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Dear Reader,

Diversity of thought is a cornerstone of American democracy that is represented and embraced throughout Carnegie Mellon University. Fostered through interdisciplinary teaching and analytical research, this openness and respect for opposing perspectives allows us to debate, articulate, and more fully understand one another and the world. In a time of political rhetoric and posturing that contributes to deep divisions among US citizens, grappling with a full range of ideas is an essential learning tool.

To better comprehend these divergent views, the third issue of CIRP Journal focuses on the evolution and application of two founding American principles: conservatism and liberalism. In this issue, students use these guiding pillars to explore factors that affect individual elections as well as the broad, long-term currents that influence our political processes. The essays explore the effects of shifting generational and minority demographics among voters alongside the influence of foundational conservative and progressive principles. We also hear from Barry Jackson, Tony Podesta, and George P. Shultz, statesmen who have dedicated their life’s work to understanding, interpreting, and shaping US politics. Although they inhabit different professional arenas, they share an inspiring optimism for the political road ahead, to be led by smart, passionate young people who dare to become involved in domestic and international politics.

While the essays and interviews in this issue predate the outcome of the 2016 election, each contains core assumptions and observations that have considerable value for our readers. Guided by analytical and objective research methods of social science and the humanities, these contributions shed light on important conversations that reach beyond our campus community.

By providing a platform for students to showcase their work and analyses, we hope that this issue of CIRP Journal will reinforce the open dialogue and mutual respect on which our strong campus is built.

Kiron K. Skinner
Publisher and Editor-in-Chief
During every election cycle, a number of Americans jump on the Libertarian bandwagon to campaign for rehashed ideas that will purportedly reinvigorate the liberty movement. The Libertarian Party, which is distinct from the faction of self-proclaimed Libertarians currently within the GOP, was formed in 1971 in response to issues surrounding the Vietnam War. Since that time, Americans have been able to cast alternative votes during presidential elections. However, few, if any, serious political contenders ever run under the mantra of Libertarianism, leaving the party and its once-every-four-year voter turnout all but a running joke on the national stage. So what exactly is the party doing wrong? A changing electorate and the appropriation of Libertarian policies might explain part of the story.

Unified by the idea that the morals and social institutions of the previous generation are outdated and defunct, a majority of today’s youths self-identify as social liberals. On the surface, since one of the basic tenets of Libertarian philosophy is social freedom, this would seem like a blatant advantage for Libertarians. If many youths claim to be socially liberal, then more youths should also be voting Libertarian. The data on this issue provides mixed results, however.

In a recent poll conducted by the international market research firm YouGov, 20 percent of respondents aged 18 to 29 identified as Libertarian while 39 percent did not. Overall, 15 percent of Americans self-identified as Libertarians, while 53 percent rejected the Libertarian label and 32 percent were unsure. In a similar ideological assessment poll conducted by Gallup, 27 percent of respondents could be classified as Libertarians—a statistic effectively making Libertarians the largest group in the American electorate ahead of conservatives, liberals, and populists. Both polls show an increase in voters who self-identify as Libertarians when compared to similar surveys taken a decade ago. But despite this trend, the data remains at odds with the results of the current election cycle. Libertarian Party candidates for the 2016 presidential race are no more recognizable than in previous years, and the selection of one-shot celebrities who threw their hats into the ring was all but predictable in an election marked
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by the end of a sitting president’s second term.\textsuperscript{2,3,4}

In addition to Gary Johnson, former Governor of New Mexico, making his second presidential campaign run, newcomer John McAfee, cybersecurity programmer and developer of the McAfee anti-virus program, jumped into the presidential race with relatively little splash. Media coverage of McAfee was almost nonexistent. This was ironic given the political opportunism presented by the national attention recently given to Apple and its legal fight with the FBI over unlocking the Santa Barbara massacre shooter’s iPhone. Despite public debates over the future of privacy rights and cybersecurity, John McAfee failed to capitalize on either his name or his reputation as a preeminent cybersecurity expert to craft an image of himself as the leading advocate of individual privacy rights within the Libertarian Party. Without seizing such easy political pickings, McAfee's campaign was relegated to obscurity and probably will be best remembered as a dinnertime story among friends.

Underwhelming campaign performances are typical of Libertarian Party candidates. For evidence of even modest electoral success for a Libertarian candidate, one would need to look outside the Libertarian Party itself to, arguably the most publicly recognizable Libertarian figure in the 2016 election, Senator Rand Paul. But even within the more established GOP, Senator Paul decided to suspend his campaign in early February after receiving less than 5 percent of all votes in the Iowa caucuses. Perhaps the results shouldn't be surprising. The support Senator Paul received throughout the 2016 campaign season was a far cry from the support that his father, Ron Paul, received during his run for the presidency. In fact, in almost every voter opinion poll surveyed by political pundits and established media outlets alike, Senator Paul consistently placed at or near the bottom of the GOP nomination race. These results ultimately cost him a place in Fox Business Network’s televised Republican primary debate in mid-January—an opportunity loss that pundits marked as the turning point in the Paul’s campaign. Many attributed the Senator’s especially short run to lackluster fundraising efforts early on in his campaign. However, even after controlling for Paul’s campaign finances, his performance in the 2016 presidential race presents a bit of a conundrum. If the results of both the YouGov and Gallup polls are taken at face value, then it is curious why the foremost Libertarian candidate for the presidency did not generally poll better when a larger percentage of the electorate allegedly self-identifies as Libertarian. Part of the problem may stem from the very nature of our political system.

Typically, there are two main reasons offered by voters who do not cast ballots in favor of Libertarian presidential candidates on election day: (1) a vote in favor of a Libertarian would be wasted because Libertarians have no realistic chance of winning under our two-party system; and (2) some aspect of the Libertarian candidate’s platform is already included in the platform of either the Democratic or the Republican Party. Voters claiming that Libertarian candidates do not have a realistic chance of winning the presidency are aware of the disadvantages that our two-party system places on Libertarian policies. Republican and Democratic candidates, motivated by the prospect of picking up additional votes from third parties, often adjust their own campaign promises in order to appeal to would-be Libertarian
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voters. In primary elections, this type of politicking hurts Libertarian candidates who make no effort to adjust their policies to appeal to more moderate voters. In addition, many of the policies advocated by Libertarians are not unique since many candidates in both the Republican and Democratic Parties also espouse them. For example, a Libertarian policy proposing a flat tax in lieu of the income tax might find common ground with conservatives who are sensitive to equity concerns underlying our tax system, while a Libertarian policy advocating for deregulation of drug use might appeal to both moderate Republicans and Democrats alike. Taken separately, it is not implausible for Republican and Democratic candidates to swipe each proposed policy from a Libertarian candidate in order to pick up more votes from Libertarians and undecided voters alike.

But that is not what happened to Senator Paul's 2016 presidential campaign. Donald Trump appeared on the scene, and his disruption of the GOP handed the Senator a most humiliating spanking that no pundit could have possibly predicted. Senator Paul tried to capitalize on the GOP's growing skepticism over the size of government, but his voting base was never quite so politically one-dimensional. Although the data produced by several opinion polls indicated that a larger share of the voting population self-identified as Libertarian, this did not mean that the voters would necessarily vote for a Libertarian when other options were present. In this case, Trump's simple and blunt political rhetoric did not steal Senator Paul's policies; they stole his voters. Riding upon the fury invoked by the Tea Party only a few years before, Trump's campaign offered Libertarian-leaning voters every practical alternative that Senator Paul's principled campaign could not. When Senator Paul rationally stressed his campaign positions during debate performances, Trump made a show of bullying the Senator and his policies into a corner just to prove the Senator's meekness. At every turn of the campaign trail, Trump spared no opportunity to show just how irrelevant the Senator's campaign was, and despite his every effort, Senator Paul never recovered from the beatings by his opponent. In short, the Senator's downfall was never because Libertarian-leaning voters attempted to remain loyal but did not like what they saw when Trump demonstrated how inadequate a Libertarian president would be.

The takeaway from Senator Paul's failed presidential bid seems to lend some support to the notion that the principles underlying a campaign do not really matter much if the salesman for those principles appears weak to his constituents. Libertarians are not simply single-issue voters who will cast a ballot in favor of any Libertarian candidate who blindly promises to reduce the size of government. They are complex voters who will vote on any number of political dimensions that appeal to them, including the perceived strength of the candidate himself. This is problematic for Libertarians at large because they operate a party that places principle before practicality and otherwise has little else going for it. While the appeal of the Libertarian Party might have been high during the 1970s when it was also common to be a conscientious objector to the Vietnam War, Libertarians now face a world in which substantive solutions are necessary to resolve the increasingly complex problems of the twenty-first century.

On many issues ranging from foreign intervention to government social programs, Libertarian policies are impractical. For example, many Libertarians would like to see a return to an isolationist international policy to eliminate our foreign entanglements. But in an era defined by globalization and information economies that span multiple borderlines, the possibility that
our nation will ever become isolationist again is just a Libertarian dream. Other Libertarians take their party agenda a step further and advocate for the elimination of the Federal Reserve and a return to the gold standard. But as grandiose as these claims appear, they are more akin to talking points than actual policy prescriptions that, realistically, have no chance of being implemented.

