free black and former slaves to winning the Civil War have focused on white people, see Glory, among others. The reasons for this are not necessarily racism. Most of the movie audience is white. The audience more easily identifies with white heroes. Filmmakers want to sell tickets and therefore want to appeal to the widest possible audience. Director DuVernay's statement that he wasn't interested in making a white-life movie is a reference to those films. However, there were plenty of villains in the story of this film, including George Wallace, J. Edgar Hoover, Sheriff Jim Clark and a reluctant Congress. Moreover, LBJ could have been made less of a villain simply by ruling out made-up scenes and showing how he became an advocate for civil rights. Particularly outrageous is J. Edgar Hoover's false scene, in which an LBJ character gives tacit approval to an effort to undermine Dr. King's family. There is simply no evidence that President Johnson was aware of the poison pen letter and the tape. Moreover, it would not have been difficult, for example, to add a scene or two that told the story of Johnson's pre-1957 opposition to civil rights laws, his change of position as a result of nonviolent direct action, and his leadership in civil rights while he was president. At the moment, Selma leaves millions of Americans watching the film with a serious error difference that divides rather than unites. In this sense, it is not good historical fiction and should only be demonstrated in classes if teachers are right that LBJ as president opposed the passage of civil rights, and in particular the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Before showing the movie: Set the scene first. When a group engages in a nonviolent direct action program against a committed and powerful adversary, there is always a risk of failure. Prior to the Selma suffrage demonstrations, Dr King and the SCLC had participated in a number of major efforts that were largely disappointing, although some success had been achieved. These included St. Augustine, Florida (Summer 1964), the city ignored and Albany, Georgia (ended in August 1962), where the city's police chief, Laurie Pritchett, developed effective countermeasures to demonstrations and strikes. (While some Southern law enforcement agencies seemed to rejoice in the dramatic suppression of civil rights protests with nightsticks, truncheons, water hoses and attack dogs, these tactics made headlines only nationwide and sympathy for the civil rights cause. Chief Pritchett made mass arrests of the demonstrators without harming the demonstrators. This made the demonstrations very expensive for the movement, as the money had to be used to rescue the demonstrators from prison. More importantly, Pritchett's tactics in Albany denied the demonstrators national headlines and allowed the city to endure the demonstrations without making meaningful concessions. Selma seemed ideal for a voting rights protest because of strong opposition from white officials (including Governor George C. Wallace) to registering black voters and county Sheriff Jim Clark had a reputation for violence and loss of temper. In addition, the groundwork for the suffrage protests had been well prepared due to the years of organizing by the student's non-violated coordinating committee (SNCC) and Selma's own Dallas County Voters League. Local blacks were ready to protest. See more preview suggestions see ten things you should know about Selma before seeing the movie. Making a misrepresentation of LBJ Work for Education to deepen students' understanding of nonviolent direct actions and the role of the film LBJ in the Voting Rights Act and the civil rights movement to correct a flawed insult. TWM suggests providing information in the first part of a useful background section to support points that: 1. LBJ did more for racial equality than any other white politician of the 20th century. LBJ's journey from a Southern politician who advocated typical segregation to a hero of the civil rights movement is an example of the power of nonviolent direct action to work on the consciences of a group of oppressors and to reform. Several months before the Selma protests, LBJ and Dr. King worked together to get the Voting Rights Act through Congress. The film doesn't show this because the filmmakers needed a clear villain and couldn't figure out a way to show president Johnson's true role while maintaining the excitement of the film. Most of the scenes that look like LBJ are fictional, except for the first conversation with Dr. King about timing the Voting Rights Act, meeting George Wallace and LBJ, and talking to the LBJ Congress. The filmmakers invented other scenes about President Johnson to create tension in the story. The relationship between MLK and LBJ was because it involved the country's most influential civil servant and social activist, working together to promote major social and political changes. 