

Chapter 1 : Why It's Time to Rename the Russell Office Building - POLITICO Magazine

New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, []. Format: Book.

Submitted by Dan Phillips on June 26, - 7: My initial reaction, and the reaction of many others judging by the responses I have seen, is "Good riddance. Will known in the past. That said, I think it is important to clear up a common misperception. I have seen a lot of people describe Will as a neocon. The article was previously only available as a PDF of the original Modern Age article and was difficult to read. Radix Journal has recently made it available in article form. It is well worth a read. Neoconservatives typically derive more or less conservative policy positions from essentially liberal premises. Will in fact does the opposite: It is therefore not surprising that his commentary is welcomed in and rewarded by liberal power centers. He enjoys every prospect of a bright future in their company. Theoretically, if all were running smoothly, this would be a good thing. The problem is that under the reign of this sort of alleged stand patism, the Eastern WASP Establishment, who used to run the show, basically gave the country away. Evidence of this decline is all around. Now, not so much. The Supreme Court now boasts no Protestants. In reality, George Will style stand patism has effectively, at best, only mitigated the decline. Why the WASPs decided it would be a good idea to usher in their own irrelevance is a fascinating subject that deserves discussion. Inherent in the genteel manners that purportedly characterized old WASP society was the concept of noblesse oblige, the idea that with station and wealth comes an obligation to the less fortunate. This was not necessarily an expression of support for generous welfare programs, although it was sometimes crudely expressed as such. It was more an expression of respect and a recognition that an orderly and well-functioning society requires all stations, and that people should be valued for who they are and what they do if they comport themselves in an honorable way. Noblesse oblige would seemingly suggest that the WASP elites should care about the fortunes of their fellow countrymen in Flyover Country and pursue policies that would benefit their country and their fellow countrymen as a whole, not just their fellow elites. Somewhere this went awry. They are also just as much a part of the condescension chorus that looks down their noses at us yahoos in Flyover Country as any other. WASPs today are a decreasing component of the globalist cosmopolitan elite that look out for each other while expressing contempt for the non-elite masses, or at least the white element of the masses. The elite reaction to the Brexit vote demonstrates this perfectly.

Chapter 2 : Project MUSE - Populism to Progressivism In Alabama

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

Additional Information In lieu of an abstract, here is a brief excerpt of the content: Progressivism, the alternative to Populism, was a substantially different reaction by a separate set of men to the same enemy Populism faced—the dominant industrial wing of the Democratic Party. What Progressivism lacked before was a viable combination of issues to forge a winning coalition among the electorate. The victories of Johnston in and as the leader of the silver faction of the Democratic Party showed that genteel reform could command a following. These victories were shallow and indecisive, however, and produced little legislation. Though the issue of race had proven ineffective in preventing the defection of the alienated to the Populist Party, it did inhibit the solidification of the groups interested in various types of moderate reforms. Though they lacked consolidation, the ingredients for a solid Progressive movement were present in Alabama during both the vigorous and the declining years of Populism. Horace Hood, editor of the Montgomery Journal, was one of these. Hood sided consistently with the progressive wing of the Democratic Party. From to his paper was the semi-official organ of the Johnston administration, and in Governor B. This was a fight between the politicians and the people, and the politicians bold, unscrupulous politicians like Joe Johnston won. The people—the honest masses—submit this time. But the future is dark. August 7, , and McKee to James E. Rufus Rhodes, editor of the Birmingham News and constant supporter of Comer Progressivism, began his 18-year battle against "moral progressive revenue bill, got the House to pass his own bill on convict leasing with only 12 negative votes. He saved the mining companies from the economic hardship of having to pay wages to their labor and at the same time indirectly benefited his own railroad employers who depended on the bulk freight traffic generated by the coal mines. His bill provided for some health safeguards but left the lease intact. The Conference committee appointed to reconcile the two the Wiley version on this before adjournment. Consequently, the legislature passed no bill at all. He not only called on people to aid in it but suggested concrete ways of discouraging practice. Among his suggestions were the use of special sessions of court, rapid trials, and the full use of the state militia. It is a commentary on the powerlessness of the Negro community, as well as the 46 Alabama. You are not currently authenticated. View freely available titles:

Chapter 3 : How William F. Buckley, Jr., Changed His Mind on Civil Rights - POLITICO Magazine

If you have the appropriate software installed, you can download article citation data to the citation manager of your choice. Simply select your manager software from the list below and click on download.

In her blockbuster new book, *Billionaire at the Barricades*: All in all, a great day. To renege on it, or in any way get around it, will be considered a breach of faith in the minds of voters, and they will not forget at election time. To overcome this, the president will have to avoid the mistakes of his predecessors and remain close to the principles and people that got him elected. Similarly, they are against huge trade deals and international organizations like the World Trade Organization because they take power out of the hands of voters and give it to a far-away and often hostile global elite. They were Bush people. They thought it was time to return the Republican Party to what they believed was its more genteel, respectable roots. In effect, it meant the return to power of the Rockefeller Republicans who had worked to deny Reagan the presidency in Bush stalled the conservative-populist engine that powered Reaganism. Bush campaigned as a populist but governed as a globalist. We lost the Senate. And we lost the White House. Ingraham was scheduled to speak at an event in Bakersfield, California, right after the tape was released. She knew then that voters were so fed up with the permanent political class that the Access Hollywood tape would not be fatal. There are plenty of other nuggets in the book that make it compelling, riveting and fascinating. Ingraham writes about the first time she met Trump in and learned that he was, in fact, a germaphobe when he handed her disinfectant wipes to ensure she did not get sick in New York City before her next television appearance. Who knew Trump has something in common with germaphobe Bob Costas? Carly Fiorina asked Ingraham for her endorsement at a famous D. Her convention speech was so impressive that she was urged to run for office herself and even amnesty advocate Jorge Ramos magnanimously praised it when he saw her at the convention. The Populist Revolution from Reagan to Trump , two things become evident. Though she went to fancy schools Dartmouth and University of Virginia School of Law , worked in the White House, socializes with power players, and is a wildly successful author and radio host, Ingraham, unlike many who share her background and experiences, has never sold out and always fights for working-class Americans on issues like immigration that matter to them. They will spend gazillions to thwart the will of working-class Americans.

Chapter 4 : Why it's time to rename the Russell Office Building - Hot Air

The genteel populists by Simon Lazarus starting at \$ The genteel populists has 1 available editions to buy at Alibris.

Politics, Professionalism, and Cause Lawyering, [6] cause lawyering consists of "using legal skills to pursue ends and ideals that transcend client service" be those ideals social, cultural, political, economic or indeed, legal". Cause lawyering does not require a particular political side, but does require a "determination to take sides in political and moral struggle without making distinctions between worthy and unworthy causes". Hilbink outlined the "typolog[ies]" of cause lawyering. In applying the broad encompassing cause lawyering definition from above, cause lawyering has existed as long as legal advocacy has existed. As long as an advocate has advocated for a client and against a perceived social or legal wrong, although the term was not coined until , cause lawyering has been active. In the s and the non-profit law firm was born. These beginning organizations of cause lawyering, and the ones that followed scored major legal victories that have lasting effects to this day; see *Brown v. Board of Education* In the s, the Ford Foundation began funding legal services programs as a component of anti-poverty programs helping fund some of the forerunners of legal services for indigent clients: Once the newly minted non-profit law firms were established as charitable organizations eligible for IRS tax-deduction, they began to advocate on behalf of disadvantaged and underrepresented groups, advancing the civil rights and poverty legal work from decades earlier. Major events, like the establishment of the Legal Services Corporation and subsequent restriction; decisions in *Loving v. Virginia* , *Lawrence v. Texas* , *Roe v. Wade* , *District of Columbia v. Heller* , *Citizens United v. Sebelius* , *Shelby County v. Holder* , *United States v. Windsor* , and *Obergefell v. Hodges* ; along with everyday victories and defeats of cause lawyers all over the United States have shaped our last one hundred years and will continue to shape the legal landscape to come. Nice to make some money, nice to have material things, but there is nothing better than knowing that you have helped the impoverished, that you have helped the hungry, that you have helped the politically powerless, and that you have helped the undereducated to gain at least a semblance of dignity. Today, public interest lawyering has expanded greatly to include free legal aid groups, liberal and conservative public interest organizations, partisan environmental groups, and individual lawyers who choose to represent the underrepresented. Definition and debate[edit] Ford Foundation With the increase in self-proclaimed public interest lawyers, the definition and categorization of public interest lawyering continues to be a debated topic. In attempt to narrow the categorization of public interest lawyering, many scholars and researchers have attempted to create a more precise definition of "public interest law". The Ford Foundation was one of the first groups to attempt to define public interest law as an "[a]ctivity that 1 is undertaken by an organization in the voluntary sector; 2 provides fuller representation of underrepresented interests would produce external benefits if successful ; and 3 involves the use of law instruments, primarily litigation. Public interest and politics[edit] There are multiple ideological groups that unite on specific issues and work towards advances the causes that they believe are in the public interest. The early successes of the public interest movements prompted the emergence of public interest law firms, advocating on divisive political issues. In their discussion of cause lawyering, Scheingold and Sarat suggest that cause lawyering, "conveys a determination to take sides in political or moral struggle without making distinctions between worthy and unworthy cause". When partisan public interest organizations first gained popularity in the s and s it was the liberal groups that bound together to promote significant social change. Drawing from the strategies developed by previous groups to advance specific causes, like the NAACP, ACLU and LDF , these public interest groups expanded their role to substantive law reform, litigation, and administrative and legislative advocacy. In response to the success of liberal groups advancing their partisan agendas, conservatives began to adopt this type of organization and developed public interest groups of their own. Public interest groups on both sides of the aisle have expanded their roles tremendously and can even be attributed to the divisive political arena that exist today. While their roles have expanded, their overall goals have not. Partisan public interest groups continue pursuing the causes that connect with their ideological beliefs and continue to have successes in advancing these interests. Community economic development lawyering[edit] Community

