

Chapter 1 : Man & Soc Age Reconstructn V 2 : Karl Mannheim :

Read "Man & Soc Age Reconstructn V 2" by Karl Mannheim with Rakuten Kobo. First published in Routledge is an imprint of Taylor & Francis, an informa company.

According to Derrida and taking inspiration from the work of Ferdinand de Saussure , [14] language as a system of signs and words only has meaning because of the contrast between these signs. Derrida refers to the "in this view, mistaken" belief that there is a self-sufficient, non-deferred meaning as metaphysics of presence. One of the two terms governs the other axiologically, logically, etc. The first task of deconstruction would be to find and overturn these oppositions inside a text or a corpus of texts; but the final objective of deconstruction is not to surpass all oppositions, because it is assumed they are structurally necessary to produce sense. The oppositions simply cannot be suspended once and for all. The hierarchy of dual oppositions always reestablishes itself. Deconstruction only points to the necessity of an unending analysis that can make explicit the decisions and arbitrary violence intrinsic to all texts. This explains why Derrida always proposes new terms in his deconstruction, not as a free play but as a pure necessity of analysis, to better mark the intervals. Derrida called undecidables "that is, unities of simulacrum" "false" verbal properties nominal or semantic that can no longer be included within philosophical binary opposition, but which, however, inhabit philosophical oppositions "resisting and organizing it" without ever constituting a third term, without ever leaving room for a solution in the form of Hegelian dialectics e. However, Derrida resisted attempts to label his work as " post-structuralist ". This foil to Platonic light was deliberately and self-consciously lauded in Daybreak, when Nietzsche announces, albeit retrospectively, "In this work you will discover a subterranean man at work", and then goes on to map the project of unreason: Does not almost every precise history of an origination impress our feelings as paradoxical and wantonly offensive? Does the good historian not, at bottom, constantly contradict? Reason, logic, philosophy and science are no longer solely sufficient as the royal roads to truth. And so Nietzsche decides to throw it in our faces, and uncover the truth of Plato, that he "unlike Orpheus" just happened to discover his true love in the light instead of in the dark. This being merely one historical event amongst many, Nietzsche proposes that we revisualize the history of the West as the history of a series of political moves, that is, a manifestation of the will to power, that at bottom have no greater or lesser claim to truth in any noumenal absolute sense. By calling our attention to the fact that he has assumed the role of Orpheus, the man underground, in dialectical opposition to Plato, Nietzsche hopes to sensitize us to the political and cultural context, and the political influences that impact authorship. For example, the political influences that led one author to choose philosophy over poetry or at least portray himself as having made such a choice , and another to make a different choice. The problem with Nietzsche, as Derrida sees it, is that he did not go far enough. That he missed the fact that this will to power is itself but a manifestation of the operation of writing. This is so because identity is viewed in non-essentialist terms as a construct, and because constructs only produce meaning through the interplay of difference inside a "system of distinct signs". This approach to text is influenced by the semiology of Ferdinand de Saussure. In language there are only differences. Whether we take the signified or the signifier, language has neither ideas nor sounds that existed before the linguistic system, but only conceptual and phonic differences that have issued from the system. The idea or phonic substance that a sign contains is of less importance than the other signs that surround it. Nevertheless, in the end, as Derrida pointed out, Saussure made linguistics "the regulatory model", and "for essential, and essentially metaphysical, reasons had to privilege speech, and everything that links the sign to phone". A desire to contribute to the re-evaluation of all Western values, a re-evaluation built on the 18th-century Kantian critique of pure reason, and carried forward to the 19th century, in its more radical implications, by Kierkegaard and Nietzsche. An assertion that texts outlive their authors, and become part of a set of cultural habits equal to, if not surpassing, the importance of authorial intent. A re-valuation of certain classic western dialectics: To this end, Derrida follows a long line of modern philosophers, who look backwards to Plato and his influence on the Western metaphysical tradition. However, like Nietzsche, Derrida is not satisfied merely with such a political interpretation of Plato, because of the

