Seminar #5 (or 4?)

* Chandler: Start so we don’t have to sit silently. Assumption that “War is Hell…” Many more jobs, many people who don’t see the front lines. Just a job… Assumption that people who fight are always killing. Supply, logistics.
* Schumacher: Not relevant… talking about people who have come back from war. Those people are perpetuating that violence.
* Chandler: Generalizes that all war is hell. Yes, it’s terrible, but not all going to war experiences that hell. You’re not funding the war… you’re helping victims. Christian goal to help those in need?
* Scott Rumsey: Seems like it’s a bit contradiction here. Withholding the AMS fund, but condemns those who don’t support nonviolence…
* Eble: They’ve been to hell… now we’re abandoning them?
* Davis: Going off what Scott says… he contradicts himself. Second sentence… those who go to war need our assistance…
* Schumacher: Agreed…
* Scott: Prayer for veterans… not like they go out and beat down other countries. Prayers are more for their safe return. Advocating violence? No…
* Jacob: Unreasonable that war will go away… force is one of the best ways to control people.
* Eble: Straw man?
* Jacob: Lessening war & violence… why withhold funds all together?
* Schumacher: Argument specifically… I would disagree. With that point, there’s something to be said to not contributing… you can’t …
* Strotman: Asked for clarification… provided an analogy with racism… one person against the world…
* Orkwis:
* Paz: Stubborn, resisting the course of the world… Berry, strip-mined coal. Futile attempt… ball is already rolling. We’re not just going to stop this immediately.
* Strotman: That would be like saying “Just because the Southern economy is reliant slavery, we should stop trying to change it.”
* Paz: But war / slavery are different…
* Wheat: Clear and present danger… unclear as to when people would attack. Times are changing… not such a cut and dry thing anymore…
* Eble: Scope of history / clarity…
* Wheat: Taugher… indirectly saying that war is wrong…
* Eble: But he doesn’t reference the current war…
* Strotman: Letter isn’t about war in Afghanistan… supporting as a church = right?
* Orkwis: Difference between advocating against, not believing in… not generally the belief of that church? Okay for someone like Wendell Berry not to believe in something… but to advocate for others…
* Strotman: Making decision for all in his parish? Premise of letter wasn’t that people who do collect are bad Catholics…
* Chandler: He’s limiting the capacity of others to support their beliefs.
* Orkwis:
* Paz: Cited the letter…
* Scott: Why not condemn people who pay taxes who support the military?
* Wheat: Main comments on the web page… abortion…
* Eble: Red Herring…
* Pappalardo: Someone called him a Leftist…

Eble: What does the public act of sharing do?

* Strotman: To inspire discussion on the Church supporting militarism… Taugher clearly thinks that the church shouldn’t support militarism. He’s trying to inspire discussion within the Church itself.
* Pappalardo: That’s a cop-out… wants view to be heard, wants people
* Wheat: Good idea, but a poor decision… withheld funds to the victims. Supposed to help those in need. Message = great idea. Why hurt the victims? Going for the tail, not the head.
* Pappalardo: Veterans as anti-war…

Eble / Chandler / Scott: Nature of fighting…

Paz: Casualty = war… war will happen…

CONVERSATION…

Eble: Berry / Taugher… are they really just being stubborn against the tide of the world?

* Paz: Nothing they can do about it… it’s irrelevant… we’re not going to snap our fingers… too late in the game…
* Strotman: I didn’t agree with what he was doing… the action wasn’t right. He should have made his views clear in a homily, in a letter… I don’t think that denying people in his parish was right. But I understand what he was trying to do. Less war = awesome.
* Paz: What really pissed me off… the article…
* Rumsey: No Catholic regiment…
* Schumacher: Organization from *A Long Way Gone*… Benin House… nonpartisan goal.
* Paz: Just thought of this… trauma to the soul… correlation between no drug and no donation?
* Strotman: His logic… what he’s trying to do… I don’t think the logic and the actions he took are easy to rationalize…
* Eble: What’s the head? How does a priest, any of us attack this “head?”
* Strotman: Try something, an action that’s directed towards the actual committing of war by the U.S. Taxes would be better…
* Eble: Anything else?
* Pappalardo: Military = defensive…

Discussion followed…

Eble: False Dilemma… supporting violence / militarism versus supporting a culture of life?

* Joe: Gospel versus Bible of life…
* Schumacher: Militarism is used as a more specifically positive…

Confusing definitions of militarism… very powerful, very militaristic…

Things to talk about:

* Turn the other cheek…

**Continuation on 11/20/13:** Strotman, question— “Should the Church be involved in supporting the military?” To what extent…

Eble: General reactions to Vowell’s article “The Partly Cloudy Patriot”

Wheat: Started with understanding, then got upset… then, by the end, I discovered that the idea of “being a patriot” is difficult, while saying that you’re a patriot is easy. Discussed the “redneck patriot with guns” perspective. The 9/11 thing made sense… overwhelming response was wonderful to start… flag thing changed meaning from recovery and strength to revenge, going out / after the people who did wrong to us. Flag changed meaning to assent…

Nick Reed: Flag during college taken from her lawn.