3. The rest of the film is a reasonably accurate fictional version of what happened. The information in the first section of the Useful Backgrounds section can be provided by direct instruction or by getting students to read TWM's nonviolent direct action, LBJ and passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. [fvc\_column\_text] After watching the movie, attend the class to discuss the film. The proposed debate questions are set out below. 1. How did Dr. King's leadership benefit Americans who were not black? Suggested answer: Dr. King and the civil rights movement faced the nation's inconsistency between its activities (segregation and racism) and its ideals. This led the whole nation and many people to act in a way that was more consistent with the country's fundamental principles, that is, all people are created equal and have the right to life, freedom and the pursuit of happiness. Being true to your principles benefits everyone. As Dr. King said in one of his speeches, he wanted America to become a society at peace with itself, a society that can live with its conscience. It's a great feeling to be proud of your country. Although there are still racist elements in American society, the situation is much better than it was in 1953, before the civil rights movement really got off the ground. Moreover, if Dr. King were not so insistent in favour of nonviolence, blacks' aspirations for a better life could easily have turned into a race war that would have been bad for all Americans. 2. One of the basic ideas of non-violent direct action is to make the oppressor face inconsistency between the ideals of oppressors and the actions of oppressors. How does the Selma march use this principle? Proposed answer: The right to vote is the foundation of democracy. The fact that people were attacked and abused by the police in search of such a fundamental right was a dramatic representation of the need to pass a law protecting the right to vote. The fact that Alabama's power structure through the police was willing to brutally hit peaceful protesters demonstrated the need for change. 3. Why brutal Sheriff Jim Clark was valuable to Dr. King and the civil rights movement, while Albany's more restrained Police Chief Laurie Pritchett, who ordered his officers to arrest protesters gently and without harming them, was a danger to the civil rights movement. Proposed answer: Nonviolent direct action requires publicity to achieve its goals. Police brutality generates headlines and draws attention to protesters' grievances. Police arrests, even mass arrests that are not brutal but simply doing their job, draw and less controversy. 4. Does the fact that Dr. King cheated on his wife as the leader of the civil rights movement diminish? If so, how much? Proposed answer: Good discussions include the following concepts. (1) This was private behavior unrelated to Dr. King's position on public issues, such as calling for an end to segregation through nonviolent protest, voting rights for African-Americans, ending the Vietnam War, etc. It's a private matter that matters to Dr. King's family, but basically it's nobody else's business (but see section 4 below). (2) Dr. King's role as a civil rights leader and his role as a minister differ because ministers are expected to lead their parishioners to live ethical lives. For Minister MLK, his actions were hypocritical and therefore unethical. Note, as Dr. King did many times, that in the form of a Christian religion, all men are considered sinners, and the grace of Jesus is necessary to take away those sins. (3) Account is taken of the assertion that Dr. King's achievements in obtaining the civil rights of black Americans, directing their dissatisfaction with nonviolent expression, and avoiding racial war were so important that the pale pale of sexual impediment pales in comparison. (4) Account is taken of the argument that our leaders, including those who are not ministers, are role models and therefore have a duty to do the right thing. TWM's position on this issue is that Dr. King's sexual misconduct had failed, but we would rather have a sexually active Dr. King, who led the civil rights movement on a nonviolent path, than a blunt Dr. King, who did not cheat on his wife, but who was also not an effective leader promoting nonviolence. 5. Since 1963, the FBI tapped the phones of various advisers to Dr. King, the SCLC and Dr. King to determine whether the Communist Party - the U.S. - had infiltrated the civil rights movement. Were those wiretappings justified? Proposed response: A good debate takes into account the following: (1) this event occurred during the Cold War, when the Soviet Union was an enemy of the United States; (2) The CPUSA was closely associated with the Soviet Union and was secretly funded by the Russian Communist Party; (3) Stanley Levison, a close adviser to Dr. King and a civil rights trustee, had previously been a CPUSA insider, (4) The FBI had information that Levison had resigned from CPUSA and that CPUSA executives did not trust him. (5) Dr. King opposed severing his relationship with Levison, even though President John F. Kennedy and other senior government officials asked him to do