particular dilemma modern humans find themselves in. His Platonic reflections are inseparably part of his critique of modernity, hence the attempt to be something beyond the modern, because of this Nietzschean sense that the modern has lost its way and become mired in nihilism. Understanding language, according to Derrida, requires an understanding of both viewpoints of linguistic analysis. The focus on diachrony has led to accusations against Derrida of engaging in the etymological fallacy. The mistranslation is often used to suggest Derrida believes that nothing exists but words. Form of Content, that Louis Hjelmslev distinguished from Form of Expression than how the word "house" may be tied to a certain image of a traditional house i. The same can be said about verbs, in all the languages in the world: The same happens, of course, with adjectives: Thus, complete meaning is always "differential" and postponed in language; there is never a moment when meaning is complete and total. Such a process would never end. Metaphysics of presence[edit] Main article: Metaphysics of presence Derrida describes the task of deconstruction as the identification of metaphysics of presence, or logocentrism in western philosophy. Metaphysics of presence is the desire for immediate access to meaning, the privileging of presence over absence. This means that there is an assumed bias in certain binary oppositions where one side is placed in a position over another, such as good over bad, speech over the written word, male over female. Derrida writes, "Without a doubt, Aristotle thinks of time on the basis of ousia as parousia, on the basis of the now, the point, etc. This argument is largely based on the earlier work of Heidegger, who, in *Being and Time* , claimed that the theoretical attitude of pure presence is parasitical upon a more originary involvement with the world in concepts such as ready-to-hand and being-with. Difficulty of definition[edit] There have been problems defining deconstruction. Derrida claimed that all of his essays were attempts to define what deconstruction is, [26]: In these negative descriptions of deconstruction, Derrida is seeking to "multiply the cautionary indicators and put aside all the traditional philosophical concepts". If Derrida were to positively define deconstructionâ€”as, for example, a critiqueâ€”then this would make the concept of critique immune to itself being deconstructed. Some new philosophy beyond deconstruction would then be required in order to encompass the notion of critique. Not a method[edit] Derrida states that "Deconstruction is not a method, and cannot be transformed into one". A thinker with a method has already decided how to proceed, is unable to give him or herself up to the matter of thought in hand, is a functionary of the criteria which structure his or her conceptual gestures. This would be an irresponsible act of reading, because it becomes a prejudicial procedure that only finds what it sets out to find. Not a critique[edit] Derrida states that deconstruction is not a critique in the Kantian sense. For Derrida, it is not possible to escape the dogmatic baggage of the language we use in order to perform a pure critique in the Kantian sense. Language is dogmatic because it is inescapably metaphysical. Derrida argues that language is inescapably metaphysical because it is made up of signifiers that only refer to that which transcends themâ€”the signified. For Derrida the concept of neutrality is suspect and dogmatism is therefore involved in everything to a certain degree. Deconstruction can challenge a particular dogmatism and hence desediment dogmatism in general, but it cannot escape all dogmatism all at once. Not an analysis[edit] Derrida states that deconstruction is not an analysis in the traditional sense. Derrida argues that there are no self-sufficient units of meaning in a text, because individual words or sentences in a text can only be properly understood in terms of how they fit into the larger structure of the text and language itself. Derrida states that deconstruction is an "antistructuralist gesture" because "[s]tructures were to be undone, decomposed, desedimented". At the same time, deconstruction is also a "structuralist gesture" because it is concerned with the structure of texts. So, deconstruction involves "a certain attention to structures" [26]: An example of structure would be a binary opposition such as good and evil where the meaning of each element is established, at least partly, through its relationship to the other element. It is for this reason that Derrida distances his use of the term deconstruction from post-structuralism , a term that would suggest that philosophy could simply go beyond structuralism. Paul de Man was a member of the Yale School and a prominent practitioner of deconstruction as he understood it. Caputo attempts to explain deconstruction in a nutshell by stating: Indeed, that is a good rule of thumb in deconstruction. That is what deconstruction is all about, its very meaning and mission, if it has any. One might even say that cracking nutshells is what deconstruction is. Have we not run up against a paradox and an aporia [something contradictory] Allison is an early translator of Derrida and states, in the introduction

to his translation of *Speech and Phenomena*: Particularly problematic are the attempts to give neat introductions to deconstruction by people trained in literary criticism who sometimes have little or no expertise in the relevant areas of philosophy that Derrida is working in. These secondary works e.