* Schumacher: She acknowledged this…
* Eble: Nice work noting Vowell’s tone here.
* Shaffer: Letting someone put a flag in her yard went against everything the U.S. stood for… Patriotism should be something people want to feel, not something they’re obligated to feel. Discussed the civil war as a “good American metaphor.” People dissenting with one another… I liked this idea here…

Paz: I loved the way that she poked fun at our patriotism—Halloween costumes, Britney Spears, Chinese factories… ridiculing feelings of patriotism. I liked how she poked fun here… Deeper meaning…

* Orkwis: Politicians using patriotism… President Bush trying to rally people to go to war. Evoking emotion from the audience is annoying.

Schumacher: On 1059… true American flag = “Don’t Tread on Me”

* Eble: But on 1065…
* Carmichael: But she says that people have their back…
* Eble: What was that anecdote?
* Carmichael: The sign on the subway…
* Paz: Much more than just a train… made a point…
* Eble… so… there seems to be a bit of a contradiction here…
* Kunkel: Relates to family anecdote… we’re all homogenous, but we look out for each other.
* Wheat: She was looking for a sign that we’re “all in this together.” She was looking for reinforcement about everyone being patriots. Not so much more/less government
* Paz: After 9/11… people sang the national anthem… she had sang at President Bush’s inauguration, when she disagreed with him.
* Henry: Last paragraph… not a contradiction… more of support for her point. She wants a government that will foster cooperation… wants people dealing with people, a government that fosters cooperation.
* Shaffer: She loves NYC…selfishness / selflessness… working for goals together… people have their own common goals.
* Orkwis: What I found contradictory… the Civil War as her favorite American metaphor…
	+ Paz: Americans fighting against, having a passion, dealing with it in an internal problem.
	+ Schumacher: She didn’t like the unity after 9/11. Didn’t feel like a patriot. Back to what Paz said about the 2000 election… she’s most comfortable…
	+ Orkwis: Fighting with parents, but they still get along…
	+ Carmichael: She was also saying that people disagree, and she supports that. References that Mel Gibson in *The Patriot,* America in 9/11were fighting for wrong reasons…
	+ Hanna: Liked Jefferson as opposed to Washington…
	+ Eble:
	+ Wheat: Why did she include *The Patriot*?
		- Eble: Paragraph one?
		- Hanna: Segue into main point…
		- Carmichael: Getting rid of refutation…?
		- Eble: How?
		- Carmichael: She’s recognizing that it’s inaccurate… not meant for that…
		- Wheat: How would she connect this to
		- Eble: False analogy… Any other thoughts?
		- Asgian: Contrast between art and life… transitions to real life…
		- Schumacher: American history is a quagmire… (people said giggity)… deeper meaning of the film is true… representing how American history is confusing.
		- Eble: Films demonstrate jingoism…
		- Kunkel: Confusing that black and white things aren’t realistic… Declaration as black and white…
		- Eble: Should we talk about that? (1060)
		- Kunkel: The kind of patriotism that she’s describing—people go wrong, band together— (broke off)…
		- Carmichael: Means more when we unify together when we’re down…
* Eble: Why would she then describe on 1061 why she feels fortunate?
	+ Paz:
	+ Eble: What’s she going for on 1060 to 1061? (read from the text)
	+ Orkwis: She likes patriotism, but she also likes the clouds… wants things to be perfect…
	+ Asgian: That’s the point of a free country…
	+ Eble: But she says that…
	+ Paz: The whole example is going against her example of a patriot… (the press secretary speaking against the talk show host)… people stand up, don’t put up the flag yet…
	+ Kunkel: She’s representing the typical patriot…
	+ Hanna: In a lot of ways, she’s extremely conservative… she wants the government to have no say in what she does. She wants anarchy
	+ Class: HUH?
	+ Eble asked for clarity…
	+ Hanna: ?
	+ Asgian: She’s kinda conservative… she agrees with that…
	+ Carmichael: A government that does what it says is one she likes…
	+ Paz: Explain patriotism…

Eble: Brought us up to speed with thesis…

* Paz: But she likes that she can disagree, but still work for a common interest…

Eble: Does this seem meaningful? What role does dissent play in our civic life?

* Henry: Creating representative government…
* Paz: Made the senate controlled by the rich upper class.
* Orkwis: Founders didn’t intend for this… more of a byproduct of human life…
* Kellis: They thought it over enough, sat around for months… you’d think that they have the foresight to see that rich people would elect rich people.
* Paz: Property owners… ?
* Kellis: Citizen requirement… aristocracy…
* Henry: Aristocracy… weren’t considering slaves, women as people.
* Orkwis: The people who mattered

Kunkel: People dissenting too much…

* Eble: She’s not reaching that balanced point?
* Kunkel: She’s not being balanced…
* Eble: So…
* Kunkel: Government reflects the people…
* Eble tried to clarify…
* Asgian: Vision shows dissenting too much… we need to dissent more…
* Paz: Educated dissenter… she’s cool with other people having different views…
* Orkwis: Best use of government… good thing that government doesn’t get a lot done…
* Paz:
* Orkwis:

Paz: Atheists, NYC?

* Shaffer: Mentioned atheism as a perfect place…
* Eble
* Paz: Like mom’s words
* Wheat: