If people were going to dock your new civilization borders tomorrow, and if you could make the rules about government, economics, and politics in a new society, what would you require?

[redacted]

- freedom of religion
- vote given to all free men
- freedom of press
- checks and balances in government, so no person or group is much more powerful than others
- any laws put in place must be enforced, no salutary neglect
- must not mess up relations with Native Americans, make it a crime to mess with the Natives

[redacted]

- well enforced, reasonable taxes
- freedom of speech, religion, and press
- democratic centralized government
- high social mobility and tolerance
- keep terms in office relatively short to avoid dictatorship
- decide up front either to completely destroy the native population or attempt to live in peace with all of them
- create a strong military

[redacted]

- Freemarket economy
- Divide land into equal portions and then phase out all centralized planning
- Complete separation of Church and power

[redacted]

- Relative economic freedom
  - Taxes over tariffs and duties
    - Taxes in place that guarantee political representation to those who qualify
    - Revenue gained from wealth of settlers, not the wealth of their commerce
      - Enhances commercial growth and makes this polity a better competitor for goods
  - Few regulations on debt
    - No debtor's prison
- Social freedom
  - Encourage disparate cultures to coexist to mitigate ignorance-based enmity
  - all religions permitted
  - prostitution prohibited
  - gambling prohibited
  - drinking allowed but not in public
  - public education, libraries
  - women have same property and voting rights as men
- Politically, when the settlers arrive, I want the best educated and most powerful to have the political power
  - Land-owners and their spouses may vote or citizens who pay a certain percentage of tax based on annual income
    - Get to vote for executive and upper house
  - Bicameral system, one based on the vote of the most sufficient citizens

Name : [redacted]

What would you do if you could make all the rules?

Imagine you were in charge of a new country. How would your structure your society? How would you structure your economy? How would you run or govern it? What would you allow? What would you forbid?

Please answer in a list. Try to list your items in order of importance. You do not have to answer all the questions listed above. You may also include additional information. Good luck!

I would have a president and have a diplomatic government. There would be public transportation. There would have shelters for the homeless. I would also use the bill of rights.

The government would be partially democratic on some choices, when the republic part cannot agree with eachother

- I would allow no bad things (murders, stealing, etc.) All good things would be allowed.

the civilization. The society will be as GREEN as poss

The entire region would be eco-friendly. Our products we would produce would be food and clean water which comes from purification centers. Cars are only used on long trips (vacations)

- Everyone would have jobs and be treated equally and kindly
- Crimes are illegal and the rules of crime are the U.S. rules

We have studied the American reaction to various perceived oppressions by the British. We know that to-be Americans have a history of using violence to solve political problems. Americans tend not to agree to disagree, they have tended to persuade their opponents by eloquence or by force.

Knowing what you know now, at what point do you think it is reasonable to use violence to secure political gain (e.g. rights)?

[redacted] publicly voicing their opinions. Same thing with the Women's rights movement. If you want something that you don't have, you find other people that don't have it and also want it, and then you as the people that can give it to you for help. If they don't then you keep asking. Then ask some more. And some more. Violence only erupts in times of heightened emotion, and should only be used in times of extreme distress in which human rights are clearly being violated. (Women being raped senselessly in the Middle East, the Holocaust, Israeli-Palestine conflict, recent civil unrest in Hong Kong). These events, however, are seen as history's tragedies. While they do pave way for progressive human rights, the violence often casts a shadow on the light of rights. (Civil War violence casting shadow on Emancipation Proclamation). Teacher strikes, [illegible]

[redacted] If a people were subjected to the loss of their life, liberty, or right to own property, violence would be warranted measure. Quality of life is so severly inhibitted by the lack of the natural rights, that many would consider it worth it to risk losing their life in an attempt to attain any of the three rights. However, violence should still be a last resort. The loss of human life is a terrible thing. Ideally, everyone should be able to live free of oppression. Peace is best, but not if you cannot fully enjoy the peace because you don't have your rights.