Chapter 2 : Reconstruction era - Wikipedia

Oku Â«Man & Soc Age Reconstructn V 2Â» Karl Mannheim Rakuten Kobo ile. First published in Routledge is an imprint of Taylor & Francis, an informa company.

In recent decades most historians follow Foner in dating the Reconstruction of the south as starting in with Emancipation and the Port Royal experiment rather than Army, President Abraham Lincoln set up reconstructed governments in Tennessee , Arkansas , and Louisiana during the war. He experimented by giving land to blacks in South Carolina. By fall , the new President Andrew Johnson declared the war goals of national unity and the ending of slavery achieved and reconstruction completed. In ten states, [10] coalitions of freedmen, recent black and white arrivals from the North carpetbaggers , and white Southerners who supported Reconstruction scalawags cooperated to form Republican biracial state governments. They introduced various reconstruction programs including: Conservative opponents called the Republican regimes corrupt and instigated violence toward freedmen and whites who supported Reconstruction. Most of the violence was carried out by members of the Ku Klux Klan KKK , a secretive terrorist organization closely allied with the southern Democratic Party. Klan members attacked and intimidated blacks seeking to exercise their new civil rights, as well as Republican politicians in the south favoring those civil rights. One such politician murdered by the Klan on the eve of the presidential election was Republican Congressman James M. Widespread violence in the south led to federal intervention by President Ulysses S. Grant in , which suppressed the Klan. Nevertheless, white Democrats , calling themselves " Redeemers ", regained control of the south state by state, sometimes using fraud and violence to control state elections. A deep national economic depression following the Panic of led to major Democratic gains in the North, the collapse of many railroad schemes in the South, and a growing sense of frustration in the North. The end of Reconstruction was a staggered process, and the period of Republican control ended at different times in different states. With the Compromise of , military intervention in Southern politics ceased and Republican control collapsed in the last three state governments in the South. This was followed by a period which white Southerners labeled "Redemption", during which white-dominated state legislatures enacted Jim Crow laws and, beginning in , disenfranchised most blacks and many poor whites through a combination of constitutional amendments and electoral laws. Intense controversy erupted throughout the South over these issues. By the s, Reconstruction had officially provided freedmen with equal rights under the constitution, and blacks were voting and taking political office. Republican legislatures, coalitions of whites and blacks, established the first public school systems and numerous charitable institutions in the South. White paramilitary organizations , especially the Ku Klux Klan and also the White League and Red Shirts formed with the political aim of driving out the Republicans. They also disrupted political organizing and terrorized blacks to bar them from the polls. From to , conservative whites calling themselves " Redeemers " regained power in the Southern states. They joined the Bourbon wing of the national Democratic Party. In the s and s the terms "radical" and "conservative" had distinctive meanings. Leaders who had been Whigs were committed to economic modernization, built around railroads, factories, banks and cities. Passage of the 13th , 14th , and 15th Amendments is the constitutional legacy of Reconstruction. These Reconstruction Amendments established the rights that led to Supreme Court rulings in the midth century that struck down school segregation. A "Second Reconstruction", sparked by the Civil Rights Movement , led to civil rights laws in and that ended segregation and re-opened the polls to blacks. Material devastation of the South in [edit] Further information: Broad Street, Reconstruction played out against an economy in ruin. The Confederacy in had towns and cities with a total population of , people; of these with , people were at one point occupied by Union forces. The rate of damage in smaller towns was much lowerâ€”only 45 courthouses were burned out of a total of By , the Confederate dollar was worthless due to high inflation, and people in the South had to resort to bartering services for goods, or else use scarce Union dollars. With the emancipation of the southern slaves, the entire economy of the South had to be rebuilt. Having lost their enormous investment in slaves, white planters had minimal capital to pay freedmen workers to bring in crops. As a result, a system of sharecropping was developed where landowners broke up large

