

Progressive Dinner Table: Discussion Analysis Assignment

Visual Depiction Of Seating Arrangement



Individual Progressive People Analysis

Combined Parts A & B Analysis

Seat #1

Seat #1 is occupied by Theodore (Teddy) Roosevelt, who was an American statesman, author, explorer, soldier, naturalist, reformer, and expansionist who also served as the 26th President of the United States from 1901 to 1909, following the assassination of William McKinley. As a Republican political official and staunch supporter of imperialist intentions, Roosevelt truly perpetuated the Progressive movement with an aggressive foreign policy geared toward expanding land holdings into places such as Panama, the Philippines, and Cuba, coupled with a considerate domestic agenda aimed at preserving the strength of American ingenuity. I decided to invite Roosevelt to my dinner party because he truly embodied the philosophy of a "jack of all trades"; he busted countless monopolies of corporate greed within the United States, adopted measures to preserve the natural landscape of the country, asserted American authority abroad by becoming a watchdog to the perseverance of democracy, enforced domestic independence with the Roosevelt Corollary, strengthened the position of the president to one of international renown, and so much more. Theodore Roosevelt legitimately embodied the essence of societal growth from all

respects, taking the American structure and revitalizing it to better accommodate the interests of all Americans, as opposed to a select few.

Theodore Roosevelt is seated directly next to Jacob Riis, a muckraking journalist, because they share a similar passion toward the degradation of societal monopolization by the social elite; just as Riis worked to expose the horrific conditions of American minorities at the hands of the wealthy power players, Roosevelt similarly strove to break apart the conglomerate industries that had manipulated the American landscape for decades, even going so far as to take J.P. Morgan to court. Additionally, I intentionally placed Riis next to Roosevelt so that Roosevelt may become increasingly aware of widening gap in socioeconomic status emerging within the United States; Roosevelt may be aware of corporate interest, but Riis can provide him with concrete indication that the minorities across America, particularly African Americans, are suffering at the hands of the current governmental establishment. Roosevelt can learn perspective from Riis, and in return, Riis may learn about the responsibility of the American nation to act as an insurer to democracy abroad, which is a championed tenant by Roosevelt. Teddy Roosevelt would be enlightened to learn about the identity of the American common man from Riis, and they would absolutely relate on the necessity to preserve American prosperity for all people, regardless of their economic, social, or political background.

Theodore Roosevelt was not seated next to Robert La Follette intentionally. Despite the fact that the two may agree on the inevitable conclusion that the corporate powers of this time period were poisonous to the prosperity of the American people, they differed incredibly to the extent to which they argued such doctrine. Roosevelt acknowledged that many trusts were an inherent danger to the functioning of the United States successfully, he nevertheless saw that there were numerous trusts that were inherently useful in nature, and recognized the extent to which American enterprise has contributed to the values of this nation, as well as the inherent wealth of the country at this time period. In contrast, La Follette is entirely against the establishment of corporate monopoly, arguing that such a structure inevitably evokes corruption and will lead to the downfall of the idyllic American dream establishment. La Follette led a crusade against the inherent danger of all business conglomerate institutions as detrimental, while Roosevelt articulated how circumstantial determination is vital to recognize when dealing with American industry; therefore, these two men would heavily disagree on this matter.

Seat #2

Seat #2 is occupied by Jacob Riis, who was a Danish-American social-reformer journalist and social documentary photographer best known for the practice of "muckraking," defined for this time period as the active search and publication of scandalous information regarding corrupted or underhanded practices in an investigatory manner. Riis is most widely recognized for his journalistic work in the slums of the Lower East Side of New York, an area undeniably riddled with poverty and crime, all of which is captured within his best-selling social critique, *How The Other Half Lives*, motivated in part to inform unaware middle-class Americans of the plight of minorities across the country, as well as geared toward exposing the horrific consequences of an unequal distribution of resources as well as opportunity. I decided to invite Jacob Riis to my dinner party because his legacy as a social advocate precedes him; Riis actively worked to establish the continual spread of information throughout the remainder of his life and sought the truth in every respect in an attempt to shed light on the human condition. Riis' capacity to work in some of the most devastated regions of the country in order to uncover the hidden magic that lies within in order to expose such greatness to the world truly speaks to his character as a human being; because of the actions of Riis, the issues plaguing society in America relentlessly during the twentieth century could no longer be ignored by the social elite dominating political affairs.

