Chapter 32

1) The events of 9/11 brought about the Bush Doctrine -- do you think this was/is justified?

Bush doctrine that was developed after the 9/11 justified military preemptive attack on nations or organizations that were claimed to be terrorists yet were not directly targeting them. On the side, there were those who concur with the idea that it must have been done so that future attacks were never repeating and to ensure that the national security of the country was not put at a risk in a world where terrorists do not observe the conventional rules of war (Corbett et al. 2014, p.886). Critics argue that it had overexerted itself and contradicted the international norms and had caused Iraq War that had been launched against wrong intelligence on the basis that Iraq was possessing weapons of mass destruction. It expanded the presidential powers in war and reproduced a bad image to the world. It is reformable depending on its position but majority of them believe the policy had caused long term instabilities and created bad precedents in the area of acting unilaterally.

2) How did George W. Bush's administration change American education?

George W. Bush has revolutionized education through advocacy of the No Child Left Behind Act (2001), that is a pioneer reform that focuses on standardization of testing, accountability and measurability of the educational outcome. The schools were required to conduct testing of students after a year in reading and math and performance by demographic groups was required as well as showing sufficient annual improvement. The schools failing to improve were punished or reorganized (Corbett et al. 2014, p.891). The proposal was meant to close achievement gaps specifically in the underprivileged students and increase federal oversight of the student education in the public period. According to the critics, it encouraged the

teaching to test, it did not invest enough in education and had impractical set standards. But in fact, it transformed the manner in which American schools evaluated the measure of success and performance in regards to the students.

3) The early 2000s seemed like the early 1900s all over again, as questions of 'Who is an American?' began to rear their head -- what was happening in this regard during the Bush years?

The years of Bush aggravated the discussion around the question of the national identity due to the increased immigration, the fear of terrorism, and the change in culture. Heightened suspicion, profiling, and discrimination became the event that changed the way and image of the Muslims and the Middle Eastern Americans after the 9/11 even though a number of people became skeptical of their Americanness (Corbett et al. 2014, p.891). The immigration of Latin Americans was also at its maximum leading to the strain on illegal immigrants, border patrol and the assimilation of the culture. The content of the public debates used to be the language, religion and the loyalty to the nation. This was further divided by such actions as the Patriot Act and the immigration crackdown. The initial phase of the 2000s was just like before when the novices are viewed with distrust and the effort to single out the definition to what it means to become an American is ongoing.

4) What did the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006 do?

The Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006 which is yet to be implemented is one of the significant efforts by the US Congress to reform its immigration policy. The bill offered an initiative of enhanced border security, a guest-worker program, an end of employer verification, and a road to citizenship of millions of illegal immigrants who are already living in

the U.S. It made an attempt to evaluate the implementation on humanist considerations and economic needs (Corbett et al. 2014, p.894). This was deemed as a good compromise to those who favoured and a compromise that was too mild or too harsh to some people. Although it was not a law, the proposal still changed the future immigration debates in the Bush and Obama regimes.

5) How did the Bush administration deal with the scientific evidence of climate change?

The Bush administration was subject to the criticism on the diminution and skepticism of scientific evidence to climate change. The administration was not willing to embrace mandatory emissions policies and combat the Kyoto Protocol though it accepted the problem. Political appointees were later said to have covered or distorted the findings concerning climate to give them a less sense of urgency. Instead of stressing upon the environmental one, Bush stressed on voluntary measures taken by the industries, technological growth and economic factors (Corbett et al. 2014, p.900). Critics said that this was a decision that did not take serious action regarding global warming. To the proponents, hard regulations would negatively affect the economy. Overall, the mentioned politics of the administration was highly conservative, quite skeptical, and was not eager to place much emphasis on climate science at the cost of energy and business.

6) How did John McCain and Barack Obama's choices of running mates prove the historical wisdom that VPs are meant to shore up their candidate's weaknesses?

Through his choice of Sarah Palin, John McCain aimed at generating momentum among conservatives, among evangelical voters in order to win, and introduce youth and charisma in his campaign. The fact that she was an outsider had assisted Palin in being at par with the presidential career of McCain. The selection of an experienced senator by Barack Obama with an

expert niche in foreign-policy was to offset his own lack of experience in Washington, and to win the goodwill of the moderate voter (Corbett et al. 2014, p.901). Another player that proved helpful in accessing the working-class Americans was Biden. The two alternatives also revealed the old tradition of Joe people to solidify the perceived failure, McCain seeking excitement and conservative support, Obama seeking experience and stability. Their decisions showed how VPs are applied in the strategic political functions.

7) Who were Mitt Romney's "47%?"

The 47 percent of Mitt Romney was referencing to the Americans who he believed too would be voting President Obama due to the fact that they depended on the government, and were not federal income tax payers. This group according to his argument would never ever find itself sponsoring the Republican policies of limited government. It was an unsavory comment that was privately recorded by video phone in a fundraiser that suggested that nearly a half of the country was not prepared to take personal responsibility (Corbett et al. 2014, p.904). The opponents asserted that it was not right to put retirees, low-income employees, students, and disabled individuals together. The remark was detrimental to the Romney campaign because it portrayed him as indifferent and insensitive to the plight of the average American citizens and it also captured millions of electorate as people whose plight was neglected.

8) What is the Pell Grant Program?

Pell Grant Program is a scheme of Federal financial aid where student athletes in colleges who are of low income receive their needs-based grants. The introduction of Pell Grants is justified since they do not have to be repaid like loans and therefore the students unable to afford the university education should be provided with the Pell Grants. The income of family is used

as a basis on which awards are provided based on cost of attending and enrolling (Corbett et al. 2014, p.905). Every year, the program helps millions of students to attend universities and career programs and community colleges. Pell Grants help more people to receive an education, reduce student debt, and promote social mobility. Pell Grants are making college both attainable and realistic in front of most of the first generation, and the low-income.

9) How were LGBTQ rights advanced during the Obama years?

During the presidency of Obama, the rights of the LGBTQ moved forward. The administration removed the same sex service ban in the army that was formerly referred to as the Don't ask, don't tell. Obama also supported the repeal of the defense of marriage act and he was publicly involved in support of the same sex marriage. The Justice Department refused to defend in the court any form of discrimination law and in this respect allowed the passage of the way to the 2015 Supreme Court ruling that legalizes the same sex marriages in the nation (Corbett et al. 2014, p.905). The federal job, health and housing protection was extended. These engagements led to the Obama era turning out to be a more radical era in the history of LGBTQ equality in the United States.

References:

Corbett, P. S., Janssen, V., Lund, J. M., Pfannestiel, T., Waskiewicz, S., & Vickery, P. (2024). *US history*.