[redacted] of greater standards of living were often choosen by race and class. However, in their pursuit of relinquishing British authority, the Americans did not wish to stop with being treated like an equal British citizen. While that was the orginal goal, the colonists strove for something greater, ie: complete emancipation and realization of their natural rights - the ability to self-govern and reduce reliance upon others. While their violence created a form of sound governance for some, it also generated an era of exceptionalsim that demonstrated the ramifications of using violence as a means to and end. Americans came to see violence as a panacea for centuries to come, and, as a result, created numerous rifts upon the inherent inequality within the American population. In their attempts to free themselves from the coercive policies of the British government, America enlisted violence, and, upon seeing its success, errono

[redacted] For the Americans, violence was used when opposition could not be persuaded through eloquence. Since, not getting what they wanted was not an option, they would resort to any means to convince people to do whatever the people wanted, like a vote. In today's world, violence is not an option for getting what someone wants. We live in a more civilized world with police and infrastructure, unlike the Americans in the British colony, who had little to no support from the British and were forced to act mostly on their own, without laws and rules in place to govern the society in some cases.

Is there ever a time to use force to get what you want, even important things like rights? Why?

yes, It is O.K. to use force when the freedoms and lives of the people you defend are in jepordy. It is also O.K. when

Is there ever a time to use force to get what you want, even important things like rights? Why?

There is never a time to use force. [redacted]e used force, than it would make talking it out much easier.

Is there ever a time to use force to get what you want, even important things like rights? Why?

Violence should only be used in self defence, even then it should be controled. If everyone did this there would be no nee for it.

Is there ever a time to use force to get what you want, even important things like rights? Why?

No, all force really does is make the situation worse. [redacted] Usually when force has been used, revenge is often desired.

Is there ever a time to use force to get what you want, even important things like rights? Why?

There are definetly times when force is justifiable, take for example the plane hijackings of 9/11, should the people on the plane headed for the White House have used polite words with the terrorists? Or should they have let the plane hit it? NO! The force used by the passengers to stop the terrorists was definetly justifiable.

People fight civil wars for many reasons, some of which have nothing to do with politics, economics, or even land acquisition. So, we must beg the question, "Do Civil Wars ever end?" Of course, the violence ends, or does it? In the section below, please reconstruct a mythical nation after a civil war using the information you know about the American Civil War and other readings. Submit your answer below.

[redacted] Even if a nation is restored, Civil war leaves a country in tatters for years after the end of the war. Violence still persists, and the reasons the people fought usually have not gone away, although a solution might be reached. Usually, countries go to war to get right, not if they already have rights. To reconstruct a nation after a civil war is an incredibly difficult thing to do. Thousands of young men will probably have died, thousands of farm acres will be in tatters, and half of your country will be unhappy with how the war turned out.

The unrest of the losing population will be the hardest part of restoring the country. Most civil wars do not end the way the United States's did, where, for the most part, Southerners decided to go home and give up their fight. Most end with a disgruntled population subdued by the more powerful one. The hardest thing to do is the reintegrate these two different populations so that the country can once again become a unified body once again. The most important thing is to give the people time to once again coagulate as one solid country. In terms of punishment for the losing side, very minimal punishments should be levied against the opposing side. To hasten reconstruction, this is a very important thing because it minimalizes bitterness and helps the nation be rebuilt much quicker.

[redacted] If I were rebuilding a nation after a civil war, my first priority would be maintaining the strength and presence of my army, even after victory is completely secured, in the territory of the my opposition. The likelihood of rebellion is increased tenfold when the rebels believe that they have a chance at succeeding, so I need to make sure that understand that we are more powerful than they are and that we will not hesitate to go to war again. However, it is imperative that my army does not oppress or abuse the losing side. If my army wrongs the rebels, only resentment will follow, and resentment leads to conflict.

[redacted] To heal the nation on the political front, I would remove any political officer, national or local, who may incite anti-reunion sentiments within their political sphere. In other words, I would eliminate all radicals from participating in politics. To counter this somewhat heavy handed move, I would encourage the more influential citizens and former officers of the war of the losing side to take political office, and make sure that no laws are passed to inhibit the voting power of the losing state.

[redacted] In closure, the reaction to the losing side should not be with animosity, but with a thorough attempt to eliminate hatred and promote unity, economic growth, liberty, democracy, and success. Wartime grudges must be forgotten. Also, polygamy must be outlawed, no exceptions.

How do you rebuild your relationship with a friend or sibling after you have had a fight or an argument where each of you totally disagreed with each other?

You have to get back to the basics. Try talking to them. Another thing that can strengthen a relationship is a conflict in which you and the person you are

How do you rebuild your relationship with a friend or sibling after you have had a fight or an argument where each of you totally disagreed with each other?

I would apologize and ~~try to be understanding~~. If I did not agree with them I would calmly state why I thaght differenthy.

[redacted]

How do you rebuild your relationship with a friend or sibling after you have had a fight or an argument where each of you totally disagreed with each other?