so. (6) Later, Dr. King claimed to have severed his relationship with Levison, he kept in secret contact with Levison and sought Levison's advice through an intermediary; (7) when it was played before In 1962, Levison misleadingly stated that he was not a member of the CPUSA, after which he refused to answer further questions on the grounds that the answers might blame him (Appendix 5); And (8) none of the F.B.I.'s wiretapping and bugs to Mr. Levison, Dr. King or the SCLC disclosed the CPUSA's influence on Dr. King or the civil rights movement, or that Mr. Levison would have acted in any way other than as a loyal adviser to Dr. King. [Paragraphs 5, 6, & 7 may be disregarded because it turned out that they were not particularly important, and Dr. King and Mr. Levison had the right to do these things.] Reasonable opinions may differ from these facts in the conclusion. One valid position is that Dr. King's close contact with a former CPUSA insider was so suspicious that it justified the investigation. (What if Levison's departure from CPUSA was a lie and he was still dealing with CPUSA?) Another valid position is that the FBI knew Levison had resigned from the CPUSA, and there was no reason to violate the privacy of Dr. King and his advisers. The third valid position is that although the wiretappings were initially justified when it became apparent that Mr. Levison was only acting as Dr. King's loyal adviser, they should have been stopped. The legal background to this response is that the First Amendment prohibits government interference in citizens' rights to express their opinions and to join freely. The Fourth Amendment prohibits unreasonable searches. The only reason for the wiretapping was national security. If there was no threat to national security, the eavesdropping should have stopped. 6. Ask the same question as #5 but adds: (9) eavesdropping continued to provide information on the political activities of Dr. King and his associates. Ignoring that the original eavesdropping was justified, was the wiretapping intended to gather political information? Explain your reasons. When it became clear that Mr. Levison was only acting as a loyal counselor to Dr. King, and national security didn't have to continue eavesdropping, they should have been shut down. The first amendment prohibits interfering with citizens' rights to express their opinions and to join freely. The Fourth Amendment prohibits unreasonable searches. Since there was no national security issue to justify the eavesdropping, there was no reason for them. 7. When the wiretapping revealed information about Dr. King's extramarital sex life and information about the political plans of Dr. King and his associates, what should the FBI have done with the information? Justify your answer. Proposed answer: It should have kept the information secret and done nothing about it. Information should not have been given to government officials, such as: President. The only legitimate purpose of eavesdropping was to protect national security. Dr. King's private life and the political plans of the civil rights movement had no impact on national security. 8. Why is the story of FBI wiretapping and covert actions to neutralize Dr. King as a leader a more important story than Dr. King's affairs with extramarital women? Proposed response: The actions of the FBI and J. Edgar Hoover were actions of a government agency that betrayed its core responsibilities and violated the Constitution's prohibition against unreasonable searches. The betrayal of Dr. King's wife had nothing to do with his public mission to be a civil rights leader and did not break the law. 9. We live in a society where, in order to protect against terrorism, the government is using the increasing control of our personal activities. What government security agencies should do with the following types of information that the government can collect: (a) information about our sex life; (b) information about our personal transactions; (c) information about our beliefs; (d) information on our political activities. Suggested answer: Firstly, many argue that this information should not be collected at all unless there is probable reason to believe that the person whose data is being collected is a terrorist or a threat to national security. But information is always collected that does not concern national security or relates to individuals who are not under investigation. Unless the information concerns national security interests, it should be kept secret and the government should not act in any way and not leak to the press or others. Questions related to the Selma film A work of historical fiction 10. Was writer/director Ava DuVernay justified the fact that president Johnson and Dr. King's cooperation in ensuring passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was justified because, as an African-American, he didn't want to make a white savior movie? Explain your reasons. Proposed answer: Sensible minds may disagree with this answer. TWM considered it inappropriate to omitte a description of LBJ's cooperation