The answer to the Libertarian’s dilemma is not to sell the same principles but to create new policies in response to many of the political issues that are largely unaddressed. For example, the rise of corporate espionage in the last decade has left many Libertarians paralyzed in devising potential policy prescriptions. In 2010, Google reported a series of cyberattacks that originated from China as part of a larger political and corporate espionage assault on major US financial, defense, and technology institutions. Most Libertarians likely would have contended that issues concerning losses to US companies ought to be left to the private sector to handle in the form of lawsuits against criminal activity. However, based on its caseload for fiscal year 2012, the FBI estimated that corporate espionage alone cost the US economy around $13 billion. This figure, however, included only those cases in which criminals were caught and formally charged.5,6

According to estimates conducted by BlackOps Partners Corporation, the leading firm conducting counterintelligence and protection of trade secrets for Fortune 500 firms and which therefore has insider knowledge of corporate losses, approximately $500 billion in raw innovation is stolen from US companies every year, resulting in an annual net loss of $5 trillion when all revenues, profits, and jobs are factored in over a ten-year period. If these numbers are any indication of the private sector’s ability to handle the problem, then it is clear that Libertarian policies are currently inadequate to handle corporate espionage.7

When Thomas Jefferson and the other Founding Fathers first championed the tenets that now form the basis of the Libertarian Party, none of them anticipated the political issues that would arise from the proliferation of technology and the Internet and the impact that they would have on our economy. Libertarians who revere the founding principles of our nation as the answer to all of our political problems demonstrate a lack of awareness of what made those principles so great. Even if maximizing individual liberty ought to be our highest political end, it should not be treated as an answer in itself, and the sooner that Libertarians realize this, the better off they will be in the long run. Corporate losses as a result of espionage persist because there are few policies in place designed to adequately defend US corporations against criminal activity from abroad. The prosecution of crimes through international court systems rarely yields success because of their political nature, and US companies rarely receive any compensation for their losses.

At times like this, Libertarians must reevaluate their party’s core values. The whole point of sanctifying economic freedom is so that individuals and companies have equal opportunities to succeed or fail based on their own merit. However, equal opportunity also means competing in a fair environment where factors out of one’s control, such as criminal factors,
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do not have the potential to affect one's prosperity. The point is that Libertarian policies have the potential to work if they are more moderate in nature. Libertarians do not have to reject outright those policies designed to protect economic freedom simply because they might involve government intervention in the private sector. To do so misses the point entirely. On other fronts, Libertarians should focus their efforts on more realistic and practical policies that can be implemented in the present, such as lowering interest rates so that US businesses can prosper, as opposed to advocating for more extreme positions, such as ending the Federal Reserve.

From a Libertarian standpoint, any policy that advances the cause of liberty should be desirable, even if it comes from another party. Libertarians lack success within their own party because there are few issues that they can realistically resolve using their own outdated platform. Furthermore, in our established two-party system, it is unlikely that third parties will ever rise to the level of political influence enjoyed by political parties in multiparty European systems. Despite these constraints, Libertarian candidates need not limit their own political ambitions when they can move to the more established ranks of the GOP to tap into a greater pool of resources and push a more moderate Libertarian agenda. This is not to say that launching a campaign inside a fragmented party would be easy, and in a post-Trump GOP it is currently unclear which factions will remain in future election cycles. But the prospect of more moderate Libertarian policies advanced from within the GOP could provide a much-needed ideological check on some of the more extreme factions, from the neoconservatives to the Tea Party, which governed much of the Republican Party for the last decade. At the very least, the addition of further Libertarian candidates to the GOP would certainly improve the electoral chances of Republican candidates in 2016 and beyond.

In the end, the Libertarian cause is not lost, but it clearly needs a significant amount of reimagining.
Minority Voting Factors in 2008 and 2012

JAE-EUN KIM

The year 2008 marked a striking change in electoral politics for the United States. It was the year when the nation elected its first minority president and when enormous support from all types of people, including the multiracial community, was galvanized into its narrative. Ever since, one of the notable features of the political spectrum and campaigns in the United States has been the growing importance of racial and ethnic minority voters. Today, as a result, much of the written literature refers to this time as a period of “revelation” about the place of race in national politics for the present and the future.

The focus of this research is not the effect on the nation of having its first black president but rather the factors that influence minority voter turnouts. As the nation moves forward into an era that is becoming ever more global, we must ask what role and social construct race will take institutionally, socially, and culturally. This question has acquired even more interest, followed by urgency and uncertainty, since the election and reelection of President Obama. To answer the question, this paper was conceived as a case study in US political elections by observing three different ethnic groups: African Americans, Hispanics, and Asians. The strength of this method is that it allows for a close examination of a number of pressing issues in the area of attaining minority voters in elections.

In addition to being the most visible cue of change (which was heavily emphasized throughout Obama’s campaign), race clearly played a pivotal role in the enfranchisement of non-white Americans into the electoral process, especially in 2008. The construction of a common identity around the idea of opportunity and possibility was evident in Obama’s campaign rhetoric. His political slogan, “Yes We Can,” was centered on the idea that the candidate and his constituency shared a common identity. “Yes We Can” was an idea that was ambiguous enough to integrate society as a whole as it embodied people’s dreams for opportunity. Fundamentally, and not just because of the color of his skin, his style, and his personal history, Obama was able to represent, as no other candidate before him ever had, the aspirations of those Americans who have traditionally been excluded from power: minorities, the poor, and the young.

By contrast, “Forward,” was President Obama’s campaign slogan in 2011. Similar to the
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2008 campaign, the 2012 campaign successfully strategized a method to gather and receive votes. In just one year, the Obama campaign raised approximately $400 million and, in the end, President Obama won his reelection bid by a nearly 4 percent margin, receiving over 51 percent of the popular vote.\(^3\) On the other hand, data on the 2012 election suggests that Romney was a particularly weak GOP candidate who was unable to motivate white voters, let alone attract non-white voters. Moreover, Obama’s personal appeal and the slowly improving economy helped overcome doubts, which resulted in a record number of voters, both white and non-white, going to the polls.\(^4\) Whether Democrats can imitate the same pattern in the next election is questionable.

A coalition of Americans from different minority groups helped President Obama win a second term in office on November 6, 2012. While just 39 percent of white Americans voted for Obama on Election Day 2012, an astonishing number of members of the black, Latino, and Asian voting bloc backed the president at the polls.\(^5\) While the reasons for this are multifaceted, it can be seen that minority voters largely supported the reelection of President Obama because they felt that Republican candidate Mitt Romney could not relate to them.\(^6\) According to 81 percent of Obama supporters in a national exit poll, the quality that mattered most to them in a presidential candidate was whether he “cares about people like me.” Romney, born into wealth and privilege, apparently did not fit their standard criteria.

Thus, comparing the 2008 and 2012 elections, there does not seem to be a great difference, yet it is evident that each minority group held a specific set of concerns as being most important. The year 2008 marked a turning point for these voters. Obama was able to successfully attract the minority’s votes by calling for change and focusing on issues most important to these factions.

Another notable observation is that three factors – socioeconomic, cultural, and political organization participation – have different degrees of importance for each of the minority voting groups. Socioeconomic factors hold the greatest weight among black and Latino populations, but are less likely to influence the voting behavior of Asian Americans, who are economically better off than the other groups. Cultural factors seem to be important for all minority groups. Political organization participation factors are most effective among black and Latino groups. The black population has had a long history of active political involvement through societal organizations; thus, these organizations are important sources of information.
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about elections. Again, in this area, the importance of political organization participation is less dominant among Asian Americans when compared to the other minority groups.

The three minority groups also have different socioeconomic statuses. According to the United States Census Bureau, Latinos and blacks are economically unstable compared to Asians. As a result, this is likely the most important factor out of the three for Latinos and blacks. In general, Asian Americans are known to be financially stable, if not well off. Each of the three ethnic groups ranked the economy as most important in 2008 and 2012. Although Obama did not have a specific economic plan, he did acknowledge that this was an issue he would address if he were elected president.

In terms of cultural factors, minority voters could relate to Obama, who was effective in understanding the importance of reaching out to these groups. His outreach to minority groups played a significant role in attracting voters to the Democratic Party. For example, the story of Asian Americans shows how important this factor is in mobilizing voters. Asians, for the most part, have regarded themselves as more aligned with Republicans because of their shared conservative values. In 1992, the Asian vote was a margin of 24 percent, with 54 percent considering themselves Republicans and only 24 percent aligning with the Democratic Party. In 2008, the number changed to a margin of 62 to 35 and the gap widened further in 2012 with a significant margin of 73 to 26. Throughout the years, Asians have overwhelmingly increased their support for the Democratic Party. According to a poll by the Center for American Progress and PolicyLink, one reason is that diversity is a very important issue for African Americans. Contrary to the views of the Republican Party, Asians are generally more supportive of immigration and the call for a new agenda in addressing racial and ethnic equality. Another factor to consider is that the majority of Asian American voters are young and well educated, and as they have started to identify more predominantly with the Democratic Party, the Republican Party may eventually lose their votes unless it changes and develops a new strategy.

Political organization and participation factors are used to mobilize and attract voters, and President Obama utilized this knowledge by campaigning frequently within the relevant organizations. In both 2008 and 2012, he addressed the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the National Urban League. Obama’s efforts to come before the people and depict himself as being on their side greatly influenced and changed people’s perceptions of him and undoubtedly encouraged them to go out and vote.

All three factors – socioeconomic status, culture, and political organizational participation – were important in influencing minority voters to go to the polls. Although there are other explanations for voter turnout, these factors seem to be the most relevant for minority groups. For a more comprehensive analysis, party identification and party ideology are also credible variables in explaining voting behavior that must be further examined. However, some racial minorities, many of whom have immigrant backgrounds, do not have a well-defined political ideology and thus are often influenced by specific factors and the issues that are most

10 Ibid.
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important and relevant to them.

As the 2016 presidential election approaches, it is apparent that Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton has attempted to follow in President Obama’s footsteps in attracting the minority vote, especially that of the black and Asian populations. On the other hand, minority outreach has been absent, for the most part, from Republican nominee Donald J. Trump’s campaign. Thus, in order for the pendulum to swing, the Republican Party must realign its focus and strategies to include the minority narrative.

