Reconstruction: Success or Failure?

Then & Now: Reparations for Slavery?

Forty Acres and a Mule
In the year 1867, Radical Republican Thaddeus Stevens introduced a bill that, had it been successful, would have granted each freed adult male slave 40 acres of land and $100.

Since then, a number of other attempts have been made to legislate reparations—make financial payment to victims—for the evils of slavery.

In 1989, Representative John Conyers of Michigan, proposed the first in a series of bills that would create a commission to study the impact of slavery. If the committee found that reparations were called for, it would recommend appropriate measures for Congress to take.

In 1999, Conyers introduced a bill that would require the government to issue a formal apology for slavery. So far, these proposals and others like them have not been passed into law.

However, a group of prominent class-action lawyers met in 2000 to begin studying the suit against the government and against businesses that profited from slavery.

Some victims of post-slavery racism have actually been granted reparations (financial payment). Early in 2001, a state commission in Oklahoma awarded $12 million to black survivors and victims’ descendants of a deadly 1921 Tulsa race riot.

Critical Thinking
What are your thoughts about reparations? Should we pay reparations for acts of slavery or racism that occurred in the past? Why or why not?

Should we also pay reparations to victims of the Holocaust and Japanese-American victims of World War II internment camps? Why or why not?

(Video)

The Three Major Problems of Reconstruction: Social, Political, Constitutional

In the aftermath of the Civil War, the South was devastated, physically, economically, even spiritually. The postwar South, it has been said, was worse off than Europe after either of the 20th Century world wars.

The Confederate defeat left most white southerners in a state of shock. The appalling loss of life was a disaster without parallel in the American experience.

Over one-fifth of the South’s adult white population of military age died during the Civil War.

The death of nearly 260,000 Southern soldiers meant that women would continue to fill many roles in society, even as they struggled to help surviving husbands and sons adapt to the reality of defeat.

During this time period, the nation faced three huge problems that would challenge this country’s leadership, as well as our desire to move forward and reinterpret our founding documents’ intent for freedom and equality for all Americans. The three major problems included:

1. **The Social Problem**: What are we to do with the newly freed slaves? Let’s face it, freedom ain’t free. It’s one thing to free a people, it’s another thing to help them to earn a living for themselves, especially when most of the newly freed slaves could not read or write.

2. **The Political Problem**: How do we reconstruct our nation? How do we bring the South back in to the Union? Do we do so with open and forgiving arms or do we punish them for the damages caused by the Civil War?

3. **The Constitutional Problem**: Who should have the authority to reconstruct the nation? Should it be up to the President? Should it be up to Congress? Should it be up to them both?

(Story continued on top of page 2)
The Three Major Problems of Reconstruction (continued)

For much of this century, Reconstruction was widely viewed as an era of corruption and misgovernment, supposedly caused by allowing blacks to take part in politics.

This interpretation helped to justify the South’s system of racial segregation and deny the vote to blacks, which survived into the 1960s.

Today, as a result of extensive new research and profound changes in American race relations, historians view Reconstruction far more favorably, as a time of genuine progress for former slaves and the South as a whole.

For all Americans, Reconstruction was a time of fundamental social, economic, and political change. Five days after Lee’s surrender at Appomattox, President Lincoln was shot while attending the theater. He died at 7:22am the next morning on April 15, 1865.

The new president, Andrew Johnson of Tennessee, was faced with many crucially important questions. Earlier in Johnson’s political career, he had said, “Treason must be made odious (horrible), and the traitors must be punished,” a sentence that he had used in many speeches, including his 1864 acceptance of the vice presidency.

Yet almost immediately after his assumption of the presidency, President Andrew Johnson changed course.

At first he appeared to side with Radical Republicans in Congress (who wanted nothing more than to punish the South and allow Blacks to vote).

Johnson however, soon took a different path, granting numerous pardons to ex-Confederates. These presidential pardons allowed these former rebels to reclaim their former property, hold office, vote, and not support the right of Black suffrage.

The social, political, and constitutional stage was set. How was this country to proceed and provide for the needs of millions of newly freed slaves? Would we honor the plan of our assassinated President? Could we trust his new replacement to steer us down the road towards an easy peace or would Congress assume the power?

(Social Problems: Black and White Responses to the End of Slavery in the South)

Overview

The Confederate defeat and the end of slavery brought far-reaching changes in the lives of all Southerners. The destruction of slavery led inevitably to conflict between Blacks seeking to breathe new meaning into their freedom by fighting for their independence from white control, and whites seeking to keep as much power as possible of the old order.

The meaning of freedom itself became a point of conflict in the Reconstruction South. Former slaves relished the opportunity to flaunt their liberation from the many rules of slavery.