Usually, it depends a lot on maturity. Sometimes, if you were actually wrong, you should apologize. If

How do you rebuild your relationship with a friend or sibling after you have had a fight or an argument where each of you totally disagreed with each other?

When you have an argument with a friend or sibling, you first apologize for having a fight. You should tell them that it is fine to have different views.

How do you rebuild your relationship with a friend or sibling after you have had a fight or an argument where each of you totally disagreed with each other?

Well, you really don't. If you're lucky it just goes away in time.

We have been learning about the age of Jackson, his somewhat volatile, if not dictatorial nature, and the impact that had on Native Americans, slavery, and the country as a whole. He clearly felt empowered by his popularity. But, is popularity enough all of the time?

If you could vote, and someone of definitively low or questionable character was about to run for President of the United States, what would you do?

As a separate and distinct question, If you could vote, and someone of definitively low or questionable character was about to become President of the United States, what would you do?

Do you feel as if the American system of checks and balances mitigates the harm anyone of low character can do as President, and if so, how would that impact you as a voter?

[redacted]

Is popularity enough:

Although popularity can give the illusion that a leader's actions are justified, it alone does not qualify a leader's actions. Popularity got Andrew Jackson into the White House, but even though he stepped outside of the Constitution, his popularity remained constant. Jackson had great success during his tenure but also killed thousands of people. Jackson embraced his popularity and ended up taking advantage of the power it gave him. Despite his successful career and high level of popularity, many of Jackson's choices were not justified, showing that popularity is not enough.

[redacted] Popularity is not enough to justify a leader's actions. What is popular is not always the just, moral, or even the most pragmatic decision. While it may be difficult for a leader to act unpopularly, it may be necessary in some situations. In relation to presidents, we should judge them on the morality and overall benefits of their actions and not on the popularity at the time.

If I could vote, and someone of definitively low or questionable character was about to run for President of the United States, I would not vote for them. This does not mean I would try to publicly bash their character beyond conversation with people I know, nor would I make any serious effort to impede their run for Presidency beyond choosing another candidate.

If someone of low character was about to become President, I wouldn't make any serious action against them. If he obtained the Presidency through moral methods, it is his right to become President of the United States, and at the very least the people who voted for him believe he is fit for office. I would not vote for him, but there is not much I could do if he were about to become President.

I think the system of checks and balances mitigates the harm someone of poor character if that person were to go outside to law to get what they want, but if they remain inside the current law it does not do much. There could be many decisions a President makes that I disagree with morally but that still survive the system. The only thing about this that I would do is that if it were legislature that I could vote on, I would vote for or against the legislation depending on what aligns with my own values,

[redacted] While the candidate might not share my "moral values," the history of US presidents shows moral and intellectual ideals don't make a good president and deep down, these immoral candidates probably shared more values in common with me, the ordinary, freeholder American than a "moral" and intellectual president. Looking back on previous presidents such as Washington, even though he was seen as the pinnacle of a "moral" man, some of his decisions such as to put down the Whisky Rebellion with excessive force would scare me as a voting American who wants control over his taxes. However, while a president like Jackson might shoot all the Indians within horseback ride of every city, its all in the interest of new lands for Americans like me or planters. He understands what I value most in a capitalist society, land and wealth, and because he works towards that goal, I would vote for him even if his means are extra-constitutional or of dubious morals.

[redacted] I would support this candidate with self-interest in mind. As long as the candidate stayed within the relative bounds and traditions of American law, as the Whisky rebels and the Shaysites did by preventing the execution of the law, not literally disobeying it, he would have my vote and support. However, if the president sought not just to circumvent but completely do away with the other branches of government, I would vote against him because that would risk a tyranny and unchecked control over the country and more importantly, my property, land or slaves.

- This point dovetails into the system of checks and balances in place designed to prevent such a situation. The existence of such a system would prevent most greedy and immoral characters from seizing uncontested power, but it would not prevent the most determined of characters. With this in mind, I would not be afraid to vote in immoral presidents as long as I felt their immorality did not threaten my liberties in the form of tyranny.

If you could vote, and someone of low, or questionable character was about to **run** for President of the United States, what would you do?

I would not vote for him. Character is huge in being president, because the president represents us when he goes to other countries.

I would try to convince everyone to vote for a better candidate.

I really wouldn't care because he probably wouldn't win - Vote for the opposite candidate

If you could vote, and someone of low, or questionable character was about to **become** President of the United States, what would you do?