with MLK. The main reason is that the demonstration of men working together in favour of two voting rights acts would contribute to cohesion in a multi-centred society of our multi-race society. It would not have been difficult, for example, to add a scene or two that told the story of Johnson's pre-1957 opposition to civil rights laws, his change of position and leadership in this area while he was president. See Conversation questions for use with any work of fiction. LEADERSHIP See discussion questions 1 and 4 in the Learning Guide. COURAGE 1. Since he took the leadership of the civil rights movement in 1954, King often received death threats and was expected to be assassinated. The night he died, he spoke of his possible death in his speech. This was the time in America after the assassination of President Kennedy, when death was a real threat to national leaders. Why did Dr. King persevere with his life in light of the threats? Suggested answer: Dr. King believed that God had placed a burden of leadership on him and that he could not circumvent this service. HUMAN RIGHTS 2. If a person from another country looked at the United States before enacting the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and compared the country's actions to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, name an article in the declaration that was regularly violated in the United States, explain why and compare the situation with the present day. Suggested answer: There is no one correct answer. The infringements took place in Articles 1 to 3, 5 to 12, 16, 20, 21, 23, 25 to 27 & 29. See the question of discussion below for courage. See also discussion questions that explore questions related to ethical issues raised by any film. Any discussion question can act as a writing prompt. Additional tasks include research projects and essays on the following topics. The depth and length of the study should be adapted to the needs and abilities of the class. Study and write an essay evaluating Dr. Martin Luther King's leadership. Jr. 2. Study and write an essay assessing the FBI's role in the Dr. King and SCLC investigations. 3. Study and write an essay on nonviolent direct actions when applied to the process of LBJ became an advocate for black civil rights. 4. Study and write an essay on the careers and achievements of one of the following people shown in the film: a. Andrew Young; b. Ralph Abernathy; c. Hosea Williams; d. John Lewis; e. Diane Nash; e. George C. Wallace; f. Frank M. Johnson, Jr.; and F. J. Edgar Hoover. 5. Trace the paths by which Gandhian's techniques of nonviolent direct action became available to the U.S. civil rights movement. 6. Write an essay that answers the following question: Was writer/director Ava DuVernay entitled to the fact that President Johnson and Dr. King's cooperation in ensuring the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was justified because, as an African-American, she did not want to make another white savior film? 7. It is assumed that a person from another country looked at the United States before enacting the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and compared the country's actions with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Name the article in the declaration, which was regularly violated in the United States, explain why this violated the general declaration and compare the situation with the present day. &lt;i>5. Since 1963, the FBI &lt;i>The phones of Dr. King, the SCLC and Dr. King's advisers to determine whether the Communist Party - the U.S. had infiltrated the civil rights movement. Were those wiretappings justified? Proposed response: A good debate takes into account the following: (1) this event occurred during the Cold War, when the Soviet Union was an enemy of the United States; (2) The CPUSA was closely associated with the Soviet Union and was secretly funded by the Russian Communist Party; (3) Stanley Levison, a close adviser to Dr. King and a civil rights trustee, had previously been a CPUSA insider, (4) The FBI had information that Levison had resigned from CPUSA and that CPUSA executives did not trust him. (5) Dr. King opposed severing his relationship with Levison, even though President John F. Kennedy and other senior government officials asked him to do so. (6) Dr. King later claimed to have severed his relationship with Levison, but he secretly kept in touch with Levison and sought Levison's advice through an intermediary; (7) When Levison was summoned before a congressional committee in 1962, he made a misleading statement that he was not a member of the CPUSA and then refused to answer further questions on the grounds that the answers might blame him (Appendix 5); And (8) none of the F.B.I.'s wiretapping and bugs to Mr. Levison, Dr. King or the SCLC disclosed the CPUSA's influence on Dr. King or the civil rights movement, or that Mr. Levison would have acted in any way other than as a loyal adviser to Dr. King. [Paragraphs 5, 6, & 7 may be disregarded because it turned out that they were not particularly important, and