plantations and rented small lots to the freedmen and their families. The main feature of the Southern economy changed from an elite minority of landed gentry slaveholders into a tenant farming agriculture system. Men worked as rail workers, rolling and lumber mills workers, and hotel workers. The large population of slave artisans during the antebellum period had not been translated into a large number of freemen artisans during Reconstruction. Others worked in hotels. A large number became laundresses. The dislocations had a severe negative impact on the black population, with a large amount of sickness and death. By the end of the 19th century and well into the 20th century, the South was locked into a system of poverty. How much of this failure was caused by the war and by previous reliance on agriculture remains the subject of debate among economists and historians. Take it quietly Uncle Abe and I will draw it closer than ever. A few more stitches Andy and the good old Union will be mended. During the Civil War, the Radical Republican leaders argued that slavery and the Slave Power had to be permanently destroyed. Moderates said this could be easily accomplished as soon as Confederate armies surrendered and the Southern states repealed secession and accepted the 13th Amendment – most of which happened by December Lincoln formally began Reconstruction in late with his Ten percent plan , which went into operation in several states but which Radical Republicans opposed. White reactions included outbreaks of mob violence against blacks, such as the Memphis riots of and the New Orleans riot. Radical Republicans demanded a prompt and strong federal response to protect freed-people and curb southern racism. Sumner argued that secession had destroyed statehood but the Constitution still extended its authority and its protection over individuals, as in existing U. Stevens and his followers viewed secession as having left the states in a status like new territories. The Republicans sought to prevent Southern politicians from "restoring the historic subordination of Negroes". Since slavery was abolished, the three-fifths compromise no longer applied to counting the population of blacks. After the census, the South would gain numerous additional representatives in Congress, based on the population of freedmen. Johnson rejected the Radical program of Reconstruction and instead appointed his own governors and tried to finish reconstruction by the end of The foundations of their institutions Congress decided it had the primary authority to decide how Reconstruction should proceed, because the Constitution stated the United States had to guarantee each state a republican form of government. The Radicals insisted that meant Congress decided how Reconstruction should be achieved. The issues were multiple: How should republicanism operate in the South? What was the status of the former Confederate states? What was the citizenship status of the leaders of the Confederacy? What was the citizenship and suffrage status of freedmen? They moved to impeach Johnson because of his constant attempts to thwart Radical Reconstruction measures, by using the Tenure of Office Act. Johnson was acquitted by one vote, but he lost the influence to shape Reconstruction policy. Congress temporarily suspended the ability to vote of approximately 10, to 15, former Confederate officials and senior officers, while constitutional amendments gave full citizenship to all African Americans, and suffrage to the adult men. While many slaves were illiterate, educated blacks including escaped slaves moved down from the North to aid them, and natural leaders also stepped forward. They elected white and black men to represent them in constitutional conventions. A Republican coalition of freedmen, southerners supportive of the Union derisively called scalawags by white Democrats , and northerners who had migrated to the South derisively called carpetbaggers – some of whom were returning natives, but were mostly Union veterans – organized to create constitutional conventions. They created new state constitutions to set new directions for southern states. The bill required voters to take the " ironclad oath ", swearing they had never supported the Confederacy or been one of its soldiers. Pursuing a policy of "malice toward none" announced in his second inaugural address, [37] Lincoln asked voters only to support the Union. Suffrage[edit] Monument in honor of the Grand Army of the Republic, organized after the war Congress had to consider how to restore to full status and representation within the Union those southern states that had declared their independence from the United States and had withdrawn their representation. Suffrage for former Confederates was one of two main concerns. A decision needed to be made whether to allow just some or all former Confederates to vote and to hold office. The moderates in Congress wanted virtually all of them to vote, but the Radicals resisted. They repeatedly imposed the ironclad oath, which would effectively have allowed no former Confederates to vote. Historian Harold Hyman says that in Congressmen "described the