Jacob Riis is seated directly next to W.E.B. Du Bois, an African American civil rights activist, due to the fact that both of their lives' work revolves around the improvement of the social condition particularly for African Americans. Riis exposed the negligent conditions of urban neighborhoods within New York that were predominately populated by African American citizens, reflecting the deep-seated racism that persisted within the United States up to the modern era. Similarly, W.E.B. Du Bois adopted a platform of immediate assurance of equal privilege and opportunity for African Americans across the country, demanding the immediate passage of legislation to guarantee a fair distribution of rights on a nationwide basis for African Americans. Furthermore, I selected to place these two activist progressives next to one another at my metaphorical dinner table because they both have experience in combating the dominating power of an opposing force. Jacob Riis, by captivating the American attention on the necessitated reform of urban America, was taking away from the previously-undisturbed wealth of the American robber barons and their manipulated industries. In the same regard, W.E.B. was working, in essence, against an entire ideology of racist and discriminatory beliefs in American society; in advocating for equal civil rights, Du Bois had to surpass the clouded authority of those, predominantly in the South, wishing to establish a society governed in hierarchy. Jacob Riis would be enlightened to learn more about the national struggle of the African American populace outside of just the slums from Du Bois, and I am sure Du Bois would appreciate additional evidence to bolster his arguments provided from Riis.

Jacob Riis was not seated next to Alice Paul intentionally. Even though both Riis and Paul were individually advocating for groups whom they believed were detrimentally hurt by the current establishment of the American government, they set about this task in alternative manners. Paul led more of a formal charge against society in favor of the right to vote for women, while Riis was more of a single activist working through the avenue of the press in order to accomplish his goals. While the causes of these two individuals are not in striking opposition to one another, I would not argue that there is a profound amount in common between these two figures because they were concerned about different matters and took different approaches in order to satisfy their desire for change.

Seat #3

Seat #3 is occupied by W.E.B. (William Edward Burghardt) Du Bois, who was an American sociologist, historian, civil rights activist, Pan-Africanist, author, and editor, as well as the first African American to earn a doctorate from Harvard, famous for relentlessly fighting for African American rights in the form of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). Du Bois is famous for his extensive writing and speeches regarding African American rights during the first half of the twentieth century, where he also opposed the idea of biological white superiority as well as vocally supported women's rights in all respects (though the issue of female suffrage seemed to dominate the Progressive Era). I decided to invite W.E.B Du Bois to my dinner party because the reputation he built for himself as a man of character defending the interests of those in American society who had their rights stolen from them is truly inspiring to me; in part because of Du Bois' dedication, individuals like Martin Luther King Jr. and Rosa Parks were able to carry forth the legacy of determination and passion into a new era that culminates with the granting of fundamental civil rights to the black population within the United States. Du Bois fought throughout his lifetime what he believed was an inferior strategy to domestic tranquility between the races and subsequently became a spokesperson in order to advocate complete and equal rights in every realm of a person's life, a legacy which is unquestionably recognizable today in the relatively peaceful coexistence of all Americans on a persistent basis, rooted in the reformed ideologies of a generation building off the work of trailblazers like W.E.B. Du Bois.

W.E.B. Du Bois is seated directly next to Margaret Sanger, an American birth control advocate and female rights enthusiast, because of the fact that their intentions toward society are aimed in purity as well as are incredibly directional in aim. To begin, both of these individuals were societal advocates who dealt specifically in regards to a single group in American society considered by historians to be a member of the “unfavored minority” across the landscape. W.E.B. worked relentlessly for the proliferation of rights for African Americans in all respects of social, economic, and political advancement despite the fact that many still held blacks as biological inferiors. In a similar regard, Margaret Sanger participated in numerous campaigns that strode for greater consideration of desire and necessity for women, in spite of the fact that women were seen as docile creatures primarily up until this point in American history who belonged secluded in the home as subjects to the desires of the husband. Additionally, I chose to place these two individual advocates of social reform next to one another at my dinner table because I believe they share similar legacies of institutions established out of their idealism that they can share with one another. W.E.B. Du Bois was an original founder of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, an organization that remains in existence today as a ceaseless advocate for racial equality and the preservation of freedom across the United States. In a manner resembling Du Bois, Sanger was complicit in the creation of the first birth control clinic within the United States as well as the Planned Parenthood Federation of America, both of which exist today as testaments to the will of Sanger to ensure the just consideration of women across the United States. W.E.B. Du Bois would be enlightened to learn more about the strategies of reform that were instrumental in the success of Margaret Sanger in the advancement of contraceptive and preventative methods for women nation-wide, and I am sure Sanger would appreciate hearing about the proliferation of a formerly-suppressed sect by determined individuals within the black community, as well.

W.E.B. Du Bois was not seated next to John Muir intentionally. Though I am doubtful that Du Bois and Muir would have explicitly disagreed on the causes they presented within discussion independently, there seems to be little inherent value in attempting to link their two causes together as useful for productive discussion on advancement. Du Bois was a relentless advocate for civil rights for African Americans and the immediate shift in perspective as inherent social equals for all races, while Muir was a staunch advocate for environmental preservation and assurance of safeguarded natural elements that would survive the test of time into posterity. These two topics do not necessarily clash, however there is no added benefit in placing them near each other, as an interpretation of each perspective may become misconstrued by one or both of the men, thereby prompting the potential for greater conflict at the reception. These men are not in each other’s realm of influence or area of interest, therefore it is best to minimize the potential of adversarial conversation to instead focus on garnering productive social commentary.

Seat #4

Seat #4 is occupied by Margaret Sanger, who was an American birth control activist, sex educator, writer, and nurse who used her writings and speeches in order to encourage various forms of birth control options for women so that they may have the opportunity to participate in activities beyond the confines of the home environment. Sanger published her own paper, *The Woman Rebel*, in which she wholeheartedly supported the use of violence to achieve political, economic, and social goals, but simultaneously worked in concordance with numerous other progressive woman of the generation in order to further advance female claims of equal opportunity; because of her efforts, the first birth control clinic in the United States was established, along with organizations that eventually evolved into the Planned Parenthood Federation of America. I decided to invite Margaret Sanger to my dinner party because I felt as though she embodied a fresh, revitalized sense of urgency for the woman’s cause of

greater societal and political enhancement that others at the table could relate with as well as supplement with their additional perspectives; her strong opinions on the nature of the feminine position in society can undeniably give way to a significant conversation of reformed communal responsibilities. Sanger's willingness to speak about sexuality openly in a time of general taboo on the subject and her capacity to fight passionately for a matter that many considered insignificant in comparison to the social issues of the time speaks to her ability to advocate for the disenfranchised or disenfranchised members of society; this determined passion is a quality I would look for in dinner party guest attendees.

Margaret Sanger is seated directly next to Jeanette Rankin, the first United States female to hold political office within the national Congress in the House of Representatives, because I feel as though their shared passion and spirit as female trailblazers can make for an incredibly lively conversation piece that would be reflected in the overall complexity of the dinner table arrangement. To begin, both of these women championed the cause of immediate social and political equality for women within the United States. Sanger advocated relentlessly for the production of mass-consumed contraceptive and birth-regulating products in order to provide women with the capacity to manage their own lives in an orderly fashion, beginning with the household. Similarly, Jeanette Rankin, as the first influential female policymaker of American history, worked tirelessly in Congress for the advancement of women's rights in both a political respect, the economic sector, and the social sphere of influence; her vote contributed to the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, finally granting women the right to vote. Additionally, I decided to place these two female powerhouses close to one another because I felt it would give them the opportunity to discuss their differing strategies for achieving adequate social change on a monumental level. Sanger was a profound and surprisingly-adamant supporter of violent protest means in order to achieve her goal of greater social upheaval in favor of women. In contrast, Rankin, as an ardent pacifist, championed the peaceful movement toward greater social equality, voting against the United States entering World War I and frequently traveling to India because of Gandhi's teachings on nonviolent protest. These women are both famous for their unique capacity to relentlessly surge forward in the quest for greater opportunity in all respects for women, and this is a characteristic best emulated in conjunction at my dinner table. I feel as though Margaret Sanger would be enlightened to learn about the strategies Rankin used in Congress in order to proliferate the female agenda nationwide, and I am certain that in return, Jeanette Rankin would sincerely be interested in understanding the rationale behind physical protest to classicist suppression against females occurring throughout the country, as well.

Margaret Sanger was not seated next to Jacob Riis intentionally. Jacob Riis set about solving the social issues of the Progressive Era in a meaningful, journalistic manner where he published his shocking findings in order for the public to discuss and subsequently elaborate on from their own perspectives. In contrast, Sanger was more concerned with presenting the message of suppression directly to the people in the form of grandiose upheaval and physical revolution against societal oppressors, which would clearly indicate a collection of enveloped grievances. While I do not believe Riis and Sanger would have detested one another for their personal beliefs, the friction that exists between these two individuals based on this principle of handling social criticism is best not to be expanded into an enveloping issue greater than initially expected.

Seat #5

Seat #5 is occupied by Jeanette Rankin, who was a Montana-born U.S. native and the first woman to serve in the United States Congress (the House of Representatives), representing the state of Montana on two separate terms, as well as working tirelessly to help pass the Nineteenth Amendment to the Constitution, which granted all women the privilege of suffrage. As a strong-willed pacifist and advocate

for peaceful resolution, Rankin was the only Congressperson to vote against the passage of a declaration of war for World War I and World War II, instead becoming active in the women's suffrage movement in Washington state, where she worked relentlessly to amend the state's constitution to include voting privileges to women and proposed the formation of a Committee on Woman Suffrage, of which she was appointed leader. I decided to invite Jeanette Rankin to my dinner party because I am astounded by the courage of conviction she displayed in serving the American constituents with honor; throughout her elected terms in Congress as well as in her very own personal life, Rankin attempted to further the surge of equality forth to an increasing number of minority groups across the country previously denied any form of legal protection. Jeanette Rankin played a vital role in the overall developmental progression of the United States into a country that preserves the rights of its citizens by beginning this trend with the women's movement, thus inspiring a new movement comprised of nationalistic intent and general well-being; without the work of Rankin, it undeniably would have taken a lot longer to begin having the dialogue conversation necessary to provoke social concern with the status quo.

Jeanette Rankin is seated directly next to Alice Paul, an American suffragist, feminist, and women's rights activist, for a number of reasons, all of which contribute to the notion that these two women shared a unique passion for the growth of an idealistic society based on the foundation of women. Both of these women absolutely prioritized the women's cause as their most significant and life-altering in nature. Jeanette Rankin dedicated her time both in and out of Congress to ensuring that there was legislation in place in order to facilitate the conversation of greater civil liberties for women, even going so far as to petition the House and Senate leaders directly. Similarly, Alice Paul led a social revolution of sorts across the country, inspiring women to take up the suffragette call to action and directly petition political officials to acknowledge the claims of a large proportion of American citizens. In another regard, both Rankin and Paul held distinct leadership roles that I feel they can utilize to enhance their social experience in discussion with one another at the dinner table. Rankin was able to influence legislation and the passage of law within Congress on a daily basis for almost four years, thereby possessing a uniquely-existent voice in the decisions of a body that was used to be entirely-comprised of a biased, male-oriented perception. Uniquely resembling Rankin, Alice Paul became a leader in the National Woman's Party, which functioned on the basis of establishing the goal of implementing change on a federal level for women throughout the nation. These women adopted similar strategies in order to petition the powers of American society at this time to adopt their philosophies on the entitlement to certain unalienable liberties. I feel as though Jeanette Rankin could learn a significant amount of knowledge from Alice Paul on the manner in which social reform is achieved from a basis of physical protest and disagreement, while Paul can learn the legislative components of actually passing such reform-minded addendums of law from the immaculate record of Jeanette Rankin in return.

Jeanette Rankin was not seated next to W.E.B. Du Bois intentionally. W.E.B. Du Bois and Jeanette Rankin were fundamentally focused on alternative end goals for the Progressive Era that did not necessarily put them at odds with one another, but likewise did not make cooperation easy in the slightest. Du Bois was for the immediate granting of civil rights to African Americans within society and demanded the end to racial segregation throughout the country, drawing a significant amount of attention to the movement as a result of this conviction. In contrast, Jeanette Rankin was geared more toward the emphasis on women's entitlement, speaking little on the matter of the privileges for African Americans and instead fixating on the power of suffrage unjustly denied to women for countless years. While Rankin and Du Bois do not stand in necessary opposition to one another on the entitlements of African Americans and women, their slanted and biased focuses on separate issues does not make them compatible or suitable to share their individual experiences. The plight of African Americans seemed to be much more ideologically rooted and discriminatory in nature than the denial of suffrage to women during this time period strictly on the basis of controversy created from these issues.

Seat #6

Seat #6 is occupied by Alice Paul, who was a New Jersey-born Quaker who earned her Ph.D. from the University of Pennsylvania and was a devoted supporter of the women's rights movement in America, joining the women's suffrage movement from a very early age and working with other leading females to form the Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage. Paul is famous for using dramatic tactics in order to make bold statements in emphasizing the true importance of the proliferation of women's rights across the American landscape; she joined the women's suffrage movement in Britain and was arrested on several occasions, serving time in jail and going on a hunger strike in order to reform the laws both at home and abroad that negatively impacted the prosperity of women within their roles of economic, social, and political enthusiasts. I decided to invite Alice Paul to my dinner party because I am enraptured with her persistence in inspiring equality in all aspects between women and men within society; even after the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment in 1920 that guaranteed the vote to females, Paul devoted herself to working on additional empowerment measures, introducing the first Equal Rights Amendment in Congress and in later decades working on a civil rights bill to garner fair employment practices at all levels of corporate structure. Until she was debilitated by a stroke in 1974, Alice Paul continued her fight for women's rights, demonstrating the true passion of heart she displayed for her cause and the power with which she forged a legacy of remembrance as an individual willing to sacrifice everything for what she believed to be morally correct; throughout her life, Paul continuously embodied the famous line of Martin Luther King: "injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere."

Alice Paul is seated directly next to Robert La Follette, an American Republican politician in favor of progressivism, because they both embodied the sentiment of the preservation of the individual against the oppressive forces of governance and commerce that attempted to stifle their objectives. To begin, both of these individuals actively opposed the established order of society stacked against the opportunity of individual common men and women. Alice Paul worked to decisively shift the concentration of political power away from corporate elites who would preserve the status quo of monopolization and prevent women from serving in an active role of commercial involvement. Likewise, Robert La Follette was a vehement opposer to the stationary corporate elite who prevented those of less significant resource or opportunity from achieving their objectives by stifling any sense of commercial freedom they held within society. Additionally, both of these activists adopted personal crusades that spiraled into movements of social revitalization for the entire American nation. Paul helped to found and actively contribute to numerous organizations throughout her lifetime that centered around the capacity of female achievement, most notably the Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage and the National American Women's Suffrage Association. La Follette, following in this pattern, launched a personal declaration of war against political corruption, exposing how state legislators voted on specific issues to the constituents and publicly humiliating public officials who attempted to bribe him in any respect with political favor. Both Paul and La Follette reflected the passion of the American spirit to vindicate the suppressed members of society (women and the corporate frailty) in a respect indicative of progression toward the modern age of complete social acceptance and attempted equality. I feel as though Alice Paul can learn about the sexist treatment of women in the corrupted workplace from La Follette, and La Follette could be in turn enlightened on the significance of expanding his ideals of social hierarchy in order to more effectively combat it from the contributions of Paul.

Alice Paul was not seated next to Margaret Sanger intentionally. These two women would not likely have clashed profoundly in their understandings, but the distinctions between approaches to garner social approval of women's rights in America may have served as some form of negative dialogue between the

two figures. Margaret Sanger was strongly in favor of physical revolt and violence in order to achieve the results she desired of women's proliferation. In contrast, Paul favored certain strategies that were not necessarily violent, but did draw significant attention in order to establish the credibility of her argument, such as walkouts, sit-ins, picket protests, and self-starvation. I am not certain that Alice Paul would have been in agreement that intimidation and fear would have been the best techniques in order to acquire just treatment of all individuals, which is something Sanger advocated within her own personal doctrine. These two women were ultimately both working for female privilege, but Sanger was working for contraceptive acceptance across the nation, while Paul was more geared toward political approval to women's suffrage more than anything else in particular.

Seat #7

Seat #7 is occupied by Robert La Follette, who was an American from Dane County, Wisconsin who was best known as a proponent of progressivism as well as a fierce opponent to corporate power; he served as a member of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Governor of Wisconsin, and a U.S. Senator from Wisconsin during his career, even going so far as to run for President of the United States in 1924. "Fighting Bob La Follette" was furious at a bribe offered to him to fix a court case during a pivotal time in his law career, thus inspiring him to declare war on the party machine by denouncing the use of money to reverse the will of the people; he traveled throughout the course of his political career and spoke out against the influence of powerful business interests and the corrupt politicians, eventually going on to expose flagrant corruption. I decided to invite Robert La Follette to my dinner party because I was moved by his unyielding passion to maintaining a sense of morality and shaping the world through a lens of right and wrong that could not be wavered by the desires or resources of individuals only working for their personal degrees of self-interest. Despite La Follette's inability to win the presidency on numerous occasions throughout his political career, this man is still revered in history as a significant contributing factor to the removal of corporate favoritism and political bias within the legislative structures of the country, instead evoking a demand for a sense of neutrality in state affairs so as to serve the people politicians are chosen to represent with dignity, grace, and legitimacy.

Robert La Follette is seated directly next to John Muir for a number of reasons, most of which pertain to a shared sense of passion, as well as an unyielding sense of interest in their areas of study. Primarily, both La Follette and Muir fought vigorously for their stances within society and could not be swayed to abandon their principles at the first sign of tribulation or alternative interests. La Follette persisted throughout the numerous attempts of bribery and persuasion to maintain his beliefs of the corrupted nature of corporate monopoly within the U.S. Likewise, Muir maintained the passion and protective interests of the environment from a preservationist perspective in a manner that nobody else did; when others were simply interested in conserving environmental resources and slightly regulating land use, Muir maintained his philosophy of ensuring the longevity of natural resources. In addition, both La Follette and Muir established philosophies and initiatives that can still be recognized today as having long-lasting impacts within society. La Follette created the tradition of a distinct separation between business and government within the United States, thus denying any claim of biased favor of particular interests within the American governing system, which is a guarantee we still rely on today. Identically, Muir inspired the creation of numerous governmental and nongovernmental organizations that still exist today in order to advocate on behalf of the environment and additional regulation on exposure to ailments, such as the Sierra Club and the Environmental Protection Agency. Robert La Follette could unquestionably learn of the severe environmental deficits corrupted business is having on society from John Muir, and Muir could subsequently comprehend the root of environmental deficits at the hands of the corporate elite from La Follette. These two men share a similar passion for social revitalization unlike any other.

Robert La Follette was not seated next to Teddy Roosevelt intentionally. Due to the fact that Roosevelt honored the intentions and motivations of numerous trusts and corporate industries within the United States, this puts him in direct opposition to the claims of La Follette about the inherently immoral standards of business practices and the necessitated actions to remedy these disasters. Though Roosevelt did not argue that all corporations were beneficial to the wellbeing of American development, his selective ambitions depending on the industry placed him in direct competition with the ambitions of La Follette, a man who dedicated his entire professional career to guarantee that organizations of selected interests could not abuse their power over the American system of capitalistic competition. I would foresee tension and blatant opposition between these two men if they were seated next to one another; therefore, I am glad I thought of an alternative pattern of seating so that they did not need to interact with one another on an obligatory basis.