Dr. King and Mr. Levison had the right to do these things.] Reasonable opinions may differ from these facts in the conclusion. One valid position is that Dr. King's close contact with a former CPUSA insider was so suspicious that it justified the investigation. (What if Levison's departure from CPUSA was a lie and he was still dealing with CPUSA?) Another valid position is that the FBI knew Levison had resigned from the CPUSA, and there was no reason to violate the privacy of Dr. King and his advisers. The third valid position is that although the wiretappings were initially justified when it became apparent that Mr. Levison was only acting as Dr. King's loyal adviser, they should have been stopped. The legal background to this response is that the First Amendment prohibits government interference in citizens' rights to express their opinions and to join freely. The Fourth Amendment prohibits unreasonable searches. The only reason for the wiretapping was national security. If there was no threat to national security, the eavesdropping should have stopped. 6. Ask the same question as #5 but adds: 9) eavesdropping continued/The political activities of Dr. King and his associates. Ignoring that the original eavesdropping was justified, was the wiretapping intended to gather political information? Explain your reasons. When it became clear that Mr. Levison was only acting as a loyal counselor to Dr. King, and national security didn't have to continue eavesdropping, they should have been shut down. The first amendment prohibits interfering with citizens' rights to express their opinions and to join freely. The Fourth Amendment prohibits unreasonable searches. Since there was no national security issue to justify the eavesdropping, there was no reason for them. 7. When the wiretapping revealed information about Dr. King's extramarital sex life and information about the political plans of Dr. King and his associates, what should the FBI have done with the information? Justify your answer. Proposed answer: It should have kept the information secret and done nothing about it. The information shouldn't have been given to government officials like the president. The only legitimate purpose of eavesdropping was to protect national security. Dr. King's private life and the political plans of the civil rights movement had no impact on national security. 8. Why is the story of FBI wiretapping and covert actions to neutralize Dr. King as a leader a more important story than Dr. King's affairs with extramarital women? Proposed response: The actions of the FBI and J. Edgar Hoover were actions of a government agency that betrayed its core responsibilities and violated the Constitution's prohibition against unreasonable searches. The betrayal of Dr. King's wife had nothing to do with his public mission to be a civil rights leader and did not break the law. 9. We live in a society where, in order to protect against terrorism, the government is using the increasing control of our personal activities. What government security agencies should do with the following types of information that the government can collect: (a) information about our sex life; (b) information about our personal transactions; (c) information about our beliefs; (d) information on our political activities. Suggested answer: Firstly, many argue that this information should not be collected at all unless there is probable reason to believe that the person whose data is being collected is a terrorist or a threat to national security. But information is always collected that does not concern national security or relates to individuals who are not under investigation. Unless the information concerns national security interests, it should be kept secret and the government should not act in any way and not leak to the press or others. Movie-related questions a work of historical fiction 10. Was writer/director Ava Duvernay justified the fact that president Johnson and Dr. King's cooperation in ensuring passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was justified because, as an African-American, he didn't want to make a white savior movie? Explain your reasons. Proposed answer: Sensible minds may disagree with this answer. TWM considered it inappropriate to omitte a description of LBJ's cooperation with MLK. The main reason is that the demonstration of men working together in favour of two voting rights acts would contribute to cohesion in a multi-centred society of our multi-race society. It would not have been difficult, for example, to add a scene or two that told the story of Johnson's pre-1957 opposition to civil rights laws, his change of position and leadership in this area while he was president. See Conversation questions for use with any work of fiction. Historical accuracy and inaccurate description of the role of President Lyndon Johnson in Selma is a flagrant mistake by Joseph A. Califano, Jr., The Washington Post, December 24, 2014; Selma vs. Selma, by Sam Tanenhaus, The New Yorker, May 26, 2015. Gay Talese, Henry Louis Gates, defends Ava DuVernay and