oath as the last bulwark against the return of ex-rebels to power, the barrier behind which Southern Unionists and Negroes protected themselves. The compromise that was reached disenfranchised many Confederate civil and military leaders. No one knows how many temporarily lost the vote, but one estimate was that it was as high as 10, to 15, out of a total white population of roughly eight million. The issue was how to receive the four million Freedmen as citizens. If they were to be fully counted as citizens, some sort of representation for apportionment of seats in Congress had to be determined. Before the war, the population of slaves had been counted as three-fifths of a corresponding number of free whites. By having four million freedmen counted as full citizens, the South would gain additional seats in Congress. If blacks were denied the vote and the right to hold office, then only whites would represent them. Many conservatives, including most white southerners, northern Democrats, and some northern Republicans, opposed black voting. Some northern states that had referenda on the subject limited the ability of their own small populations of blacks to vote. Lincoln had supported a middle position to allow some black men to vote, especially army veterans. Johnson also believed that such service should be rewarded with citizenship. Lincoln proposed giving the vote to "the very intelligent, and especially those who have fought gallantly in our ranks. Sumner preferred at first impartial requirements that would have imposed literacy restrictions on blacks and whites. He believed that he would not succeed in passing legislation to disfranchise illiterate whites who already had the vote.

Chapter 3 : Bocksten Man - Wikipedia

*Man & Soc Age Reconstructn V 2 [Karl Mannheim] on www.nxgvision.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers. First published in Routledge is an imprint of Taylor & Francis, an informa company.*

Reconstruction refers to the period following the Civil War of rebuilding the United States. It was a time of great pain and endless questions. On what terms would the Confederacy be allowed back into the Union? Who would establish the terms, Congress or the President? What was to be the place of freed blacks in the South? Did Abolition mean that black men would now enjoy the same status as white men? What was to be done with the Confederate leaders, who were seen as traitors by many in the North? Although the military conflict had ended, Reconstruction was in many ways still a war. This important struggle was waged by radical northerners who wanted to punish the South and Southerners who desperately wanted to preserve their way of life. Library of Congress LC-USZ This drawing of African American soldiers returning to their families in Little Rock, Arkansas, after the war captures the exuberant spirit of many former slaves upon gaining their freedom. They were soon to find out that freedom did not necessarily mean equality. Slavery, in practical terms, died with the end of the Civil War. Three Constitutional amendments altered the nature of African-American rights. The Thirteenth Amendment formally abolished slavery in all states and territories. The Fourteenth Amendment prohibited states from depriving any male citizen of equal protection under the law, regardless of race. The Fifteenth Amendment granted the right to vote to African-American males. Ratification of these amendments became a requirement for Southern states to be readmitted into the Union. Although these measures were positive steps toward racial equality, their enforcement proved extremely difficult. The period of Presidential Reconstruction lasted from to He pardoned most Southern whites, appointed provisional governors and outlined steps for the creation of new state governments. Johnson felt that each state government could best decide how they wanted blacks to be treated. Many in the North were infuriated that the South would be returning their former Confederate leaders to power. They were also alarmed by Southern adoption of Black Codes that sought to maintain white supremacy. Recently freed blacks found the postwar South very similar to the prewar South. He later tried to disband the group when they became too violent. The Congressional elections of brought Radical Republicans to power. They wanted to punish the South, and to prevent the ruling class from continuing in power. They passed the Military Reconstruction Acts of , which divided the South into five military districts and outlined how the new governments would be designed. Under federal bayonets, blacks, including those who had recently been freed, received the right to vote, hold political offices, and become judges and police chiefs. They held positions that formerly belonged to Southern Democrats. Many in the South were aghast. President Johnson vetoed all the Radical initiatives, but Congress overrode him each time. It was the Radical Republicans who impeached President Johnson in The Senate, by a single vote, failed to convict him, but his power to hinder radical reform was diminished. Not all supported the Radical Republicans. Many Southern whites could not accept the idea that former slaves could not only vote but hold office. It was in this era that the Ku Klux Klan was born. A reign of terror was aimed both at local Republican leaders as well as at blacks seeking to assert their new political rights. Unable to protect themselves, Southern blacks and Republicans looked to Washington for protection. After ten years, Congress and the radicals grew weary of federal involvement in the South. The withdrawal of Union troops in brought renewed attempts to strip African-Americans of their newly acquired rights.

