

# DOWNLOAD PDF OUR ITALIAN FELLOW CITIZENS IN THEIR OLD HOMES AND THEIR NEW

## Chapter 1 : Do Immigrants Import Their Economic Destiny? - Economics

*Search the history of over billion web pages on the Internet.*

This Discover Our Shared Heritage Travel Itinerary highlights the wide variety of places listed in the National Register of Historic Places that illustrate and have influenced the lives of 43 presidents of the United States. Nearly half of the featured places are units of the National Park System, while the rest are preserved by other stewards. These powerful tangible links to the presidents tell their stories and illuminate their achievements and impact on the office and the nation, bringing several centuries of American history to life. The American Presidents travel itinerary offers several ways to discover and experience the historic places that shaped and honor the leaders of our nation: Visitors can read an "Introduction to The Presidents: This section also provides additional resources on the presidents and the places associated with them and a bibliography. View the itinerary online or print it as a guide if you plan to visit in person. The itineraries are created by a partnership of the National Park Service; the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers; and Federal, State, and local governments and private organizations in communities, regions, and heritage areas throughout the United States. The National Park Service and its partners hope you enjoy this itinerary and others in the series. Introduction to The Presidents: I was one of those. My fascination with presidents grew. Later that year, I saw Kennedy tell us on television that he would risk nuclear war to get Soviet missiles out of Cuba. Knowing how neighboring towns were sometimes demolished by tornadoes, I wondered whether mine population forty-six hundred would be leveled by a nuclear attack. Three years later, I kept on seeing, or so I thought, the same picture, day after day, week after week, on the flag-embazoned front page of the Chicago Tribune. The image was of a smiling Lyndon Johnson signing a bill, with members of Congress clustered behind him. Only later did I understand that it only looked like the same picture, and that Johnson was enacting the most substantial body of social legislation in history. That year "LBJ also began his first major escalation of the conflict in Vietnam. My fifth-grade teacher gravely told our class, "You boys and girls may not realize it yet, but your country is at war. I presumed at the time that this must have been true for most of American history. Stirring displays of presidential leadership continue to affect us today: George Washington inventing key elements of our political system, Andrew Jackson battling the Bank of the United States, Abraham Lincoln binding the Union, Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson involving the government more than ever before in our economic affairs and expanding our role among nations, Franklin Roosevelt rescuing our society and the world, Harry Truman improvising the means that would defeat the Soviet empire, Ronald Reagan seeking to end the Cold War. What makes these achievements all the more spectacular is that our presidents have all operated under a Constitution that did not grant them unilateral power. This was not accidental. On the cusp of independence the founders of the new American republic did not wish to endow the presidency with powers that might lead to some new American version of the British monarchy they had fought so hard to shake off. The limited powers of the office stand in contrast with the acts of presidential leadership that have driven so much of our history. Thanks to the American system, our people have managed frequently to choose leaders who have had the character to alter public opinion, the vision to spot public dangers and opportunities, and the skills to get Congress, citizens, and sometimes the world to share their view of the way things should be. More than anyone else, George Washington demonstrated how the strictures of the Constitution would be translated into actual power. It was left to John Adams to follow the adored and groundbreaking leader who had stood above partisanship to navigate grave crises with France and with Alexander Hamilton. Adams was the first president to live in the Executive Mansion. He understood the potential of the white stone house as a unifying symbol of the new democracy, writing his famous prayer that heaven "bestow the best of Blessings on this House and all that shall hereafter inhabit it" and that "none but honest and wise men ever rule under its roof. For the next quarter-century, with the exception of James Polk, who pursued American expansion and revived the independent treasury, the candlepower of the presidency

## DOWNLOAD PDF OUR ITALIAN FELLOW CITIZENS IN THEIR OLD HOMES AND THEIR NEW

dimmed. Martin Van Buren struggled against the Panic of 1837. William Henry Harrison died after a month in office. John Tyler, "His Accidency," established the expectation that Presidents-by-succession assumed the office in full and annexed Texas, but was ultimately expelled by his own party. Zachary Taylor, Millard Fillmore, and Franklin Pierce were among the weakest leaders ever to serve as president. The final president before the Civil War, James Buchanan, embodied the failure that shadowed the reputations of his seven immediate predecessors: Each had tried to paper over the deepening issue of slavery that divided the American people, endangered the Union, and threatened to make a mockery of the American notion of democracy. Few historians would disagree that Abraham Lincoln was our greatest president. What better demonstration could there be of the American idea that anyone can become president than a boy who sprang from "the short and simple annals of the poor" with a year and a half of sporadic formal education; who mastered Euclid, the Bible, Shakespeare, and Blackstone; made himself the natural leader of almost any community he entered; and then went on to confront the issue of slavery and save the Union with a costly and complicated war? The end of the Civil War, which had seen Lincoln expand the powers of his job to prevail over the Confederacy, might have opened the way to a new era of strong presidents. The most severe crisis of the Union was over and as Reconstruction unfolded, the Congress, Supreme Court, and the American people were eager to whittle the presidency back to more human scale. Although Rutherford Hayes helped to restore the office after the tremors of Johnson and Grant, he was constrained by his failure to win the popular vote and his pledge to serve merely a single term. James Garfield was murdered after a half-year in office. Although Grover Cleveland aspired to strengthen the presidency, he was frustrated in many of his public ambitions. You might well ask yourself whether America could have been a greater country during this era had it benefitted from stronger executive leadership or was this a period in which the nation, after the greatest crisis in its history, had to lick its wounds and consolidate? Then, on the eve of the twentieth century, the wheel turned again. Theodore Roosevelt and, after the William Howard Taft interlude, Woodrow Wilson expanded presidential power over foreign policy and our economic life. The presidencies of Warren Harding and Calvin Coolidge were largely a rebuke to the powerful presidency, but Herbert Hoover "far more than most people understood at the time" was a forerunner of the dramatic surge in presidential authority that began in 1933. Franklin Roosevelt launched the longest period of sustained presidential command in our history. The American epoch from the early 1930s until the start of the 1960s was dominated by what the historian Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. Roosevelt would have been stultified to be president in a time that did not allow such potential for leadership. He was only too happy to oblige, sending new domestic programs through Congress that were so far-reaching that the Supreme Court struck some of them down. Nevertheless, what Congress gave Roosevelt in the domestic arena, it withheld in foreign and military affairs. In 1941, backed by three-quarters of Americans according to one reputable survey, Congress almost passed an amendment requiring that, except in case of invasion, "the authority of Congress to declare war shall not become effective until confirmed by a majority of all votes cast in a Nation-wide referendum. After the Japanese attack, the American people and Congress handed Roosevelt authority to fight World War II that far exceeded anything he had amassed in the 1930s. Leading the Allies into battle, forging an industrial "arsenal of democracy" on the home front, FDR was as near to being a king of the world as any president would ever be. When the war ended in 1945, there was every expectation that presidential power would recede, just as it had after the Civil War and World War I. But, with its air of a clear and immediate danger, the Cold War gave Harry Truman and those leaders who followed him power in foreign affairs that neared that of a president fighting a hot war. Especially during showdowns like the Berlin blockade of 1948 and the Cuban Missile Crisis, many Americans felt that literally one human being was shielding them against a worldwide threat. Congress was often willing to give presidents the benefit of the doubt. In domestic affairs, Americans seemed willing if not eager to continue the flow of national power to Washington that had begun with the New Deal and continued as Americans on the home front girded to win World War II. The imperial presidents were happy to exploit congressional deference that stemmed from the Cold War danger to get controversial domestic programs passed. Eisenhower justified his highway and

## DOWNLOAD PDF OUR ITALIAN FELLOW CITIZENS IN THEIR OLD HOMES AND THEIR NEW

education programs by saying they were essential for national defense. When Kennedy wished to shoot for the moon—a program that had little direct military value and in fact took resources away from more important military ventures—he reasoned that Americans needed the added prestige and would have to command outer space in order to win the struggle with the Soviet Union. The strong presidency of the twentieth century also gained power by acquiring new symbols, mystique, and ways to influence the public that it had never had before. In the absence of kings and queens, Americans had always wanted to hold up presidents of special stature like George Washington and Abraham Lincoln as examples for their children. But after World War II, the office was provided with new theatrical props. JFK started a craze for two-button suits. His refusal to wear hats he thought they made his cheeks look too fat threatened to ruin the hat industry. Besieged by desperate hat moguls, Kennedy was persuaded to at least carry a hat during public ceremonies like airport greetings and military parades. Presidents of the eighteenth and nineteenth century had had to address the public through newspapers or handbills. When you saw the presidential seal dissolve into JFK talking about Cuba or Nixon about Cambodia, you knew it was something important and you usually watched. Another way presidents seized power for themselves during this period was in no way public. These were the illicit abuses of presidential power that constituted a scarlet thread in the underside of the presidential carpet. Under Kennedy, the telephones of presidential critics were tapped and their tax returns, including those of Richard Nixon and his mother, were audited. These misdeeds expanded presidential influence. If you were a Washington columnist whose private life might look tawdry in an FBI file or who had cheated on your income taxes, you might have thought twice before incurring the wrath of a sitting president. The congressional opposition and a new watchdog press leaped at any public hint of abuse. In the last decade of the twentieth century, the foundations of the strong presidency cracked. In December, when the Soviet Union dissolved and the Cold War ended once and for all, George Bush found that his influence not only in foreign affairs but also domestic policy shrank almost overnight. Americans wanted a stop to the era of Big Government, as Bill Clinton acknowledged in his State of the Union, and one of the chief casualties was the strong presidency. What better symbol was there of Big Government than imperial presidents such as Franklin Roosevelt and Johnson and Nixon—and Reagan, who expanded the federal budget? In the absence of an overwhelming foreign or domestic crisis that seemed to cry out for executive leadership, Congress stopped acceding so often to presidential will as it had during the Great Depression, World War II, and the Cold War. There was the prospect that the clock might be turned back to the post-Civil War period, when speakers of the House and Senate majority leaders often dictated to presidents and were sometimes better known and more influential than the men in the White House. By the end of the twentieth century, the belief that presidents were well-intentioned and told the truth, the idealism and trust that endowed presidents such as Theodore and Franklin Roosevelt, Eisenhower and Kennedy with so much of their public impact had been drained away. After presidential deceptions over the Bay of Pigs and Vietnam as well as the Watergate, Iran-contra, and Monica Lewinsky scandals, Americans especially the young were much more skeptical about what they heard from the White House. And in the age of round-the-clock television news and the Internet, presidents would have to compete for air-time with Madonna and O. At the dawn of the twenty-first century, as I write, we are therefore in a period in which it will be very difficult for presidents to exercise strong leadership in the absence of some all-encompassing crisis like the Civil War or the Great Depression—or the election of some leader with such extraordinary stature and political skills that he or she can overcome the ebbing authority of the office. As the Civil War historian Bruce Catton wrote in , "If the story of the Presidents proves nothing else, it testifies to the enormous stability of the office itself and of the nation that devised it. But at critical moments, the absence of that distinctive presidential voice and of the executive power to push foot-dragging public officials and skeptical citizens to think anew or make vital sacrifices can endanger the country. Few historians today would argue that Washington, Lincoln, and Franklin Roosevelt belong anywhere but at the top of the presidential ladder. But for most of the other presidents, the metaphor should be not ladder but stock exchange. Presidential reputations are constantly fluctuating—some much more than others—as we

## DOWNLOAD PDF OUR ITALIAN FELLOW CITIZENS IN THEIR OLD HOMES AND THEIR NEW

discover new information about them from letters, diaries, secret memoranda, tape recordings, and other sources, and as we see them in more distant hindsight, the phenomenon that the historian Barbara Tuchman so vividly called the "lantern on the stern. On pale-blue-lined grammar school paper, I scrawled a letter to his successor, Lyndon Johnson, saying, "You could get some large carving firm to carve his head in the Mount Rushmore Memorial of South Dakota. As for himself, until Johnson died in , disparaged for his rough-hewn style and his war in Vietnam, he insisted that those same historians would have no wish or ability to understand him. The LBJ surge is a superb example of what makes the history of the American presidents so mesmerizing. Like a rushing river drawing force and direction from unforeseen new currents and streams, what we think and write about the leaders who have gone before is never final and is always changing. Excerpted from *The Presidents*:

## DOWNLOAD PDF OUR ITALIAN FELLOW CITIZENS IN THEIR OLD HOMES AND THEIR NEW

### Chapter 2 : Our Italian fellow citizens in their old homes and their new - Details - Trove

*Excerpt from Our Italian Fellow Citizens in Their Old Homes and Their New Italy is of peculiar interest, not only because we were associated with her in the recent earth shaking crisis, but because she has sent so many millions of her sons to our shores, and is likely to send millions more now that Peace broods over a tortured world, and.*

Obama Bashes Americans to Immigrants Getty Images 15 Dec Immigrants are better than Americans, in part, because they know they must get involved in progressive politics, President Barack Obama told a group of selected immigrants. Each year, Americans give birth to 4 million new Americans, and the country also takes in roughly 1 million new migrants from far-distant countries, cultures and ethnic groups. But those American-born Americans are, seemingly, a big disappointment to Obama. As for hundreds of millions of non-immigrant Americans? From the start, Africans were brought here in chains against their will, and then toiled under the whip. They also built America. Chinese immigrants faced persecution and vicious stereotypes, and were, for a time, even banned from entering America. During World War II, German and Italian residents were detained, and in one of the darkest chapters in our history, Japanese immigrants and even Japanese American citizens were forced from their homes and imprisoned in camps. We succumbed to fear. We betrayed not only our fellow Americans, but our deepest values. We betrayed these documents. He has a point â€” many of his American supporters failed to turn out in the or mid-terms, complicating his plan to fundamentally transform America. The truth is, being an American is hard. Being part of a democratic government is hard. Being a citizen is hard. It is a challenge. Today is not the final step in your journeyâ€¦ Our system of self-government depends on ordinary citizens doing the hard, frustrating but always essential work of citizenship â€” of being informed. Of speaking out when something is not right. Of helping fellow citizens when they need a hand. And that work gives purpose to every generation. It belongs to me. It belongs to the judge. It belongs to you. It belongs to you, all of us, as citizens. To follow our laws, yes, but also to engage with your communities and to speak up for what you believe in. And to vote â€” to not only exercise the rights that are now yours, but to stand up for the rights of others. Obama and other Democrats have long pushed this theme â€” that immigrants are just better people than American-born citizens. Nancy Pelosi told a crowd of illegal immigrants gathered for a pro-amnesty rally in October , in a country of million native-born Americans, and 40 million immigrants. In a November speech in Chicago, Obama poured out the compliments for migrants. One study a few years ago found that immigrants start more than a quarter of all new businesses in the United States â€” one-quarter of them. Another study found that immigrants and their children start over 40 percent of Fortune companiesâ€¦ it makes sense, because being a nation of immigrants gives us this huge entrepreneurial advantage over other nations. And that, sometimes, has been a bottleneck to how we think about immigration. Even though the only people who have the right to say that are some Native Americans. In , Obama used the immigration laws to bring in roughly 2 million foreign workers â€” plus women and children â€” in a year when 4 million Americans began looking for jobs. Unsurprisingly, wages flatlined while profits spiked and the stock market shot up to record highs. Obama ended his Dec.

# DOWNLOAD PDF OUR ITALIAN FELLOW CITIZENS IN THEIR OLD HOMES AND THEIR NEW

## Chapter 3 : Mr. President, I Wish You'd Been There | History News Network

*Our Italian Fellow Citizens in Their Old Homes and Their New* by Francis Edward Clark starting at \$ Our Italian Fellow Citizens in Their Old Homes and Their New has 5 available editions to buy at Alibris.

Immigration has become a big political issue in the U. At least among economists, almost all the debate has focused on the short run, and most of that has focused on lower-skilled immigrants. The overall answer is fairly clear: That means that in the short run, the most important effect of low-skilled immigration is that it helps low-skilled migrants themselves. But what happens in the very long run? As immigrants shape the culture of their new homelands, will they import more than just new ethnic cuisines? Will they also import attitudes and policies that wound the golden goose of first-world prosperity? Ultimately, will migrants make the countries they move to a lot like the countries they came from? Why do some countries have relatively liberal, pro-market institutions while others are plagued by corruption, statism, and incompetence? Three lines of research point the way to a substantial answer: The Deep Roots literature on how ancestry predicts modern economic development, The Attitude Migration literature, which shows that migrants tend to bring a lot of their worldview with them when they move from one country to another, The New Voters-New Policies literature, which shows that expanding the franchise to new voters really does change the nature of government. The Deep Roots of Prosperity A glance at the map tells much of the tale: The major exceptions are oil-rich countries. East Asia and Northwest Europe are precisely the areas of the world that made the biggest technological advances over the past few hundred years. It means the frontier of human artistic and technological achievement. Exceptions exist, but so does the rule. Recently, a small group of economists have found more systematic evidence on how the past predicts the present. A growing body of new empirical work focuses on the measurement and estimation of the effects of historical variables on contemporary income by explicitly taking into account the ancestral composition of current populations. The evidence suggests that economic development is affected by traits that have been transmitted across generations over the very long run. The positive effect of ancestry-adjusted early development on current income is robust. The most likely explanation for this finding is that people whose ancestors were living in countries that developed earlier in the sense of implementing agriculture or creating organized states brought with them some advantage—such as human capital, knowledge, culture, or institutions—that raises the level of income today. To sum up some of the key findings of this new empirical literature: Indeed, all three of these papers do some version of that. For instance, without adjusting for migration, Australia has quite a low ancestral technology score: The migration adjustment matters crucially: Do migrants bring their institutions with them? So migration from high-SAT countries bring the seeds of prosperity: But what exactly are they bringing? As the authors of the Quarterly Journal of Economics article speculated, did they bring along a tendency to establish good institutions—the rule of law, low corruption, and competent government? Fortunately, an economist has already checked to see whether SAT-type scores drive good institutions. He goes on to note: If migration shaped institutions in the past, perhaps migration will shape institutions in the future. Perhaps, to coin a phrase, this time really is different. By the standards of European colonization, Chinese migration post has been relatively I emphasize relatively peaceful. The non-Chinese residents of these countries tended to have lower ancestral SAT scores than Chinese residents, so we can ask: Of course, since this is a question about migration from China, China itself should be left out of the analysis. The graph below tells the story. It compares Chinese ancestry data from the Putterman-Weil global migration matrix with the Fraser Economic Freedom of the World Index for Asian countries with substantial numbers of Chinese immigrants: The x-axis data come from the Putterman-Weil global migration matrix, reflecting post flows of Chinese migrants to these nations. The correlation is 0. The graph is truncated at three because no nation on earth has an economic freedom score below three. Singapore, Hong Kong, and Taiwan, the countries with the largest percentage of post Chinese immigrants, are the freest. Hong Kong, which had only a few thousand Chinese residents before

## DOWNLOAD PDF OUR ITALIAN FELLOW CITIZENS IN THEIR OLD HOMES AND THEIR NEW

the British arrival, is now the economically freest country in the world. Malaysia a third of whose residents are of Chinese descent and Thailand 10 percent are next, and Malaysia is clearly the freer of the two. The remaining countries, Laos and Myanmar, are substantially less economically free than Singapore. Of course, including China in this graph would weaken the relationship, but to repeat: Migrating Attitudes So, how do migrants change the governments in countries they move to? For a partial answer, we can look at the Attitude Migration literature. The simplest approach is to see if the descendants of, say, Italian migrants to America tend to have the same attitudes toward government as Italians living back in Italy. Since public opinion surveys are common around the world, this is an easy topic to investigate. One study looks at attitudes toward income redistribution, finding that second-generation immigrants to the U. More importantly, the same holds for trusting behavior: And the link from trust to economic performance is well-accepted at this point: Yes] is now routinely cited in economics textbooks. And why do low-trust societies generate worse economic performance? One reason is that low-trust individuals demand more government regulation. Using the World Values Survey, we show both in a cross-section of countries, and in a sample of individuals from around the world, that distrust fuels support for government control over the economy. The authors suggest that this happens because in low-trust societies, people want someone checking up on untrustworthy businesses and individuals, and a strong government is one way to do just that. Together, this literature suggests that migration from low-trust societies will tend to hurt long-run economic performance, partly because low-trust individuals demand more government regulation. One particular attitude has been well-studied in the migration literature: A remarkable handbook chapter by Alesina and Giuliano finds that: They are also related to a lower level of trust, more emphasis on job security, less desire for innovation and more traditional attitudes toward working women. And, unsurprisingly at this point, amoral familism itself tends to migrate: As immigrants join the culture, they start to shape the culture. Migrants start eating some of the foods of the country they move to, but at the same time older residents start trying some foods from immigrant cultures. As students of migration repeatedly claim, acculturation is a two-way street: America is different because of Italian and Irish migration, and not just because of the food we eat. Get Economics in your inbox To some extent, this point is obvious, but it has far-reaching implications. We all become a little like each other. So if we really are shaped by our neighbors, then we have yet another good reason to choose our neighbors wisely. This means that the Attitude Migration channel is perhaps only half the story, but it also means that the other part of the story will be harder to detect. Past researchers have documented two quite separate findings: Many migrant attitudes persist to their descendants Migrants and their descendants seem to make their new homes quite a bit like their old homes. The first point need not be the only cause of the second point. Migrants and their descendants tend to influence the attitudes of their new fellow citizens, so that all groups in society become at least a bit more like each other. Perhaps, when it comes time to vote, migrants completely conform to their new home countries. Look at times when large groups of individuals were suddenly given the vote, and then check to see if government policies changed within a few years. Even better, only look at large groups of individuals who had been living somewhat peacefully in the nation for decades. This extension of the franchise has been heavily studied by economists: The best-known paper draws on the fact that different U. Suffrage coincided with immediate increases in state government expenditures and revenue and more liberal voting patterns for federal representatives, and these effects continued growing over time as more women took advantage of the franchiseâ€On the basis of these estimates, granting women the right to vote caused expenditures to rise immediately by 14 percentâ€by 21 percent after 25 years, and by 28 percent after 45 years. Women did not quietly, meekly vote for whatever the men around them supported. They had their own minds, and those minds, when empowered by the vote, moved policy in a more progressive direction. And notice that the longer-run effect was twice the immediate effect: Expanding the franchise to a group that favored more government spending indeed increased government spending, but it took decades to see the full effect. And this is no one-off study: To quote a study focused on Europe: Using historical data from six Western European countries for the period , we provide evidence that social spending out of GDP increased by

## DOWNLOAD PDF OUR ITALIAN FELLOW CITIZENS IN THEIR OLD HOMES AND THEIR NEW

0. Again, the long run effect matters more than the short run effect. New voters, new policies: Which brings us to one last test of the NVNP hypothesis: The increase in voting rights for when poll taxes were eliminated in the United States. Here again, evidence supports NVNP: How immigrants shape institutions We now have the key pieces of the puzzle: The Attitude Migration literature, which shows that migrants bring a substantial portion of their attitudes toward markets, trust, and social safety nets with them from their home country. And in the long run, new citizens lead to new policies. Together, these three literatures provide a combination of big-picture and close-up evidence that if a country is choosing between high-SAT and low-SAT immigration policies, the high-SAT approach will yield big benefits in the long run. Individual countries will always be exceptions to the rule, so some countries taking the low-SAT immigration path will still look pretty good. And Changing the World. We spend hundreds of hours and lots of dollars each month creating, curating, and promoting content that drives the next evolution of economics.

# DOWNLOAD PDF OUR ITALIAN FELLOW CITIZENS IN THEIR OLD HOMES AND THEIR NEW

## Chapter 4 : Full text of "Our Italian fellow citizens in their old homes and their new"

*Our Italian Fellow Citizens in Their Old Homes and Their New [Francis Edward Clark] on blog.quintoapp.com \*FREE\* shipping on qualifying offers. This is a pre historical reproduction that was curated for quality.*

My country, Italy, is young. Both pride themselves on their past. Both are said to have marked national characters. There are old Roman stones in the basement of my building in Verona, and the heroes in my school were Leonardo and Michelangelo. Dante marked my education, as did Shakespeare and Dostoevsky. I was born in bigoted Verona, and experienced a culture shock studying in libertine Bologna. My identity comes from my own family unique, as any family is ; my friends from childhood; the cultural tribe of my youth; my scattered friends in adult life. It comes from the constellation of values, ideas, books, political dreams, cultural concerns and common purposes that were shared, nurtured and fought for; that were passed along within communities and across national boundaries. This is what makes us all: But if this is the variegated identity of each of us, why do we organise our collective and political behaviour around the nation and its sense of belonging? The answer is easy: National identities are created by power structures. Seen from my young and still rather dysfunctional country, this is perhaps easier to spot than from the UK. But it is the same. It is astonishing how differently history is taught in different countries. For an American, the key event that gave rise to the modern world, liberty and democracy, is the war of independence waged against Britain. For an Indian, the roots of civilisation are found in the era of the Vedas. They are designed to create a sense of belonging to fictitious families called nations. Less than two centuries ago, people in Calabria called themselves Greek, and today not everybody in Scotland or Wales would support England in the World Cup. National identities are political theatre. On the contrary, unifying people for the common good " whether Venetians, Sicilians or distinct Anglo-Saxon tribes " is wise politics. If we fight each other we are obviously worse off than if we work together. We benefit from cooperating rather than competing. Civilisation is the result of collaboration. Whatever the difference between Naples and Verona, things are better without borders. The exchange of ideas and goods, of looks and smiles, the stuff that forms our complex reality, only makes us richer " in wealth, intelligence and soul. It may foster solidarity at one level, but it can become a serious impediment to cooperation on a larger scale. The intense emotional identification of Germans with a single Volk ended up devastating Germany and much of Europe. When we value conflict over cooperation, and stop searching for compromise and agreed rules, national identity becomes toxic. Nationalist politics are spreading across the world, increasing tensions, sowing conflict, threatening each and every one of us. My own country has just fallen prey to this again. I think we should respond by saying loud and clear that national identity is fake. Politics plays with our insatiable desire to belong. Foxes have earths and birds have nests, but a human being has no place to lay their head. Glorifying local or national identity by placing it above cooperation is not just counterproductive, it is also miserable, ugly and morally reprehensible. It is not that we do not have national identities " we do. Rather, it is that each of us is a crossroads of multiple and often stronger identities. By putting nation first, we betray others. Not because we are equal, but because we are different within nations. We are many, and we have a wonderful place to care about, the Earth, and a marvellous, variegated tribe of brothers and sisters with whom to identify, and with whom to feel at home here.

## Chapter 5 : Our Italian fellow citizens in their old homes and their new | Search Results | IUCAT

*Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.*

## Chapter 6 : Text Only--Presidents: A Discover Our Shared Heritage Travel Itinerary

## DOWNLOAD PDF OUR ITALIAN FELLOW CITIZENS IN THEIR OLD HOMES AND THEIR NEW

*Read the digitized book: Our Italian fellow citizens in their old homes and their new - Our Italian fellow citizens in their old homes and their new By using this website you consent to our use of cookies.*

### Chapter 7 : Obama to Immigrants: Americans Suck!

*IUCAT is Indiana University's online library catalog, which provides access to millions of items held by the IU Libraries statewide.*