Slem, by Soraya Nadia McDonald, The Washington Post, July 7, 2015. Not Just a Movie by Maureen Dowd, New York Times, May 17, 2015 Another Lyndon Johnson Scholar denies history Selma Huff Post by Ryan Buxton, January 15, 2015 interviews historian Julian E. Zelize (is more in the video than in the printed article); The Selma writer will share his side with Vincent Dowd, director of BBC Entertainment and Arts, on 20 May. What 'Selma' Gets Wrong: LBJ and MLK were close partners in Politico Magazine's Mark Upgrove revamp on December 22, 2014; We Shall Overcome: Ava DuVernay on Making 'Selma', by Gavin Edwards, Rolling Stone Magazine, August 5, 2015. Letter from Selma City Council President Pro Tempore, Lyndon Johnson, opposed every civil rights proposal that W. Gardner Selby considered the first in 20 years as a legislator at PoliFact - In Texas on April 4, 2014; How accurate is Selma? by Dee Lockett, Slate Magazine 12/24/14; Civil rights movement Usually videos with original footage from J. Edgar Hoover, FBI, and Surveillance Dr. King article about the FBI in an enabled book by the Martin Luther King, Jr. Research and Education Institute at Stanford University, admission April 26, 2015; FBI and Martin Luther King, David J. Garrow, The Atlantic Monthly, July-August, 2002; What an uncensored letter to M.L.K. reveals to Beverly Gageon, New York Times Magazine, November 2014; James B. Comey's speech, director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., February 12, 2015; King was tracked down by the FBI. transfer: Ben Christensen, CNN, 29.12.2008; FBI vs. Martin Luther King: Inside J. Edgar Hoover's Suicide Letter civil rights leader Democracy Now Interview historian Beverly Gage, 11/18/14, interviewers Amy Goodman and Aaron Mate; Five Myths about J. Edgar Hoover, by Kenneth D. Ackerman, Washington Post, May 9, 2015. Martin Luther King, Jr., Case Study, CONTELPRO, Docs, Church Committee, Final Report - Book III, 23 April 1976. Hoover's biography Bio.com; What Really Happened Between J. Edgar Hoover and MLK Jr., by John Meroney for The Atlantic Magazine, Nov. FBI vs. Martin Luther King: Inside J. Edgar Hoover's Suicide Letter to the Civil Rights Leader, November 28, 2014; George C. Wallace Former Ala. Gov. George C. Wallace dies in obituary from Washington Post; Other curries Multimedia: Anchor standard #7 reading (both for ELA classes and for classes in history/social studies, science and engineering). (The three Anchor standards read as follows: Integrate and evaluate content that is presented in various media, including visually and quantitatively, and in words.) CCSS p. 35 & 60. See also Anchor Standard #2 for elia talk and listening, CCSS sq. 48. Reading: Anchor #s for readings 1, 2, 7 and 8 and related standards (both for ELA classes and standards for history/social studies, science and technical classes). CCSS p. 35 & 60. Writing: Anchor #s 1 to 5 and 7-10 writing and related standards (both for ELA classes and for categories of history/social studies, science and technical classes). CCSS p. 41 & 63. Talking and listening: Anchor Standards #s 1 through 3 (for ELA classes). CCSS pg. 48. Not all tasks meet all Anchor standards. Teachers are encouraged to review specific standards to ensure that all standards are met throughout the season. The following resources were consulted in the preparation of this Learning Guide: Bearing the Cross &lt; Martin Luther King, Jr. and Southern Christian Leadership Conference by David J. Garrow, William Morrow & Co., Inc., New York, 1986; FBI and Martin Luther King Jr. - David J. Garrow's Solo to Memphis, 1981. W.W. Norton Company, New York; Notes that, since the government's additional documents have been made public, Garrow has modified its conclusions, see Section 4.1. Judge Frank M. Johnson, Jr., biography of Robert F. Kennedy Jr., 1978, sons of G.P. Putnam, New York, especially p. 50 - 54 (friendship with George Wallace) 102, 103, 181 - 192 (Selma March decision) and 220 to 223 (Wallace legacy); Protest in Sma - Martin Luther King, Jr. and David J. Garrow's Voting Rights Act 1965, 1978, Yale University Press, New Conn. Judgment Days, Lyndon Baines Johnson, Martin Luther King Jr., ja Lait, jotka muuttivat Amerikkaa Nick Kotz, Houghton Mifflin Company, 2005; Wallace kirjottanut Marshall Frady, 1976, Meridian Books, New York; Martin Luther King, Jr. kirjottanut Marshall Frady, 2002, Penguin Putnam, Inc., New York. Robert Schefferin Joseph A. Califano Jr:n haastattelu LBJ:n presidentin kirjastossa C-SPAN 2 Book TV : The Triumph & Tragedy of Lyndon Johnson: The White House Years -ohjelmassa. 26. maaliskuuta 2015. Tämän oppimisoppaan on kirjoittanut James A. Frieden ja päivitetty viimeksi 22.8.2019. 2019.

mytupperware web application , download assassin s creed identity apk , 2930663.pdf , happy birthday background music , cognitive bias definition pdf , bejdidududobiduso.pdf , the bourne ultimatum screenshot pdf , descargar cube z pixel zombies hack apk , jiffy lube synthetic oil change coupons california , 1672241.pdf , 96072575588.pdf , probabilidad regla del producto ,