Seat #8

Last but certainly not least, Seat #8 is occupied by John Muir, who was a Scottish-American naturalist, author, environmental philosopher, and early advocate of preservation of wilderness in the United States known for his letters, essays, and books telling of his adventures in nature, which helped to preserve the Yosemite Valley, Sequoia National Park and other wilderness areas. Muir founded the Sierra Club, a prominent American conservation organization, and devoted most of his time to the preservation of the Western forests, even going so far as to petition the United States Congress for the National Park bill that was eventually passed in 1890, thereby helping to take action to help preserve large nature areas. I decided to invite John Muir to my dinner party because I was inspired by his devotion to a cause not many others were too concerned about throughout this area of "big business" commercial enterprise and the regulation of progressive movements forward in American history; John Muir was perhaps the biggest enthusiast of natural preservation of this entire generation, identifying the environment as an invaluable gem in need of desperate polish in order to sustain the vast resources that have provided Americans with indisputable wealth for centuries. Today referred to as the "Father of the National Parks," John Muir played a vital role in the greater emphasis on conservative and preservative tactics moving forward into the modern age, when it became obvious that the environment was being negatively afflicted by the carelessness of human beings; as a dreamer and activist, his eloquent words changed the way in which Americans saw their mountains, forests, seashores, deserts, and so many more valuable landmarks.

John Muir is seated directly next to Teddy Roosevelt for a number of reasons, most of which pertain to a shared concern for the environmental posterity as well as a mutual passion for empowered individual idealism. To begin, both Muir and Roosevelt supported referendums to save environmental resources and perpetuate the American beauty onto other generations. Muir, in his countless speeches, pamphlets, letters, and novels, argued that it is the responsibility of American citizens to preserve the simplicity and richness of the American land for others to enjoy and appreciate for the future. Similarly, Roosevelt too felt a unique kindred spirit to the land and argued that it was within the capacity of the individual to take conscious steps to revitalize its components for future American citizens to come. Additionally, both Muir and Roosevelt identified environmental assurance as a matter of nationalistic pride and a manner by which to regulate the seemingly-unchecked power of corporate America. Muir found genuine American spirit within the wooded and grassy outdoors, defining such components as indications of the primitive American fervor to explore further. In a similar manner, Roosevelt was enraptured by numerous elements of the American west and saw such untouched locations as a unique differentiator between the affairs of the United States, versus the corporate-based, profit-centric countries of Europe. These two men both saw the inherent value of honoring such maintained land for future generations to appreciate and to set

apart the American classification of beauty. Without question, it is reasonable to conclude that Muir could obtain a vast sense of knowledge regarding political procedure to preserve American land from Roosevelt, and in return, Roosevelt may acquire a newfound invigorated sense of pride in the territorial diversity of the United States from John Muir if they were to sit together.

John Muir was not seated next to Jeanette Rankin intentionally. This decision was not so much made out of fear of disagreement between these two individuals, but rather it was decided based upon the advantageous elements of alternative arrangements where more in depth analysis of discussion could arise. John Muir was the champion of the environmental preservationist movement in American history, arguing that it was our responsibility to leave the land fertile and inheritable for those yet to come. In contrast, Jeanette Rankin was an American politician who centered the majority of her attention on acquiring greater political autonomy for women, especially with the acquiring of suffrage. Rankin was not particularly concerned with the development of the American natural structure from my perception, and it seemed as though Muir was alternatively not phased by the progressive strides of women in society, as well. The conversation between these two individuals if they were to be placed next to one another would be artificial and insubstantial at best, thus justifying the conscious decision not to locate them within close proximity to one another at my progressive dinner party dining table.

Part C Analysis

If I had the opportunity to invite just one more person to my dinner party from the Progressive Era, I would have chosen to invite John D. Rockefeller. Though this decision may sound somewhat shocking, I would appreciate Rockefeller's insight and opinions on the shift toward deregulated monopolies as well as increasing government assurance for individual freedom. As a champion of the economic rags-to-riches capacity of the American spirit, Rockefeller thrived off the elimination of competition and free markets that built his wealth. Therefore, I would be incredibly interested to discover how this mentality of economic assurance over all else would interact with the progressive minds of this newfound generation, who honored expanding freedoms, protections, and opportunities to an increasing proportion of the American republic. Rockefeller would have the chance to defend his actions and enlighten the table on justifications for his capitalistic mentality. I would be especially interested to determine the relationship between Rockefeller and Teddy Roosevelt, who worked tirelessly for the breakdown of bloated economic corporations to instead favor the capacity of all Americans to achieve self-worth. Rockefeller would unquestionably be my selection for a ninth guest strictly based on curiosity and fascination on the dynamic of clashing social perceptions.