Chapter 4 : Reconstruction [www.nxgvision.com]

With an OverDrive account, you can save your favorite libraries for at-a-glance information about availability. Find out more about OverDrive accounts.

Date[edit] The find is generally dated to the 14th century. The dating is based on the clothing, especially the type of hood he wore. Albert Sandklef specified the date of the find to the s, while Margareta Nockert suggests the s. Owe Wennerholm argues that the hood he wore was used over a much larger time frame and only limits the date of the find to between and He does however put forward the hypothesis that the man might be Simon Gudmundi, a 15th-century priest, known to have died in A bit of the cloth was radiocarbon dated in the late s. It gave as result a 68 percent likelihood of a date between and and a 95 percent likelihood of a date between and Some uncertainties do however arise as the conservation process might have affected the result. The fact that the find came from a bog is also of concern, as bog finds are known to be hard to date. Age[edit] Based on the teeth, forensic odontologist Gunnar Johansson has concluded that the man was between 25 and 35 years old when he died. Osteologist Nils-Gustaf Gevall has, based on the skeleton, come up with an age of between 35 and 40 years, though the man might have been up to 60 years old. The hood he wore was usually worn by the more prosperous classes and it has therefore been suggested that he was a tax collector or a soldier recruiter. The type of hood was also used within the church. Based on this and a symbol on a shield-shaped pendant, it has been suggested by Owe Wennerholm that the man belonged to the Ordo Sanctus Spiritus. Local legend[edit] Some days after the find was revealed a local farmer Karl Andersson told Albert Sandklef of a legend he had heard as a child. He had been killed by the peasants and buried in a bog. He would start haunting late at night, and in order to stop this, poles were struck through his body, whereafter the haunting stopped. However, nobody recognized the legend. Cause of death[edit] It has been a matter of some discussion what actually caused the death of the man. In January a professor and a doctor at Sahlgrenska University Hospital performed an "operation" on a plastic model of the body, based on computed tomography of the body. As a result, they concluded that he had first been hit at the lower jaw, then at the right ear and finally a lethal hit further towards the back of his head. In his book, *Vem var Bockstensmannen? Who was the Bocksten Man?* It is also likely that Gudmundi visited the area. He worked with a group which tried to get Catherine of Vadstena canonized. One of her reputed miracles had taken place in the neighboring village. The hundreds were responsible for the handling of murders, which meant that in this case there might be some confusion over the correct hundred to handle the case, to the advantage of the killer s. It has therefore been assumed that the killer s had good local knowledge.

Chapter 5 : Man and Society In an Age of Reconstruction by Karl Mannheim

Man & Soc Age Reconstructn V 2 by Karl Mannheim starting at \$ Man & Soc Age Reconstructn V 2 has 2 available editions to buy at Alibris.

Chapter 6 : Unit 4: Civil War and Reconstruction - Social Studies - Ms. Wolter

First published in Routledge is an imprint of Taylor & Francis, an informa company..

Chapter 7 : Man & Soc Age Reconstructn V 2

The country you have selected will result in the following: Product pricing will be adjusted to match the corresponding currency. The title will be removed from your cart because it is not available in this region.

Chapter 8 : The Rise of the Common Man [www.nxgvision.com]

RESUMEN Man & Soc Age Reconstructn V 2. First published in Routledge is an imprint of Taylor & Francis, an informa company. Detalles.

Chapter 9 : Top shelves for Man and Society In an Age of Reconstruction

Man & Soc Age Reconstructn V 2