White Responses

Most white southerners reacted to defeat and emancipation with dismay. Many families had suffered the loss of loved ones and the destruction of property. Some thought of leaving the South altogether, or retreated into nostalgia for the Old South and the Lost Cause of the Confederacy.

In 1865 and 1866 many white Southerners joined memorial associations that established Confederate cemeteries and monuments throughout the region. Others, unwilling to accept a new relationship with former slaves, resorted to violent opposition to the new world being created around them. In fact, shortly after, several southern states started to adopt a series of so-called, “Black Codes.”

Furthermore, former slaves were really no better off when they realized that whites in the South were economically holding them back through share cropping and tenant farming. Sharecroppers were supposed to have a chance to climb the economic ladder, but by the time they had shared their crops and paid their debts, they rarely had any money left. In fact a sharecropper often became tied to one plantation, having no choice but to work until his or her debts were paid. If they were lucky, they might eventually have the chance to become tenant farmers, but the chances were slim.

Black Responses

Immediately after the Civil War, former slaves sought to give meaning to freedom by reuniting families separated under slavery, establishing their own churches and schools, seeking economic independence, and demanding equal civil and political rights.

Reuniting families separated under slavery, and solidifying existing family relations, were essential to the black definition of freedom. The family stood as the main pillar of the postwar black community.

Most slaves had lived in family units, although they faced the constant threat of separation from loved ones by sale. Freed people made remarkable efforts to locate loved ones - a Northern reporter in 1865 encountered a former slave who had walked more than 600 miles searching for his wife and children, from whom he had been sold away during slavery.

Before the war, slave marriages had no legal standing; now tens of thousands of freed people registered their unions before the army, Freedmen’s Bureau, and local governments.

Family and kinship ties, together with the church, remained the foundation of the black community.

An Uncertain Future

The question as to whether or not a state has the legal right to secede was settled on the battlefield. The Union clearly won that argument. However, the assassination of Lincoln and his unfinished work concerning Reconstruction would have to be sorted out between a Democratic President and a Republican controlled Congress.
Lincoln’s Plan for Reconstruction: Amnesty and Reconstruction

Lincoln’s Reconstruction Plan followed a plan that included a Proclamation of Amnesty (forgiveness) and Reconstruction.

A lenient plan, it offered a full pardon and restoration of all rights (except slaves) to all persons who took an oath of loyalty to the Union and promised to accept emancipation. This pardon however, did not include high-ranking civil and military officers of the Confederate government, who could in fact, according to Lincoln, run for political office—a notion that many Radical Republicans opposed as they wished to be much harsher towards the defeated Confederates.

Basically, Lincoln’s plan stated that when 10 percent of the number of legal voters in the rebel state had taken the loyalty oath, a new state government could be established and the state was permitted to take its regular place in the Union. Nothing was said about black suffrage in Lincoln’s original plan.

What the president’s plans actually were, especially with regard to who would be able to vote in the postwar South, will never be known, for he died less than a week after Lee’s surrender.

His last public speech nevertheless hinted that he was moving toward embracing limited African American suffrage (right to vote).

Congress’ Reconstruction Plan: The South is Conquered But They Are Not Loyal!

Congress’ Reconstruction Plan called for a much harsher plan than that of Lincoln’s plan. Basically, the Radical Republicans in Congress wanted the political power of the slave owning class destroyed, give blacks full citizenship, and make the South pay for their actions.

The Radicals believed the South to be conquered but not necessarily loyal to the Union.

In February of 1864, two Radical Republicans, Senator Benjamin F. Wade of Ohio and Representative Henry W. Davis of Maryland, sponsored a bill in response to Lincoln’s plans for Reconstruction. Particularly, the Wade-Davis bill was proposed to counteract three political factors that threatened their Republican power in Congress.

First, the Radical Republicans believed that Lincoln’s policy of Reconstruction and his ‘Ten Percent Plan’ was too weak and forgiving towards the rebellious southern states.

Second, Radicals feared that once the southern states were restructured, southern politicians would then be eligible to run for office and then challenge the Republicans’ views in Congress—a power that the Radicals were reluctant to concede at this time.

And third, the Radicals hoped to prevent Lincoln’s re-nomination in 1864 in lieu to his lenient policies with the South.

The Wade-Davis Bill challenged Lincoln’s Reconstruction by demanding a more stringent plan of Reconstruction. Specifically, the bill endorsed:

1. the congressional control of Reconstruction;
2. an end to slavery;
3. the placement of Confederate states under temporary military rule;
4. the imposition of an ironclad oath of loyalty to the Union;
5. the enforced readmission of any seceding states to an allegiance of at least 50% of the voters of 1860; and
6. the exclusion of more Confederate officials from government office than that of Lincoln’s original plan.