Protest or move out of the country until he resigns from office. Deal with it but not like it.

I would live the same way I do now.
I would just live my life.

Move to Canada.

If that was out of question, I would protest and argue and be a stubborn pain in the butt to his campaign. Down with the president!

Given what you know about the triumphs and pitfall of the executive office of the united states, please answer the following questions:

[redacted]1: Would you ever want to be President of the United States? Briefly explain your position.
2: Do you find the office of President and admirable position? In other words, regardless of wanting to be president, do you find the job worthy of elevated stature?

[redacted]1. No way. The President's office makes decisions that transcend a plain utilitarian ethic. It is easy to say that sacrificing the lives of a dozen soldiers for the purpose of saving thousands is a good decision, but it is a lot harder to actually do. The ethical dilemmas that the president faces each day, combined with the scrutiny provided by the modern media ensure that no business remains "private" or out of the public eye anymore.

2. All this being said, it makes me admire our current and past presidents even more (the competent presidents). The office necessitates a very intricate grasp of foreign policy, handling different domestic political agendas, and preserving America's position as the global hegemon. Anyone capable of doing this job at a reasonable performance deserves to be lauded.

[redacted]No. I don't think that the job would amount to the idealism that I would most likely bring to the table. It would be too frustrating to not be able to accomplish my goals in a timely matter or not at all. I don't really admire or want to get mixed up in the political games that take place such as gerrymandering, graft, and shamelessly appealing to special interest groups. I also would find it difficult to make the moral hazard kind of choices that take place such as drone strikes.

I think its sort of a wash. There are just as many Presidents that I don't like as Presidents that I do like. The President has incredible power to do good, but it also has incredible power to do bad. Every decision is something of a two-way street. Despite all that Teddy Roosevelt did to help the common man and even in a way that increased Competition by breaking up trusts and allowing unions to negotiate, he without a doubt expanded the scope of government in a way that future Presidents could take advantage of and use in less productive ways than Roosevelt. The succeeding president , Taft, rolled back many of the previous reforms that Roosevelt put in place.

[redacted]1: Yes, I would like to be President of the United States. While some circumstances might be out of my control, and the stress would be ridiculously, the position is uniquely suited to channeling and changing American society and world society. It is a position in which one man can shape the direction of the world. I would like to helm that position and implement my vision for America and the world.

2: Yes, I find the job worthy. While bad presidents did hold the office, by virtue of their election by the American people, the President holds a mandate by the American people to lead. Usually, the public chooses at least competent leaders capable of shouldering the immense responsibility, and this responsibility makes the job worthy of its elevated stature.

Name: [redacted] ☺ 6th graders are amazing! ☺

Please consider the following questions. Answer thoughtfully and honestly.

4. What is a leader? What characteristics do leaders have?

A leader is someone who enthusiastically helps, cares, and cheers on others, even when the going is tough. They're honest and

Name: [redacted] ☺ 6th graders are amazing! ☺

Please consider the following questions. Answer thoughtfully and honestly.

4. What is a leader? What characteristics do leaders have?

A leader is someone who is always trying to move the community forward no matter what happens They are honest, brave, and kind.

Name: [redacted] ☺ 6th graders are amazing! ☺

Please consider the following questions. Answer thoughtfully and honestly.

1. What is a leader? What characteristics do leaders have?

A leader is a person who is honest, kind, helpful, respectful, fun to be with, and has good behavior.

2. Who do you consider a good leader? Please provide an example.

[redacted]

Because he is kind and thoughtful towards other people. He is a nice person to be with and goes out of his way to help people.

3. Do you consider yourself a leader? Will you share more about that?

Most of the time I think I am helpful towards others and kind.

(2) Who do you admire most? Why?

My father. He is my Idol and I want to be just like him.

(2) Who do you admire most? Why?

My mom, because her work ethic and determination really shines through. :)

(2) Who do you admire most? Why?

I haven't really picked a role model yet, but the best thing you can do is learn from others mistakes, not follow them blindly.

(2) Who do you admire most? Why?

I probably admire Gandhi the most for his courage to stand up to the British without weapons.

(2) Who do you admire most? Why?

I admire many people, but one person stands out to me. I don't admire him for his leadership, but for his talent. Stephen Curry is a point guard for the Golden State Warriors. I admire him for many things. One, he is probably one of the best shooters of all time. 2nd, this year, he is in the top 10 for PPG (points per game) & APG (assists per game). These talents make me want to have his wonderful talent.