Observing this pattern, it is obvious that there is cause for concern about future elections. Currently, it is clear that the Democratic Party receives the majority of support from most of the minority groups. While it is true that the minority vote is still small, it represents a growing population, and there is no doubt that minorities will be powerful and effective swing voters if they are strategically courted. In the end, however, it is important to keep in mind that the significance and relevance of the minority vote extends well beyond defending and defining issues that affect minorities to helping America itself fulfill its mission of equality, opportunity, and justice.
The Great Republican Challenge: Capturing an Illusive and Fickle Millennial Vote

ASHLEY GADDIS

As the 2016 election approaches in an environment of extreme partisan rhetoric, it is more unclear than ever who will rise to the highest office in the land. Despite deep disdain for the Republican Party following the departure of the Bush administration, public opinion indicates a favorable shift towards Republican leadership. Polls indicate that 53 percent of registered voters would support a Republican Congress in order to balance Obama’s progressive policies.¹ This evidence suggests that, with a few calculated steps, a 2016 White House victory might once again be within the grasp of the Republican Party. If the GOP also sets its sights on courting young voters, its chances of success are likely to grow exponentially.

To efficiently target these young voters, the party must consider their dominant identity markers. For example, racial diversity is an important aspect of millennial culture. Census data from 2015 indicates that the number of individuals in the United States who identify as “white” is decreasing as the number of individuals who identify as members of one of a variety of minority groups continues to increase.² Millennials are educated at higher rates than ever before, and millennial women are educated at rates higher than their male counterparts, at 27 percent versus 21 percent. This suggests that women may be more politically active and will therefore require more nuanced targeting efforts from campaigns. Similarly, the rising cost of education is a serious concern for these voters. Though heightened rates of education would suggest the development of a more robust professional class, data shows that millennials are more likely to be unemployed than their predecessors. The unemployment rate for 18- to 29-year-olds is approximately 8 percent, while the national average is 4.9 percent.³ As millennials make up 30 percent of the voting population, ongoing campaign efforts must address the challenges and identifiers faced by this group of young Americans.

Learning from Past Elections

In 2012, the Republican Party released a document explaining its current political platform
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titled “We Believe in America.” Republicans described themselves as defenders of the American Dream, fearful of how Obama’s irresponsible policies would affect the country. Accusatory language and pleas for change that characterized the message of the party had a desperate tone that rendered it ineffective, especially with the younger generation. The 2012 election also served to highlight the generational disparities in the American political system, as Obama won 5 million votes more than Romney from the under-30 age group. It was the second time he had garnered support from this group.  

The branding of the Obama campaign in 2008 was largely responsible for attracting interest from younger voters. Though both the Republican and conservative movements promise liberty and personal freedoms as the most essential elements of their platforms, their stances on social issues contradict such statements in the eyes of many young voters. Appeasing the baby boomer voting block will be a significant concern for the Republican Party for the next few elections; however, shifts in social policy must also be considered to draw young voters. The 2012 Romney campaign appeared to focus fairly exclusively on the economic issues stifling American growth and success. Though these issues are important to many young Americans, especially those contending with an inhospitable job market and the high costs of education, social issues have become increasingly polarizing. Many polls showed confidence among voters that Republican economic policies would lead to job creation; however, a general distrust of Republican social policies hindered efforts to gain support. A McClatchy poll from 2011 reported that 61 percent of Americans believed that Obama inherited economic instability from the previous administration. This opinion suggests that voters have lost faith in the Republican administration’s ability to affect change, despite voter alignment with Republican economic policy issues.

Roadblocks to a Republican White House

Despite a recent show of confidence in Republican leadership, the party should address what young voters perceive to be its limitations. With the rise of social media and growing support for liberal social issues, the conservative agenda has become increasingly obsolete in the minds of many young voters. In 2014, Pew Research Center reported that millennial generation voters favor the Democratic Party, with 51 percent identifying as Democrats. More specifically, while 10 percent of those aged 18-29 identify as either “steadfast conservatives or business conservatives,” 45 percent of this population identify as “solid liberals, faith and family left, or New Generation left.” The power of the youth vote in electing Barack Obama highlights the fact that the Republican Party cannot afford to forego the support of this demographic in the next election.

In order to gain the attention and support of young voters, Republicans would be wise to address the issues largely focused on by the millennial block such as gay marriage, legalization
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of marijuana, and abortion access. While the conservative stance is unpopular in the minds of many young voters, the Republican Party must strategize a method of rallying them behind conservative social values in a more persuasive way. Initiatives to build support on college campuses would be a wise place to start, as many college-aged voters view affiliation with the Republican Party as socially stigmatizing. Liberal students are able to voice their opinions freely, knowing that the majority of their peers will agree with them. However, Republican and conservative students don't always enjoy the same ease of self-expression. Such a dynamic hinders the ability of students to support conservative and Republican candidates in a meaningful and organized way. Thus, the party must spearhead efforts to build supportive environments for conservative values in mainstream academia.

Further highlighting the need to think innovatively about young voter outreach is the fact that many young Republicans do not support the party's positions on social issues. A chapter of the Young Republicans organization recently made the news for its split from traditional GOP views in favor of liberal stances. Anibal Cabrera, the group's leader, explained, “We've grown up in a time where everything’s much more open. We want to talk about more things. We're willing to listen to the other point of view. We're willing to have an opposite opinion.”

Similarly, there is a notable rise in the number of individuals who are advocates of free markets yet consider themselves to be libertarian in terms of social policy. The rift between the older generation and young conservative voters can be further illustrated in recent polls regarding views on same-sex marriage. While 56 percent percent of voters under the age of 45 supported same sex marriage, only 29 percent of older Republicans shared their opinion. With the proliferation of this mindset, the Republican Party will surely find itself in an identity crisis, resulting in a disjointed base going into the 2016 election.

**Potential Changes to Widen the GOP Voting Base**

Though data suggested decreasing enthusiasm of young voters from 2008 to 2012, the group ultimately provided a hefty advantage to the Obama campaign. The Republican Party had an opportunity to capitalize on the group's disillusionment over a lack of job opportunities and high costs of student loans; however, the legacy of poor outcomes from the Bush administration appeared to be a significant factor in dissuading young voters from choosing Romney. To rectify this image of ineptitude, Republicans in power in the Senate, House, and individual states must carefully choose the policies that they will support in the future, taking into account the voices of their young constituents. The party must redefine itself and strive to become relevant in light of the changing political and cultural environment.

The primary goal for this Republican Party transformation must be to unify its conservative base by bridging the gaps between voter blocks. Conservatives and Republicans should seek to develop unique and pioneering perspectives on environmental policies, women's issues, and education reform in order to reinvigorate members of the party and attract new support. The Republican leadership should work harder to appeal to women, who participated in greater numbers than men in the 2012 election. In order to successfully engage female voters, the party must take deliberate steps to further incorporate women into the party. Research
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released by the Pew Center shows that men who grew up with sisters are more likely to be Republican because of their lifelong perception that a woman’s place is in the home.\textsuperscript{13} This connection may seem peripheral to the issue of women’s involvement in the party; however, it suggests that subordination and limiting the involvement of women represents the views of the party. In order for women of the millennial generation to invest in Republican movements, this traditional and esoteric ideology must be abolished.

Furthermore, though the Tea Party movement appears to be a dynamic and influential branch of conservative thinkers, their protests and animosity towards the establishment serve to alienate young voters rather than encourage them to participate in an important cause. The Tea Party represents the continuation of stereotypical conservative values rather than something new and provocative.

While the party has considerable work to do to bring in new support and energize a young voter base, the potential for growth appears promising. The College Republican National Committee’s study “Grand Old Party for a Brand New Generation” claims that of those polled, “some 45 percent named ‘growing the economy so more people can have jobs’ as one of their top two or three policy priorities, roughly tied with ‘reducing government spending and cutting our national deficit’ at 46 percent, but far outpacing any of the other many options available.”\textsuperscript{14} This economic perspective resembles that of the Republican platform. Similarly, College Republican studies revealed that wording plays an important role in the way that young voters understand a specific message. For example, young voters are more likely to want to lessen spending rather than combat Big Government – two similar tenets championed by the Republican Party. This indicates that Republican efforts of issue branding will be a key component in the future success of the party.

Social media platforms present enormous branding and outreach opportunities for the GOP, as Facebook and Twitter have emerged as significant forums for self-expression and discussion among peers. Engagement with voters through social media will play a significant role in connecting to the under-30 population in the future. The Republican Party must find a way to engage with potential voters over such platforms similar to the successful strategies employed by the Obama campaign. This will mean garnering the support of young voters to serve as online advertisers and frequently updating the accounts of conservative candidates and organizations. Increasing communication between conservative representatives with the public, specifically tech-savvy youth, will catalyze interest in and understanding of the party’s ideology. Other forms of increased interaction may include boosting involvement on college campuses to normalize any stigma associated with conservative values and to encourage increased youth involvement. Offering young, politically minded individuals the opportunity to work within their community will not only support the party’s political ambitions but also will likely create a more cohesive party identity across demographics.

**The Trump Factor**

Though many have tried to undermine the influence that Donald Trump has had in the past several months, it is impossible to consider the current state of politics in the United States without assessing his impact. Trump’s rise to prominence and nomination by the Republican
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Party reveals a major change occurring in the conservative sphere. Much of this change could be attributed to reactionary sentiments among frustrated Republicans around the country. One of the more arresting aspects of Trump’s candidacy is his refusal to participate in many of the usual games of political respectability. This no-holds-barred tactic has proven to be more successful with millennial voters, as Trump won the votes of the under-30 population in four states and finished second in three states over the course of the Republican primaries.\(^{15}\) When interviewed about their support for Mr. Trump, voters of all ages indicated that his message incites an emotional response.\(^{16}\) Though Trump offers an unfiltered, blunt assessment of the political system, his demeanor and message have splintered the Republican Party to a certain degree. Members of the Republican establishment, including Senator Kelly Ayotte of New Hampshire, in particular, have said that they will vote for Trump but not endorse him.\(^{17}\) This behavior indicates a fear of political fallout if Trump is not elected. Though establishment candidates might agree with Trump on a personal level, strong connections with his campaign may hinder their careers in the future.