Although they outdid each other in their funeral speeches to the fallen president, secretly the Radical Republicans were not altogether displeased by Lincoln’s death.

For one thing, Lincoln could be used as a martyr for their own cause, which included building a strong national government through a strong Republican party.

It became very clear to the Radical Republicans that in order to stay in power, they must allow African Americans the right to vote, while denying the right of pro-Confederate whites their legal and political rights.

Johnson’s Reconstruction Plans: Where Does He Stand?

When senators from the seceding states walked out of Congress in 1861, Johnson was the only southern senator who refused to leave; he continued to occupy a seat until Lincoln appointed him military governor of Tennessee on March 3, 1862.

By late August 1863, he had reversed his position on emancipation (as he was originally opposed to it), energetically aided in the recruitment of twenty thousand African American soldiers for the Union army, and later promised blacks, “I will indeed be your Moses, and lead you through the Red Sea of war and bondage to a fairer future of liberty and peace.” Thus, when Lincoln was looking for a “War Democrat” to balance the party’s ticket in 1864 (to replace Hannibal Hamlin, who wanted to return to the Senate), his eyes almost naturally fell on Andrew Johnson.

Johnson’s Reconstruction Plan began as one that would simply continue with Lincoln’s plan and readmit each state if the state would declare that secession is illegal, swear allegiance to the Union, and ratify the 13th Amendment (which abolished slavery). In return, the South would not have to pay off any war debts/damages that occurred during the Civil War.

But how would Johnson resume Lincoln’s policies of Reconstruction after Lincoln’s assassination? How would this new President (who was a Democrat by the way) work with a unified Republican Congress?

The political and constitutional stages were set for disaster.
The Federal Government’s Solution to the Social Problem: The Freedmen’s Bureau

The Freedmen’s Bureau was a special organization to help former slaves and poor whites in the South. In 1865, Congress established the Freedmen’s Bureau to provide assistance to former slaves. Union Army general Oliver O. Howard was the Bureau’s Commissioner.

The Freedmen’s Bureau was to aid and protect the newly freed blacks in the South after the Civil War. Established by an act of Mar. 3, 1865, under the name “bureau of refugees, freedmen, and abandoned lands,” it was to function for one year after the close of the war.

A bill extending its life indefinitely and greatly increasing its powers was vetoed (Feb. 19, 1866) by President Andrew Johnson, who viewed the legislation as an unwarranted (and unconstitutional) continuation of war powers in peacetime. The veto marked the beginning of the President’s long and unsuccessful fight with the Radical Republican Congress over Reconstruction.

In slightly different form, the bill was passed over Johnson’s veto on July 16, 1866. Organized under the War Dept., with Gen. Oliver O. Howard as its commissioner, and thus backed by military force, the bureau was one of the most powerful instruments of Reconstruction. Howard divided the ex-slave states, including the border slave states that had remained in the Union, into 10 districts, each headed by an assistant commissioner.

The bureau’s work consisted chiefly of five kinds of activities:
1. Relief work for both blacks and whites in war-stricken areas.
2. Regulation of black labor under the new conditions.
3. Administration of justice in cases concerning the blacks.
4. Management of abandoned and confiscated property, and
5. Support of education for blacks.

To a great degree the bureau operated as a political machine, organizing the black vote for the Republican party and as a result, the bureau’s political activities made it thoroughly hated in the South.

The Plot Thickens: The Constitutional and Political Problems Between Johnson and Congress

Johnson vs. Congress

During the beginning of Johnson’s presidency, the Radical Republicans believed that Andrew Johnson would be more sympathetic to their cause, which included a harsh and thorough reconstruction of the southern economy, society, and life. After all, Johnson had been a loyal unionist and a harsh military governor of Tennessee during the Civil War.

In addition, Johnson said many times that treason “must be made odious, (horrible) and the traitors must be punished and impoverished!” Radical Republicans believed Johnson to be sympathetic to Black suffrage (and a harsh reconstructionist more than Lincoln had been.

And yet the Radical Republicans seriously misjudged President Johnson. Although many of his initial statements and speeches as president had given Radicals the impression that he supported a strict policy of reconstruction of the South, by the end of May 1865, Radicals were increasingly alarmed that the president either had misled them or had changed his mind with regard to the reconstruction of the South.

In May of 1865, with Congress out of session, Johnson appeared to do a 180 and surprise Congress by announcing his own plan for Reconstruction. Johnson declared that each of the remaining Confederate states could be readmitted into the Union if it would meet several conditions:
1. Each state would have to withdraw its right of secession;
2. Each state would have to swear allegiance to the Union;
3. The federal government would annul (cancel) the war debts; and
4. Each state would have to ratify (approve) the 13th Amendment, which abolished slavery.