economic development work includes building coalitions of interested parties to create social policies that improve affordable housing opportunities, increases access to affordable financing options, develops workforce skills, and generally produces more economic production within suffering urban and rural communities. Washington believed that the best way to advance African Americans interests was through encouraging economic self-sufficiency through encouraging job training and entrepreneurship. To achieve his vision, Washington created vocational training programs and presided over the National Business League with the goal of supporting African American business networks, products, and services. In response, the Federal government created focused programs that targeted disadvantaged communities by providing increased education, job training, and family services. Beginning with the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, both state and federal governments began to reinvest in struggling urban and rural communities through the creation of Enterprise Zones. According to these studies, the underlying conditions needed to improve an economic zones chances of success are: McFarlane, CED lawyering efforts have fallen short of their intended goals of building economic development within a community. First, the structure of the economic stimulus has been designed to benefit large corporations that generally do not require high paying jobs. Finally, simply providing a job does not address the entire problem facing a community and should include housing programs, workforce development, and food security among other things. Organizations[edit] A significant portion of cause lawyering is done through special interest groups or legal advocacy organizations. Cause lawyering groups are a type of public interest law organization PILO. These organizations are generally tied to specific social movements. These organizations allow cause lawyers to pool time and resources to develop complex litigation strategies for their causes. They often employ staff, have formal members, rely on grant or foundation funding, and even operate on a national scale. In 1925, Tennessee passed the Butler Act which outlawed the teaching of evolution. High school biology teacher. Scopes urged students to testify against him and he was eventually arrested under the Butler Act. Although Scopes lost at trial, the proceedings were heavily publicized and changed public opinion on the role of faith in public schools. Legal advocacy groups also educate the public and political leaders about their causes, sometimes through litigation. Legal advocacy organizations span the political spectrum. Originally, these groups tended to support politically liberal causes. Today, there are many politically conservative legal advocacy organizations, such as the Liberty Counsel. CCLOs tend to focus their litigation on religious freedom , opposing same-sex marriage, and the right to life movement. Criticisms of legal advocacy groups[edit] Some grassroots organizations criticize national legal advocacy groups for dominating social movements. Legal advocacy groups may set the political agendas of social movements because legal advocacy groups generally have significantly more resources than grassroots activist groups. Additionally, legal advocacy groups may use a "top-down" approach to identifying and solving social problems without considering the actual needs of groups at the grassroots level. Handler conducted research that focused on how public interest law firms have changed over time. Citing a Weisbrod study, [45] Handler surveyed other cause lawyers to determine how cause lawyering has changed over time. According to the study, cause lawyer organizations have become multi-issue driven as opposed to the single issue focus held in the past. Handler found that since 1970, the historically liberal public interest topics have, for the most part, experienced a decline in the percent of effort expended. Primarily focused on expanding the recognition of human rights, Chinese public interest lawyers have attempted to change the government by litigating high-profile cases and organizing public gatherings demanding government reform. Covering a wide range of issues, these networks primarily focus on issues surrounding human rights and the environment. Notable cause lawyers who have created this change include:

Chapter 5 : Cause lawyer - Wikipedia

Simon Lazarus is the author of The genteel populists (avg rating, 2 ratings, 1 review, published).

It seems like a no-brainer. The decisions we make about naming official government buildings and spaces say much about our shared understanding of democratic values and citizenship. In this regard, Richard Russell is a poor fit for a diverse and modern nation. First elected to the Georgia legislature at the age of 23, he moved steadily up the ranks of the Democratic Party as state House speaker, governor and United States senator, an office he held from until his death in 1961. In his first term, Russell adroitly strong-armed his way onto the Senate Appropriations Committee and later rose to the chairmanship of the Armed Services Committee, a powerful perch from which he tightly controlled the flow of military spending and influenced the foreign policy of successive presidential administrations. As a young man, Russell had been a middling student, at best. I had a good time. Colleagues—particularly those from his native South—would later marvel at the sheer volume of words that Russell could read and recall, but in truth, he was a man of parochial learning and little imagination whose sole interests were the Senate and the Lost Cause. He devoted his life to both. Like most public men of his age and region, Russell was an unapologetic white supremacist. Yet Russell hailed from a particular Southern tradition. His variety of white supremacy was patrician and genteel. He abhorred populists like Eugene Talmadge, his successor as governor and opponent for nomination to a full Senate term in 1948. Where Talmadge invoked ugly racial rhetoric from the stump, Russell eschewed wild gesticulation and angry racial rants. Like most Southern members of Congress in the 1940s and 1950s, including Lyndon Johnson, Russell regularly opposed legislation to ban the poll tax, make lynching a federal crime and create employment protections for African-Americans. Armed with his encyclopedic knowledge of Senate procedure and precedent, Russell pioneered a strategy that his Southern caucus would play to much success over the next 15 years: Only when the White House and its congressional supporters gradually dropped their civil rights proposals did the Senate resume ordinary business. It was a playbook that lasted well into the 1960s. Kennedy remarked roughly a year before his death. This is one of those moments when there is reason to wonder whether the congressional system as it now operates is not a grave danger to the Republic. As Russell worked hard to thwart a civil rights agenda, he pushed forward his own brand of white supremacist policies. In 1956, he introduced legislation that would have subsidized the voluntary removal of African-Americans from Southern states to Northern cities. The bill, which was largely intended to score a rhetorical point against civil rights supporters from states with small black populations, went nowhere. Notably absent from the declaration were warnings of race mixing and integration. Russell is most famous today for his leadership of Southern congressmen who mounted a losing attempt to stall and even kill the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Ironically, as the country became less tolerant of explicit appeals to racial animus, Russell grew more strident in his tone.

Chapter 6 : Sarah Sanders In Virginia: A Wonderful Look At Conservative Ineptitude – Occidental Dissen

The rules of civility; or, the maxims of genteel behaviour, Newly done out of the twelfth edition in French; containing among other additions, a short treatise of the point of honour.

By Chrystia Freeland, November 1 The rise of the political extremes is most evident, of course, in the domination of the Republican Party by the Tea Party and in the astonishing ability of this small group to shut down the American government. All of these are triumphs of populists over plutocrats: The left wing of the Democratic Party opposed the appointment of Mr. Summers as part of a wider backlash against the so-called Rubin Democrats as in Robert E. Rubin, who preceded Mr. Summers as Treasury secretary during the Clinton administration and their sympathy for Wall Street. Even the Tea Party, which in its initial phase was to some extent the creation of plutocrats like Charles and David Koch, has slipped the leash of its very conservative backers and alienated more centrist corporate bosses and organizations. The limits of plutocratic politics, at both ends of the ideological spectrum, are being tested. Political scientists like Larry M. Bartels and Martin Gilens have documented the frightening degree to which, in America, more money means a more effective political voice: Democratic and Republican politicians are more likely to agree with the views of their wealthier constituents and to listen to them than they are to those lower down the income scale. Money also drives political engagement: Citizens United, which removed some restrictions on political spending, strengthened these trends. Why are the plutocrats, with their great wealth and a political system more likely to listen to them anyway, losing some control to the populists? The answer lies in the particular nature of plutocratic political power in the 21st century and its limitations in a wired mass democracy. The Koch brothers, who have found a way to blend their business interests and personal ideological convictions with the sponsorship of a highly effective political network, are easy to latch on to partly because this self-dealing fits so perfectly with our imagined idea of a nefarious plutocracy and partly because they have had such an impact. But the Kochs are the exception rather than the rule, and even in their case the grass roots they nurtured now follow their script imperfectly. Most plutocrats are translating their vast economic power into political influence in two principle ways. The first is political lobbying strictly focused on the defense or expansion of their economic interests. This is very specific work, with each company or, at most, narrowly defined industry group advocating its self-interest: Often, these are fights for lower taxes and less regulation, but they are motivated by the bottom line, not by strictly political ideals, and they benefit very specific business people and companies, not the business community as a whole. Business leaders of the postwar era were individually weaker but collectively more effective; C. The postwar era, not coincidentally a period when income inequality declined, was the time when business executives could say that what was good for G. Bill Gates is the leading philanthropist, and he has many emulators – nowadays, having your own policy-oriented think tank is a far more effective status symbol among the super-rich than the mere conspicuous consumption of yachts or private jets. Philanthropism can be partisan – George Soros, one of the pioneers of this new approach, backed a big effort to try to prevent the re-election of George W. Bush – but it is most often about finding technocratic, evidence-based solutions to social problems and then advocating their wider adoption. Philanthropism, particularly when you agree with the basic values of the capitalist in charge, can achieve remarkable things. Consider the work the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation has done on malaria, or the transformative impact of Mr. In City Hall, Mr. As he prepares for life after political office, he is already honing the more typical plutocratic skill of using his money to shape public policy by energetically engaging in national battles over issues like gun control and immigration reform. At its best, this form of plutocratic political power offers the tantalizing possibility of policy practiced at the highest professional level with none of the messiness and deal making and venality of traditional politics. You might call it the Silicon Valley school of politics – a technocratic, data-based, objective search for solutions to our problems, uncorrupted by vested interests or, when it comes to issues like smoking or soft drinks, our own self-indulgence. But the same economic forces that have made this technocratic version of plutocratic politics possible – particularly the winner-take-all spiral that has increased inequality – have also helped define its limits. The gap is

cultural and social, too. Plutocrats inhabit a different world from everyone else, with different schools, different means of travel, different food, even different life expectancies. The technocratic solutions to public-policy problems they deliver from those Olympian heights arrive in a wrapper of remote benevolence. Plutocrats are no more likely to send their own children to the charter schools they champion than they are to need the malaria cures they support. People might not mind that if the political economy were delivering for society as a whole. But it is not: Meanwhile, the plutocrats continue to prosper. More radical ideas, particularly ones explicitly hostile to elites and technocratic intellectuals, gain traction. Part of the appeal of plutocratic politics is their power to liberate policy making from the messiness and the deal making of grass-roots and retail politics. In the postwar era, civic engagement was built through a network of community organizations with thousands of monthly-dues-paying members and through the often unseemly patronage networks of old-fashioned party machines, sometimes serving only particular ethnic communities or groups of workers. The age of plutocracy made it possible to liberate public policy from all of that, and to professionalize it. Instead of going to work as community organizers, or simply taking part in the civic life of their own communities, smart, publicly minded technocrats go to work for plutocrats whose values they share. The technocrats get to focus full time on the policy issues they love, without the tedium of building, rallying and serving a permanent mass membership. They can be pretty well paid to boot. The Democratic political advisers who went from working on behalf of the president or his party to advising the San Francisco billionaire Thomas F. Steyer on his campaign against the Keystone XL pipeline provide a telling example. Twenty years ago, they might have gone to work for the Sierra Club or the Nature Conservancy or run for public office themselves. Today, they are helping to build a pop-up political movement for a plutocrat. Plutocratic politics have much to recommend them. They are pure, smart and focused. But at a time when society as a whole is riven by an ever widening economic chasm, policy delivered from on high can get you only so far. Voters on both the right and the left are suspicious of whether the plutocrats and the technocrats they employ understand their real needs, and whether they truly have their best interests at heart. That rift means we should all brace ourselves for more extremist politics and a more rancorous political debate. Where does that leave smart centrists with their clever, fact-based policies designed to fine-tune 21st century capitalism and make it work better for everyone? Part of the problem is that no one has yet come up with a fully convincing answer to the question of how you harness the power of the technology revolution and globalization without hollowing out middle-class jobs. Liberal nanny-state paternalism, as it has been brilliantly described and practiced by Cass R. Sunstein and like-minded thinkers, can help, as can shoring up the welfare state. But neither is enough, and voters are smart enough to appreciate that. Plutocrats, as well as the rest of us, need to rise to this larger challenge, to find solutions that work on the global scale at which business already operates. The other task is to fully engage in retail, bottom-up politics not just to sell those carefully thought-through, data-based technocratic solutions but to figure out what they should be in the first place. The Tea Party was able to steer the Republican Party away from its traditional country-club base because its anti-establishment rage resonated better with all of the grass-roots Republican voters who are part of the squeezed middle class.

His variety of white supremacy was patrician and genteel. He abhorred populists like Eugene Talmadge, his successor as governor and opponent for nomination to a full Senate term in Where Talmadge invoked ugly racial rhetoric from the stump, Russell eschewed wild gesticulation and angry racial rants.

Which is obviously ridiculous, I mean, what could the Republican party and the National Rifle Association have to do with that? Guns are merely an epiphenomenon. The reason Republican state legislatures pass so many more bills loosening gun restrictions after a horrifying gun tragedy must be postindustrialization. The more we keep postindustrializing, the more the voters will demand more restriction-loosening gun laws. That just stands to reason. And what can we do about this situation? I may disagree with what he says, but I will defend to the death his right to say he did his homework, if I think he did, which I do at least in this case. In , according to a Pew survey , only 29 percent of Americans supported more gun rights and 67 percent supported more gun control. By , 52 percent of Americans supported more gun rights and only 46 percent supported more control. The research in fact clearly backs gun control, as is shown comprehensively in this Vox explainer by German Lopez: Then I looked at the actual empirical research and studies. Speaking of changing minds, better facts tend to be counterproductive on hot-button issues like gun control. Instead, they invent more reasons their prior position was actually correct. The smarter a person is, the greater his or her ability to rationalize and reinterpret discordant information, and the greater the polarizing boomerang effect is likely to be. A study has found individual differences in myside bias. This study investigates individual differences that are acquired through learning in a cultural context and are mutable. The researcher found important individual difference in argumentation. Studies have suggested that individual differences such as deductive reasoning ability, ability to overcome belief bias, epistemological understanding, and thinking disposition are significant predictors of the reasoning and generating arguments, counterarguments, and rebuttals. Many of the issues the respondents were asked about are extremely politically charged – abortion and gun violence and illegal immigration – and the experiment was conducted during one of the most heated and unusual presidential elections in modern American history. Nyhan and Reifler, pleasingly, instead of doubling down on their own hypothesis, have cheerfully joined in the new research. So why are lawmakers responding to mass killings by loosening gun laws? The wrong answer is that the N. In fact, the N. Or you could read me , you know. The official PAC of the National Rifle Association spends quite a bit, though not more than the maximum amount allowed by law, on campaign contributions for a select number of federal candidates in every election; in the cycle House candidates including 5 Democrats and 23 Senate candidates. This money is directly correlated to the pushing of those anti-gun control bills in the state legislature: The measure eliminates the prohibition on carrying firearms into police stations, jails, prisons, and mental health facilities, unless those locations post signs to prohibit weapons on their grounds or in their buildings. The proposal also eliminates the prohibition on carrying guns, bows and crossbows in wildlife refuges, and while operating all-terrain vehicles. The measure would also allow people to carry tasers. Which is how it works. She had an A-plus. So Maggart ultimately decided to table the legislation. She actually was reflecting the will of her caucus and the idea was that once it was tabled, they would study it more. And then what they did was they fielded a candidate who had no political experience but who was further to the right on the political spectrum from her to run against her in the primary. With the billboards and then with also, like, just one or two really simple YouTube advertisements characterizing her as a gun grabber and in, like, a month her ratings dropped. She was someone who was very popular in her district and she wound up losing the primary. The real reason the gun rights side is winning is postindustrialization. The gun issue has become an epiphenomenon of a much larger conflict over values and identity. No, you know what? I also violently object to the use of "postindustrialization" as a noun, as if it were derived from a verb "to postindustrialize". But one more bit is too rich to pass up: Over a century ago, industrialization brought on a culture clash between agrarian populists and the genteel Victorian aristocrats. Theodore Roosevelt transcended the fight by inventing a new American nationalism. Meanwhile, the progressives cleaned up elite corruption and nurtured a square deal for those being left behind by

technological change. Cultural leaders introduced new institutions and community forms, like the Boy Scouts and the Settlement House, that drew from both cultures and replaced them. Does Brooks think sharecroppers might be concerned that a lady in Newport could get an abortion? The Square Deal domestic program had three main goals: Both came from England, but the scouting movement was more Edwardian than Victorian, having been imagined in , and reached the US during the Taft presidency, in , and the Settlements in Chicago and New York and other gritty cities were far from genteel. And in what sense did they "replace" the previous cultures, or what sentence was Brooks even trying to write there?

Chapter 8 : Populism and Racism | Trollblog

Over a century ago, industrialization brought on a culture clash between agrarian populists and the genteel Victorian aristocrats. Theodore Roosevelt transcended the fight by inventing a new.

Hope in a Scattering Time: Eerdmans, It is a recurring story of American politics: Moneychangers have occupied the temple, comes the charge, and no alternative exists but to sweep the place clean. Yet no sooner do the plain folk raise their pitchforks than a great tut-tutting is heard from on high. The problem, it turns out, lies not with Wall Street or Washington but with the people themselves. Populism—synonymous with bigotry and ignorance—has once again raised its ugly head. The good of the Republic requires that order be restored. The people must return to their places. If they have complaints to make, they should express them quietly and respectfully. Suggestions that the whole game is rigged against them are inappropriate and not to be entertained. Populists, writes Brooks, mistakenly view the country through the lens of social class. The verdict of history is clear: The truth about American politics is this: The two main parties collaborate in preserving that consensus. Doing so requires declaring out-of-bounds anything even remotely resembling a fundamental critique of how power gets exercised or wealth distributed. Populism poses a challenge to that consensus—hence, the hostility with which it is treated by those purporting to express respectable opinion. When it comes to political choice, devotees of the existing two-party system contend that Americans already have all they need or can handle. What Brooks and other enforcers of ideological discipline deride as populism is radicalism in the American grain, expressing itself in an authentically American, if less than genteel, voice. Populism frightens the fat cats and the defenders of the status quo, and with good reason. Yet for observers who find the status quo intolerable, the populist critique contains elements worthy of empathy and respect. One such observer was the late Christopher Lasch⁹⁴, historian, cultural critic, contrarian, and wayfarer. Miller, who teaches history at Geneva College, has written a biography of Lasch, with the evocative title *Hope in a Scattering Time*. A fine, thoughtful, and even moving book, its appearance could hardly be more opportune. In our own day, the politics of progress have passed the point of exhaustion. Only knaves and fools will look to Washington to devise solutions to the problems afflicting American society today. Indeed, further deference to established centers of power, on issues domestic or foreign, will surely perpetuate and even exacerbate those problems. So the times call for a searching reassessment of the American condition. Neither left nor right—especially in the adulterated form found in the actually existing Democratic and Republican parties—possesses the capacity to render such an assessment. Lasch occupied and speaks from such a vantage point. His calling was simply to speak the truth and offer it for their consideration. This he was determined to do, however harsh or unwelcome others might find the verdicts he handed down. Begin with the issue of progress itself. Conservatives and liberals pretend to differ on how to define it and on how best to achieve it. Yet both camps subscribe to this common baseline: It entails amassing more: So defined, progress incrementally enhances American life, making it more democratic and enabling Americans in ever greater numbers to exercise freedom. Lasch rejected this proposition. Progress, he believed, was converting America into a spiritual wasteland. Rootlessness and chronic anxiety increasingly defined everyday American life, and individuals sought to fill the resulting void through compulsive efforts to satisfy unappeasable appetites. Consider how teenagers obsessively caress their cell phones and iPods as if cradling in their hands some sacred amulet. This process of cultural debasement was not the product of spontaneous combustion. It occurred because it served the interests of large institutions and of individuals directing their fortunes. Writing in , while still a graduate student, Lasch accurately discerned the implications: Once members of Congress figured out that the distribution of largesse held the key to perpetual incumbency, keeping consumers consuming—cash for clunkers! As they accumulated cars, gadgets, and brand-name clothes, filled their bathroom cabinets with potions promising to make them look and feel good, and dragged their kids off to theme parks, Americans were told that life itself was getting better and better. Indeed, during the Cold War as again, after September 11 , government agencies promoted American-style freedom as the model to which the rest of the world was destined to conform. As interpreted by Washington, such was the will of Providence.

According to Lasch, however, all of this was bogus. Americans were being played for chumps. By defining progress as more stuff combined with the shedding of self-restraint, they were not gaining greater freedom. Instead, they were donning a strait jacket. The antics of the counterculture soon disabused him of this expectation, however. The New Left contained its own elitist and authoritarian tendencies. So the forces of revolution, such as they were, turned out to be fraudulent. As a consequence, although his books and other writings commanded attention and attracted admirers, he had few real allies. Lasch was his own drummer. His was a lonely movement of one. Indeed, over the course of his intellectual journey, Lasch moved toward a cultural conservatism, which drew upon older Jeffersonian, agrarian, and "above all" populist traditions. Conservatism in this sense was less an ideology than an orientation, one that recognized, valued, and sought to defend an inheritance assailed by the proponents of progress. Once squandered, Lasch believed, that inheritance was likely to prove irretrievable. Lasch expressed complete contempt for those styling themselves as conservative while worshipping at the altar of capitalism, employing conservative-sounding tropes to justify a worldview profoundly antagonistic to conservative values. To understand this point, ask yourself, for example, what, if anything, George W. For Lasch, only a genuinely conservative orientation was entirely consistent with his radical self-identity. Indeed, in late-twentieth-century America, only an anti-progressive sensibility could provide the basis for serious radicalism. This Tory radicalism, as Miller dubs it, placed Lasch at odds with other would-be radicals of his time. Nowhere was this more evident than on matters relating to gender. A small percentage of women benefited, as a result; the vast majority did not. Although Lasch devoted the preponderance of his attention to domestic affairs, his critique has considerable implications for foreign policy. The progressive impulse to construct a secular utopia at home finds its counterpart in dreams of doing likewise in the great, wide world abroad: Do not mistake this rushing to the aid of others "Cubans in , Afghans in " for altruism, however. The impulse to do good remains bound inextricably to a determination to do well. They also point ineluctably toward great crusades, since those standing in the path of righteousness necessarily represent the forces of darkness and put themselves beyond the pale. For those of a messianic bent, inaction implies complicity with evil. Given such a mindset, prudential considerations need not apply: That which should be must be. The progressive mindset pervading both of the major American political parties refuses to acknowledge the existence of limits. An appreciation of limits "not simply of power, but also of understanding" infuses and distinguishes an authentically conservative sensibility. In that regard, we have a long way to go. Of at least equal importance, whereas the proponents of progress believe that the key to success is to entrust power to a corps of experts "a power elite, to use the classic formulation devised by C. Wright Mills " any serious conservative rightly sees this as mostly bunk. Do four-star generals, high-ranking government officials, insider journalists, corporate executives, and Wall Street financiers possess a demonstrably superior understanding of the way the world works? Are they any smarter, more sophisticated, or better intentioned than your Aunt Betty Lou or your Uncle Fred? Survey the various and sundry debacles of the past decade alone "the September 11 attacks, the invasion of Iraq, the collapse of Enron, Hurricane Katrina, the Madoff scandal, the Lehman Brothers downfall the list goes on " and the question answers itself. Washington attempts with one hand to buy people off and with the other to frighten them into acquiescence. This is the insight to which populists from the time of William Jennings Bryan to the present have returned again and again. The demonstrable truth of that insight explains why populism is not going away any time soon. It also explains why Christopher Lasch, the great exponent of democratic populism, deserves our respectful attention today. Bacevich is a professor of history and international relations at Boston University. His book, *Washington Rules*:

Chapter 9 : NYT: Plutocrats vs Populists | The Next Deal

Start studying History Midterm. Learn vocabulary, terms, and more with flashcards, games, and other study tools.

Continue to article content When the conservative editor and intellectual William F. Buckley pointed out the inherent unfairness in the administration of drug laws and in judicial sentencing. How did a man who later proclaimed his greatest legacy was keeping the conservative movement free of bigots, kooks and anti-Semites move past a nakedly racist editorial like that? He went so far as to condone the violence whites committed to perpetuate segregation. In , years before he adopted the southern strategy, Nixon was one of the highest-profile defenders of civil rights in the Republican Party. All states should disenfranchise the uneducated of all races. He saw no reason to confine such practices to the South. As he contemplated the merits of the franchise and to whom to extend it, Buckley had restated views he had advanced while a student at Millbrook, his preparatory school. In a term paper he had written for his headmaster, Buckley maintained that uneducated voters might be manipulated by demagogues into surrendering some of their freedom in exchange for benefits raised through taxation of the citizenry. In staking out this position, Buckley was taking his place in a long line of conservative theorists beginning as far back as Aristotle, who saw in such democratic practices the roots of tyranny. It was these intellectual currents that turned Buckley away from the Southern politicians of the time—and toward his reversal on civil rights. The Buckleys had ample experience with such politicians before and had come to treat them with contempt. Wallace on two grounds: Federal intervention was necessary. Privately, he was beginning to harbor doubts about legal segregation, a practice he had accepted without question his entire life. That May, racial tensions mounted in Birmingham, Alabama, when Commission of Public Safety Bull Connor ordered hoses, nightsticks and dogs turned on young demonstrators. During these months, Buckley remained on an intellectual and emotional seesaw that still tilted southward. Buckley was outraged when white supremacists set off a bomb in a Birmingham church on Sept. An early biographer reported that Buckley privately wept when he heard about the incident. He blamed Wallace for the tragedy. African-Americans were upping their efforts to secure the right to vote in the South and Southern whites were showing increasing hostility, with the Ku Klux Klan and other white vigilantes resorting to violence and terrorism. Gradually, but steadily, Buckley shifted his emphasis, directing his criticisms less against those who sought federal intervention and more toward those whose recalcitrance made that outcome inevitable. In his columns and elsewhere, Buckley ridiculed practices designed to keep African Americans off the voter registration rolls, such as demanding that those seeking to register to vote state the number of bubbles in a bar of soap. In columns, he condemned proprietors of commercial establishments who declined service to African Americans in violation of the recently enacted Civil Rights Act. Still, Buckley worried that once enfranchised, African-Americans in the South would prove just as easily manipulated by demagogues as other voters: It made reference to the religious roots of the civil rights movement and foresaw a major transformation of the region. Five years later, Buckley rejoiced in his column that so much had changed. He disowned the fanaticism of Ayn Rand and the John Birch Society and barred any National Review writer from also writing for the American Mercury, a conservative magazine that had descended into anti-Semitic conspiracy theories. He urged readers not to vote for race-baiting politicians like Wallace and cheered when one remaining holdout of overt racism, conservative columnist James J. Kilpatrick, gave up his opposition to federal desegregation. The moment may be at hand for another Buckley to step up to the plate and, as his transformation demonstrates, it may come from the most unexpected source. The Political Odyssey of William F. This article tagged under: