Taxation without Representation in the 21st Century

A student-centered curriculum set for exploring the lack of voting rights for our nation’s capital. Includes ready-to-go lesson plans and materials for both middle school and high school classrooms.
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Background Information for Educators

Origins of this curriculum set
This curriculum set was originally created by D.C. Public Schools for 12th grade D.C. History teachers and was modified by DC Vote for the purposes of reaching a broader audience. For more information about DC Vote and its nonpartisan mission, please visit dcvote.org.

The struggle for voting rights
Since its founding, the residents of the District of Columbia have been denied the same right that sparked the American Revolution - the right to voting representation within our legislature, and the right to self government. The timeline below explores this history from the ratification of the U.S. Constitution to today, including past attempts to grant the people of D.C. full representation and sovereignty over their local laws.

Additionally, below are popular clips that discuss this issue in a modern (and humorous) context:

- Last Week Tonight With John Oliver: tinyurl.com/pgmzb23
- The Colbert Report, “Better Know a District”: tinyurl.com/pf2h3h2
- The Colbert Report, “DC Voting Rights Act”: tinyurl.com/ybu3s649

A Brief History:

September 17, 1787: The constitution is ratified at the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention. It provides for the creation of a national capital that would be separate from a state, because Delegates to the Convention wished to allow Congress to protect itself by endowing it with police power over this new federal District. Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 gives the U.S. Congress the power "to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such capital district."

1790: The site for the new capital district is selected, combining land from Maryland and Virginia to form the District of Columbia. Area residents continue to vote in, and even run for Congress from their former states.

February 27, 1801: Congress passes the Organic Act of 1801. This Act takes away the voting rights and representation that citizens had previously enjoyed. It divides the District into the counties of Washington (former Maryland area) and Alexandria (former Virginia area) and Congress assumes jurisdiction over the District of Columbia as a territory.

1846: Congress receives a request that the portion of the District of Columbia that had originally been part of Virginia be merged back into Virginia. The citizens of Alexandria Town, the State of Virginia, Congress, and the President approved of the decision to fragment George Washington’s original “ten-mile square.” The citizens of Alexandria County did not approve, but they were few in number. The residents of Washington City, Washington County, and Georgetown were not allowed to vote on the matter. Congress passes a law allowing this, and the DC residents living in the former Virginia portion of the District (about one-third of DC) now have their voting rights and representation restored.

April 16, 1862: Slavery in the federal district is abolished by passing the District of Columbia Compensated Emancipation Act, paying slave owners in the District of Columbia for their enslaved people to grant them freedom.
1888: Conservative newspaperman Theodore Noyes of The Washington Star launches campaign for congressional representation and strongly opposes real democracy. Noyes writes, "National representation for the capital community is not in the slightest degree inconsistent with control of the capital by the nation through Congress." Sen. Henry Blair of New Hampshire introduces the first resolution for a constitutional amendment for D.C. voting rights in Congress and in the Electoral College, which fails to pass.

1935: The California legislature passes a resolution recommending Congress amend the Constitution to grant D.C. representation in Congress.

1952: President Harry Truman states: "I strongly believe that the citizens of the District of Columbia are entitled to self-government. I have repeatedly recommended, and I again recommend, enactment of legislation to provide home rule for the District of Columbia. Local self-government is both the right and the responsibility of free men. The denial of self-government does not befit the National Capital of the world's largest and most powerful democracy. Not only is the lack of self-government an injustice to the people of the District of Columbia, but it imposes a needless burden on the Congress and it tends to controvert the principles for which this country stands before the world."

1961: The 23rd Amendment to the U.S. Constitution is ratified, granting DC residents the right to vote in U.S. Presidential elections for the first time ever. In spite of a population of over 700,000 people, the District is limited to the same number of electors as that of the smallest state. The amendment was opposed by all border and southern states, except Tennessee.

1964-1973: Military personnel from DC suffer more casualties in Vietnam than 10 other states.

December 24, 1973: Congress passes and President signs District of Columbia Self Government and Governmental Reorganization Act-a.k.a. the "Home Rule Act." It provides for a popularly elected mayor, 13-member Council with legislative authority over "all rightful subjects of legislation," with restrictions-prohibits taxing federal property, federal exemptions, or income of non-District residents who work in the District; changing height limitation for buildings; altering court system, or changing the criminal code until 1977, after which time any changes could be vetoed by single House of Congress. On all legislative acts of Council, Congress retains right to review and overturn if both houses vote within 30 legislative days. District budget requires approval of Congress and President. President appoints District judges from list of three nominees per position, provided by 7-member Judicial Nominating Commission. A "floating" federal payment for services and tax exempt status continued. In 1974, District citizens approved the partial home rule charter.

August 22, 1978: With overwhelming bipartisan support, both chambers of Congress pass the DC Voting Rights Constitutional Amendment, which would give District residents voting representation in the House and the Senate, by two-thirds majority in each chamber. The amendment will require 38 states to ratify it before it becomes effective. Congress places a seven-year time limit on ratification.

1980-1982: District electors approve the District of Columbia Statehood Constitutional Convention of 1979, which became DC law and which called for convening a state constitutional convention. After the constitutional convention in 1982, a Constitution for the State of New Columbia is ratified by District voters.

1985: The DC Voting Rights Constitutional Amendment fails, receiving 16 of the required 38 states for ratification.
November 22, 1993: The U.S. House of Representatives defeats H.R. 51, the DC Statehood Bill, on a vote of 277 - 153.

2000: By a vote of 2 - 1, a Federal appeals court rejects a case brought by residents of the District of Columbia to gain full voting representation in Congress. The U.S. Supreme Court declines to hear the case on appeal. The city of Washington, DC, adopts a new license plate motto Taxation Without representation to go on all newly printed license plates for vehicles.

March 23, 2001: The "No Taxation Without Representation Act of 2001" is introduced by Senator Joseph Lieberman (D-Conn.). The bill states that notwithstanding any other provision of law, the community of American citizens who are residents of the District constituting the seat of government of the United States shall have full voting representation in the Congress. The bill would also amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide a tax exemption to District of Columbia residents for years during which such residents do not have full voting representation in the Congress.

2006: United Nations’ Human Rights Committee finds DC’s lack of voting representation in Congress to violate the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights—a treaty ratified by more than 160 countries, including the US.

2007: Rep. Davis, Republican of VA. and Del. Norton introduce the District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act. It would provide a voting representative in the House for DC and allow for an additional House seat for Utah. It passes the House (H.R.1905). In September, in a procedural vote, a small group of Senators blocked the bill from being debated with a vote of 57 yeas - 42 neas. In order to overcome a filibuster, 60 votes are required. It is the first filibuster of voting rights legislation since the days of segregation.

February 26, 2009: The DC Voting Rights Act passed in the Senate, with a filibuster-proof majority of 61 votes the first time in 31 years, that a DC voting rights bill passed the Senate; but at the last minute, a gun amendment was attached to the bill that made progress in the 111th Congress impossible.

January 12, 2011: D.C. Delegate Eleanor Holmes Norton introduces H.R. 265, the New Columbia Admission Act. Over the course of the Congressional Session, 27 cosponsors are added.

April 11, 2011: DC Vote led unprecedented protests to defend and promote DC’s right to local control over local decisions. Forty-one (41) DC residents are arrested for protesting Congressional attacks on DC’s local budget.

January 2013: After a DC Vote-led petition, President Obama ordered the District’s Taxation Without Representation license plates be placed on the Presidential limousine.

November 8, 2016: District voters overwhelmingly vote for statehood with 87% (or 244,134) of those voting on the referendum approving it. By approving the referendum, the voters advise the D.C. Council to petition Congress to approve an admission act.

March 2, 2017: D.C. Delegate Eleanor Holmes Norton introduces HR. 1291, the Washington, D.C. Admission Act with a record setting 116 cosponsors. Mayor Muriel Bowser and D.C. Council Chairman Phil Mendelson deliver the Council’s formal petition for statehood to the Congress, as directed by the statehood referendum of November 8, 2016.

2018: The people of D.C. and their supporters across the country appeal to members of Congress to support the Washington DC Admission Act. In the House of Representatives, a record smashing 178 do so and 29 Senators.
Overview of Curriculum and Its Pathways

This curriculum sets your students ahead of most Americans
A nationwide poll in 2005 demonstrated that almost four-fifths of Americans expressed some level of ignorance regarding D.C.’s lack of congressional voting representation. Our country prides itself as the premier model of democracy, and yet the 700,000 residents of our nation’s capital are denied the right to fully participate in our representative democracy. Teachers across the country could change this by helping their students become more informed and learn about the options available for the District of Columbia. Residents of D.C. have struggled and fought for their voting rights for over two hundred years; this is why our struggle has been called one of the “original forms of voter suppression”. By implementing this ready-to-use curriculum, you can bring to the public’s attention what the DC League of Women Voters calls a hole in our democracy.

Online Access
Should you need to make any adjustments to this curriculum set to meet the needs of your classroom, please visit tinyurl.com/yagzyy49. If you do not already have a Gmail account, you will need to create one in order to complete the next steps. Once you are logged into your Gmail account and have entered the link, go to “File” and select “Make a copy”. This will allow you to make edits to the documents.

Curriculum Objectives
By the end of the lesson(s), students will be able to:

- explain the voting status of the District of Columbia and its effects on residents.
- evaluate several plans proposed to remedy D.C.’s lack of Congressional voting representation and justify which plan they support.

There are extension activities provided for both the middle school and the high school lesson plans. These extension activities provide students with opportunities to take informed action and go beyond the objectives listed above.

Course-specific topics that align with this curriculum

➢ Civics courses
  - Voting as a civic duty
  - Voting as the cornerstone of a democracy

➢ U.S. History
  - Social justice and the historical disenfranchisement of targeted communities
  - Voting rights expansion (*15th Amendment, 19th Amendment, 26th Amendment, Voting Rights Act of 1965*)

➢ U.S. Government
  - Voter suppression tactics
  - Effects of partisanship and polarization
Common Core Standards

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.WHST.6-8.2: Write informative/explanatory texts, including the narration of historical events, scientific procedures/ experiments, or technical processes.

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RH.6-8.2: Determine the central ideas or information of a primary or secondary source; provide an accurate summary of the source distinct from prior knowledge or opinions.

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RH.6-8.7: Integrate visual information (e.g., in charts, graphs, photographs, videos, or maps) with other information in print and digital texts.

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.WHST.9-10.1: Write arguments focused on discipline-specific content.

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RH.9-10.1: Cite specific textual evidence to support analysis of primary and secondary sources, attending to such features as the date and origin of the information.

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RH.9-10.9: Compare and contrast treatments of the same topic in several primary and secondary sources.

C3 Framework Standards

D1.2: Explain points of agreement and disagreement experts have about interpretations and applications of disciplinary concepts and ideas associated with a compelling question.

D2.Civ.2: Analyze the role of citizens in the U.S. political system, with attention to various theories of democracy, changes in Americans’ participation over time, and alternative models from other countries, past and present.

D2.Civ.4: Explain how the U.S. Constitution establishes a system of government that has powers, responsibilities, and limits that have changed over time and that are still contested.

D2.Civ.8: Evaluate social and political systems in different contexts, times, and places, that promote civic virtues and engagement.

D2.His.3: Use questions generated about individuals and groups to assess how the significance of their actions changes over time and is shaped by the historical context.

D4.1: Construct arguments using precise and knowledgeable claims, with evidence from multiple sources, while acknowledging counterclaims.
 approximate time needed: 55 minutes

Lesson objective(s):
By the end of class, students will be able to:
● explain the civic status of the people who live in the District of Columbia and its effects on them.
● evaluate several plans proposed to remedy D.C.’s lack of Congressional voting representation and lack of self-governance, and justify which plan they support.

Materials:
1. Pencil
2. The provided handouts can be given to students individually or as a packet:
   a. Washington, D.C Home to 700,000 People and Growing
   b. State versus Territory
   c. Weighing the Options for D.C.

ENGAGEMENT (5 minutes)
1. Give students “Washington, D.C. Home to 700,000 People and Growing” handout and ask a volunteer to read the ‘fun fact’ section.
2. Ask students to respond to the questions on their handout:
   a. Why have most people heard of Washington, D.C.? What makes this city special?
   b. Where on the map do you think D.C. is located? Use your pencil and draw a circle where you think it is.
3. After students have shared out their reasons for what makes D.C. special and their guesses regarding its precise location, clarify as needed:
   a. “Most people have heard of D.C. because it is our nation’s capital. This is where our President lives, and where the Representatives we elect to Congress work most days.”
   b. Show where D.C. is on the map, and clarify, “D.C. is located between Virginia and Maryland. Although it looks small on a map, it is home to over 700,000 people. That is more than all the people who live in the states of Wyoming or Vermont and almost as many as live in the big state of Alaska!”

EXPLORATION (15 minutes)
1. Inform students that although D.C. is our nation’s capital, it is not a state. Explain the difference between a state and a territory (i.e. A state has some independence and can make a lot of decisions by itself, but the national government has the final say over what happens in a territory).
2. Give the next handout to students, **State versus Territory**. Ask students to use the space provided and list all of the things they look forward to doing once they live on their own.
   a. Allow students two minutes to create their list, and one minute to share out.
3. Call on a student to read the first paragraph under the section, ‘Things citizens of DC Can’t Do’.
   a. Give students 3-5 minutes to read the list. Once students have finished, call on volunteers to summarize in their own words, the things citizens of D.C. cannot do.
   b. Have students underline the sentence that they think shows the ‘biggest’ or ‘most serious’ thing D.C. citizens are not allowed to do. Then, have them turn and talk with a partner to explain why they chose that sentence.

**EXPLANATION (5 minutes)**
1. Before moving on to the next phase of the lesson, check your students’ understanding. A suggested tactic for doing this is having students complete a Quick Write in response to the sentence starters below:
   a. *Why is D.C. treated differently?* D.C. is treated differently compared to states because...
   b. *What evidence is there that D.C. is treated differently?* An example of how D.C. is treated differently is...
2. Check on students as they complete their sentences. Encourage students to correct each other, and call on several students to model correct answers.

**ELABORATION (20 minutes)**
1. Using the handout, **Weighing the Options for D.C.**, students will read short summaries of different ways D.C. could gain more independence. After reading each summary, students will:
   a. Explain each plan in their own words, and then
   b. Determine which ‘right’ D.C. will gain if that plan was implemented: the right to creating its own laws, the right to create its own budget, or the right to have representation in Congress.

**EVALUATION (10 minutes)**
1. After students have completed the chart, ask:
   a. Which plan seems the easiest or most realistic?
   b. Which one would give D.C. the most independence?
   c. Do you think D.C. deserves more independence?
2. Students write a short paragraph demonstrating their learning from the lesson and evaluate the plans proposed.
   a. Writing prompt: *Explain the status of D.C. voting rights. Then, identify and justify which plan for D.C. you would advocate to others.*
Washington, D.C.- home to 700,000 people and growing

Fun facts:
- You can call this city: “Washington, D.C.”, “the District of Columbia”, “Washington”, or just “D.C.”. People who live there use all of these names for their city!
- Washington, D.C. is named after our country’s first president, George Washington. One of the reasons is because he helped picked the location of this city! His family’s crest was also used to create D.C’s unique flag (see image above).

Speaking of D.C.:
1) Why have most people heard of Washington, D.C.? What makes this city special?

2) Where on the map do you think D.C. is located? Use your pencil and draw a circle where you think this city is located.
State versus Territory

When I Live On My Own
What civic actions do adults in my community or state take? List things I will be able to decide or do once I am an adult:

1. 
2. 
3. 

Things the people of DC Can’t Do
Think about your list above. It is probably exciting to know that one day you will be able to make your own decisions, right? Unfortunately for people who call D.C. home, they feel like their city will never be allowed to ‘grow up’. Because it is a territory and not a state, there a lot of things D.C. people cannot do that people in states can.

Here are some of things that D.C. cannot do or does not have because it is a territory.

1. **D.C. does not have final say over its own laws:** Although D.C. has a mayor and a city council that can create laws, Congress and the President can reject these laws. In states, it is their legislature and their governor who get the final say over their laws. And if the people in those states don’t like what their legislature or governor does, they can vote them out. But D.C. can’t vote out the whole Congress; its treated differently because it is a territory and not a state.

2. **D.C. does not have the final say over how it spends its own money:** When you have a job, you pay taxes (give a portion of the money you earn) to the national government and your state or territory government. States use the money they earn from taxes to create programs that benefit their residents. It is the state legislatures and the governors who decide how this money is spent. The District of Columbia creates a plan for how it will spend the money it earned from taxes it collects, but Congress and the President can change D.C.’s plans and there is nothing DC can do about it.

3. **D.C. people do not get to have a voice in Congress:** Our national Congress is split into two groups: the Senate (members are called Senators) and the House of Representatives (members are called Representatives). Each state gets two Senators and a number of Representatives depending on the number of people that live in that state. For example, Wyoming has two Senators and only one Representative because it has a small population.

   Senators and Representatives make decisions that affect everyone, no matter what state or territory they live in. We fought a war, the Revolutionary War, to make sure Americans would be able to vote for the people that make decisions on their behalf. But D.C., even though it has a larger population than Wyoming, does not get any Senators nor any Representatives that can vote because D.C. is not a state. In other words, D.C. gets no say over any of the decisions Congress makes just because D.C. is considered a territory.
Doesn’t the Constitution Say There HAS to be a Federal District?

Yes, the Constitution requires that there be a Federal District. In each of the options below, a Federal District will still exist. The first two options will simply shrink the boundaries of the Federal District to include the Capitol Building, the White House, the Supreme Court and the federal museums called the Mall - all the things that people associate with our nation’s capital. The area surrounding this district, where people live, go to school, shop, worship, could become the area to be a state.

Weighing the Options For D.C.

Directions: Below are several plans that could be used to give D.C. independence. After you have read each plan, work with a partner to:

1. Summarize, in your own words, what actions the plan proposes.
2. Determine which ‘right’ D.C. will gain if that plan is chosen: the right to creating its own laws, the right to create its own budget, or the right to have voting representation in Congress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option Details</th>
<th>Summary of the actions proposed</th>
<th>Which ‘right’ will D.C. gain if this plan is used?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DC could become a state the same way all the other territories became states. DC voters already completed step one of this process by voting for statehood in 2016. The next step is the approval of Congress and the President. If D.C. was allowed statehood, it would grant the residents of D.C. and their government all of the same rights as any other state. This includes the right to have two Senators and the right to one Representative, all of whom would have voting rights in Congress. Congress would not be able to change DC’s local laws.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another plan is called “Retrocession to Maryland”. Many people do not know this, but the land that D.C. currently occupies today used to belong to Maryland. Maryland gave up the land to the national government so the capital could be created. (Virginia also gave land, but asked for it back and it was granted in 1846). Retrocession means to give back, so this plan proposes that the District of Columbia joins Maryland as a city within their state. A small portion land, such as the National Mall where the White House and the U.S. Capitol buildings are located, would remain as the federal enclave of the national government. If this is plan were accepted, D.C. would be treated like any other city within a state. Residents of D.C. would have to follow Maryland laws and pay taxes to Maryland, but they would get to vote for the MD Senators and Representatives who have a say in the national Congress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The third plan is to not change anything. Congress and the President would maintain control over D.C.’s laws and budget. D.C.’s Delegate to the House of Representatives would be allowed to be present during meetings, but would not be able to vote on any bills or other matters of importance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Middle School Extension Activities**

Below are several options you can use as enrichment activities after students have completed the lesson. All options require students to take informed action and demonstrate their learning in a meaningful way.

**Option 1: Presenting to Family Members**
Students create a 30 second “elevator pitch” speech to explain to their family members how D.C. lacks independence and the three plans that could address this issue. Students create these pitches in class and practice on one another. Students give feedback to each other on their pitches (*You did a good job when.... You could improve your pitch by....*).

For homework, students are asked to deliver their pitches to at least two family members. Each family member should record what they learned and the plan they would support, and the students report out this information in class the next school day. The teacher can capture this information on the whiteboard or on flip chart paper. Based on the data collected, students can create arguments for why one plan was more popular than others among their family members.

**Option 2: Creating a Class Campaign**
Students lead a class discussion and go more in-depth about the merits of each plan. The class then votes which plan they would collectively support and create a list of ways they could make people in their communities more aware of this issue. Students can either group themselves by the strategy they think would work best, or the class can vote again on one singular strategy to employ. Students should be given time in class to create their campaign and then determine how they will track the campaign/be able to evaluate its effectiveness in getting out the message.

**Option 3: Writing to Senator or Representative**
Students are given the contact information for their two U.S. Senators and their member in the U.S. House of Representatives. Students select one of these elected officials to whom they will write a letter or email. In their chosen method of communication, students should include an explanation of the current voting status of D.C. and a detailed argument for the plan they are lobbying their representative to support.

For additional resources on finding elected officials and tips for helping students write to their representatives, please visit [https://www.apa.org/advocacy/guide/letter-email.aspx](https://www.apa.org/advocacy/guide/letter-email.aspx).
High School Option A: One-Day 5E Lesson Plan

Note: The lesson below has been adapted from the original DC Public Schools 12th grade curriculum to create a 70-minute lesson. Should you be able to dedicate more time to this topic, please explore the original four-day module in this curriculum set.

Approximate time needed: 70 minutes

Lesson objective(s):
By the end of class, students will be able to:
- explain the voting status of the citizens of the District of Columbia and its effects on residents.
- evaluate several plans proposed to remedy D.C.’s lack of congressional voting representation and lack of full sovereignty and justify which plan they support.

Materials:
- See, Think, Wonder
- Understanding D.C.’s Lack of Voting Rights
- Plans for D.C.
- Plans for D.C. Source Packet

ENGAGEMENT (10 minutes)
1. Display the following prompt: Democracy means that citizens have the right to vote.
   a. Then ask students to choose two of the following questions to respond to in their notes:
      i. Which groups of people did not have the right to vote when our country was founded but are able to vote now?
      ii. Who still isn’t able to vote?
      iii. Do you think a country should be called a democracy if everyone cannot vote or does not have a representative in legislative body?
   b. Allow several minutes for discussion and encourage students to respond to each other’s comments rather than just reporting their answers to you.
2. Display the image from the See, Think, Wonder and then give the handout to the students. and questions. Ask students to complete the following stems “I see ... I think ... I wonder...” on their handout.
3. Once students have completed their sentence stems, ask:
   a. What questions come up?
   b. If students do not pose the question themselves, guide the class to talk about the possible meaning of “bringing democracy home?”. Possible follow up questions:
      i. “Is democracy missing?”
      ii. “Which place or location is the poster referring to? Which image leads us to this understanding?”
4. This should lead toward a transition. Mention that there has historically been a question about the presence of democracy in DC, and the rest of the lesson will explore why.

1. Handout copies of **Understanding D.C.’s Lack of Voting Rights**, and allow 2-3 minutes for students to independently respond to the questions in Step 1.
   a. Ask for a volunteer to share out their response for their first question.
   b. For the second question, display a map of the United States and show students the location of D.C. Explain to students: “Washington, D.C. was not the nation’s capital until 1801 and it did not even exist until about decade prior to that. The state governments of Maryland and Virginia, plus landowners, agreed to give the federal government some of their land to create the District of Columbia. However, D.C. as it exists today is only the land Mayland gave as Virginia took back their land in 1846.”

2. For Step 2, students will watch a clip from Last Week Tonight with John Oliver. This video is very powerful but has a few moments with adult language. You can find this video easily on YouTube or by using this link: tinyurl.com/pgmzb23. As students are watching the clips, they should take notes on Oliver’s claim and evidence as presented in the clips.

3. To ensure your students do not hear any inappropriate language or jojes, air the video but only the minutes listed here: 00:00-1:40, 2:11 – 8:30, 8:50 – 10:00, 10:20 – 15:22. To be safe, pre-watch the video in its entirety and see what you are comfortable airing for your classroom.

4. After students have finished the video and the reflection questions, ask:
   i. “What information from this video surprised you?”
   ii. “What would you find to be the most upsetting to deal with if you were a resident of Washington, D.C.?”
   iii. “Relate the information from this video back to the poster we examined at the beginning of class. What do you think the poster was used for?”

**EXPLANATION (25 minutes)**

1. Place students in groups of four. Handout copies of the **Plans for DC and Plans for DC Source Packet**.
2. Model for students how to complete the chart, using Plan #1. Use a Think-Aloud approach or have students share out how they analyzed the sources in order to identify the actions of the plan itself, its advantages and disadvantages.
3. In their groups, students should select different plans to study (jigsaw reading) and spend 10-15 minutes independently reading and recording their notes on their **Plans for DC** handout.

**ELABORATION (12 minutes)**

1. Students will take turns in their groups presenting to one another about the plan they read about and helping their group members complete the **Plans for DC** chart.
   a. Once students have finished in their groups, ask them to rank the plans- 1 being the best plan, and 6 being the worst plan.
2. After students have completed the chart, ask:
   a. Which plan seems the easiest or most realistic?
   b. Which one would give D.C. the most independence?
   c. Do you think D.C. deserves more independence?
EVALUATION (5 minutes)
1. Students independently complete the “Conclusion” portion at the end of the Plans for DC handout.
See, Think, Wonder

Name: ___________________________ Date: ____________ Period: ____________

**Washington, D.C. and Its Voting Status**

**Instructions:** Examine the photo and then complete the sentence starters below it. After you have finished, jot down questions you have.

What do you see in the image? I see ...

What do you think the point is of this image? I think ...

What do you wonder about after looking at this image? I wonder ...

What questions does the image make you ask? Jot them down.
Understanding D.C.’s Lack of Voting Rights

Step 1: Answer the questions below using your prior knowledge.

1. Why have most people heard of Washington, D.C.? What makes this city special?

2. Where on the map do you think D.C. is located? Use your pencil and draw a circle where you think this city is located.

Step 2: Answer the questions below as you watch the video clip.

1. What does D.C. “lack”?

2. What does Congress have control over in regards to D.C.?

3. Identify at least two different pieces of evidence John Oliver gives to support the argument that D.C. should be given more autonomy and/or voting representation in Congress?

Step 3: Reflect on the information from the video and then respond to the question below.
In your personal opinion, does denying the people of D.C. voting representation in Congress go against the principles of democracy? Why or why not?
### Plans for D.C.

**Name:**

**Date:**

**Pd:**

**Day 2: Options for Changing D.C.'s lack of voting representation in Congress**

*Remember, currently D.C.'s Delegate to the House of Representatives cannot vote and the legislation and budgets proposed by DC City Government can be rejected by the House Oversight Committee, or defunded by any member of Congress.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>How it would work?</th>
<th>What changes are involved?</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Drawbacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Statehood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Retrocession to Maryland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Virtual Statehood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>How it would work? What changes are involved?</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Drawbacks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:</td>
<td>Vote in Maryland elections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:</td>
<td>DC as Congressional district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:</td>
<td>No Change to DC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusions**

1. If I were a resident of D.C., I would want Plan # ___ because

2. I think that we _________ (should/ shouldn’t) take action on this issue because
Plans for D.C. Source Packet

Plan #1: Statehood

Source 1 for Statehood Plan: CRS Report RL33830
All previous territories were granted statehood by a simple majority vote in the House and the Senate and the approval of the President. However, according to some scholars, the District’s unique status raises constitutional questions about the use of this statutory method to achieve statehood. It could be argued that the granting of statehood for the District would violate Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, which gives Congress exclusive legislative control of the District. Because of these constitutional issues, some argue the best path to statehood is through the constitutional amendment process.

Granting statehood to the District of Columbia would settle the question of congressional representation for District residents. A ratified constitutional amendment granting statehood to the District would entitle the District to full voting representation in Congress. As citizens of a state, District residents would elect two Senators and at least one Representative, depending on population.

Source 2 for Statehood Plan: DC Gazette, 1970
Statehood is a clear, just and attainable goal to which District residents can aspire. Unlike the ambiguities of "home rule" -- whose home rule? Lyndon Johnson’s, Richard Nixon’s, Channing Phillips’? David Carliner’s? Joseph Tydings’? The Washington Post’s? -- statehood is a concept whose prerogatives and privileges are easily understood. Statehood means nothing more nor less than what Wyoming, Rhode Island, Delaware, or any of the states smaller and larger than the District enjoy. When Alaska became a state, Congress declared that it was "admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the other States in all respects whatever." That’s what we should demand: equal footing, not some more benevolent form of colonialism foisted off as "home rule." In the old days, when Congress admitted new states, it put it even more gracefully and accurately.

The states were declared a "new and entire member of the United States of America."

The District has never been an entire member of the United States of America. It is the indentured servant of the nation. Our goal must be simple and clear: the US must let us in.

It can be done. In fact, it can be done more directly and more simply than all the tortured meanderings proposed by those who claim to have a pragmatic vision of the District’s future. It can be done without constitutional amendment, requiring only two legislative acts on the part of Congress to accomplish the prime objective:

First, redefine the District. The Constitution does give Congress exclusive legislative jurisdiction over the District. But it does not define the District other than to restrict it to not more than ten square miles. At the time the city became the seat of the government, it contained a mere 14,000 residents, whom Madison assured in the Federalist Papers "will of
course be allowed” a municipal legislature “for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages.” On this land sprung a metropolis of three-quarters of a million, as large as all the New England states in 1800 combined, excluding Massachusetts. Only the peculiar perversity of the congressional mind has led to the conclusion that the framers of the Constitution expected Congress to exercise total control over, and deny franchise to, a population equal to five of the 13 original colonies. If John McMillan and Joel Broyhill had been around then, pushing such a scandalous suggestion, the Union might never had made it past Philadelphia.

But we need not continue the debate on the intent of the forefathers. We can swiftly correct the ill effects of their vagueness by redefining the District (perhaps to a narrow strip running from the White House to the Capitol) over which avaricious national legislators can exercise their domain, and the rest of the city shall be evermore free of the curse of Article I, Section 8.

The initial exercise, therefore, is to force Congress to restrict the size of the District, and to declare the rest of the city the Territory of Columbia, or whatever other name we would wish.

Second: Admit the city as a state. A constitutional convention should be called to draw up a plan for statehood. An interim government must also be elected, with or without the acquiescence of the national administration and Congress, in order to provide to provide a body with a mandate to represent the city-territory in the difficult days prior to statehood. This can be no overnight operation for the benefit of the evening news. We must avoid the errors of our unwanted masters and begin in the neighborhoods. The specifications of freedom must sprout from the communities.

Once the neighborhoods have defined their needs and goals and elected their leaders, the constitutional convention can proceed to draw up a state constitution and apply to Congress for membership in the Union. By mere majority vote, Congress can grant that admission.
Plan #2: Retrocession to Maryland

Source 1 for Retrocession Plan: *Letter to the Editor, Washington Post*³

The District has been talking for years about statehood. A better idea would be to retrocede the land to Maryland. There is precedent for this: The portion of the nation’s capital ceded by Virginia in 1790 was retroceded in 1846.

Many consider the land area and population of the District to be too small to make a viable state. Retrocession would give the citizens of the District all the political rights that other Americans enjoy. The District could be incorporated by the state in a manner similar to Baltimore, giving citizens home rule, including the election of a city council and mayor.

Some Marylanders object to retrocession in the belief that it would fundamentally change the political landscape of Maryland. But the effect would be much smaller than that of making a state out of what was once a small portion of Prince George’s County, creating an entity with the power to counteract the will of Marylanders. If Maryland passes on its opportunity to regain the land ceded, it will regret it. And to repurpose the land without the express permission of the people of Maryland would be a betrayal of trust.

Maryland should petition to have the land comprising the District returned to Maryland. If the people or the federal government no longer want it for the purposes of its donation, it should be returned to Maryland with costs paid by the federal government.


It could have been a big moment: a congressional hearing room packed in such numbers that an overflow room was needed to accommodate the audience; a moment two decades in the making; an issue that had the support of President Obama.

But when only two senators showed up last month for the first congressional hearing since 1994 on the idea of making the District of Columbia its own state, it brought home that the event was more about what was not happening than what was. With Republicans on the verge of deepening their hold on the House — and perhaps taking over the Senate as well — advocates for D.C. statehood showed up in force despite the certainty that the hopes for statehood that had flourished with Mr. Obama’s election had hit a brick wall. The two senators who bothered to appear were Senator Tom Carper, the Democrat who sponsored the bill, and Senator Tom Coburn, a Republican, who showed up only to denounce it...

...Dreams are sometimes deferred, other times modified. Bills in both chambers would give D.C. autonomy over its own budget — something Congress now controls — and there is a modest movement afoot to send D.C. back to Maryland — known as retrocession — which would leave just the federal area of D.C. its own place. Maryland would get more representation, more revenue and would likely be able to charge Virginia commuters a tax.


“We see nothing but positives for D.C. to rejoin Maryland as a unique, home-rule city like Baltimore,” said John Forster, a spokesman for the Committee for the Capital City. “We believe strongly that a new state from D.C. will not happen.”

Less than thrilled are the people of Maryland. “I do not support retrocession,” said Representative Steny H. Hoyer, Democrat of Maryland and the minority whip, in an email. He added: “I will continue to work to give D.C. residents the full voice in government they deserve.”

This is something less than a burning issue for the American people, whose view of Washington is dim to begin with. “My suspicion is that most Americans don’t understand this issue,” Mr. Young said. “When you talk to tourists here in town, they are shocked when you tell them the district has no voting in Congress. But in two seconds Marion Barry gets brought up,” he said, referring to the infamous former mayor. “By that logic, why is Chicago part of the United States?”
Plan #3: Virtual Statehood

Source for Virtual Statehood Plan: *CRS Report RL33830*

Much of the latest thinking on securing voting rights for citizens of the District centers on the premise that Congress has the power to define the District as a state for the purpose of granting voting representation. Proponents of virtual statehood note that the District is routinely identified as a state for the purpose of intergovernmental grant transfers, that Congress’ authority to define the District as a state under other provisions of the Constitution has withstood Court challenges, and that Congress has passed legislation allowing citizens of the United States residing outside the country to vote in congressional elections in their last state of residence. They also note that the Constitution gives Congress exclusive legislative control over the affairs of the District and thus the power to define the District as a state.

Opponents argue that the District lacks the essential elements of statehood, principally an autonomous state legislature, charged with setting the time, place and manner for holding congressional elections.

During the 109th Congress Delegate Eleanor Holmes Norton and Senator Joseph Lieberman introduced identical bills in the House and Senate (H.R. 398/S. 195: No Taxation Without Representation Act of 2005) that would have treated the District as a state for the purpose of congressional representation. In addition, the bill would have

1) given the District one Representative with full voting rights until the next reapportionment;
2) granted full voting representation to District citizens, allowing them the right to elect two Senators, and as many Representatives as the District would be entitled to based on its population following reapportionment;
3) permanently increased the size of the House from 435 to 436 for the purpose of future reapportionment.

The proposal raised several questions, chief among them, whether Congress has the legal authority to give voting representation to District residents. The bill differed significantly from the other measures introduced in during the 109th Congress. H.R. 398 would have provided citizens of the District with voting representation in both the House and the Senate, unlike the other measures which would provide representation only in the House.

---

Plan #4: Vote in Maryland Elections

Source 1 for Maryland Election Plan: CRS Report RL33830

Short of retroceding all or a portion of the District to Maryland, [another] option would allow District residents to be treated as citizens of Maryland for the purpose of voting in federal elections. Such an arrangement would allow District residents to vote as residents of Maryland in elections for the House of Representatives, and to have their vote counted in the election of the two Senators from Maryland. This semi-retrocession arrangement would allow District residents to be considered inhabitants of Maryland for the purpose of determining eligibility to serve as a member of the House of Representatives or the Senate, but would not change their status regarding Congress’ exclusive legislative authority over the affairs of the District.

The idea of semi-retrocession is reminiscent of the arrangement that existed between 1790 to 1800, the ten-year period between the creation and occupation of the District as the national capital. During this period residents of District residing on the respective Maryland and Virginia sides of the territory were allowed to vote in national elections as citizens of their respective states and in fact voted in the 1800 presidential election...

...On March 6, 1990, Representative Stanford Parris introduced H.R. 4193, the National Capital Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1990. The bill would have given District residents the right to cast ballots in congressional elections as if they were residents of Maryland. It also would have maintained the District’s governmental structure, and was offered “as a workable way to change the [status quo] which represents taxation without representation” and as an alternative to a statehood measure, H.R. 51, introduced by Delegate Walter E. Fauntroy of the District of Columbia.

In defending the proposal, Representative Parris noted his opposition to statehood for the District and offered this explanation of his proposal in a letter published in the Washington Post on March 18, 1990.

This approach would allow the government of the District to remain autonomous from the Maryland state government. D.C. residents would continue to vote for a mayor and a city council, and would not participate in Maryland elections for state positions such as delegate, state senator and governor. The reason for this is the constitutional mandate that the nation’s capital remain under the exclusive legislative jurisdiction of Congress.

There is an important distinction between this action and the Voting Rights Constitutional Amendment proposed in 1978. That action, rejected by the states, called for the election of members of Congress from the District. It did not, as my proposal does, elect those members as part of the Maryland delegation. There is also a distinction between this and proposals simply to turn the District over to Maryland [retrocession].

---
With my proposal, there is no need to delineate the federal enclave, and there would not be a requirement to obtain the approval of the Maryland legislature...

I take this action because the current injustice should be corrected, and this proposal is the only one that takes into account the constitutional limitations on statehood and the compelling case to restore voting rights in national elections to District residents.

Source 2 for Maryland Election Plan: Center for Washington Area Studies 2009 Report

If, instead, the District is treated for the purposes of federal elections in Maryland just like any other city or county in the nation, then two questions arise. First, what will be the size of Maryland delegation? Second, how will Maryland draw its new congressional district lines now that the District is included?

...Currently, Maryland has eight representatives to the House. Will adding the District add members to this delegation? To keep the discussion reasonably simple I will stick to 2000 census numbers and pretend that electoral retrocession occurred at the start of the current decade. All the points hold for 2010 or 2020 dependent on the population growth of Maryland and the District relative to the nation. Based on 2000 numbers a Maryland/District hybrid has a population of 5,868,545. (This is the sum of the District of Columbia and Maryland populations.)

The crucial point here is that adding District voters to Maryland yields an increase in Maryland’s delegation size and does not dilute Maryland voters. Under this scenario the state gains a seat and average district size drops. Crucially, however, how much Maryland’s delegation increases (or decreases) over time would depend on the population growth of Maryland and the District relative to the rest of the United States.

This is a serious question. While Maryland ranked twenty-third among states in population growth between 1990 and 2000, the District continued to lose population during that period. (No other state lost population during the 1990-2000 decade. The District has seen some growth during the current decade.) Extrapolating from the Census Bureau’s 2007 population estimates, it does appear that a Maryland/District hybrid gets nine seats under the 2010 census-based apportionment with a House of 435 seats.

The next question then becomes how would the Maryland state legislature draw its district lines to create these nine seats? Precisely answering this hypothetical is obviously impossible, but a few things are clear. First, some or all District voters will be grouped with Maryland voters. The District will be either parsed among two or more congressional districts or some part of Maryland will join an intact District. The one person, one vote requirement allows little variation in intra-state district size...

...Arguably, splitting Washington, D.C. more or less equally across two congressional districts helps the District by effectively doubling its representation in the House. What the District wants to avoid, however, is dispersal across so many congressional districts that the voter impact on any given seat is small and thus the influence of Washington voters diluted.

Then there are partisan considerations. Maryland is a heavily Democratic state. The General Assembly is majority Democratic. Usually the state elects Democratic governors and the current two U.S. senators from Maryland are Democrats. District voters vote even more reliably Democratic than Maryland voters...

---

Plan #5: D.C. as a Congressional District

Source for Congressional District Plan: Slate, 2009

If the measure [to give D.C.’s delegate to the House of Representatives voting rights] passes, there’s a good chance the Supreme Court will strike it down as unconstitutional. But Congress should still pass and President Obama should still sign the District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act of 2009 as a major step toward ending the “taxation without representation” of D.C. residents.

Supporters of D.C. voting rights have pushed for years to get a bill like this through Congress. (D.C. residents already have a delegate, Eleanor Holmes Norton, who can serve on committees but when it counts can’t vote on final bills.) The district’s supporters came close in 2007 with a measure that also would have created a new congressional seat for Utah (which was next in line among the states, given congressional reapportionment earlier this decade). Despite this neat attempt at partisan balance (a Democrat for D.C., a Republican for Utah), Republicans filibustered the measure after a threatened veto by President George W. Bush. Things are different this time. President Barack Obama co-sponsored the 2007 version of the bill, and the current one in the Senate is worded identically. There’s a chance supporters can muster 60 votes in the Senate to defeat a filibuster.

If that political battle is won, the war will shift to the courts, where it faces uncertain prospects. The constitutional claim against the D.C. Voting Rights Act is that Congress lacks the power to create a new congressional seat for the district. There’s a strong textual argument for this position, advanced by George Washington University law professor Jonathan Turley and others. Article I, Section 2 of the Constitution provides that “[t]he House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several states …” and there’s no question that Washington, D.C., is not a state. Congress cannot amend the Constitution through ordinary legislation simply by calling D.C. a “state,” and therefore the D.C. act is ostensibly unconstitutional. Supporters like Turley have backed up their arguments with extensive historical analysis based on the Framers’ intent in giving the District of Columbia its odd status.

Perhaps surprisingly, some conservative heavy hitters (who tend to favor textualist and originalist interpretations of the Constitution) nonetheless have come out in favor of the constitutionality of the measure. Ken Starr has argued that Article I elsewhere, in what’s called the District Clause, authorizes House representation for the district by providing that “[t]he Congress shall have power … to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever” over the District of Columbia. Professor Viet Dinh, who worked as an assistant attorney general in the Bush administration, has made similar arguments that Congress’ power under this Clause is plenary, and he backs it up with his own analysis of the Framers’ intent.

The debate also centers on an obscure 1949 Supreme Court case, National Mutual Insurance Co. v. Tidewater Transfer Co. Tidewater considered the constitutionality of a 1940 congressional statute, which provided that federal courts should consider residents of Washington, D.C., as coming from “states” for purposes of “diversity jurisdiction.” (That’s the legal framework that allows federal courts to hear cases arising under state law when a resident of one state sues the

---

resident of another.) In a fractured decision, the Supreme Court upheld the 1940 law, despite an earlier 1805 Supreme Court ruling holding that D.C. residents could not be considered residents of states for diversity jurisdiction purposes.

Three of the justices in the majority in Tidewater relied on Article I’s District Clause in reaching their conclusion, and supporters of the current D.C. voting rights legislation say Tidewater supports their position that Congress, broadly speaking, has the power to treat D.C. as a state. Opponents counter that there was no majority opinion in Tidewater and that even the three justices who relied on the District Clause would have found the current voting rights legislation unconstitutional. These justices “took pains to note the limited aspect of their holding” as not extending to fundamental rights. The nonpartisan and well-respected Congressional Research Service read Tidewater this way in a 2007 report, noting that at least six of the Tidewater justices “authored opinions rejecting the proposition that Congress’s power under the District Clause was sufficient to effectuate structural changes in federal government” and suggesting that perhaps all nine justices would have agreed on the unconstitutionality of the D.C. bill.

If the current D.C. voting rights law is indeed unconstitutional, then the only way to get D.C. a full House member is the way that gave district residents the right to vote for president: a constitutional amendment that would either make D.C. a state, give it a member of Congress (and possibly two senators) without making it a state, or merge D.C. back into a neighboring state, such as Maryland. But constitutional amendments are extremely difficult to pass, requiring a vote of two-thirds of Congress and three-fourths of the states. With a country preoccupied by the most serious economic troubles of our lifetimes and two wars, voting rights for D.C. is not at the top of the list. Despite broad public support for some form of voting rights for D.C., the forces of inertia are strong.

This is precisely why Congress should pass the current law, even if it is likely to be struck down by the Supreme Court. Rejection by the court would put the issue on the front burner. Obama could then push for quick passage of a constitutional amendment in Congress and the states. He could remind people that many of our most important advances to voting rights have come through constitutional amendment, including enfranchisement of African-Americans, women, 18-year-olds, D.C. residents (in presidential elections), and those too poor to pay a poll tax to vote in federal elections.

The lack of voting rights for residents of Washington, D.C., is an example of what law professors call “constitutional stupidities.” Given this country’s commitment to equal voting rights for all, there’s no legitimate policy reason to deny congressional representation to the District’s residents. If that’s right, then the only argument I can see against a vote for the D.C. bill is that it could be viewed as violating the oath taken by members of Congress and the president to uphold the Constitution. But with legitimate arguments by credible legal scholars in favor of the bill, the constitutional question is not settled. Members of Congress can vote for D.C. voting rights in good conscience. Then we’ll see what happens next.
High School Option B: Multi-Day Module

Note: Each lesson below is designed to take approximately 70 minutes of class time.

Day 1 Overview: Students will explore what makes D.C. different in comparison to the fifty states of America.

Day 2 Overview: Students will examine the five plans proposed in recent history to address D.C.’s lack of congressional representation.

Day 3 Overview: In a town hall simulation or seminar, students will discuss which plan for D.C. they support and will construct a thesis statement at the end of the lesson.

Day 4 Overview: Students will draft a letter or email to an elected representative to inform and persuade the representative to support one of the plans for D.C.
Day 1

Approximate time needed: 70 minutes

Lesson objective(s):
By the end of class, students will be able to:
- analyze a series of sources in order to determine the nature of Washington, DC’s unique relationship with the federal government.

Materials:
- See, Think, Wonder
- Close Read of Article I, Section 8, Clause 17
- Teacher’s Copy- Close Read of Article I, Section 8, Clause 17
- Understanding D.C.’s Lack of Voting Rights (Option A)
  - John Oliver Clip *(Accompanies Option A only)*
- Understanding D.C.’s Lack of Voting Rights (Option B)
  - Washington 101 Reading *(Accompanies Option B only)*

ENGAGEMENT (8 minutes)
1. Display the image from the See, Think, Wonder and then give the handout to the students. Ask students to complete the following stems “I see ... I think ... I wonder...” on their handout.
2. Once students have completed their sentence stems, ask:
   - c. What questions come up?
   - d. If students do not pose the question themselves, guide the class to talk about the possible meaning of “bringing democracy home?”. Possible follow up questions:
     - i. “Is democracy missing?”
     - ii. “Which place or location is the poster referring to? Which image leads us to this understanding?”
3. This should lead toward a transition. Mention that there has historically been a question about the presence of democracy in DC, and the rest of the lesson will explore why.
   - a. Display a map of America and show students where D.C. is located if using Option B instead of Option A for the Understanding D.C.’s Lack of Voting Rights activity.

EXPLORATION (5 minutes)
1. Explain to students that the origins of D.C. and its unique status in America stems from the U.S. Constitution.
2. Give students the Close Read- Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 handout
   - a. Ask for volunteers to complete the sentence stems under “Step 1”.
3. Give students two minutes read the text once without marking it up. During their second read, ask students to circle words that they do not recognize or are preventing them from understanding the text. Provide students with synonyms or short definitions as they share out.
EXPLANATION (25 minutes)

1. Using your Teacher’s Copy of the Close Read- Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, lead students through the guided questions. Below is a suggested protocol for each question:
   a. Allow students 30 seconds to process the question
   b. Have students turn and talk with an elbow partner
   c. Cold call on a different student each time to share out their answer. Encourage students to correct each other if incorrect information or incorrect inferences are given.

ELABORATION (30 minutes)

1. Explain to students that although the Constitution is over 200 years old, that one sentence in the Constitution has lasting effects on the residents of the District of Columbia.
2. Before the lesson, decide which activity would be most suitable for your students and your classroom.
   a. If using Option A of Understanding D.C.’s Lack of Voting Rights, allow students one minute to independently complete Step 1.
      i. For Step 2, students will watch a clip from Last Week Tonight with John Oliver. This video is very powerful but has a few moments with adult language. You can find this video easily on YouTube or by using this link: tinyurl.com/pgmzb23. As students are watching the clips, they should take notes on Oliver’s claim and evidence as presented in the clips.
      ii. To ensure your students do not hear any inappropriate language or jojes, air the video but only the minutes listed here: 00:00-1:40, 2:11 – 8:30, 8:50 – 10:00, 10:20 – 15:22. To be safe, pre-watch the video in its entirety and see what you are comfortable airing for your classroom.
      iii. After students have finished the video and the reflection questions, ask:
           a. “What information from this video surprised you?”
           b. “What would you find to be the most upsetting to deal with if you were a resident of Washington, D.C.?”
           c. “Relate the information from this video back to the poster we examined at the beginning of class. What do you think the poster was used for?”
   b. If using Option B of Understanding D.C.’s Lack of Voting Rights, assign students to groups of two, and then give each student a copy of the handout plus the Washington 101 Reading packet. The partners will complete a jigsaw read, and each person will record information from their reading that pertains to the questions on the chart. The assigned sections for the jigsaw read are:
      i. Self-Governance and Congressional Representation (p. 100-110)
      ii. Race and Racial Politics, Budget Politics, and Conclusion (p.110-118)
   c. Students will need approximately 15-18 minutes to complete their assigned reading, and another 5-7 minutes to teach each other and complete their charts together.
   d. When most students have finished, ask:
      i. “What information from this reading surprised you?”
      ii. “What would you find to be the most upsetting to deal with if you were a resident of Washington, D.C.?”
      iii. “Relate the information from this text back to the poster we examined at the beginning of class. What do you think the poster was used for?”
EVALUATION (7 minutes)

1. To assess their learning today, have students copy and complete the sentence starters below:
   a. D.C. is....
   b. D.C. is not...
   c. D.C. does not have...
   d. I think D.C. ____________ (should / should not) be given more rights because....
See, Think, Wonder

Name: | Date: | Period: | Day 1: Introduction to D.C.

Instructions: Examine the photo and then complete the sentence starters below it. After you have finished, jot down questions you have.

What do you see in the image? I see ...

What do you think the point is of this image? I think ...

What do you wonder about after looking at this image? I wonder ...

What questions does the image make you ask? Jot them down.
Close Read- Article I, Section 8, Clause 17

Step 1: Complete the sentences below to show your understanding of the document we are discussing.

● The purpose of the U.S. Constitution is _______________________________________________________

● Article I of the U.S. Constitution discusses the powers of Congress. Congress is the group of people who _____________________________________________________________

Step 2: Read the text along with your teacher. When your teacher asks you questions about the text, write your responses in the space provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text under Discussion</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Student Understandings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by cession of particular states, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the state in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings;--</td>
<td>Exclusive- total, absolute Exceeding- going over Cession- give up, forfeit Erection- to build</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TEACHER’S COPY
Close Read- Article I, Section 8, Clause 17

Step 1: Complete the sentences below to show your understanding of the document we are discussing.

● The purpose of the U.S. Constitution is ________________________________________________________

● Article I of the U.S. Constitution discusses the powers of Congress. Congress is the group of people who___________________________________________________________________________________________

Step 2: Read the text along with your teacher. When your teacher asks you questions about the text, write your responses in the space provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text under Discussion</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Student Understandings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To exercise *exclusive* legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District (not *exceeding* ten miles square) as may, by *cession* of particular states, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the state in which the same shall be, for the *erection* of forts, *magazines*, * arsenals*, dockyards, and other needful buildings;-- | *Exclusive*- total, absolute  
*Exceeding*- going over  
*Cession*- give up, forfeit  
*Erection*- to build  
*Magazines*- place to store ammunition  
*Arsenals*- weapons store | Teacher Directions
1. Read aloud the text to the students as they follow along.
2. Students re-read the text silently to themselves. Students should be encouraged to identify any words that are keeping them from understanding the meaning of the text.
3. Pose the following text-dependent questions to the students:
   a. The clause begins with “to exercise exclusive legislation”. Who is the Constitution referring to when mentioning this power?
   b. What does it mean to have the power to “exercise exclusive legislation”?
   c. Who will Congress have this power over?
4. Based on your understanding of this text, how does this document define the relationship between Congress and the Capital city?
Understanding D.C.’s Lack of Voting Rights (Option A)

Step 1: Answer the questions below using your prior knowledge.

3. Why have most people heard of Washington, D.C.? What makes this city special?

4. Where on the map do you think D.C. is located? Use your pencil and draw a circle where you think this city is located.

Step 2: Answer the questions below as you watch the video clip.

4. What does D.C. “lack”?

5. What does Congress have control over in regards to D.C.?

6. Identify at least two different pieces of evidence John Oliver gives to support the argument that D.C. should be given more autonomy and/or voting representation in Congress?

Step 3: Reflect on the information from the video and then respond to the question below.
In your personal opinion, does denying D.C. voting representation in Congress go against the principles of democracy? Why or why not?
Understanding D.C.’s Lack of Voting Rights (Option B)

Name: Date: Period: Day 1: Introduction to D.C.

Instructions: In small groups, read pages 101-118 of Washington 101 and discuss and answer the following questions. Be sure to annotate the document as you read - circle words that you are unclear about or unfamiliar with and underline AND number information that answers the question. When you are finished, provide a three-sentence summary of the reading.

Terms that are unclear/unfamiliar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Evidence/Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What are some reasons that Congress interferes with DC’s degree of local governance and representation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What are some of the ways in which Congress has asserted its constitutional authority over DC?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What are the consequences of Congress’ influence over local politics?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of reading:
CHAPTER 7
Home Rule, Race, and Revenue: The Local Politics of Washington

Washington, D.C., the center of national politics, also has a politics all its own. As in any city, Washington's local politics can be quite complex; community leaders, the local media, businesses, unions, churches, and government officials competing and cooperating to make policy for a diverse citizenry. But three central, enduring, and interconnected elements of Washington explain much of its local politics and make those politics unique. The first is D.C.'s lack of full self-governance and representation in Congress. The second is the influence of African Americans and racial attitudes and identity in determining city affairs. The third is the significant constraints on the city's ability to raise and spend revenue. In this chapter, we examine each of these themes in detail and the ways they distinguish Washington, D.C., from other American cities.

Self-Governance and Congressional Representation
The United States may consider itself a beacon of democracy, but in its own capital city that beacon shines but dimly. The absence in Washington, D.C., of two cornerstones of democratic rule—full self-governance and federal representation—serves as a rallying cry for its inhabitants, a limit on the governing authority of its elected leaders, and an opportunity for the federal government to shape city policy.

Take first Washington's lack of full self-governance. To be sure, like any other American city, the capital has a system of local government. There is a mayor who serves a four-year term and a city council of thirteen members also elected to four-year terms. Together they draft, consider, and enact local laws and an annual budget. To further empower neighborhoods, the city government includes Advisory Neighborhood Commissions (ANCs), elected
groups responsible for conveying concerns and suggestions from areas of the city to the mayor and city council. Furthermore, with no separate county government to deal with, D.C.’s local politicians have more autonomy and less bureaucratic entanglements than their compatriots in other urban places.\footnote{1}

However, while the arrival of local government to Washington in 1794 was touted as “home rule” for the city, it is home rule of a very limited sort, for Congress retained the explicit power to have the final say on all local laws and the city’s budget. In fact, the District of Columbia is the only place in America named in the U.S. Constitution for which Congress is given the right “to exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever.”\footnote{2} Congress has been far more eager and willing to use that authority than the few national legislatures of other countries with similar powers over their capitals.\footnote{3} Table 7.1 lists a sample of the many kinds of policies—ranging from abortion to the hours of operation of a local swimming pool—over which Congress has used its power to make or change city laws.

The second major issue particular to D.C. politics is apparent to anyone who has seen a Washington, D.C., license plate. Unlike the mottos on other state plates—“The Silver State,” “Sunshine State,” “The First State”—the slogan on Washington’s is far more provocative: “Taxation Without Representation.” Introduced in 2000 to replace the inauspicious motto “Celebrate and Discover,” it succinctly captures a long-standing grievance of the city: its lack of representation within the national government. Washingtonians can vote for president, but their city has no senators and is represented by a single delegate in the House of Representatives with limited voting rights. (There are two non-voting “shadow” senators and one non-voting “shadow” representative elected by the district, whose sole job is to advocate for making D.C. a state.)\footnote{4} Whereas the citizens of other American cities elect U.S. senators and House members with full voting power, plus state legislators who “can link up with their counterparts in the state legislature to protect their political interests,” Washingtonians cannot. City residents are denied all but a whisper of influence within the institution that controls its fate, and the observation of an early nineteenth-century Washingtonian still holds true: “Every member [of Congress] takes care of the needs of his constituents, but we are the constituents of no one.”\footnote{5} In fact, Washington is the sole capital of a federal government whose residents do not have full representation in that government.

What explains the curious absence of political autonomy in and representative democracy for the nation’s capital? Writing a few years before Washington was founded, James Madison argued that the reasons for Congress’s absolute authority over the District of Columbia were self-evident: it kept the national government free from undue influence by the city or state in which the capital resided, and “public improvements” to the city would be “too great a public pledge to be left in the hands of a single State.” But Madison did not suggest that congressional authority should translate into a lack of self-governance or representation for D.C. residents. When a state surrendered its land to create the federal district, he predicted, it would “no doubt provide in the compact for the rights and the consent of the citizens inhabiting” that territory, and Madison confidently declared that the future city’s residents “will of course” have “a municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages.” Nor did Madison advocate a lack of representation in Congress for city residents.\footnote{6}

Madison’s confidence that there would be democracy for the district was misplaced, however. In 1790, when Virginia and Maryland offered portions of their territory to create the new ten-mile square federal district along the Potomac, both states insisted that their (now former) residents should be represented in Congress and retain their suffrage and other state rights, and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Examples (Dates)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abortion</td>
<td>* No federal funds may be spent on abortion (1979–present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay Rights</td>
<td>* No federal or local funds may be spent to implement city law granting rights to same-sex couples (1992–2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbying Congress</td>
<td>* No funds may be spent to lobby Congress for statehood/voting representation in Congress (1998–2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lottery</td>
<td>* Advertising of lottery prohibited on public transportation (1981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Marijuana</td>
<td>* No funds may be spent to implement city law legalizing medical marijuana (1998–2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needle Exchange Program</td>
<td>* No federal funds may be spent to give clean needles to drug addicts (1998–2008, 2011–present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* No local funds may be spent to give clean needles to drug addicts (1998–2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi Cabs</td>
<td>* Use of meters in taxis banned (1974–1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>* Swimming pool at local high school must be closed after 9:00 p.m. (1974)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Spending on “test borings and soil investigations” capped at a fixed amount (1974–1982)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Portion of street to be renamed Ronald Reagan Place (1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Referendum must be held to decide whether to establish death penalty (1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Capitol Hill firehouse must be kept open (1986–1993)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Congress complied. But when the district was officially turned into a federal territory ten years later, no right to participate in federal elections was explicitly granted to its inhabitants—a "historical accident," in the opinion of two legal scholars. Residents of D.C. could not vote for president until 1964 and, except for a brief period in the 1870s, had no representation in Congress until 1970. And though Washingtonians were able to elect at least some members of city government for the first seven decades of the city's existence, in 1874 Congress replaced Washington's locally elected government with a three-member board of commissioners appointed by the president, a board made permanent in 1878 (see table 7.2). For the following nine decades, the only people allowed to govern the district besides the president and congressmen were the city's three appointed commissioners, with informal influence held by members of the (white) business community through its Board of Trade organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Enactment</th>
<th>City Governance</th>
<th>Representation in National Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Three commissioners</td>
<td>Citizens retain representation in Congress, right to vote in national elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801</td>
<td>Mayor (appointed by president), city council (elected), upper chamber (appointed by council)</td>
<td>Citizens lose representation in Congress, right to vote in national elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802</td>
<td>Mayor (elected), city council (elected), upper chamber (appointed by council)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1804</td>
<td>Upper chamber made elected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812</td>
<td>Mayor (elected), Board of Alderman (elected), city council (elected)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>Mayor elected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Governor (appointed by president), city council (appointed by president), House of Delegates (elected)</td>
<td>City given an elected (non-voting) delegate to U.S. House of Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Temporary board of three commissioners (appointed by president)</td>
<td>House delegate eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Board made permanent</td>
<td>Right to cast ballots for president in electoral college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Mayor-commissioner (appointed by president), city council (appointed by president)</td>
<td>City given an elected (non-voting) delegate to U.S. House of Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Board of Education (elected)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Mayor (elected), city council (elected), neighborhood commissions (elected)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Right for citizens to put initiatives, referenda on ballot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Financial control board established with power over certain city operations</td>
<td>Voting rights eliminated for U.S. House delegate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Financial control board disbanded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Financial control board disbanded</td>
<td>Voting rights eliminated for U.S. House delegate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Financial control board disbanded</td>
<td>Voting rights eliminated for U.S. House delegate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Financial control board disbanded</td>
<td>Voting rights eliminated for U.S. House delegate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 7.2 Changed to City's Internal Governance and Representation in National Government, 1802–2011

It took many decades of lobbying by city residents and political leaders before Washingtonians were granted a measure of home rule and national representation in the 1960s and 1970s. But Washington was denied all but limited representation in Congress and less-than-complete independence. The president and Congress reserved the power to appoint all of the city's judges; Congress was allowed to overturn any local law within thirty days; and the House and Senate were permitted to modify or add restrictions to Washington's annual budget. As a result, more than a few observers have suggested that Congress resembles a colonial power with respect to the District of Columbia, ruling it with near absolute authority.
Throughout its history, then, Washington, D.C., has occasionally been allocated some degree of local governance and representation in Congress, but never as much as other cities, and it has often had none at all (see Table 7.2). The degree of governance and representation allocated to Washington has often been the result of party politics in Congress. When city residents voted reliably Republican in the early 1870s, for instance, it was a Republican-controlled Congress that gave the city its first ever delegate to the House of Representatives, a position the Republican Senate tried to restore in 1878, but Democrats, who by then controlled the House, would not. Today, with Washingtonians voting almost entirely Democratic, the position of the two parties has reversed. Democrats in the House expanded the D.C. delegate's voting rights when they led the chamber in 1993 and 2009, which Republicans reversed when they took over the House in 1995 and 2011.

At least until recently, a second reason Congress has tinkered with Washingtonians’ democratic rights and representation is race. After the Civil War, the city's black population had grown significantly, and antislavery Republicans in Congress stood behind local governance and the right of blacks to vote in Washington. But local whites were rarely supportive of black enfranchisement, and, as Republican lawmakers increasingly lost their passion for pursuing racial equality, Congress withdrew that support, temporarily eliminating local government in 1874. Washington's budgetary problems confirmed “widespread assumptions about the incapacity of black men to responsibly use their newfound political power.” When the Democratic Party—representing white supremacy and the former slave-holding South—won control of the House in November of that year, they were happy to put a permanent end to suffrage in the one-third African American city, and did so in 1878. Even though it cost them their own voting rights, many of Washington’s whites supported this move to rob African Americans of political power. Later, during the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s, racially progressive congressmen believed that supporting self-governance for Washington, with a large and growing black population, would be “as much a vote against White supremacy as it was a vote for District autonomy.”

Meanwhile, Southern segregationist Democrats in Congress strongly resisted all efforts to grant self-government and federal representation to the city, despite the tendency of urban voters and African Americans to vote Democratic. As late as 1972, one Southern Democratic congressman openly worried that home rule meant “Black Muslims” would rule D.C.

One explanation that Congress has given for eliminating or limiting local governance is Washington’s fiscal health. In 1871, the House and Senate voted to get rid of the city’s elected mayorality and one of its two legislative chambers following reports of fraud and deficit spending by city officials. All local government was abolished in 1874 in the wake of a widely publicized congressional investigation that revealed corruption and gross overspending under the city leadership of Alexander “Boss” Shepherd (vice chair of the city’s Board of Public Works from 1871 to 1873 and territorial governor from 1873 to 1874); Democrats were also emphasizing good government in their quest to win that year’s elections. After weathering two scandals in those years, ending city government altogether seemed to many citizens the solution of an otherwise impossible situation,” and the “depth of conviction” that Washington could not manage money responsibly “would linger on for the next eighty years.” History repeated itself in 1995 when the city’s government, crippled by shrinking revenues and spiraling expenses, was forced by Congress to surrender some of its powers to a presidentially appointed control board. Some congressmen may push for these limits on local democracy because they genuinely “don’t want to see the District fall apart on their watch,” as one congressional aide put it. But often these problems—which are hardly unique to Washington, D.C.—are used to justify denying self-government to the capital for other, less noble motives.

Finally, and perhaps most fundamentally, Congress does not grant Washington greater self-governance or representation because lawmakers like having the power to influence city policy. It is an old temptation that goes back at least as far as the 1830s, when Jacksonian Democrats in Congress took the liberty of “intervening in local affairs, mainly disputes over the financing of capital projects.” Some lawmakers—and presidents, for that matter—have interfered out of genuine concern with the welfare of the city, and, as Madison observed, the national government has an inherent interest in ensuring it can conduct its business in the capital. In the first several decades of the nineteenth century, annual presidential addresses often contained a plea to Congress to fund internal improvements in Washington, and President Ulysses Grant (1868–1877) was particularly tenacious in advocating for local development projects. But legislators act out of more selfish motives too. Before the establishment of local government in 1974, members of Congress’s D.C. committees appointed friends to positions in city government, and some even used inside information about future projects to enrich themselves. Congressmen have also been known to act purely out of spite. One allegedly pledged to vote against the city’s budget when his car was towed away, while another proposed revoking D.C. autonomy completely after his complaints about potholes on a bridge had gone unanswered. Then there are lawmakers from neighboring states who try to shape city laws to help their own constituents at Washington’s expense. The city’s first convention center, constructed in the early 1980s, was built smaller than intended, in part because legislators representing Maryland feared a bigger center would compete with a similar facility in their state. The shrunken D.C. convention center was soon dwarfed by centers built in other cities and was demolished two decades later.
Presidents and members of Congress also like the opportunity to impose their own, their party's, or their constituents' ideological preferences on the city. History offers plentiful examples. Deeply opposed to the institution of slavery, Republicans eliminated it in the district in 1862 over the opposition of many whites in Washington. Anti-liquor activists in Congress banned all liquor sales in the district in 1917, two years before national prohibition. President Harry Truman used his authority to expand the rights of blacks in the city, part of his push for the Democratic Party to embrace civil rights.\footnote{23} President Kennedy's secretary of the interior, Stewart Udall, gave an ultimatum to the Washington Redskins, the last all-white professional football team: draft black players or face eviction from your stadium. Richard Nixon, a conservative law-and-order president, pushed for a strong anti-crime bill limiting the rights of criminal suspects in the city. Today Congress routinely adds language to the city's budget bill banning funds for abortion and needle exchange programs (see table 4.1), and a recent bill to give the city's delegate in the House full voting rights was delayed when Republicans amended it to require that the district repeal its handgun laws.\footnote{24}

Many of these efforts are charitably described as "tests" or "experiments" of national policy on a smaller scale. More frequently, they constitute cynical moves to win support from like-minded voters in home districts or from interest groups who see the district "as a model for the states."\footnote{25} But sometimes they reflect the interests of certain groups within the city who, unable to win at the local level, appeal to Congress instead. When in 1981 Congress overturned city law legalizing sodomy, Washington clergy were among those who had lobbied for Congress to do so. Congressional Republicans reinstated a voucher program in 2011 that allowed district students to go to private schools, pointing to polls showing the program was popular in the city even if it was opposed by local elected leaders.\footnote{26}

The disproportionate influence of Congress over the district has had three consequences for the city's local politics. First, it forces D.C. officials to cultivate good relations with members of Congress and consider their policy preferences before enacting new laws, lest Congress retaliate by overturning those laws or otherwise making their lives difficult. As former lobbyist for the city Julius W. Hobson, Jr., put it, "We live in a goldfish bowl, surrounded by members of Congress." In 1989, for example, the city opted not to enact a strict gun control ordinance when a congressman threatened to invalidate it. More recently, Mayor Vincent Grey assiduously courted key congressmen who, despite being from the opposite party, would later prove to be supporters of greater autonomy for the district.\footnote{27}

Second, greater independence for the district is a powerful and perennial political cause in the city. Local groups, such as DC Vote, Committee for the Capital City, and Stand Up for Democracy, organize letter-writing campaigns, coordinate public demonstrations, distribute lawn signs, and sponsor other activities on behalf of more autonomy and representation for the city (see figure 7.1). Unsurprisingly, it is "a mantra for every elected official" to make D.C. its own state because it can "always serve as a rallying cry by satisfying emotional needs as well as promising long-denied fundamental political rights."\footnote{28} Local elected officials have occasionally gone further than mere rhetoric: Mayor Vincent Gray, for example, was among those arrested in April 2011 during a protest on Capitol Hill after Congress agreed to a federal budget that put limits on the city's ability to pay for abortions.\footnote{29}

The third effect of the city's relationship with Congress—a result of the second and somewhat at odds with the first—is that local leaders can gain political points for being perceived as standing up against Capitol Hill.\footnote{30} This is especially true when Congress is haughty, arrogant, or paternalistic toward the district—be it the 1980s congressman who boldly declared that "we are the local government here"; the congressional lawmaker who announced that residents who want more independence "can move to Maryland or Virginia"; or the representative who warned that "we gave it [home rule], and we can take it away." One district politician who benefited as much as anyone from...
this perception of congressional arrogance was Marion Barry, Washington’s
time African American “mayor for life,” who in many ways personified
black politics in the city from the mid-1970s to the mid-1990s. Barry is a
remarkable character and, in many ways, an icon of city politics: charismatic,
flamboyant, and often divisive, as Mayor Barry was able to win reelection
even in the face of controversies surrounding his governance of the city and
his own personal peccadilloes—in part by rallying the support of Washing-
tonians disgruntled by their treatment from Congress. Asked why he voted for
Barry as mayor in 1994 despite Barry’s conviction and imprisonment for
drug possession—an election which Barry won—one resident explained that
by doing so he would “at least send somebody up there where they [congress-
men] won’t push around.”

Mayor Barry was, in fact, generally cautious about challenging Congress, aware
of its power over the district. His criticisms of Capitol Hill were usually
guarded, and he frequently sought common ground with congressional law-
makers. But Barry did sometimes use racial language to rally for personal
support. (“I’m not going to be lynched,” he proclaimed in the face of a federal
probe into accusations of drug use.) He also occasionally voiced complaints
that tapped into a deeper fear—widely shared by black voters at the time—that the (predominantly white) Congress might try to “etale” the city. This
brings up the second important element of Washington’s politics (which we
also touch upon in more detail in the next chapter): the importance of race.

Race and Racial Politics

Washington has always had a significant, at times influential, African Ameri-
can population. Benjamin Banneker, an assistant to Pierre L’Enfant’s chief
surveyor Andrew Ellicott, was a free black man who lived in nearby Mary-
land, and in the decades leading up to the Civil War the city’s freedmen
population was one of the largest in the country, though it had little political
influence and often suffered considerable discrimination. With the war and
the end of slavery, Washington’s black population grew from 18 to 33 percent
of the city’s residents, and congressional Republicans gave them the right
to vote in 1866. African Americans began winning seats in the local legislature,
participated actively in Republican “ward clubs” and political parades, and
helped pass citywide antidiscrimination laws.

Their political influence disappeared, however, when the district lost its
ability to elect its own government or representatives to Congress in 1874,
leaving power in the hands of those white elites who had the resources and
connections (including members of the Board of Trade) to influence Con-
gress informally. Washington’s blacks tried to exercise influence through

nongovernmental organizations such as the National Association for the
Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), which opened its D.C. branch
in 1913; the D.C. Federation of Civic Associations, founded in 1921;
and the Washington Urban League, established in 1938. But racism and
discrimination were major impediments to black empowerment. Even worse,
the chairman of the congressional committees who oversaw the district were
usually racist white Southern Democrats. They included Sen. Theodore Bilbo
(MS), who once complained about a “black cloud” of African American gov-
ernment workers, and Rep. Ross Collins (MS), who explained that he could
not support funds for a D.C. school for impoverished black girls because “my
constituents wouldn’t stand for spending money on niggers.”

The political equation finally began to change for African Americans in
Washington (and in other cities) with a major influx of Southern blacks to
the North after World War II and the wave of civil rights activism that fol-
lowed. When Washington became the first non-Southern city to become
majority black in the 1950s, “the issue of District voting rights became fused
with the cause of civil rights.” The number of African Americans in positions
of power in D.C. slowly grew. In 1961, President John F. Kennedy named the
first black commissioner of Washington, and six years later President Lyndon
Johnson appointed an African American, Walter Washington, to be the city’s
first mayor in nearly a century. Meanwhile, people from around the country
were coming to D.C. to fight for home rule, including a young Marion Barry,
whose activism became the basis for his rise to power. Another local leader
and future D.C. delegate to the U.S. House, Walter Fauntroy, took advantage
of newly registered blacks in the district of Rep. John McMillan (D-SC)—an
opponent of home rule with authority over district affairs—and led a cam-
paign that ousted McMillan in a 1972 primary election. When Congress first
allowed the city to elect its own school board in 1968, seven of the board’s
eleven seats were won by African Americans, and after Washington, D.C.,
was finally granted home rule in 1973, black candidates often won, and have
continued to win, local elected office.

If it is still true, as political scientist Michael Dawson wrote in the 1990s,
that “African-American politics, including political behavior, is differ-
ent,” how does Washington’s large, black population uniquely shape the city’s
politics? For one thing, because blacks vote overwhelmingly for Demo-
crats, liberal candidates have a huge advantage in local elections. So too do
black candidates, given that African Americans have traditionally been more
inclined to vote for blacks running for office—a consequence of their higher
“group consciousness” that mimics the self-perception and voting behavior of
ethnic urban voters of the past. This strong group identity may also
make black voters highly loyal to, and thus more hesitant to criticize, African
American officials. Leaders like Marion Barry have in turn been accused of exploiting this race consciousness in order to "rally black voters to their side in reelection campaigns."37

In the city's early decades after home rule, the twin legacies of racial discrimination and Congress's dominance over city affairs reinforced some of these race-oriented political tendencies. Without a tradition of local governance, some argued that D.C. residents—particularly African Americans who had recently migrated from a repressive South—suffered from an underdeveloped democratic culture and a lack of community spirit. This in turn may have contributed to a blind faith in city leaders, even those embroiled in accusations of incompetence or corruption such as Mayor Barry. In the 1980s, many in the city's black community came to believe in "the Plan"—a rumored conspiratorial effort by whites to retake control of Washington— which reinforced loyalty to African American office holders and a perception that persecuted leaders like Barry were "yet another link in a long chain of black leaders systematically discredited by racist law enforcement officials." The economic and social problems that were especially prevalent among the city's poor blacks, another unfortunate legacy of racial discrimination, may have helped Barry win elections, especially in his later, more troubled years in office. After being caught on videotape smoking crack cocaine in 1990, some speculated that Barry retained the allegiance of black voters who "had experienced falls similar to Barry's."38

However, the voting patterns of city blacks and electoral successes of Washington's African American politicians cannot be explained by skin color alone. For one thing, city residents, regardless of their ethnicity, have voted most loyally for elected leaders who provide them with concrete goods. Barry followed a long-standing tradition of "ethnic" mayors of the past, in cities like New York and Boston, who distributed benefits and services to voters from the same racial or ethnic background and won their support in the process. He provided city jobs to African Americans, sponsored a summer work program for youths (both black and nonblack), brought libraries and trash collection to previously neglected African American neighborhoods, and secured city contracts for minority-run companies.39 By contrast, a more recent African American D.C. mayor, Adrian Fenty, lost his reelection in 2010, in part by hiring nonblack candidates to leadership posts in city government; and allowing his controversial school administrator, Michelle Rhee, to fire a large number of (mostly African American) teachers.40

Political skills also matter a great deal. "City politics is a sweaty contact sport," as two D.C. reporters once aptly observed, and candidates like Barry and Fenty won citywide election by being open, accessible, and friendly with everyone. One former city official put it this way: "Marion Barry was the ultimate politician ... and that man knew everybody." Barry was particularly good at building connections with key Washingtonians, especially church leaders in the African American community who could sway large blocs of voters. He famously called himself "a situationist," able to modify his rhetoric and positions depending on the audience and the political context, and he was masterful at converting former enemies to his side. Victorious candidates do not simply expect their ethnic background to deliver them to office; they must also be able to fund and organize an effective election campaign, as Barry, Fenty, and other successful local politicians in the past did remarkably well.41

Nor is race either a consistent or predominant dividing line among city voters. Figure 7.2 shows the percentage of the vote received by the winning mayoral candidate in selected primary elections from two city wards: Ward 3, which is predominantly white, and Ward 8, which is predominantly black. In 2006 Adrian Fenty did well in both wards, and in his first run for mayor in 1978 Marion Barry actually received more of the vote from Ward 3 than from Ward 8. Income is another, often overlapping political cleavage in the city. Ward 3 is wealthy as well as white, whereas Ward 8 is the city's poorest ward.42 In some D.C. mayoral elections, the winning black candidate has lost support from wealthier voters, irrespective of race.43

![Figure 7.2 Percent of Vote Reached by Winning Mayoral Candidate in Wards 3 and 8, Selected Primaries](image-url)
Finally, racial politics in Washington and other cities have changed and continue to change. Barry was part of a generation of black "civil rights" mayors elected in the 1960s and 1970s that focused on steering jobs and patronage to African American voters and targeting police brutality. But his successors, Anthony Williams (1999–2007) and Fenty (2007–2011), were from a new cohort of "technocratic" black mayors who had also emerged in cities like Newark, Cleveland, and Atlanta "promising to de-emphasize race, promote efficient government, and offer strategies to lure investors to strengthen downtown businesses and create jobs."44

Budget Politics

Cities face two basic political challenges related to money: where to get it and how best to spend it. Washington, D.C., is no different than any other city when it comes to the second problem. Every year, different groups, interests, and government agencies compete for limited dollars to pay for schools, roads, police, garbage collection, and a host of other city functions and entities. Most of these services are both essential and expensive, and many are dedicated to the nation's neediest—its poor, sick, unemployed, and homeless—who are usually concentrated in urban places.45 If a city can raise more money, of course, this challenge can be alleviated, if not avoided. But Washington not only faces the same limitations in raising revenue as do other American cities but has additional constraints that further complicate its budget politics and reinforce Congress's power to dictate city policy.

A strong local economy brings with it thriving companies and educated, tax-paying citizens—and thus more revenue—so not surprisingly, "cities constantly seek to upgrade their economic standing." But cities compete against each other for wealth, and all depend on the state of the national and international economy, over which they have virtually no influence, for success. Furthermore, they usually cannot tax urban property owned by the state or federal government, and by one estimate between four and five times as much tax-exempt property exists in cities as it does outside them. Meanwhile, those who use urban services often commute from the suburbs and thus have no taxable property within city limits. As a result, cities are forced to rely on funding from state coffers and revenue sources such as user fees and taxes on local sales that are "extremely sensitive to variations in the economy," as two urban scholars note. For this reason, writes political scientist Paul Peterson, "city politics is limited politics."46

Peterson's description fits Washington, D.C., to a tee. Though the federal government is a large and well-funded employer in the capital, it also owns a lot of city territory that cannot be taxed.47 The greater D.C. metropolitan area is home to over five million people—one of the most populous in the country—but over 80 percent of them live outside the city's borders and pay income taxes in other states. Even worse, Congress prohibits Washington from imposing a commuter tax (a prohibition staunchly supported by representatives from Maryland and Virginia), while other American cities often collect taxes from workers who live in different states. Washington's local leaders have thus faced the same, if not a greater, challenge to find sources of revenue as officials in other cities have, to the point that they may at times sacrifice the interests of D.C.'s poorer residents in order to entice developers to invest in the district.48

The nation's capital has an additional burden related to budgetary politics: its fixed boundaries. In 1890, the district was geographically larger (68 square miles) than such cities as New York (44 square miles), Baltimore (30 square miles), Los Angeles (29 square miles), and Detroit (22 square miles). However, as other American cities grew to absorb outer towns and unincorporated areas, D.C.'s borders remained set by the Constitution and federal law. After four decades, Washington was still 68 square miles, whereas Baltimore's size had more than doubled (to 79 square miles). Detroit and New York had expanded six-fold (to 138 and 259 square miles, respectively), and Los Angeles had grown fifteen-fold (to 440 square miles). These and other cities eventually faced resistance to additional growth from suburban communities, but by then Washington was already far behind in geographic size.49 Ranked 110th in square mileage among all American cities in the year 2000 with at least 100,000 in population, Washington is forced to operate with relatively little space to house new tax-paying residents and companies.

Thus, D.C. could not even dream of redrawing its borders to recapture the many Washingtonians who moved away after World War II. Americans moved away from plenty of urban places, thanks to cheap suburban housing, ease of driving, and "white flight." Though the exodus was steeper and financially more onerous to government coffers in other cities, Washington's local leaders could still nod their heads in agreement when Philadelphia mayor Richardson Dilworth famously warned in the 1950s that "the suburbs are becoming a white noose strangling the cities." With desegregation, "white flight" soon turned into "wealth flight," as blacks fled to the suburbs as well. In 1970, more people lived in suburbs than in cities for the first time in U.S. history, and D.C.'s population had fallen more than 5 percent from its peak of 800,000 two decades before. By the year 2000, only 570,000 people lived in D.C.50 Other cities facing the same decline in population could, at least in theory, turn to their states to meet their funding needs, but D.C. had no state government to turn to.

This inability to keep, let alone expand, a large population of tax-paying residents exacerbates political conflicts among different interest groups
competing for a piece of the same shrinking budgetary pie. It also pits Washington against its neighboring states that benefit from growing D.C. suburbs, and it ensures that collecting money from commuters remains high on the city's political agenda. And it exacerbates the often-difficult relationship between the city and Congress: for while Washington is the only American city to have consistently received supplemental funding from Congress, that aid comes with significant strings attached.

The U.S. Congress has been willing to intervene in district affairs almost from the very beginning; but, when it began providing significant funding for the city in the 1870s, “taxpayers of the United States were to consider the District budget and administration as no mere local question.” Congress usually exercises its influence over city policy through D.C.’s annual spending bills—bills that must be passed for the city to have any budget at all, let alone supplemental dollars from the federal government. That control, and the city’s dependence on Congress’s largess, was codified in Washington’s 1973 Home Rule Charter, which explicitly barred the capital from collecting revenue from certain sources, including commuters and government property.\footnote{As a result, the city has to impose higher taxes than the typical state, though in comparison to the average city its tax rates are fairly low.} Further hampering Washington, D.C.’s ability to attract new investments is Congress’s more-than-occasional reluctance to actively serve as city “booster,” especially in comparison to how other states treat their cities. Commitment by the national government to fund Washington’s needs has waxed and waned over the course of history.\footnote{To be sure, federal investment in museums, the Metro, and other attractions and infrastructure projects has helped the capital tremendously. And Congress has been willing from time to time to rescue Washington from bankruptcy, financial mismanagement, and desperately needed improvements to its infrastructure. The 1874 and 1995 budgetary crises that hit the city were resolved when Congress provided Washington with monetary support. But keep in mind that these crises were also followed by Congress taking away some or all of the city’s political independence. In both cases, it is telling that many Washington residents were willing to give up their political power in part because they hoped that Congress would provide economic stability to D.C.\footnote{In this way, Washington’s fiscal problems are inexorably tied to the power of Congress and the city’s ability to rule itself.} Home rule, race, and budgetary conflicts help explain a great deal of Washington’s local politics. Of course, there are other important features of the local political scene. Voters care about jobs and crime, for example, and elected officials who fail to do enough about either may face punishment at the polls.\footnote{Another, more unfortunate feature that deserves mention is the occasional case of corruption and government mismanagement. Though hardly unique to Washington, political corruption is especially problematic for the city, because many see the capital as representative of the nation and because the failings of African American city leaders may play into existing racial biases.} Corruption and criminal misbehavior became a particularly troubling feature of local politics under Mayor Marion Barry. Stories of gross incompetence and poor governance tarnished the city’s reputation: city ambulances, which became lost while answering emergency calls, failing to get patients to hospitals before they died; an understaffed and overworked police force battling drug-related urban violence; and chronic failures to distribute proper housing and educational services to the city’s neediest residents.\footnote{However, it would be wrong to assume that Barry’s departure meant an end to city corruption. In 2012, city councilman Harry Thomas, Jr. was convicted of embezzling funds from the city; council chair Kwame Brown resigned amid charges of fraud; scandal-plagued councilman Michael Brown lost reelection; and Mayor Vincent Gray was plagued by ongoing allegations of illegal campaign activity. It is a sad reminder that the potential for corruption is always present, irrespective of who is in office.} Whether the future of district politics? Perhaps the development with the biggest potential to dramatically alter the city’s political life is the decline in the percentage of blacks in the city. The 2010 census put the percentage at just a hair above 50 percent, and though D.C.’s white population is growing, there has also been a gradual rise in the Asian and Latino population. Many Washington blacks fear that this may end their political influence, or at least force members of the African American community to join forces with like-minded members of other ethnic groups if they want to continue to shape city affairs. One early sign that changing demographics—both in race and in age—may change the city’s electoral politics appeared in a special election for city council in April 2013. Though the incumbent black candidate won, a little-known white candidate and self-described reformer named Elissa Silverman did surprisingly well, losing by only five points and garnering significant support not only among Caucasian voters but younger black D.C. voters too.\footnote{Though this trend suggests that racial and ethnic politics could change in Washington, D.C., any shift in the city’s budget politics, home rule, or congressional representation seems far more remote. The district has no foreseeable new sources of revenue to draw from, and Congress has every incentive...}
to maintain its influence over city affairs. Attempts to pass a law or amend the Constitution to give the district voting representation in Congress or even convert it into a full-fledged state have also failed. In April 2013 city voters did overwhelmingly approve a referendum allowing Washington to pass its own annual budget without Congress's approval, but its constitutionality was in doubt. One study showed that people endorse D.C. independence when they perceive the city to be economically stable and well-governed; but even so, national support for city statehood has never been high. It would most likely take a nationwide, grassroots campaign to convince American citizens—and, by extension, their representatives in Congress—to fundamentally change the status quo. Until then, as one scholar put it, the city will likely remain "mere plankton in the political sea."
Day 2

**Approximate time needed:** 70 minutes

**Lesson objective(s):**
By the end of class, students will be able to:
- Cite evidence in order to justify their evaluation of voting representation alternatives for DC residents.

**Materials:**
- Warm Up Activity
- Plans for D.C.
- Plans for D.C. Source Packet

**ENGAGEMENT (7 minutes)**
1. Students review the content of the previous by completing the **Warm Up Activity**.
   a. After 3-4 minutes, ask for volunteers to share their responses to the third question.
   b. If students do not offer a variety of opinions, you may want to use the questions below to spark further discussion:
      i. Why do you think D.C. has been denied voting representation in Congress for over 200 years?
      ii. Who would support D.C. receiving more rights? Who would be opposed to this? Why?

**EXPLORATION (5 minutes)**
1. Pose the following discussion to students. Allow students thirty seconds to reflect, and then have them Turn and Talk to a partner to share their responses:
   a. Do you think that DC’s lack of voting representation in Congress is a major issue? Why or why not?
   b. If you had the power to do so, how would you fix this problem? What do you think the options are?
   c. If you don’t think it is a problem, what issue would you focus on instead?
      i. Pay close attention to which students feel that this issue is not worthy of fixing. To keep these students engaged throughout the module, find opportunities for them to share their opinion while using the text(s) and other sources to support their conclusions.
2. Call on several students to share out their solutions to the whole group. Record their solutions on the board and/or flip chart paper for reference later in the lesson.

**EXPLANATION (30 minutes)**
1. Place students in groups of four. Handout copies of the **Plans for DC and Plans for DC Source Packet**.
2. Model for students how to complete the chart, using Plan #1. Use a Think-Aloud approach or have students share out how they analyzed the sources in order to identify the actions of the plan itself, its advantages and disadvantages.
3. In their groups, students should select different plans to study (jigsaw reading) and spend 10-15 minutes independently reading and recording their notes on their **Plans for DC** handout.
### ELABORATION (23 minutes)
1. Students will take turns in their groups presenting to one another about the plan they read about and helping their group members complete the **Plans for DC** chart.
2. Once students have finished presenting in their groups, ask the class to review their initial class list of solutions. Ask them:
   a. Which of your solutions were presented among the five plans reviewed today?
   b. Did your opinion/preferred solution change after learning about these other plans? Why or why not?
   c. Which plan do you think most residents of D.C. would prefer? Congress? Other states?

### EVALUATION (5 minutes)
1. Students complete the two reflection statements under the “Conclusions” section of the **Plans for D.C.** handout.
Warm Up Activity

1. Look at the picture of the license plate above. According to the license plate, what is D.C.’s motto?

2. Why would D.C. choose this motto? Give an explanation that incorporates at least one piece of evidence from our last lesson.

3. Can America still call itself a democracy if representation in Congress is not afforded to all citizens? Why or why not?
# Plans for D.C.

**Directions:** Read each option for addressing D.C.’s lack of voting representation in Congress. Remember, currently D.C.’s delegate to the House of Representatives cannot vote and the legislation and budgets proposed by DC City Government can be rejected by the House Oversight Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>How it would work?</th>
<th>What changes are involved?</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Drawbacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statehood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrocession to Maryland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual Statehood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>How it would work? What changes are involved?</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Drawbacks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:</td>
<td>Vote in Maryland elections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:</td>
<td>DC as Congressional district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:</td>
<td>No Change to DC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusions**

1. If I were a resident of D.C., I would want Plan # __ because

2. As a resident of ____________ (write the same of your state), I _______ (do / do not) advocate for the same plan because
Plans for D.C. Source Packet

Plan #1: Statehood

Source 1 for Statehood Plan: CRS Report RL33830

In the past, statehood has been granted by a simple majority vote in the House and the Senate and the approval of the President. However, according to some scholars, the District’s unique status raises constitutional questions about the use of this statutory method to achieve statehood. It could be argued that the granting of statehood for the District would violate Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, which gives Congress exclusive legislative control of the District. Because of these constitutional issues, most statehood proposals for the District have sought to achieve statehood through the constitutional amendment process.

Granting statehood to the District of Columbia would settle the question of congressional representation for District residents. A ratified constitutional amendment granting statehood to the District would entitle the District to full voting representation in Congress. As citizens of a state, District residents would elect two Senators and at least one Representative, depending on population.

Source 2 for Statehood Plan: DC Gazette, 1970

Statehood is a clear, just and attainable goal to which District residents can aspire. Unlike the ambiguities of “home rule” -- whose home rule? Lyndon Johnson’s, Richard Nixon’s, Channing Phillips’? David Carliner’s? Joseph Tydings’? The Washington Post’s? -- statehood is a concept whose prerogatives and privileges are easily understood. Statehood means nothing more nor less than what Wyoming, Rhode Island, Delaware, or any of the states smaller and larger than the District enjoy. When Alaska became a state, Congress declared that it was “admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the other States in all respects whatever.” That’s what we should demand: equal footing, not some more benevolent form of colonialism foisted off as “home rule.” In the old days, when Congress admitted new states, it put it even more gracefully and accurately.

The states were declared a “new and entire member of the United States of America.”

The District has never been an entire member of the United States of America. It is the indentured servant of the nation. Our goal must be simple and clear: the US must let us in.

It can be done. In fact, it can be done more directly and more simply than all the tortured meanderings proposed by those who claim to have a pragmatic vision of the District’s future. It can be done without constitutional amendment, requiring only two legislative acts on the part of Congress to accomplish the prime objective:

First, redefine the District. The Constitution does give Congress exclusive legislative jurisdiction over the District. But it does not define the District other than to restrict it to not more than ten square miles. At the time the city became the

---

seat of the government, it contained a mere 14,000 residents, whom Madison assured in the Federalist Papers “will of course be allowed” a municipal legislature “for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages.” On this land sprang a metropolis of three-quarters of a million, as large as all the New England states in 1800 combined, excluding Massachusetts. Only the peculiar perversity of the congressional mind has led to the conclusion that the framers of the Constitution expected Congress to exercise total control over, and deny franchise to, a population equal to five of the 13 original colonies. If John McMillan and Joel Broyhill had been around then, pushing such a scandalous suggestion, the Union might never had made it past Philadelphia.

But we need not continue the debate on the intent of the forefathers. We can swiftly correct the ill effects of their vagueness by redefining the District (perhaps to a narrow strip running from the White House to the Capitol) over which avaricious national legislators can exercise their domain, and the rest of the city shall be evermore free of the curse of Article I, Section 8.

The initial exercise, therefore, is to force Congress to restrict the size of the District, and to declare the rest of the city the Territory of Columbia, or whatever other name we would wish.

Second: Admit the city as a state. A constitutional convention should be called to draw up a plan for statehood. An interim government must also be elected, with or without the acquiescence of the national administration and Congress, in order to provide to provide a body with a mandate to represent the city-territory in the difficult days prior to statehood. This can be no overnight operation for the benefit of the evening news. We must avoid the errors of our unwanted masters and begin in the neighborhoods. The specifications of freedom must sprout from the communities. Once the neighborhoods have defined their needs and goals and elected their leaders, the constitutional convention can proceed to draw up a state constitution and apply to Congress for membership in the Union. By mere majority vote, Congress can grant that admission.
Plan #2: Retrocession to Maryland

Source 1 for Retrocession Plan: *Letter to the Editor, Washington Post*¹¹

The District has been talking for years about statehood. A better idea would be to retrocede the land to Maryland. There is precedent for this: The portion of the nation’s capital ceded by Virginia in 1790 was retroceded in 1846.

Many consider the land area and population of the District to be too small to make a viable state. Retrocession would give the citizens of the District all the political rights that other Americans enjoy. The District could be incorporated by the state in a manner similar to Baltimore, giving citizens home rule, including the election of a city council and mayor.

Some Marylanders object to retrocession in the belief that it would fundamentally change the political landscape of Maryland. But the effect would be much smaller than that of making a state out of what was once a small portion of Prince George’s County, creating an entity with the power to counteract the will of Marylanders. If Maryland passes on its opportunity to regain the land ceded, it will regret it. And to repurpose the land without the express permission of the people of Maryland would be a betrayal of trust.

Maryland should petition to have the land comprising the District returned to Maryland. If the people or the federal government no longer want it for the purposes of its donation, it should be returned to Maryland with costs paid by the federal government.


It could have been a big moment: a congressional hearing room packed in such numbers that an overflow room was needed to accommodate the audience; a moment two decades in the making; an issue that had the support of President Obama.

But when only two senators showed up last month for the first congressional hearing since 1994 on the idea of making the District of Columbia its own state, it brought home that the event was more about what was not happening than what was. With Republicans on the verge of deepening their hold on the House — and perhaps taking over the Senate as well — advocates for D.C. statehood showed up in force despite the certainty that the hopes for statehood that had flourished with Mr. Obama’s election had hit a brick wall. The two senators who bothered to appear were Senator Tom Carper, the Democrat who sponsored the bill, and Senator Tom Coburn, a Republican, who showed up only to denounce it...

...Dreams are sometimes deferred, other times modified. Bills in both chambers would give D.C. autonomy over its own budget — something Congress now controls — and there is a modest movement afoot to send D.C. back to Maryland — known as retrocession — which would leave just the federal area of D.C. its own place. Maryland would get more representation, more revenue and would likely be able to charge Virginia commuters a tax.


“We see nothing but positives for D.C. to rejoin Maryland as a unique, home-rule city like Baltimore,” said John Forster, a spokesman for the Committee for the Capital City. “We believe strongly that a new state from D.C. will not happen.”

Less than thrilled are the people of Maryland. “I do not support retrocession,” said Representative Steny H. Hoyer, Democrat of Maryland and the minority whip, in an email. He added: “I will continue to work to give D.C. residents the full voice in government they deserve.”

This is something less than a burning issue for the American people, whose view of Washington is dim to begin with. “My suspicion is that most Americans don’t understand this issue,” Mr. Young said. “When you talk to tourists here in town, they are shocked when you tell them the district has no voting in Congress. But in two seconds Marion Barry gets brought up,” he said, referring to the infamous former mayor. “By that logic, why is Chicago part of the United States?”
Plan #3: Virtual Statehood

Much of the latest thinking on securing voting rights for citizens of the District centers on the premise that Congress has the power to define the District as a state for the purpose of granting voting representation. Proponents of virtual statehood note that the District is routinely identified as a state for the purpose of intergovernmental grant transfers, that Congress’ authority to define the District as a state under other provisions of the Constitution has withstood Court challenges, and that Congress has passed legislation allowing citizens of the United States residing outside the country to vote in congressional elections in their last state of residence. They also note that the Constitution gives Congress exclusive legislative control over the affairs of the District and thus the power to define the District as a state.

Opponents argue that the District lacks the essential elements of statehood, principally an autonomous state legislature, charged with setting the time, place and manner for holding congressional elections.

During the 109th Congress Delegate Eleanor Holmes Norton and Senator Joseph Lieberman introduced identical bills in the House and Senate (H.R. 398/S. 195: No Taxation Without Representation Act of 2005) that would have treated the District as a state for the purpose of congressional representation. In addition, the bill would have

1) given the District one Representative with full voting rights until the next reapportionment;
2) granted full voting representation to District citizens, allowing them the right to elect two Senators, and as many Representatives as the District would be entitled to based on its population following reapportionment;
3) permanently increased the size of the House from 435 to 436 for the purpose of future reapportionment.

The proposal raised several questions, chief among them, whether Congress has the legal authority to give voting representation to District residents. The bill differed significantly from the other measures introduced in during the 109th Congress. H.R. 398 would have provided citizens of the District with voting representation in both the House and the Senate, unlike the other measures which would provide representation only in the House.

Source for Virtual Statehood Plan: CRS Report RL3383013

Plan #4: Vote in Maryland Elections

Source 1 for Maryland Election Plan: CRS Report RL33830

Short of retroceding all or a portion of the District to Maryland, [another] option would allow District residents to be treated as citizens of Maryland for the purpose of voting in federal elections. Such an arrangement would allow District residents to vote as residents of Maryland in elections for the House of Representatives, and to have their vote counted in the election of the two Senators from Maryland. This semi-retrocession arrangement would allow District residents to be considered inhabitants of Maryland for the purpose of determining eligibility to serve as a member of the House of Representatives or the Senate, but would not change their status regarding Congress’ exclusive legislative authority over the affairs of the District.

The idea of semi-retrocession is reminiscent of the arrangement that existed between 1790 to 1800, the ten-year period between the creation and occupation of the District as the national capital. During this period residents of District residing on the respective Maryland and Virginia sides of the territory were allowed to vote in national elections as citizens of their respective states and in fact voted in the 1800 presidential election...

...On March 6, 1990, Representative Stanford Parris introduced H.R. 4193, the National Capital Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1990. The bill would have given District residents the right to cast ballots in congressional elections as if they were residents of Maryland. It also would have maintained the District’s governmental structure, and was offered “as a workable way to change the [status quo] which represents taxation without representation” and as an alternative to a statehood measure, H.R. 51, introduced by Delegate Walter E. Fauntroy of the District of Columbia.

In defending the proposal, Representative Parris noted his opposition to statehood for the District and offered this explanation of his proposal in a letter published in the Washington Post on March 18, 1990.

This approach would allow the government of the District to remain autonomous from the Maryland state government. D.C. residents would continue to vote for a mayor and a city council, and would not participate in Maryland elections for state positions such as delegate, state senator and governor. The reason for this is the constitutional mandate that the nation’s capital remain under the exclusive legislative jurisdiction of Congress.

There is an important distinction between this action and the Voting Rights Constitutional Amendment proposed in 1978. That action, rejected by the states, called for the election of members of Congress from the District. It did not, as my proposal does, elect those members as part of the Maryland delegation. There is also a distinction between this and proposals simply to turn the District over to Maryland [retrocession]. With my proposal, there is no need to delineate the federal enclave, and there would not be a requirement to obtain the approval of the Maryland legislature...

I take this action because the current injustice should be corrected, and this proposal is the only one that takes into account the constitutional limitations on statehood and the compelling case to restore voting rights in national elections to District residents.

Source 2 for Maryland Election Plan: Center for Washington Area Studies 2009 Report

If, instead, the District is treated for the purposes of federal elections in Maryland just like any other city or county in the nation, then two questions arise. First, what will be the size of Maryland delegation? Second, how will Maryland draw its new congressional district lines now that the District is included?...

Currently, Maryland has eight representatives to the House. Will adding the District add members to this delegation? To keep the discussion reasonably simple I will stick to 2000 census numbers and pretend that electoral retrocession occurred at the start of the current decade. All the points hold for 2010 or 2020 dependent on the population growth of Maryland and the District relative to the nation. Based on 2000 numbers a Maryland/District hybrid has a population of 5,868,545. (This is the sum of the District of Columbia and Maryland populations.)

The crucial point here is that adding District voters to Maryland yields an increase in Maryland’s delegation size and does not dilute Maryland voters. Under this scenario the state gains a seat and average district size drops. Crucially, however, how much Maryland’s delegation increases (or decreases) over time would depend on the population growth of Maryland and the District relative to the rest of the United States.

This is a serious question. While Maryland ranked twenty-third among states in population growth between 1990 and 2000, the District continued to lose population during that period. (No other state lost population during the 1990-2000 decade. The District has seen some growth during the current decade.) Extrapolating from the Census Bureau’s 2007 population estimates, it does appear that a Maryland/District hybrid gets nine seats under the 2010 census-based apportionment with a House of 435 seats.

The next question then becomes how would the Maryland state legislature draw its district lines to create these nine seats? Precisely answering this hypothetical is obviously impossible, but a few things are clear. First, some or all District voters will be grouped with Maryland voters. The District will be either parsed among two or more congressional districts or some part of Maryland will join an intact District. The one person, one vote requirement allows little variation in intra-state district size...

Arguably, splitting Washington, D.C. more or less equally across two congressional districts helps the District by effectively doubling its representation in the House. What the District wants to avoid, however, is dispersal across so many congressional districts that the voter impact on any given seat is small and thus the influence of Washington voters diluted.

Then there are partisan considerations. Maryland is a heavily Democratic state. The General Assembly is majority Democratic. Usually the state elects Democratic governors and the current two U.S. senators from Maryland are Democrats. District voters vote even more reliably Democratic than Maryland voters...

---

Plan #5: D.C. as a Congressional District

Source for Congressional District Plan: Slate, 2009

If the measure [to give D.C.’s delegate to the House of Representatives voting rights] passes, there’s a good chance the Supreme Court will strike it down as unconstitutional. But Congress should still pass and President Obama should still sign the District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act of 2009 as a major step toward ending the “taxation without representation” of D.C. residents.

Supporters of D.C. voting rights have pushed for years to get a bill like this through Congress. (D.C. residents already have a delegate, Eleanor Holmes Norton, who can serve on committees but when it counts can’t vote on final bills.) The district’s supporters came close in 2007 with a measure that also would have created a new congressional seat for Utah (which was next in line among the states, given congressional reapportionment earlier this decade). Despite this neat attempt at partisan balance (a Democrat for D.C., a Republican for Utah), Republicans filibustered the measure after a threatened veto by President George W. Bush. Things are different this time. President Barack Obama co-sponsored the 2007 version of the bill, and the current one in the Senate is worded identically. There’s a chance supporters can muster 60 votes in the Senate to defeat a filibuster.

If that political battle is won, the war will shift to the courts, where it faces uncertain prospects. The constitutional claim against the D.C. Voting Rights Act is that Congress lacks the power to create a new congressional seat for the district. There’s a strong textual argument for this position, advanced by George Washington University law professor Jonathan Turley and others. Article I, Section 2 of the Constitution provides that “[t]he House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several states ...” and there’s no question that Washington, D.C., is not a state. Congress cannot amend the Constitution through ordinary legislation simply by calling D.C. a “state,” and therefore the D.C. act is ostensibly unconstitutional. Supporters like Turley have backed up their arguments with extensive historical analysis based on the Framers’ intent in giving the District of Columbia its odd status.

Perhaps surprisingly, some conservative heavy hitters (who tend to favor textualist and originalist interpretations of the Constitution) nonetheless have come out in favor of the constitutionality of the measure. Ken Starr has argued that Article I elsewhere, in what’s called the District Clause, authorizes House representation for the district by providing that “[t]he Congress shall have power ... to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever” over the District of Columbia. Professor Viet Dinh, who worked as an assistant attorney general in the Bush administration, has made similar arguments that Congress’ power under this Clause is plenary, and he backs it up with his own analysis of the Framers’ intent.

The debate also centers on an obscure 1949 Supreme Court case, National Mutual Insurance Co. v. Tidewater Transfer Co. Tidewater considered the constitutionality of a 1940 congressional statute, which provided that federal courts should consider residents of Washington, D.C., as coming from “states” for purposes of “diversity jurisdiction.” (That’s the legal framework that allows federal courts to hear cases arising under state law when a resident of one state sues the resident of another.) In a fractured decision, the Supreme Court upheld the 1940 law, despite an earlier 1805 Supreme Court ruling holding that D.C. residents could not be considered residents of states for diversity jurisdiction purposes.

---

Three of the justices in the majority in *Tidewater* relied on Article I’s District Clause in reaching their conclusion, and supporters of the current D.C. voting rights legislation say *Tidewater* supports their position that Congress, broadly speaking, has the power to treat D.C. as a state. Opponents counter that there was no majority opinion in *Tidewater* and that even the three justices who relied on the District Clause would have found the current voting rights legislation unconstitutional. These justices “took pains to note the limited aspect of their holding” as not extending to fundamental rights. The nonpartisan and well-respected Congressional Research Service read *Tidewater* this way in a 2007 report, noting that at least six of the *Tidewater* justices “authored opinions rejecting the proposition that Congress’s power under the District Clause was sufficient to effectuate structural changes in federal government” and suggesting that perhaps all nine justices would have agreed on the unconstitutionality of the D.C. bill.

If the current D.C. voting rights law is indeed unconstitutional, then the only way to get D.C. a full House member is the way that gave district residents the right to vote for president: a constitutional amendment that would either make D.C. a state, give it a member of Congress (and possibly two senators) without making it a state, or merge D.C. back into a neighboring state, such as Maryland. But constitutional amendments are extremely difficult to pass, requiring a vote of two-thirds of Congress and three-fourths of the states. With a country preoccupied by the most serious economic troubles of our lifetimes and two wars, voting rights for D.C. is not at the top of the list. Despite broad public support for some form of voting rights for D.C., the forces of inertia are strong.

This is precisely why Congress should pass the current law, even if it is likely to be struck down by the Supreme Court. Rejection by the court would put the issue on the front burner. Obama could then push for quick passage of a constitutional amendment in Congress and the states. He could remind people that many of our most important advances to voting rights have come through constitutional amendment, including enfranchisement of African-Americans, women, 18-year-olds, D.C. residents (in presidential elections), and those too poor to pay a poll tax to vote in federal elections.

The lack of voting rights for residents of Washington, D.C., is an example of what law professors call “constitutional stupidities.” Given this country’s commitment to equal voting rights for all, there’s no legitimate policy reason to deny congressional representation to the District’s residents. If that’s right, then the only argument I can see against a vote for the D.C. bill is that it could be viewed as violating the oath taken by members of Congress and the president to uphold the Constitution. But with legitimate arguments by credible legal scholars in favor of the bill, the constitutional question is not settled. Members of Congress can vote for D.C. voting rights in good conscience. Then we’ll see what happens next.
Day 3

Note to teachers: The lesson plan below has students engage in a simulated town hall meeting. Alternatively, students could also participate in a Socratic Seminar or Paideia Seminar and still achieve the same lesson objectives. Use your discretion and your knowledge of your classroom to determine which method of facilitation would best help your students communicate their informed conclusions.

**Approximate time needed:** 70 minutes

**Lesson objective(s):**
By the end of class, students will be able to:
- determine and justify a plan that they believe will best fix DC’s representation issue.

**Materials:**
- “Four Corners” Station Markers
- Analytical Thesis Statement (Option A)
- Analytical Thesis Statement (Option B)

**ENGAGEMENT (12 minutes)**
1. Before students enter the classroom, create **four station markers**. Each station marker should have one of the following statements:
   a. I strongly agree
   b. I mostly or somewhat agree
   c. I mostly or somewhat disagree
   d. I strongly disagree
2. Place each station marker at a different corner of the room. As students enter the room, have them place their belongings at their desks so they can move around for the activity.
3. You will read and/or display the following statements. After each statement is read, students should go to the corner/statement marker that best aligns with their own opinions. Once students are settled, they should discuss with others at the same station their reasons and supporting evidence for being there. Then, cold call on various students to share what someone else said at that station. Repeat this process until all of the statements have been read.
   a. Peanut butter is superior to Nutella (*This is a fun, practice round that allows students to see how the process works*)
   b. America is a democracy
   c. Everyone in America deserves the right to vote
   d. D.C. should have a voting representative in Congress
   e. D.C. should be given statehood

**EXPLORATION (8 minutes)**
1. Students return to their desks work with an elbow partner to create a list in response to the following prompt: “What are the different ways citizens and residents can interact with policy makers?”
a. Explain to students that the activity they just participated in allowed them to share their opinions with one another, but for change to occur, residents must allow discuss their opinions with the people who create the policies.

b. For students who are unfamiliar with this topic, you may want to display visual cues such as pictures of letters and town hall meetings.

2. Call on several pairs to share their answers and record a classroom copy on either the whiteboard or a flipchart paper.

3. Students examine the list and determine which way also encourages citizens to interact with each other (Answer= town hall).

a. If students are unfamiliar with the concept of a town hall, you may anticipate and plan for this lack of prior knowledge by providing students with a list of interactions and brief definitions.

4. Tell students that they will simulate a town hall meeting today in class.

a. If time allows, show a short clip of what a Town Hall meeting looks like. You can access a clip from C-SPAN through the following link: tinyurl.com/ybwtgx5u.

**EXPLANATION (10 minutes)**

1. Explain to students that they will engage in a town hall simulation based on the different plans to fix DC’s lack of congressional representation.

   a. Students should select one person to be the U.S. Representative that they are trying to persuade to support their plan. This student will determine, at the end of the town hall, which group presented the most compelling arguments and supporting statements.

2. To prepare for the town hall, students should review the different plans from the previous lesson and create a list of reasons why the plan they prefer is the best plan for D.C.

   a. As an added challenge, you can also ask select students (or the whole class) to create counterarguments to the points they think others will make in support of opposing plans.

**ELABORATION (30 minutes)**

1. There are several ways you can set up your classroom for facilitation of the town hall. The goal is to get every student to speak about their preferred plan in front of the group.

   a. One possible classroom setup for the town hall is to place three markers (“mics”) in the front parts of the room and allow for students to literally line up behind them as they speak to the group. Rotate from mic to mic and allow students to speak about their plans. Limit that no more than 3 people can be lined up at any mic at any time.

   b. Explain to students that their time speaking does not have to directly address the previous comments—like many town hall meetings, people often just get up and make their statements regardless of the previous comments. However, the best town hall meetings occur when people are having a discourse by listening and responding to one another’s ideas.

2. Before students begin, communicate how many times you want students to speak (2 times minimum, for example). Attaching this expectation to grade might help encourage more students to meet the minimum expectations.

3. As students are speaking, you should quietly meet with students that have not spoken midway through the town hall and encourage them to speak. You may choose to give them the sentence starters below as an accommodation

   a. I believe the best plan for the District is ___________________ because of _________________________.

   b. I believe this is a superior plan to _____________________ because of ____________________________.
EVALUATION (10 minutes)

1. After the town hall meeting, hand out the Analytical Thesis Statement to aid students in drafting an analytical thesis statement based on their plan choice.
   a. There are two options for the Analytical Thesis Statement. Option A is the default option, but if there are any students who believe that D.C. should not receive any additional voting rights/representation, then you may want to give Option B to those select students so they can still have their voice heard.
   b. Let students know that they do not have to stick with the plan they originally chose as the best one, especially if other students’ arguments persuaded them to support a different plan instead. This would be an ideal outcome because that demonstrates they were actually listening what each other had to say.

2. Communicate to students that their completed Analytical Thesis Statement will serve as the basis for the next lesson’s activity.
   a. Depending on your students’ writing and communication abilities, you may want to collect these handouts at the end of class in order to give concrete feedback and ensure that students have created a fluid line of reasoning.
## Analytical Thesis Statement (Option A)

Name:  
Date:  
Period:  

**Day 3: Choosing a plan to support**

**Instructions:** Follow the steps below to craft a rough draft of your analytical thesis statement. You will utilize this thesis statement in our next class when you write a letter to an elected official of your choice.

**Prompt:** How should we fix DC’s lack of congressional representation?

### Steps for writing your analytical thesis statement:

1. Write an opening statement about the issue that will engage the reader first. You can hook the reader using an interesting fact, compelling background information, or a quote.
2. Write our analytical thesis statement broken up into 2 sentences.
   
   **Example:** The best way to fix the DC’s lack of representation in Congress is (state answer here). We should pursue this path because (reason 1), (reason 2), and (reason 3).

---

**Example:**

**Prompt:** Who is the most influential recording artist alive today?

1. The name Kanye means “the only one” in Swahilli, and this is a fitting name for the biggest name in the game: Kayne West.
2. Kayne West is the most influential recording artist alive today because of his album sales, influence in fashion, and ability to make headlines.

---

**Now it’s your turn:**

**Prompt:** How should we fix DC’s lack of congressional representation?
Analytical Thesis Statement (Option B)

Name: | Date: | Period: | Day 3: Choosing a plan to support

Instructions: Follow the steps below to craft a rough draft of your analytical thesis statement. You will utilize this thesis statement in our next class when you write a letter to an elected official of your choice.

Prompt: Should we fix DC’s lack of congressional representation?

Steps for writing your analytical thesis statement:

1. Write an opening statement about the issue that will engage the reader first. You can hook the reader using an interesting fact, compelling background information, or a quote.
2. We write our analytical thesis statement broken up into 2 sentences.
   
   Example: D.C.’s lack of congressional representation ________ (is / is not) a problem that needs to be solved. Due to this, the best path to pursue is to __________ (state plan) because (reason 1), (reason 2), and (reason 3).

Example:

Prompt: Who is the most influential recording artist alive today?

1. The name Kanye means "the only one" in Swahilli, and this is a fitting name for the biggest name in the game: Kayne West.
2. Kayne West is the most influential recording artist alive today because of his album sales, influence in fashion, and ability to make headlines.

Now it’s your turn:

Prompt: Should we fix DC’s lack of congressional representation?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
**Day 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Approximate time needed:</strong></th>
<th>70 minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Lesson objective(s):**
By the end of class, students will be able to:
- write a persuasive letter or email to an influential policymaker about DC and congressional representation.

**Materials:**
1. Warm Up Activity  
2. Gallery Walk *(Needs to be posted around the classroom by the teacher before the start of class)*  
3. Sticky Notes  
4. Letter Framework

**ENGAGEMENT (7 minutes)**
1. Hand out or display the **Warm Up Activity**. Ask students to contemplate each quote and determine which plans these two figures (Trump and Clinton) would agree with.
   - The Trump quote is vague, and that is ok. You can go into depth and talk about why a Republican candidate might not be able to support Statehood even if he/she agreed with in it principle—because most DC voters are Democrats.

**EXPLORATION (23 minutes)**
1. Students walk around examining each station of the **Gallery Walk**.
   - During this time students will make comments directly on the pictures using sticky notes. Students will write what could be a persuasive counterargument to the policymaker’s comments.
2. At their last station rotation, have students read the posted comments and select their favorite “come back”. Cold call on several students.

**EXPLANATION (5 minutes)**
1. Explain to students that they will each write a letter or email to an elected representative (their U.S. Representative, one of their U.S. Senators, or the President) to inform them about D.C.’s current status and the plan for which they (the student) are advocating.
2. Explain that the goal is to write a compelling letter while taking into consideration that person’s point of view.
   - Students should use their **Analytical Thesis Statement** from the previous lesson as the basis for the letter.
   - Have students deliberate with an elbow partner about whether it is more effective to write to a potential supporter of the plan or whether they should address someone who likely needs convincing/might currently oppose the plan.
     - Should students select the latter option, have them reflect back to the Gallery Walk and suggest that they anticipate the push-back from that representative by including information that would address the counterpoints.
   - For additional resources on finding elected officials and tips for helping students write to their representatives, please visit [https://www.apa.org/advocacy/guide/letter-email.aspx](https://www.apa.org/advocacy/guide/letter-email.aspx).
3. Once students have selected the representative to whom they are writing, they should be given the **Letter Framework** to use as a writing guide.

a. Students can write their letter to agree with the person OR to try and persuade them to change their opinion. Either way the students must take the perspective of the individual they are writing to into account.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELABORATION (<strong>30 minutes</strong>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Allow students rest of class time to work on their drafts. As students work, circulate and find students who are struggling with their letters/emails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Make sure that they have all available resources from the previous lessons and their <strong>Letter Framework</strong> if they are struggling to find evidence that supports their analytical thesis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION (<strong>5 minutes</strong>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students trade papers and check their partner’s paper to make sure that all parts of the letter are complete:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Is a brief background of the issue and a relevant analytical thesis statement present?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Is all of the evidence relevant to the thesis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Is the evidence elaborated on?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Is the representative told a specific action that they should take?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Is the letter/email persuasive?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is recommended that you allow students to improve and/or type their final drafts at home. Students should turn in two copies: one copy to be mailed and one copy to be graded. It is also recommended that, if possible, you provide students with envelopes to individually address and then ask your school or school district to provide the postage. If students chose to send an email, ask them to BCC or CC you on it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Warm Up Activity

**Trump:** “I would like to do whatever is good for the District of Columbia because I love the people. You know, it’s funny. I’ve really gotten to know the people, the representatives, and the mayor, and everybody. They’re really special people. They’re great. And they have a great feeling.”

**Todd:** “So you’re okay with either way? If they want statehood, you’re for statehood?”

**Trump:** I mean, people are talking about that. I’d look at it. I’d certainly look at it—”

-Candidate (now President) Trump speaking with Chuck Todd on “Meet the Press” in August 2015.

**Clinton:** “Giving the 600,000 residents of the District of Columbia their fair representation in Congress is long overdue. It is why I applaud the House of Representatives for finally passing the DC Voting Rights Act today. Our nation was born out of a struggle against taxation without representation. And yet, even as we endeavor to promote democracy around the world, it is shameful that we deny our own American citizens who live in the District the right to voting representation in Congress. This injustice tarnishes our democracy as a whole. The right to be represented in the national legislature is fundamental to our core American values. I hope the Senate will act swiftly to pass the DC Voting Rights Act and that the President will not delay in signing this long overdue legislation into law.”

-(Then) Senator Clinton’s 2007 statement on the D.C. Voting Rights Act

Select one quote and explain which plan you believe this person would be most in favor of and the plan they would be in least favor of.

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
Delegate Eleanor Holmes Norton (D-DC)

"[Citizens of the District] are the only taxpaying Americans who are not treated as full and equal citizens. The only way for them to obtain the citizenship rights they are entitled to is through the same statehood used by other Americans."

“Some in Congress say … the reason why D.C. residents can’t have full access to the franchise is because of too many Democrats. Can you believe that? Do you think access to democracy is a Democratic or Republican issue? No, it’s an American issue.”


“We are 670,000 tax-paying Americans, just like you. And with statehood and only with statehood, will we have votes in Congress, just like you. The next president of the United States, Hillary Rodham Clinton, will sign our admission into the United States of America as the 51st State.”

“Most of my focus is not on Washington, D.C., but when they tend to step over the line, we’re going to do what we need to do. We have other tools at our disposal. That’s what the mayor and others need to remember. We’re not bashful about using those tools either.”


“It’s our nation’s capital and the Constitution deals with it in a unique way,” he said. “Washington, DC, is not a state. My proposal is stronger than Eleanor Holmes Norton’s proposal, because I’d like to see it retroceded back into a state.”

“The same Constitution protected slavery and said certain people of color were worth three-fifths. Same Constitution. But we changed it. … The fact that you exercise your will over an entire city just because you can does not make it right or noble. In fact, if we follow the logic of my friends of the other side, why not take over? Let’s do rezoning. Let’s do emergency preparedness. Let’s run the EMT and the fire department. Let’s take over mental-health services. Why go only halfway? I’m curious. Why is it only the budget?”

"I'm very much opposed to D.C. statehood. The District of Columbia was set up to belong to all Americans, and it has a special place, not only in the life of our country, but I think to all of the individuals who come here from all of the states. It’s a very important city, but it is a city. All other states are combinations of urban, suburban and rural areas, and they have all of these different aspects to them, all of these competing interests, all of these combinations that D.C. doesn’t have."

Remarks after attending Senate hearings in 1978: "You may recall the one day of the Senate Youth Program that was set aside for the delegates to visit their Senators. I have never before felt inferior to fellow Americans. That day I did. All I could do was listen at dinner that evening when my friends told of how they had discussed important national issues, such as the Panama Canal Treaties, energy policy, and health care with their Senators. I, too, have opinions on these and other vital issues. That day, I could share them with no one who had a voice or a vote in the United States Senate."

https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/local/1978/02/11/students-vote-dc-representation/8e129111-5dab-40f7-86eb-f29061c09e8e/
Letter Framework

Your Address Here
And Here
Date of Letter

Recipient’s Name:

People read letters quickly. Therefore, get to the point in the first paragraph. This is where your analytical thesis statement should go. Explain why you think this is the best plan for the district.

Add line between paragraphs. Because people read business letters quickly, use shorter sentences and paragraphs than you would in a longer document. Sentences should average fewer than twenty words, and paragraphs should average fewer than seven lines. This is where you say why you agree or disagree with this person about their plan for the district. Use textual evidence to support your claim.

Final paragraphs should tell readers what you want them to do or what you will do for them. Ask them to vote or support your plan here. Leave them with an action step.
Sincerely,

Signature

Your Name Here
**High School Extension Activities**

Below are two options you can use as enrichment activities after students have completed the module. Like the letter students write in Lesson #4, all options require students to take informed action and demonstrate their learning in a meaningful way.

**Option 1: Polling Project and Class Campaign**
A study in 2005 demonstrated that more Americans would be likely to support voting rights for D.C. if they knew more about D.C.’s status and the consequences. To see whether the findings of this study holds true, students create a poll that seeks to know what percentage of their community was already aware of D.C.’s unique status and their likelihood for supporting giving D.C. statehood and/or congressional representation before and after learning more on the topic.

Based on their polling results, students devise a campaign that would best address reasons for their community’s lack of awareness on the topic and the plan that the class collectively supports advocating for. Ideally, students will implement this campaign and track its effectiveness.

**Option 2: Social Media and/or YouTube Outreach**
Students create short videos and/or compelling social media posts to share on their various accounts to inform their networks about D.C.’s lack of voting rights and what they advocate as the solution. Students can track in their classes how many times the posts are shared, liked, watched, etc in order to determine the effectiveness of some posts/videos over others.