Johnson’s plan outraged the Radical Republicans who wanted stricter measures. In addition, the Radicals became more frustrated when they learned of Johnson’s future plans for Reconstruction.

However, because of political scandals within the bureau caused by corrupt agents within the bureau itself, an economic panic, and southern white resistance, the work of the Freedmen’s Bureau was discontinued by July 1, 1869. Its educational activities, however, were carried on for another three years and helped thousands of former slaves to be able to read and write.

Johnson did not think it necessary to require most high-ranking Confederates and wealthy southern landowners to take the loyalty oath. Furthermore, Johnson failed to address the needs of former slaves in three areas: land, voting rights, and protection under the law.

Southerners were relieved with Johnson’s softer views towards Reconstruction. He supported states’ rights instead of a strong federal government. He also denied former slaves from gaining the right to vote and then pardoned more than 13,000 former Confederates because he believed that “white men alone must manage the South.”

With the exception of Texas, all of the remaining southern states (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina) quickly agreed to Johnson’s terms. These states established new state constitutions, set up new state governments, and elected new members of Congress to send to Washington D.C.

The Radicals were not amused by Johnson’s actions. Something had to be done.

(Video)
When Congress reconvened in December of 1865, the Radical Republicans were not happy to see the 58 newly elected southern Congressmen. This was a direct threat to the Republican Party's political power.

Radical Republicans called for the overthrow of the southern governments established under President Johnson's Reconstruction policy and they began to establish new state governments so that black men as well as white were allowed to vote.

Congress then adopted two bills; one extending the life of the Freedmen's Bureau, the second, the Civil Rights Act of 1866, guaranteeing blacks' equality and protection from discrimination. Johnson quickly vetoed this act stating that it was not Congress' right to establish such a law. After all, Johnson thought that he should be in charge of Reconstruction.

But Johnson's veto of these measures actually backfired on him. His veto angered many Republicans and moved many moderate Republicans, who were at least willing to compromise with Johnson, to side with the Radicals. And so began the bitter conflict over who should control the policy for Reconstruction.

In 1866, Congress passed the Civil Rights Act over Johnson's veto, and proceeded to approve the Fourteenth Amendment, which forbade states to deprive any citizen of the "equal protection of the laws." This amendment became the first Constitutional guarantee of the principle of equal civil rights regardless of race.

In response to Congress' actions, the president denounced Congressional efforts to extend citizenship rights to former slaves, claiming that they would "destroy our institutions and change the character of our government."

But it didn't matter anymore. In the 1866 elections, moderate and Radical Republicans won a landslide victory over the Democrats in Congress, which would assure them the numbers to override any future presidential vetoes.

Congress could now move forward with its Reconstruction policies because they had enough votes in both houses to override any presidential vetoes.

Although it appeared that the Radicals were in complete control over the constitutional problem of Reconstruction, more trouble lay ahead for the Republicans. This time, the trouble existed outside of Washington D.C.

Remember, the South is conquered but are they loyal? The Radicals were looking for any reason to reconstruct the South with very harsh terms. All they needed now was an excuse to do so.

The Radicals Take Charge...Politically

Because of their severe opposition to Congress' radical actions, many southerners felt forced to take matters into their own hands—violently.

A series of violent episodes would soon haunt the South. For example, race riots in Memphis, Tennessee and New Orleans, Louisiana occurred which caused the deaths of at least 80 African Americans.

In addition, most of the southern states refused to adopt the 14th Amendment, which gave ALL citizens equal protection under STATE laws.

Such violence and opposition convinced northern voters that the federal government must step in and protect the rights of former slaves. Congress was ready to move forward with its new Reconstruction policy.

The Reconstruction Act of 1867 did not recognize the new southern state governments formed under the Lincoln and Johnson administrations. Any of the state governments that had already been created under Lincoln's and Johnson's plan would have to start all over again. In fact, the demands were now set even higher by the Radical Republicans.

The Reconstruction Act of 1867 included the following demands from the South:
1. Divided the southern states into 5 military districts.
2. Civilian courts are abolished and replaced by tribunals.
3. New state constitutions were adopted giving blacks the right to vote.
4. States could be readmitted into the Union only if they ratify the 14th Amendment.

Despite the fact that Johnson would veto this Act, Congress had the majority to override his veto.

The South was outraged!
Should President Johnson Be Removed From Office?

As Reconstruction continued under the radical watch of the Republicans, Radical leaders felt President Johnson was not carrying out his constitutional duty to reinforce the Reconstruction Act. For instance, Johnson removed military officers who attempted to enforce the act. The Radicals then began to look for grounds on which to impeach the president.

The Bait
In March of 1867, Congress had passed the Tenure of Office Act, which stated that the president could not remove cabinet officers (the President's advisors) without the consent of the Senate. One purpose of this act was to protect cabinet member, Edwin Stanton, who was the Secretary of War and a Radical Republican.

The Hook
Johnson believed this act to be unconstitutional so he fired Stanton and decided to challenge its legal legitimacy. But by doing so, Johnson had provided the Radicals with the opportunity they needed. The House of Representatives (who has the power to impeach, or accuse a political official) accused the President of violating 9 counts of the Office of Tenure Act.

The Catch
Johnson’s lawyers disputed these charges by pointing out that President Lincoln, not Johnson, had appointed Secretary Stanton, so the act did not apply. However, the votes passed in the House and the trial was passed on to the Senate with the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court presiding.

The Release
People in the Senate chamber held their breath as one by one the senators gave their verdicts. When the last senator declared “Not guilty,” the vote was 35 to 19, one vote short of the two-thirds majority needed to remove the president.

Grant Takes Command Again...this time, it's political!

Shortly after the trial, the Republicans nominated Ulysses S. Grant, the North’s greatest war hero, for president. Ulysses S. Grant chose Schuyler Colfax, former Speaker of the House, as his running mate in the 1868 presidential campaign. “Let us have peace,” the last line of Grant’s letter accepting the nomination, became the Republicans’ campaign slogan.

The 1868 presidential campaign revolved around the issues of Reconstruction. The Democrats’ nominee, Horatio Seymour, ran on a platform opposing Reconstruction.

“This Is A White Man’s Government” became the slogan of a Democratic campaign that openly appealed to racial fears and prejudice.

In November, Grant won the presidency by a wide margin in the electoral college, but the popular vote was less decisive. Out of the almost 6 million ballots cast, Grant received a majority of only 306,592 votes because of other candidates running under other party platforms. About 500,000 southern African Americans had voted, most of them for Grant, bringing home the importance of the African American vote to the Republican party.

After the election, the Radicals feared that pro-Confederate southern whites might try to limit Black suffrage. Therefore, the Radicals introduced the 15th Amendment, which stated that no one can be kept from voting because of “race, color, or previous condition of servitude.” The amendment would also affect northern states, many of which at this time DID NOT allow African Americans the right to vote.

The 15th Amendment was ratified in 1870 and was an important victory for the Radicals. However, some of the southern governments refused to enforce the 14th & 15th Amendments, and some white southerners used violence (i.e. KKK) to prevent African Americans from voting. In response, Congress passed the Enforcement Act of 1870, giving the federal government more power to punish those who tried to prevent African American suffrage.

In his early years in office, Grant would do well to support the Enforcement Act and squash the KKK, but as his years in office grew older, so did his challenges to see Reconstruction through to its faithful end.

Reconstruction Social Success: Coming of Age for African Americans

Coming of Age of Political Rights
Under the terms of the Reconstruction Act of 1867, Republican governments came to power throughout the South, offering blacks, for the first time in American history, a genuine share of political power. These governments established the region’s first public school systems, enacted civil rights laws, and sought to promote the region’s economic development. The coming of black suffrage under the Reconstruction Act of 1867 produced a wave of political mobilization among African Americans in the South. The Forty-First and Forty-Second Congress included black members for the first time in American history. A total of sixteen blacks served in Congress during Reconstruction. Blacks were joined by white newcomers from the North - called “carpetbaggers” by their political opponents. And the Republican Party in some states attracted a considerable number of white Southerners, to whom Democrats applied the name “scalawag” - mostly Unionist small farmers but included some prominent plantation owners.
Reconstruction Social Success (continued from bottom of page 6)

The Reconstruction Act of 1867 stipulated that all former Confederate states except Tennessee hold conventions to draft new constitutions that granted former slaves the rights of citizenship. Two-hundred and sixty-five African Americans, or twenty-five per cent of the total delegates, attended these conventions held in Southern states in 1868-69, making them the first public bodies in American history with substantial black representation.

Composed of slave ministers, artisans, and Civil War veterans, and blacks who had been free before the Civil War, a black political leadership emerged that pressed aggressively for an end to the South’s racial caste system.

African Americans served in virtually every political capacity during Reconstruction, from member of Congress to state and local officials. Their presence in positions of political power symbolized the political revolution brought on by Reconstruction.

Political Rights Leads to Education

By 1870, the former Confederate states had been readmitted to the Union under new constitutions that marked a striking departure in southern government. For the first time in the region’s history, state-funded public school systems were established, as well as orphan asylums and other facilities.

The new governments passed the region’s first civil rights laws, reformed the South’s old fashioned tax system, and embarked on ambitious and expensive programs of economic development, hoping that railroad and factory development would produce a better tomorrow shared by both races.

Education, denied them under slavery, was essential to the African-American understanding of freedom. Young and old, the freed people flocked to the schools established after the Civil War.

For both races, Reconstruction laid the foundation for public schooling in the South.

Northern benevolent (charity) societies, the Freedmen’s Bureau, and, after 1868, state governments, provided most of the funding for black education, but the initiative often lay with blacks themselves, who purchased land, constructed buildings, and raised money to hire teachers.

The Beginning of the End of Reconstruction: Opposition & Violence

From the outset, Reconstruction governments created bitter opposition among the majority of white Southerners. Though they disagreed on specific policies, all of Reconstruction’s opponents agreed that the South must be ruled by white supremacy.

Growing Opposition

To numerous former Confederates, the new governments appeared as living reminders of military defeat. Congress’ ambitious programs of economic development and school construction produced rising taxes and spiraling state debts.

The essential reason for the growing opposition to Reconstruction, however, was the fact that most southern whites could not accept the idea of African Americans voting and holding office, or the open policies adopted by the new governments.

Beginning in 1867, southern Democrats launched a campaign that opposed Reconstruction, including racial slogans against Blacks, as well as more measured criticisms of Reconstruction policies.

The Rise of the KKK

As soon as blacks gained the right to vote, secret societies sprang up in the South, devoted to restoring white supremacy in politics and social life. Most notorious was the Ku Klux Klan, an organization of violent criminals that established a reign of terror in some parts of the South, assaulting and murdering local Republican leaders.

Founded in 1866 as a Tennessee social club, the Ku Klux Klan was soon transformed into an organization of terrorist criminals, which spread into nearly every Southern state. Led by planters, merchants, and Democratic politicians, the Klan committed some of the most brutal acts of violence in American history.

Institutions like black churches and schools frequently became targets. The Klan’s aim was to restore white supremacy in all areas of Southern life — in government, race relations, and on the plantations.

The new Southern governments generally proved unable to restore order. Only the intervention of federal marshals in 1871, backed up by the army, succeeded in crushing the Klan.

In 1871 and 1872, federal marshals, assisted by U.S. troops, brought to trial scores of Klansmen, crushing the organization. But the North’s commitment to Reconstruction soon decreased.

Many Republicans came to believe that the South should solve its own problems without further interference from Washington. To make matters worse for the Republicans and their goals for Reconstruction, in 1872, a group of Republicans were accused of wild corruption within the Grant administration, which damaged the party’s reputation.

Despite Grant’s reelection, Northerners were growing tired of Reconstruction, a reaction accelerated when an economic depression began in 1873, pushing economic issues to the forefront of politics instead of sectional ones.

Racism, which had decreased in the aftermath of the Civil War, now began to grow. Influential Northern newspapers portrayed southern blacks not as upstanding citizens but as little more than unbridled animals, incapable of taking part in government.

When, in 1874 and 1875, anti-Reconstruction violence again reared its head in the South, few Northerners believed the federal government should intervene to suppress it. [Video]
The Centennial Election: Republican control of the White House in exchange for Democratic control of the southern states

In 1876, the United States marked the centennial of the Declaration of Independence. A year-long exposition in Philadelphia celebrated a century of material and moral progress. Yet the year’s election campaign was again marked by violence in the South.

By 1876, Reconstruction had been overturned in all the Southern states except South Carolina, Louisiana, and Florida. The presidential election hinged on the outcome in these states, which both parties claimed to have carried.

United States troops who had been guarding the state houses in South Carolina and Louisiana were ordered to return to their barracks (not to leave the region entirely, as is widely believed). The Redeemers, as the southern Democrats who overturned Republican rule called themselves, now ruled the entire South.

The Unfinished Revolution: Did Reconstruction succeed or fail?

In the generation after the end of Reconstruction, the southern states deprived blacks of their right to vote, and ordered that public and private facilities of all kinds be segregated by race.

Until job opportunities opened in the North in the twentieth century, spurring a mass migration out of the South, most blacks remained locked in a system of political powerlessness and economic inequality. A hostile and biased historical interpretation of Reconstruction as a tragic era of black supremacy became part of the justification for the South’s new system of white supremacy.

Not until the mid-twentieth century would the nation again attempt to come to terms with the political and social agenda of Reconstruction. The civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s is often called the Second Reconstruction. Its achievements were far-reaching.

Today, racial segregation has been outlawed, blacks vote on the same terms as whites, and more black Americans hold public office than ever before.

Like the first Reconstruction, however, the second failed to erase the economic inequalities that originated in slavery and were reinforced by decades of segregation. Many black Americans have entered the middle class, but unemployment and poverty remain far higher than among whites.

Some Americans believe the nation has made major progress in living up to the ideal of equality. Others are more impressed with how far we still are from that ideal.

Reconstruction: Then and Now—Making Historical Connections

The United States government is facing the same social, political, and constitutional crisis today in Iraq and Afghanistan as it did during the Reconstruction era of 1865-1877. Social: how do we help the newly freed people in Iraq and Afghanistan? Political: How do we re-establish their governments to assure political and economic stability? Constitutional: Who should be in charge of this new reconstruction: the President or Congress?

Today, the United States is trying to reconstruct Iraq and Afghanistan through four main tasks that could be related to the Reconstruction era of 1865-1877. The tasks include: 1) Maintaining order; 2) Rebuilding the government; 3) Rebuilding the economy; and 4) Sustaining American support for the occupation effort both among US citizens and Iraqi/Afghani citizens.

What do you think we should do? (Video)
Operation Reconstruction Afghanistan: In Afghanistan, Reviewing A Decade of Promises by Quil Lawrence

Introduction
People living in Afghanistan 10 years ago had little electricity, few radios and almost no televisions to alert them of the Sept. 11 attacks in New York and Washington. The news didn’t really reach across the country until the American bombing campaign and invasion began a month later. The fall of the Taliban regime at the end of 2001 and the flood of international aid raised hope in Afghanistan. With a U.S.-sponsored government setting up in Kabul, President George W. Bush spelled out America’s pledge to Afghanistan in a speech at Virginia Military Institute in April 2002. Bush invoked America’s patron saint of nation-building, George Marshall, the World War II general who oversaw the reconstruction of Germany.

Afghan troops participate in a training exercise at Camp Blackhorse in Kabul, March 10, 2010. After a decade of fitful training and billions of dollars, the Afghan security forces have an abysmal record of acting without direct NATO assistance.

Building Security Forces
Bush: “Peace will be achieved by helping Afghanistan train and develop its own national army.”

In the northern city of Mazar-e-Sharif, Afghan commandos train with live ammunition at a military base. American efforts are focused now more than ever on training Afghan security forces to face down an insurgency that is much stronger now than 10 years ago. NATO trainers hope to reach 300,000 soldiers and police on the job this autumn.

But gunfights are less common in this war. The preferred weapon of the insurgency is the bomb and booby trap — in military jargon, an improvised explosive device, or IED.

Noor Hameed is the senior Afghan instructor at the counter-IED school at the base.

“To be honest, before this 10 years, we didn’t have IED teams,” he says. “The people of Afghanistan didn’t know what IED is.”

Doctors assist an injured Afghan soldier at the Davoud Khan military hospital in Kabul on April 23. U.S. medics have traveled to Afghanistan to help train 600 nursing students over a period of two years at a medical training center at the hospital.

Trainers like Hameed are just what the Afghan forces need: native sons to replace foreign experts. But it’s a tall order. After 10 years of fitful training, and nearly $30 billion invested by the U.S. alone, the Afghan security forces have an abysmal record of acting without direct NATO assistance.

Attrition is still a problem, as are fears of ethnic factionalism. Literacy is only 14 percent among security personnel, a huge obstacle to building a police force that can support an evidence-based justice system.

(Article continued on next page)
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Building Infrastructure, Services
Bush: "We're working hard in Afghanistan. We're clearing mine fields. We're rebuilding roads. We're improving medical care."

That holds up, according to Dr. Nadera Burhani, Afghanistan's deputy health minister. She cites huge improvements in basic health, thanks in large part to U.S. aid.

In 2002, the country had just 500 health facilities; now, there are 2,019. "It has a very direct impact on services to the very needy people in very rural areas," Burhani says.

But she admits that in some ways, Afghanistan is still behind where it was decades ago, before three successive wars destroyed the country.

"Sometimes I am disappointed. Because when I was in 5th [grade], the war start in my country. Now I am 43 years old, still the war is going on. I wish that my country become secure. No more than that," she says.

Afghanistan has hundreds of kilometers of new roads, but fewer of them are safe to drive. On the day Burhani spoke with NPR, an insurgent suicide bomber leveled a health center in Logar province, killing dozens of patients, doctors and nurses.

A motorcyclist rides along the still under construction Bamiyan-Yakawlang road in Yakawlang, Afghanistan, June 10. Despite the construction of new roads, many of them are unsafe to drive.

The report card on narco-trafficking, according to the United Nations and the World Bank, is a solid F. While poppy production has ceased in some provinces, the U.N. says the drug economy rivals the billions in aid still pouring into Afghanistan and threatens to dwarf the legitimate economy as donors draw down. The legitimate economy is also plagued by endemic corruption.

The U.S. inspector general for Afghan reconstruction concluded recently that high-ranking Afghan officials, including government ministers, are carrying out as much as $10 million per day through the Kabul airport.

At a windswept gravel pit on the outskirts of Kabul, a construction company owner agreed to speak on condition of anonymity. "There is no system to award the good people and to punish the bad. There is no incentive toward doing good things," he said. The man said bribes start the moment a contract is won, with a huge fee to be paid directly to the minis-

The United Nations reported over the summer that civilian deaths from the war are at their worst level since the invasion — the vast majority from insurgent bombs.

Building The Legitimate Economy
Bush: "We will work to help Afghanistan to develop an economy that can feed its people without feeding the world’s demand for drugs."

Afghan President Hamid Karzai gestures before casting his vote at a polling station in Kabul, Sept. 18, 2010, in parliamentary elections that were marred by allegations of fraud.

"The future seems very dark, because the president has played a dangerous game, and he has lost that game. Next three, four years, we have to leave again. Leave everything," he said.

(Article concluded on next page)
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Afghan President Hamid Karzai gestures before casting his vote at a polling station in Kabul, Sept. 18, 2010, in parliamentary elections that were marred by allegations of fraud.

**Building Government**

Bush: "Peace will be achieved by helping Afghanistan develop its own stable government."

That final promise from the U.S., to bring a stable government to Afghanistan, is also an open question. Election observers say Afghan politics have grown more fraudulent over the years, and most consider Karzai’s re-election in 2009 to be illegitimate.

An equally questionable parliamentary election last year resulted in a near endless dispute, with Karzai trying to reinstate allies who had lost according to the official tally.

Still, among the warlords and government cronies, some new faces have emerged in the Afghan parliament — especially from the newly empowered Afghan media.

Baktash Siawash, 27, was the country’s youngest TV talk show host before he became the country’s youngest member of parliament. Many Afghans are pinning their hopes on the next generation, a demographic that includes about half of the country.

But Siawash says the American promise of reconstruction has been a failure.

"Forty-one countries came here. It was the golden chance. I do see some progresses, but it is not enough for spending billions of dollars. With the energy, the money and the blood of your brothers, sisters and your sons which have died for democracy-making in Afghanistan, it’s nothing. We could have done more than what we have," he says.

Siawash says it’s now up to Afghans to take charge and reshape their country. The son of a poor family with no political connections, Siawash himself is a symbol of budding democracy in Afghanistan. But he’s not sure that democracy will survive the departure of U.S. troops.

"The life of this regime, this government or this democracy will end with the withdrawal of the last soldier from the international community," he says.

It’s that projected date — the end of 2014 — that is preoccupying Afghans. At that time, they will again weigh the pledges made to them in 2001, and decide whether the promises have been kept.

**Extension Activity: What do you think?**

Given the fact that the war in Afghanistan has a personal impact on most of our lives, what is your assessment about the ongoing reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan? Be sure to check out the Reconstruction maps on the next page.

**Compare:** How are the reconstruction challenges after the Civil War similar to the reconstruction challenges in Afghanistan?

**Evaluate:** To what extent were we successful with our reconstruction mission after the Civil War?
1. Did we provide a strong security force for our citizens?
2. Did we build a strong infrastructure and services for the people?
3. Did we build a legitimate economy?
4. Did we successfully rebuild our government?

**Evaluate:** To what extent have we been successful with our reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan?
1. Have we built a strong security force for their people?
2. Have we built strong infrastructure and services for the people?
3. Have we built a legitimate economy?
4. Have we successfully rebuilt their government?

**Problem Solve:** What would you have done? What would you do today?
1. What should our government have done differently during American Reconstruction?
2. What should our government have done differently during Afghanistan’s Reconstruction? What should we do now? In the future?

**VT Standard—Historical Connections**

6.4: Students identify major historical eras and analyze periods of transition in various times in their local community, in Vermont, in the United States, and in various locations world-wide, to interpret the influence of the past on the present.
The Maps of Reconstruction: *American and Afghani Reconstructions*

**Critical Thinking:** Below you will see two maps that represent American and Afghani Reconstruction efforts.

1. What similarities do you see?
2. What are the purposes of dividing these areas? What are the advantages/disadvantages of dividing these areas?
3. What are your thoughts about the ‘troop deployment’ noted in the bottom right-hand corner of the page?