Throughout the party’s nomination process, many candidates boasted about their outsider status. However, as major primaries and caucuses passed, these outsiders left the race, leaving the well-established candidates to compete, with one major exception. Donald Trump, a true enigma in the world of politics, has not only managed to stay alive during these trials but has flourished. Candidates such as Trump and Bernie Sanders have mobilized voters in a way that is nearly unprecedented. Despite being seen as easy targets that would eventually fade into irrelevance, these men have refused to be ignored. Because of Sanders’ stalwart political beliefs, voters have taken notice of vulnerabilities and contradictions in Secretary Clinton’s message and her relationship with Wall Street, in particular. When compared with other 2016 presidential hopefuls, these men stand out for their honesty and authenticity. Conversely, candidates such as Ted Cruz and Hillary Clinton have come under fire for a lack of sincerity and likeability.

Optimism for A Modern Republican Party

The millennial generation has come of age in a post-9/11, technologically advanced world and will make up 36 percent of the voters casting ballots in November 2016. This vital block of voters is looking into the future when considering who will receive their vote. Millennials are considering the environment, reproductive rights, and the massive amount of debt they will incur when they choose to obtain a now nearly essential college education. Rather than being guided by the principles of our forefathers, the effort to “Make America Great Again” should depend upon charting a future that can provide stability and security to all members of society.

Though the Republican Party has developed social media pages to attract support from millennials, they have failed to spark the attention that Democratic candidates have


\(^{16}\) Ibid.

attracted. Research shows that rather than committing to a single party, millennials are more likely to classify themselves as independents. Additional research conducted by the Pew Research Center reveals that individuals in this age group are “the most liberal”\(^{18}\) of the four generations studied. However, a look at the differences between self-identified Democratic and Republican respondents provides some interesting insights. While young adults who identify as Republican tend to be less hardline than their predecessors, the same study found that younger Democrats tend to develop slightly more conservative leanings. While older Democrats would be more likely to suggest that the government is able to provide services for vulnerable populations, younger Democrats are more likely to say that there is little room for the expansion of these programs.\(^ {19}\) Paying attention to this data, Republican strategists should understand that attracting millennial voters will be a challenge. However, with the growing number of independents, there is more room for Republicans to attract individuals who have not committed to a party.

Because the Republican Party will depend on the votes of those who are part of the Republican establishment, it is unlikely that the party will be able to make major strides towards adopting a progressive social or environmental policy that could attract young, independent voters. However, a departure from some of the more inflammatory rhetoric that has been found offensive in the past would be a place to start. Being the party of reasonable policy rather than explosive political divisiveness would go a long way towards rebuilding a larger and more diverse community of Republican voters. Similarly, selecting candidates who represent diversity but do not embody its tenets may come across as insincere and may frustrate young voters.

The 2016 election affords Republicans the opportunity to win based upon the significant weaknesses of the Democratic contenders. While Bernie Sanders proved to be too liberal to gain the full support of the Democratic Party, Hillary Clinton's credibility can be attacked from many vantage points. Without ideal representation from the party nominees, both parties are likely to find themselves at a crossroads.

The next president of the United States will have to contend with many significant issues spanning from immigration to national security. Whether or not our next president will be a Democrat or a Republican, this individual will need to have the abilities and confidence to confront these challenges effectively. Given the partisan crossroads at which our nation finds itself, young people must take the initiative to vote for the candidate who represents their hopes for the future of this country.


\(^{19}\) Ibid.
Barack Obama’s election to the American presidency signaled the ascendancy of liberalism in the United States at the dawn of the twenty-first century. The millennials, a rising political generation, came of age in the economic aftermath of the Great Recession. They voted in historic numbers for Obama in 2008 and 2012 and, at least for the foreseeable future, present a formidable obstacle to the resurgence of conservatism at the polls. But American conservatives must not give up hope. In our democracy, an experienced body politic – one that oscillates between liberalism and conservatism in response to economic and political circumstances – is essential. The millennials, recently in thrall to Hope and Change, will mature into such a body politic. Conservatives, however, must do their part by supplying an ideological counterweight if their substantial political tradition is to attract voters in the coming years. In this paper, I shall consider the fundamental conservative convictions that must inform our contemporary attempt to redeem American conservatism.

Modern American conservatism emerged in reaction to the horrors of the Second World War. Richard Weaver, in his seminal conservative text *Ideas Have Consequences*, conveys profound despair about that fallen state of the world: “Now, in the first half of the twentieth century, we look about us to see hecatombs of slaughter; we behold entire nations desolated by war and turned into penal camps by their conquerors; we find half of mankind looking upon the other half as criminal. Everywhere occur symptoms of mass psychosis.”

This bleak vista drove conservatives to seek an alternative to rampant liberalism, with its centralization of state power and deification of human reason, which they blamed for the madness of the Second World War. The unspeakable toll of total war, culminating in the atomic obliteration of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and the inhumanity of the German Third Reich, deeply offended the conservative moral sensibility. The rise of Communist Soviet Union after World War II, led by Joseph Stalin and buttressed by a massive central government supremely confident in its historical inevitability and expansion, violated the conservative precept that human reason alone can identify the drivers of history and settle the ends of society. Together, these reflections on the Second World War impelled American conservatives to search for another philosophy to guide political activity at home.

The most prominent conservative voice of the postwar era was that of William Buckley Jr., who in 1955 founded the *National Review* (still a major organ of American conservative thought) and who famously proclaimed that the *National Review’s* function – and the function of conservatism generally – was to “stand athwart history, yelling Stop, at a time when no one is inclined to do so, or to have much patience with those who so urge it.” Buckley was contending in dramatic fashion with liberalism’s main conviction: that the story of history,
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especially in the last two centuries, is a story of rapid human progress; that the gradual unshackling of human reason from traditional mores drives this progress; and that, in the modern age, centralized governments staffed by the best and the brightest will become the institutional arbiters and guarantors of the good life. Buckley had no patience for liberals who subscribed to a progressive view of history, especially in light of the “hecatombs of slaughter” that haunted the West after the Second World War, and who sought to perfect society along rational lines.

Michael Oakeshott, perhaps the most profound conservative political theorist of the postwar era, captured conservatism’s central conviction with this striking metaphor:

In political activity, men sail a boundless and bottomless sea; there is ... neither starting-place nor appointed destination. The enterprise is to keep afloat on an even keel; the sea is both friend and enemy; and the seamanship consists in using the resources of a traditional manner of behavior in order to make a friend of every hostile occasion.3

Conservatism does not perceive history as a story of human progress, as a voyage on a bounded sea from one predetermined port to another. Consequently, since it eschews an historical “starting-place,” it does not seek the realization of some perfect civil society, an “appointed destination.” It does not do so because it holds that each individual must be free to live as he chooses, and the objective of some perfect society in the future, aimed at by a government in the present, will ultimately lead that government to infringe on this individual's freedom in the present to expedite his society’s march to a future utopia. In this sense, Oakeshott echoes Buckley’s simple dictum that the struggle between liberalism and conservatism is, at a human level, a struggle between collectivism and individualism.4

Moreover, conservatism is deeply skeptical about the likelihood of realizing utopias. Friedrich Hayek, the great conservative economist, asserted that “the fundamental attitude of individualism is one of humility toward the processes by which mankind has achieved things which have not been designed or understood by any individual and are indeed greater than individual minds.”5 When humility is called for concerning the order of things, then it is monumentally egotistical to presume that the human mind is capable of wholly improving this order. Such ego has no place in the psychological disposition of the true conservative, who keenly appreciates the law of unintended consequences in matters of perfecting civil society. Instead, conservatives affirm, in the ringing phrase of Russell Kirk, that “men not being angels, a terrestrial paradise cannot be contrived by metaphysical enthusiasts; yet an earthly hell can be arranged readily enough by ideologues of one stamp or another.”6 Therein lies the danger of utopias to civil society. While liberals may be well intentioned, the folly of human reason and the corruptibility of human nature inevitably poison their vision and make life hellish for their fellow citizens.

When conservatism ascends to political authority, it seeks to sustain the state. In this, it is deeply mindful of Ortega y Gasset’s observation that “the simple process of preserving our
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5 Friedrich August Hayek, Individualism and Economic Order (Auburn, AL: Ludwig von Mises Institute, 1972), 32.
present civilization is supremely complex, and demands incalculably subtle powers.” Rather than perfecting the civil society that it has been elected to govern, conservatism seeks to preserve it so that future generations may also lead free and individuated lives within it. Governance is not approached as the “management of [a utopian] enterprise, but as the rule of those engaged in a great diversity of self-chosen enterprises.” In this approach to governance, conservatism ensures the individual’s freedom to a much greater degree than does liberalism because it allows the individual to prefer the convenient to the perfect today rather than deferring this freedom to some infinitely distant utopian date.

A healthy respect for society’s traditions plays a major role in conservatism’s work of sustaining the state. Alarmed by the radicalism of the French Revolution, which gravely threatened Great Britain’s civil society, the great Irish statesman Edmund Burke penned Reflections on the Revolution in France (1790), the foundational tract of modern Western conservatism. In this towering polemic, he exhorts the conservative to respect tradition as a bulwark against such reckless radicalism, reminding him that civil society is “a partnership not only between those who are living, but between those who are living, those who are dead, and those who are to be born.” The true conservative considers the impact of his political decisions not just on his constituents but on their children, and in light of decisions that affected their ancestors. Such respect for tradition is, in fact, a respect for the continuity of political development and the attendant growth in liberty. In Kirk’s words, perpetuating liberty in civil society depends on “retaining those habits of thought and action which guided the savage in his slow and weary ascent to the state of civil social man.” If tradition stops commanding such respect, then man will be thrust back upon his puny and fallible reason to make political decisions, and if the murderous history of the twentieth century is any guide, he will “cheer the demagogue, enrich the charlatan, and submit to the despot.”

Liberals often mock conservatism for its reluctance to improve civil society. This reluctance is rooted in a healthy respect for tradition and stems from the conservative’s belief that “a known good should not lightly be surrendered for an unknown better.” But it would be a mistake to confuse this reluctance for refusal. Conservatives are open to essential reform, but not all reform; they do not approach governance as a chance to fix everything under their rule.

In our capitalistic world, especially after the Great Recession, debate about the scope of reform often centers on the proper role of government in the marketplace. It will perhaps surprise the reader to learn that Hayek, today the avatar of small-government orthodoxy, argued in favor of government intervention in the marketplace as long as it seeks “the preservation of competition, private initiative, and private property” upon which our economy and our state rest. Hayek’s psychological motivation here reveals conservatism’s deep attitude towards reform: it is necessary and commendable when the present state of affairs threatens the ability of citizens to keep leading free and individuated lives. Of course, great disagreement exists over whether any particular state of affairs warrants such reform, but it does not speak to a philosophical difference between liberalism and conservatism on the subject. Thomas
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11 Ibid., 42.
12 Oakeshott, Rationalism in Politics, 172-173.
Macaulay, the great nineteenth-century British Whig, adroitly closed ranks between these competing philosophies when he proclaimed, “Reform, that you may preserve!”\(^\text{14}\) When guided by conservatives, reform can renew civil society; indeed, Burke claims that the conservative is inherently better suited for this task because, unlike the liberal who desires change for its own sake, the conservative “combines an ability to reform with a disposition to preserve.”\(^\text{15}\)

American conservatism today, in T.S. Eliot’s phrase, is “too often a conservation of the wrong things.”\(^\text{16}\) Its rhetoric of negation and exclusion towards sexual, religious, and ethnic minorities in the American body politic violates the conservative emphasis on considering the individual in his own unique light and respecting his freedom to live as he chooses. Such rhetoric, by sowing ugly dissension, profanes the classical vision of the body politic as a group of seafarers voyaging together, bound to each other for the enjoyment of their freedom and the preservation of their well-being. Moreover, conservatism today too often lobbies only for the interests of the wealthy; it privileges individualism only for this class, reflexively advocating an abolition of the state’s services for citizens from other social classes and forgetting that the great conservative theorists did not call for such a narrow and unyielding interpretation. In Kirk’s biting quip, conservatism is “something more than mere solicitude for tidy incomes,”\(^\text{17}\) and one powerful vein of conservative argument posits that “broadened governmental functions in the economic and social realm do not necessarily contract but may enlarge individual freedom.”\(^\text{18}\) As a consequence, most contemporary conservatism, odious in tone and cramped in action, repels millennial voters and explains the current ascendancy of American liberalism. In time, liberalism will overreach – as it is historically wont to do – and these voters will search for another governing political philosophy. Conservatism will then triumph if, and only if, it embraces its foundational tenet of a broad and vigorous individualism mediated by a healthy respect for the traditions of society and for the occasional need for reform within these traditions.


\(^{15}\) Kirk, The Conservative Mind: From Burke to Eliot, 45.


The Future of Liberalism in America: The Democratic Party Needs to Become a 50-State Party

EMMETT ELDRED

At first glance leading up to the election, things are looking good for the Democratic Party and trending upwards. Democrats decisively won the last two presidential elections, and with Donald Trump on the Republican ticket, most polls predict a landslide victory for the Democratic nominee in 2016.¹ Moreover, Democrats seem poised to take back the US Senate.² Though they haven’t controlled the House of Representatives since 2010 and are unlikely to reclaim it soon, this hasn’t prevented President Obama from shaping a progressive legacy that has made him one of the most popular eight-year presidents in recent memory.³ In the public’s eye, the Democratic Party scores higher on important indicators like honesty, empathy, and overall favorability.⁴ Long-term demographic trends favor Democrats as Democratic-leaning minorities increase their share of the electorate.⁵ Meanwhile, the Democratic Party is winning more new voters while GOP voters are dying faster than Democratic voters.⁶

But from a different angle, the Democratic Party has never been worse off. While Democrats have a strong national apparatus, they are losing in state and local elections, and they are no longer competitive in much of the country. Despite nationwide success, the Democratic Party is not a 50-state party. Democrats struggle to compete in red states, while Republicans have shown that they can win elections even in such deep-blue states as Massachusetts and New York.

Given demographic trends and public sentiment, the future of liberalism looks bright in America. However, instead of celebrating national victories, Democrats need to re-strategize with two goals in mind: (1) become more competitive in deep-red states; and (2) consolidate their control of blue state governments.
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The situation is most dire for Democrats in state governments, where Democrats control the fewest legislative seats since at least 1900. Republicans have firm control over the state governments of red states, and they compete strongly in elections in purple and even blue states. Figure 1 shows that Republicans currently have complete control of 17/23 red state governments, complete control of 3/7 purple state governments, and at least partial control of 13/20 blue state governments, including complete control of the state governments in Michigan, Nevada, and Wisconsin. By comparison, Democrats have complete control of just 7/20 blue state governments, complete control of no purple state governments, and partial control of only 5/23 red state governments. Of the 20 state governments that neither party controls, Republicans have majority control of 12 compared to the Democrats' 8.

Becoming competitive in red state elections should be the Democratic Party's first priority. Holding a governor's seat or controlling at least one chamber of a state's legislature helps to slow partisan legislative advances. Using a strategy called policy balancing, a Democratic governor can, for example, prevent a Republican legislature from redistricting congressional seats to favor their party, or a Democratic general assembly can stop a Republican bill from reaching the governor's desk.

Democrats may have an opening to compete in some red states. For example, John Bel Edwards was elected governor of Louisiana in 2015, proving that a Democrat can win statewide office in the Deep South. Driven by Donald Trump's historic unfavorable numbers, Hillary Clinton is polling surprisingly well in deep-red states like Georgia, Arizona, Kansas, and Utah. Moreover, the projected demographic changes that favor Democrats will be most dramatic in red states in the South and Southwest. In fact, two Republican strongholds, Georgia and Mississippi, could be majority-minority states by 2023.

While Democrats have a chance to compete in red states, especially in the South where demographic changes are working in their favor, winning will take organization and strategy. To win in red states, Democrats should: (1) organize so that the demographics of the electorate reflect changes in the demographics in the population; and (2) emphasize the Democratic ideas that poll most strongly in the South; namely, liberal economic policies.

To win in red states, Democrats need to invest in field organizing: registering minority voters and making sure they turn out to vote. While demographic changes favor Democrats, states with diverse populations will not elect Democrats unless the electorate is also diverse. Though the two fastest-growing Southern minority groups, Latinos and African-Americans, favor Democrats, eligible minority voters register to vote and turn out to vote at lower rates than do white voters. In 2010, South Carolina elected its Republican governor, Nikki Haley, by a margin of only 60,000 votes. In that year, there were 100,000 black South Carolinians who were eligible to vote but were not registered. Had those voters been registered, and had they gone to the polls, Haley's Democratic challenger likely would have won. Turnout has always

8 See Figure 1.
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11 Ibid.
been a struggle for Democrats in nonpresidential election years. But, if Democrats can organize the increasingly diverse electorate, they have a chance to win in the South.

Democrats can also win in red states by emphasizing the Democratic positions that poll most positively among voters there. In particular, populist economic positions such as raising the minimum wage and expanding Medicaid poll consistently high across the country, including in Southern red states. By comparison, common Democratic positions on social issues such as support for a woman's right to choose are considerably less popular in red states than in blue states. This is not to say that Democrats should abandon their principles on social issues. However, the issues they choose to emphasize will matter to the electorate.

It seems self-evident that candidates should emphasize the positions that resonate with voters, but this has not always been the strategy of Democratic candidates in red states. In 2014, Democrats hoped that Texas Senator Wendy Davis could run a competitive bid for Texas governor and perhaps even win. Davis had risen to national prominence after filibustering a bill to place new restrictions on abortion clinics. During the race, Davis made a woman's right to choose the central issue of her campaign, although only 36 percent of Texans supported the right to choose in all or most cases in 2014. Ultimately, Davis's 21-point loss was worse than the loss by the Democratic nominee in 2010.

Democrats should not abandon their positions on social issues, especially because those positions are popular in many other states and among the nation as a whole. However, to win in red states, Democrats running in those races would be wise to emphasize economic populism over social liberalism. Ultimately, Democrats should agree that elected officials who quietly support Democratic social positions are preferable to elected officials who loudly oppose them.

Though Democrats should make competing in red states their top strategic investment, they must also improve their performance in purple and blue states. Republicans have proven themselves far more capable of winning elections in Democratic-leaning states than vice-versa. As a result, Republicans are able to employ more policy balancing, limiting what Democratic state officials can accomplish. Pennsylvania has one million more Democratic voters than Republicans, yet Republicans have solid majorities in both of its legislative chambers. New York has a Cook Report Partisan Voting Index of +11 towards Democrats, yet the Republican coalition in its senate controls 38 seats to the Democrats' 25. Both Massachusetts and Maryland have PVIs of +10 towards Democrats, yet both states elected Republican governors in 2014.
The greatest challenge for Democrats in these elections is turnout. While Democratic voters show up in presidential election years, they do not vote as often in other elections. Though Pennsylvania Democrats have failed to win majorities in the state legislature, their organization in the 2015 election demonstrates how blue state Democrats can organize effectively in nonpresidential years. In 2015, Democrats won all five statewide races, including three seats on the Pennsylvania Supreme Court. Their unexpected success was largely attributable to robust organizing and investment, including unprecedented fundraising and campaign spending, get-out-the-vote efforts, and coordinating all five campaigns.

How Democrats perform in blue and swing states affects their influence nationwide. Though Pennsylvania has one million more Democratic voters, the state has eight Republican members of the House of Representatives and only five Democrats because the Republican-controlled state legislature has gerrymandered Pennsylvania’s congressional districts. Nationwide, Democratic candidates for the House received 1.37 million more votes than Republican candidates in 2012, but Republicans won a 33-seat majority. To win back their majority in Congress, Democrats must consolidate their advantages in blue states and compete in swing states.

Considering national electoral trends, public opinion, and demographic shifts, the future of liberalism in America looks bright, but for the Democratic Party to capitalize on this moment, it must not grow complacent. Instead, it must diagnose its challenges, acknowledge its shortcomings, and pave a new way forward. Because of its historic electoral weakness in so many red states, the Democratic Party cannot truthfully claim to be a 50-state party. Yet, there are cracks in the Republican Party’s Southern fortress. With organization and strategy, the Democratic Party can once again be competitive in all 50 states.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Red/Purple/Blue State&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Governor Party&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Lower Chamber Party&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Upper Chamber Party&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Complete Party Control&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Purple</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Purple</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Purple</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### Figure 1: Partisan Control of State Governments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Red/Purple/Blue State</th>
<th>Governor Party</th>
<th>Lower Chamber Party</th>
<th>Upper Chamber Party</th>
<th>Complete Party Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican (Unicameral)</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Purple</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Purple</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Purple</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Figure 1: Partisan Control of State Governments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Red/Purple/Blue State&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Governor Party&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Lower Chamber Party&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Upper Chamber Party&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Complete Party Control&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Purple</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Complete Control</th>
<th>Majority Control</th>
<th>Partial Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>17/23 Red States</td>
<td>23/23 Red States</td>
<td>23/23 Red States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/7 Purple States</td>
<td>6/7 Purple States</td>
<td>7/7 Purple States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/20 Blue States</td>
<td>6/20 Blue States</td>
<td>13/20 Blue States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23/50 States</td>
<td>35/50 States</td>
<td>43/50 States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>0/23 Red States</td>
<td>0/23 Red States</td>
<td>5/23 Red States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0/7 Purple States</td>
<td>1/7 Purple States</td>
<td>4/7 Blue States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7/20 Blue States</td>
<td>14/20 Blue States</td>
<td>17/20 Blue States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7/50 States</td>
<td>15/30 States</td>
<td>26/50 States</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5. The term “Complete Party Control,” refers to the governor and the majority in both chambers of the state legislature all belonging to the same party. “Majority control” refers to the party with control of at least 2/3 of those bodies. “Partial control” refers to any party with at least 1/3 of those bodies.
PROMESA Only Promises to Ignore the Underlying Issue Causing Financial Distress in Puerto Rico

José M. López

Puerto Rico has been suffering financial troubles for the past two decades. Recently, these problems have been highlighted by the local government’s decision that it will not pay its debtors. Governor Alejandro García Padilla has been warning that Puerto Rico would default on its debts since June of 2016.\(^1\) In July, the Wall Street Journal confirmed Puerto Rico’s first-ever default on its debt.\(^2\) The governor stood by his decision of nonpayment by blaming Wall Street firms and “vulture funds” rather than the mismanagement of public funds in Puerto Rico. Even though this immediate debt crisis is the result of various factors (including mismanagement of funds, lack of transparency from Puerto Rico’s Department of State, excessive borrowing, excessive government spending, etc.), it is most blatantly a reflection of Puerto Rico’s current political situation.

Puerto Rico’s political status has remained colonial in nature since the island was colonized following Columbus’ second voyage. Four centuries later, the colony fought for, and obtained, some degree of autonomy under Spanish rule. However, before Puerto Rico could implement this autonomy, the United States invaded the territory in 1898 to oust Spain from the island. With the signing of the Treaty of Paris at the end of the Spanish-American War, the island was given to the United States along with Cuba and the Philippines. The Foraker Act of 1900 allowed the president of the United States to appoint the island’s governor, cabinet, and all of the judges on the island.\(^3\) In 1917, the Jones Act of Puerto Rico provided American citizenship to all Puerto Ricans and those born on the island.\(^4\) However, until 1948 Puerto Ricans were not allowed to elect their own governor. Then, in 1950, President Truman signed the Puerto Rico Commonwealth Bill that enabled Puerto Rico to establish its own constitution. The Puerto Rican constitution was signed on the 54th anniversary of the US invasion of the island and established the political status that is present today.

“Estado Libre Asociado” translates to “Associated Free State,” but the island has remained an

---


José M. López is originally from Puerto Rico and grew up in a very politically conservative atmosphere. This upbringing made him study International Relations and Politics at Carnegie Mellon University. He graduated in May 2016, and now works for the university in Student Affairs.
unincorporated territory whose constitution does not allow it to truly govern itself or have total say over its own affairs. This colonial status was recently confirmed by the decision in *Puerto Rico v. Sanchez Valle* (2015). Justice Kagan outlined that, in the court’s opinion, the understanding of sovereignty should be seen as “whether the prosecutorial powers of the two jurisdictions have independent origins—or, said conversely, whether those powers derive from the same ‘ultimate source.’” Therefore, since the powers of Puerto Rico’s government do not stem from its constitution and are powers provided by Congress, then it is understood that Puerto Rico is not a sovereign state. This decision also came on the heels of an amicus brief from the executive branch reaffirming the colonial status of the island and certifying that the 1952 constitution does not make it a self-governing entity.

The fact that the island is not able to govern itself and its finances in the manner that other states and US cities do has created the space for a financial crisis like the one Puerto Rico is facing. Some hope can be found in PROMESA, Congress’s newly established law creating a financial oversight board for Puerto Rico. Because of the immediate need it addresses, this bill was supported by both parties and faced gradual changes from its first mention in Congress to its final version once it passed. The main source of hope comes from Congress finally allowing Puerto Rico to begin the process of declaring bankruptcy and restructuring its debt. Criticism and cries of colonialism quickly arose on the island, and all of the major news networks in Puerto Rico predicted that the establishment of the oversight board would essentially result in Puerto Ricans having less of a say in their government’s affairs and the institution of harsh austerity measures, even though the governor voluntarily agreed to this board.

One of Puerto Rico’s major political parties, which supports neither statehood nor independence, argued that Puerto Rico has been a sovereign entity since 1952 and that its status does not need to change. However, proponents from the other two major parties (one of which supports statehood and the other of which supports independence) argued that Puerto Rico obviously did not have sovereignty, but that their choices for political status would provide it.

Meanwhile, the two major parties in the United States have recognized that Puerto Rico's status is a significant issue and they have thus included specific provisions for Puerto Rico within their platforms. The Democratic National Committee kept its wording vague, stating that they should look into working together with the Puerto Rican people to help them determine their own political status. The Republican National Committee, however, took a stronger stance and stated that statehood is the only way forward, recognizing the results of...
the 2012 plebiscite on non-colonial status for the territory.\textsuperscript{12}

Both parties selected representatives who will ultimately decide on the composition of the oversight board. Most of those selected have some connection with Puerto Rico, be it heritage or business connections on the island. A prominent figure who provides hope for Republicans in Puerto Rico is Marco Rubio. Senator Rubio won the Puerto Rican Republican primary in a landslide and has shown a clear understanding of Puerto Rico’s need for better political status that would permit the people of Puerto Rico to join the rest of the United States as equals.

Although the parties play an important role in Puerto Rico’s political status, there is no mention of this crucial factor in PROMESA. The law aims to alleviate the short-term ailments of the island, but it largely ignores the deep-rooted underlying causes of the financial crisis. It thoroughly undermines efforts for self-determination and has created an environment of mistrust within political systems in Puerto Rico. The passage of PROMESA is the first time that the US federal government has taken control of its full powers over the island since the establishment of Puerto Rico’s constitution, leading some to believe that this is the beginning of a more colonial relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico.

Interview with George P. Shultz
Former Secretary of State
Interviewed by Kavita Varadarajan on August 19, 2014

Varadarajan: Thank you so much for agreeing to do this. It is such an honor to meet you. I spent the last two years working with Dr. Skinner here, reading your memoirs and studying the Reagan administration. It’s an honor to meet you.

We wanted to get your thoughts on what conservative ideas you think would be most important in this next generation.

Shultz: I think the word “conservative” isn’t quite the right word. It’s common sense that we conservatives advocate. Right now, for example, we have a corporate tax system that has the United States with the highest corporate taxes of any main country in the world. We also do something else that hardly any other country does: if a US company has a subsidiary in some other country and that subsidiary makes money and is taxed in that other country, we say it’s also going to be taxed here. The result is the money never comes here. Now they’re getting mad in Washington because companies are reacting to these tax incentives. So I say, Get real. People react to incentives, so change the system so that you get companies to be doing what you want. Change the incentives. It’s common sense. The piece I wrote in the Wall Street Journal a week or so ago sets out some of things that the economic community seems to think conservatives ought to pay attention to, and those things are really just common sense.¹

Varadarajan: Given that retrospective economic voting and economic-based voting has been the platform in American elections for many years, but in the last two elections voters have tended to vote more on social issues – immigration, gun control, those kind of issues – how do you see the Republican Party now being able to respond to those voters who are voting on those issues rather than economic issues?

Shultz: Well, if I am against abortion and you’re for it, I say, Okay, I have my view and you have a different view, but I don’t want to have a law that makes you think the way I do. I think we have to have a way of governing over diversity and, rather than try to stamp it out or ignore it, we need to figure out how to govern over it.

There’s a famous painting of Washington crossing the Delaware. If you look at that painting, there’s Washington with his vision and his saber, and there’s Lieutenant Monroe holding the flag, and there are 11 other people in boat. If you look carefully, you’ll see they are all different. Altogether, they represent the 13 states. And the states were different. Washington led over diversity. He had the Revolution as his unifying theme, but when it came time for us to put together a constitution, it was a struggle and a messy process. People realized that they had 13 very different states on their hands and that reality had to be reflected in their constitution. They had to make sure that the small states recognized that they weren’t going to be rolled over by the big states. In the Senate, can you imagine the Virginians – Washington, Jefferson, Madison – the biggest state, agreeing that little Rhode Island should have the same number of votes in the Senate as they had? So they were governing over diversity and they understood how to do it.

I think we need to pay more attention to the problems that come with diversity. You see it all over the world. You see it in the Middle East now. The Iraqis are having a hard time

governing over their diversity.

In this country, I think we have to recognize that there is diversity and sometimes there are issues that overwhelm the diversity. We have a Declaration of Independence that says, “All men are created equal,” and after a while it became intolerable to have free states and slave states so we had a civil war over that. It was diversity that was more than we were willing to put up with. There’s a lot of other diversity that we should recognize. In San Francisco, we have Chinatown. It expresses something about San Francisco; 20% of its inhabitants are Chinese.

So I think that governing our diversity is very important. You have to learn where to recognize differences and where you should try to unify them.

**Varadarajan:** But it takes a special kind of thought to be able to recognize the diversity and to be able to govern over it. Who do you see as front-runners in the Republican Party that have that forethought?

**Shultz:** Well, from what I know of him, Jeb Bush certainly has it. He’s been effective as a governor. I’m very impressed with Scott Walker from Wisconsin because he has had some strong views and he has fought for them against great odds, put them into effect, and they are working. He’s up for re-election again and I hope he wins. His colleague in Wisconsin, Paul Ryan, has managed to put together a budget, working with the Democrats, so he’s showing the capacity to govern. I think that’s what we need to focus on.

**Varadarajan:** So as far as different thoughts go, when you were in the Reagan administration, you and Caspar Weinberger had highly different opinions when it came to the most crucial forms...

**Shultz:** We had different opinions on some things, but on most things, we agreed.

**Varadarajan:** When it came to your diplomacy tactics, both of you were…

**Shultz:** We had a difference of opinion about how to handle the Soviet Union, which was important, and we had a difference of opinion about terrorism.

**Varadarajan:** So when it came to those terrorism changes, how do you think Reagan handled that difference of opinion and how to deal with terrorist threats? How do you think President Reagan chose between your perspective and Caspar Weinberger’s?

**Shultz:** President Reagan had a soft spot in his heart for Americans who were being mistreated. Americans had been taken hostage in Lebanon, and it bothered him a lot. He thought, I’m the President of the United States and here are some American citizens who are being mistreated and I can’t do anything about it. If you were one of those people out there, you’d like to think that the President was worried, wouldn’t you? And he was. But it led him to make a mistake. People came to him with a story about making an arms deal with Iran, and I might say that both Cap Weinberger and I opposed it vigorously. Whenever there was a meeting about it, we’d be on the same side; we said it was a mistake. But the plan went ahead and it blew up eventually. The underlying policy that Reagan understood was that you don’t trade arms or money for hostages because it exposes Americans to the danger of being taken hostage by people who say, “If I grab you as a hostage, I can get something for you.”

**Varadarajan:** It incentivizes the…

**Shultz:** Exactly. So he understood that, but he got trapped by his heart.

**Varadarajan:** Especially when it comes
to terrorism, the conservative ideals have always promoted a strong sense of privacy, and now that foreign terrorism has become a domestic problem as well, how do we find a balance between Republican conservative concepts of personal privacy and the need for strong domestic intelligence?

**Shultz:** It's hard. We have to keep our country secure. That's the first responsibility of the government. I think it's possible to collect information without undue violation of privacy. Privacy is being violated by private companies all the time. For example, we have a little place in the Berkshire Mountains that has been in my family for a long time. I looked it up on Google and anyone can see what's going on in my back yard.

**Varadarajan:** So, do you think our governing policies when it comes to intelligence are satisfactory in that department?

**Shultz:** I think the intelligence community has gone somewhat off the rails and people don't trust them anymore. When I was secretary of the Treasury back in the '70s, I went to an NSA meeting and the director of the CIA was a man named Dick Helms. The meeting started and he gave an intelligence briefing and answered questions. Then, when policy was being discussed, he left the room. He would not be present when policy was being discussed because he didn't want to have people think that policy views were affecting the intelligence. The intelligence should be driven by the intelligence, not by views on policy. These days, the intelligence community wants to be part of the policy process. They say they're not, but they want to be present and know about it. It's a mistake.

**Varadarajan:** So how do we regain that trust in a world that is also untrustworthy? We just got reports that the Germans have been listening in on Hillary Clinton. How do we build trust at home but also make sure that we're aggressive with our intelligence?

**Shultz:** I think there are certain realities that people have to recognize. I can remember once when I was negotiating with the Japanese about something and the CIA people came to me and said, “We can get information on what their positions are.” I said, “I don't want it. This will come to light and the sense of trust that I am building with the Japanese will be blown away. I don't need some clandestine way of knowing what their positions are; I know what their positions are because they tell me and I can figure it out.” By the process of negotiating you find out where the bottom lines are. That's what negotiators do. So that was an instance in which intelligence people had an ability that I thought was going to hurt rather than help.

**Varadarajan:** When it comes to negotiations, you've been extremely successful both in China with the Taiwanese relationship and when you were negotiating the Arab-Israeli peace settlements. How do you think we could implement better negotiating techniques now, especially with the Soviets and with the Israelis?

**Shultz:** First of all, I think America has to get its act back together again. We have to do the necessary things to get our economy on track again and show that we know how to govern ourselves. We obviously want to build up our military, and it probably needs a different structure than it has had in the past. We need some no-nonsense people who will work on that and help us pull it together in the right way. Then we need to build up our military capabilities and let Mr. Putin see that we can't be pushed around. You have to remember to be careful about what you say. If you're going to make a threat – if you're going to draw a red line – and it is crossed,
then you have to do something.

I think of my time in Marine Corps boot camp at the start of World War II. My sergeant hands me my rifle and says, “Take good care of this rifle. It’s your best friend. But remember one thing: never point this rifle at anybody unless you’re willing to pull the trigger.” No empty threats. Marines live by that idea and that’s one reason they’re so effective. But when the president draws a red line in Syria and it’s crossed and he doesn’t do anything, nobody pays any attention to what he says anymore because they think that there is nothing behind it. That can be changed easily by being careful. If you’re going to draw a red line, you ought to have thought through beforehand what you’re going to do if it’s crossed.

Varadarajan: How much do you think our current position and our weakened economic status in the world compared to when you were negotiating on behalf of the US has hurt our ability to negotiate? Do you think that’s the biggest factor? Do you think our position is weakened because we’re considering reducing our military strength?

Shultz: I think that the army isn’t as strong as it could be and should be. We need to have strategic thinking. If you have a strategy, you know where you are trying to go. If you have a strategy, you resolve your tactical issues in line with that strategy. If you have no strategy, you’re just trying to solve a problem day by day and that doesn’t add up. So I think there is a need for strategic thinking.

Varadarajan: And how would you suggest we mold our strategy around the current situation in Israel between the Israelis and the Palestinians right now?

Shultz: There’s an interesting phenomenon that’s developed. I call it asymmetrical warfare. With the United States in the lead, there have been a lot of developments having to do with how you should conduct yourself in a war. You minimize civilian tragedies, for instance. And what has happened is that our adversaries are turning our values against us and making them weapons. The Palestinians are putting their weapons in mosques and hospitals and schools and firing, and when the Israelis fire back, they kill women and children and this gets publicized. So if the Israelis don’t fire back, you would have created the perfect sanctuary from which you can fire and take offensive action. It’s a relatively new phenomenon and I don’t think it has been thought through carefully and worked out.

Varadarajan: How do you think that back and forth will play out in Iraq now – that asymmetric warfare – because the Iraqis operate very similarly?

Shultz: Well, you see the threat by ISIS that if you don’t convert to Islam they will kill you. That’s a demonstration of intolerance – a total lack of thought about how to govern over diversity. That’s the reason Iraq is falling apart. It had a government dominated by Shias that was intolerant of the Sunnis and the Kurds, so it’s just falling apart. Maybe somebody can put it back together again, but right now it’s asunder.

Varadarajan: With your experience in the military and on the diplomatic side, how would you judge our past nearly 15 years in Iraq?

Shultz: It’s too big a topic.

Varadarajan: How would you judge the Bush administration’s work in Iraq and, by contrast, the Obama administration’s decision to pull out and now this decision to go back in, not with troops but with force – this back and forth that we should be in and we should be out? How do we develop a strategy that spans administrations to give
some consistency to the region and the area while we still have change in domestic and political implications?

Shultz: There was a lot of continuity during the Cold War from one administration to another. And there was a common understanding for who our adversary was, and why, and a broad consensus of policy. We consulted a lot and spent more time between the executive branch and Congress talking about what we were doing and listening to people and so on. It worked pretty well. That tradition does not seem to be present. I haven't been in office for a quarter of a century now, and I don't even recognize the Washington that is being described to me today. I know quite a few of the people in Washington and they're all good, solid people. I know Democrats and I know Republicans, and they're good people. Something has got to get pulled back together, I believe.

Varadarajan: I do, too. So coming back to the topic of the journal, you've worked with a host of Republican and Democratic administrations. How do you see the Republican Party evolving as a whole in this next election of 2016?

Shultz: I think the Republicans will wind up putting together a program that's positive that says, Here is what we think will work for the country and make us better, and furthermore, here are some people who know how to make something happen. Governance is hard. It isn't just having an idea. It's making the idea into a reality and managing it. People seem to have lost sight of the fact that if you become a cabinet secretary you have a big department to manage and make it work. Right now, too many things aren't working. There are Republicans with good, positive ideas and they will put them together in a way that will make them work.

Varadarajan: The Democratic Party has traditionally been more fractionalized and traditionally the Republican Party has been slightly more cohesive. With the Tea Party now, the Republican Party has had to evolve to deal with an internal fraction. How do you think that will play out in 2016?

Shultz: I think the main thing that people don't like about the Tea Party is its intolerance. There's been a reaction to that and the Tea Party candidates didn't do well in these primaries. I think a lot of the ideas are fine, so the Tea Party energy will continue, but tactically I think there's been a correction.

Varadarajan: So you think the voting party will be able to overcome the fractionalization in the last…?

Shultz: Absolutely.

Varadarajan: And you think that that will happen by 2016?

Shultz: Sure.

Varadarajan: That's good to hear. More recently, a lot of younger Republicans like myself have found that we are highly outnumbered, especially on college campuses. How do you think we can bring more enthusiasm for conservative thought? Even if many of my colleagues feel that they are with the party fiscally, they feel like some of the social values, some of the extremes, the intolerance that you've mentioned from the Tea Party, have seeped into the party as a whole and they feel they can't identify at all. How do we combat that, especially when the Democrats have had such a strong footing in the last election?

Shultz: Young people are interested in opportunities, and that's our mantra: opportunity. And one of the ways you get that is through education. The Republicans
want to see that everybody has a chance for education. Many Democrats, under the thumb of the teachers’ unions, think that the purpose of schools is to provide employment for the teachers. We think the purpose of schools is to educate kids. We want to educate kids and give people an opportunity. The Latinos in California would give anything to get the education that they think they deserve. There’s been a lawsuit recently (you’ve probably heard about it) where there was a successful suit saying that you’re violating our constitutional rights by insisting that you can’t fire poor teachers. We’re on that side, and I should think the fact that we want to give students a chance would appeal to young people.

Varadarajan: But in the last election, the Republican Party lost a great deal of the Latino vote. Do you think that we can regain that with the education issue?

Shultz: We’re the opportunity people.

Varadarajan: How do we combat that with our stance on immigration compared to the Democratic stance?

Shultz: I think we’re worrying about the wrong border. Do you know what the net immigration of Mexicans to the United States was last year?

Varadarajan: No, I don’t know.

Shultz: Zero. None. There were more coming from the US to Mexico than the other way around. Our problem is Mexico’s southern border, and we should be helping Mexico avoid being a transit country with all of the corruption and degradation that goes with that. We also have to be aware of the fact that in these Central American countries from which the kids come, the conditions are intolerable. That’s why they are leaving. They are intolerable because of the power of the drug lords. And where do the drug lords get the money and their arms? From the United States.

So we need to examine our so-called war on drugs policy. I’m a radical on the subject. I’ve written about it and talked about it and I think that if anything has failed, that has failed. It has the goal of keeping drugs out of the country but it has not worked; they’re here. It has the idea of curbing the use of drugs, but the use of drugs in the United States is relatively high compared to other countries, so it hasn’t worked. I think that drugs are bad for people and bad for society, so we need to have a policy that deals with them. If we reduce the demand for drugs here, we’ll have a policy that doesn’t produce the huge profits that drug lords fight about and kill for.

Varadarajan: You’ve spoken a great deal on your views on the drug policy, so how about coming back to education for a moment. Our rankings in the worldwide education system seem to have dropped dramatically. We’re number 15 in math and science. How do you think that we can change our policies on a national level to bring this back up to where it used to be?

Shultz: First of all, we shouldn’t approach this as a federal problem. It’s a state-level problem. If we try to have the federal government take over, goodness knows what a mess we’ll have. So some states have been doing well and others not so well. I think the fundamental reason is if you let kids choose the schools they’re going to go to, it makes schools compete for students, and then suddenly everything changes. So it’s all back to school choices.

Varadarajan: I agree. So if you had to pick a front-runner for the 2016 election, who would it be?

Shultz: I wouldn’t know how to do that. I think we have quite a few good candidates.
I hope we could have a primary process that doesn’t include the ones who are show boating and focuses on the serious candidates. In fact, I am ready to go back to the smoke-filled room strategy and let some of the party stalwarts pick the candidates.

Varadarajan: Thank you so much for your time. Again, it’s such an honor to meet you. Thank you so much.
Interviews with Barry Jackson and Tony Podesta

Barry Jackson, Former Chief of Staff for House Speaker John Boehner
Tony Podesta, Washington Lobbyist and Founder of the Podesta Group
Interviewed by Emily Baddock on September 27, 2016

Barry Jackson and Tony Podesta joined the Center for International Relations and Politics on campus on September 27, 2016, for a friendly debate surrounding the upcoming election, moderated by Professor Kiron Skinner. While at CMU, Emily Baddock took a few minutes to sit down with each to hear their perspectives on what makes this election cycle different and how it affects millennial voters.

Interview with Barry Jackson

Baddock: Thank you again for agreeing to speak with me for an interview for CIRP Journal. This issue will focus on the future of conservatism and liberalism. So, what does conservatism look like to you, and how is the younger generation helping define that?

Jackson: So, I’m one of those who are actually upbeat, because I think that the basic tenants of conservatism are bedrock principles that never go away. Things like the free market, individualism, individual liberty - those concepts - you start talking about a John Locke theory of the world - the back and forth of what happens in politics, it’s interesting, but the fundamentals of conservatism do not change. So regardless of what happens in this election, there are bright men and women that are going to pick up the banner and run with it. And I think the great thing about conservatism is that we don’t have to bend and mold our principles to what the world is going through - they apply. And it doesn’t matter if you’re talking French Revolution, or if you’re talking what Russia and China are doing today. These fundamentals are always there - timeless.

Baddock: You have extensive experience in Congress, as well as working on Presidential elections. How is the role and the influence of the party different between the executive and legislative levels?

Jackson: It’s hugely different. And it continues to evolve. The first thing is - when you go back and you think about the Federalist papers and Alexander Hamilton commenting, defining the executive - the nature of it - there’s a unitary executive. Doesn’t mean it’s a monarch, but it’s a single voice that speaks. And throughout history it’s mostly been this way. Everybody on the president’s team, so the president’s own staff in the White House, the cabinet officials - at the end of the day when the president says, “these are the words, this is the policy,” you’re, “Yes, sir. This is where we’re going.” And in Congress, even if you are the majority party, even if you have majority in both houses, your leader serves at the pleasure of these members, who are not beholden to that leader, they’re beholden to their constituents. So, we always used to say in Speaker Boehner’s office, “I’m just dang lucky if I get them singing on the same hymnal.” If I get them singing on the same “and”, I’m doing great. And the president, he gets to direct that all of the time. And on the party side of it - you know, the irony of John McCain and Russ Feingold doing McCain-Feingold, which supposedly was going to take dirty money out of politics and on and on… It had the exact opposite effect. And it particularly hurt the Republican Party, because traditionally, the national Democratic Party was a weak, central entity. But supported in a very strong fashion by their affiliated groups. So whether it was the labor unions, or the trial lawyers, or
the radical environmentalists, you know, they were just: salute - that was the team. Republicans for all of our individualism, we're the exact opposite. The national party was the core and everything organized around it, so when McCain-Feingold passed, and you ended up cutting off funds to the party, that's where the individualism took hold, because, now the individual members of congress and individual parties could just say – we don't care what's going on at the national level. We're going to do things our way and now there wasn't an entity that could pull it all together. President Bush could hold it together because he was president, which gives you all kinds of power, and it gives you a microphone that nobody else has, but Boehner took over. And we have Paul Ryan now, who by all accounts is the intellectual center of the conservative movement and Speaker of the House and he's struggling with the same issues that Boehner did. So, the McCain-Feingold ruling and the subsequent Supreme Court rulings have really decreased central organizing power and tenets of the party and its ability to impact the legislative branch and I don't know, we'll see if Donald Trump's elected, or the next time we have a Republican in the White House, how it impacts there.

**Baddock:** Despite binding principles, do you think that the [2016] election has emphasized a disjoint within the party?

**Jackson:** You know, I think we're living with it in the sense that nobody planned for this, and in some ways you could see Donald Trump coming from a mile away, and in other ways it was a complete surprise. I remember almost two years ago, I was telling people, “There is a movement out there. People are frustrated.” They’re frustrated with their government, and they’re frustrated with Republicans because frankly, mostly with our outside groups, they were encouraging members to make unrealistic promises and it caught us, if you will. And so, the surprise for the party is that you’ve got an individual who is not a conservative, not a Republican, in any traditional sense of the word. He does not have a history with the party, he doesn't have a history with the conservative movement, and in fact, a lot of conservative positions that he has taken, I think a lot of people in the back of their heads are going, “Really? I wonder if he'll hold to that.” So, we see it that way. And you see, when people like Speaker Ryan struggle with how to be supportive of the candidate, how to be supportive of the party, because the speaker role is a party role, it's not just a parliamentary role, and I think everybody is trying to wrap their arms around that.

**Baddock:** Is there is a particular issue that is going to be the deciding factor this cycle?

**Jackson:** Yea, I think at the end of the day, the issue – what it comes down to – is what Donald Trump said in the first debate, which is: you’ve been there for thirty years. [Secretary Clinton] just happens to be the perfect foil for that line. But you could have put up just about anyone on the Democrat side other than Bernie Sanders – if you went up to New Hampshire during the primary, what was striking, was that the number of people who said, “I'm trying to decide between Donald Trump and Bernie Sanders.” Now if you're a traditional party activist, your head is spinning. What?! What could possibly boil it down to those two? Well, it's because both of them want to blow the system up, and that's where people are.

**Baddock:** I think it's safe to say that both candidates are operating at a trust deficit. Regardless of who is elected, how do you think that candidate can regain the trust of the American people?

**Jackson:** This is a really deep and serious problem. You've got academics who are writing in the great blogosphere, about, “Is this the death of democracy?” type of
thing. Because, when people lose trust and faith and confidence, and they’re own self-governing, you’ve got an issue on your hand. Now, I don’t think we’re that far along. And frankly, whether its Secretary Clinton or whether its Donald Trump, the issues that they’re going to be facing, whoever takes the oath of office, is going to force them and challenge them to do things that they could not even anticipate today. It is just where the world is, whether you’re talking international relations, or macronomics, or whether you’re just talking about day-to-day life. You can look throughout history, and presidents who you never would have thought would have risen to the occasion do, so if it was just a normal kind of environment, I would be worried about how do you reclaim the trust deficit and address it, but in this one, they will have an opportunity because they are going to be confronted with major challenges. And I’ve told people, I don’t particularly understand how Democrats think, and I don’t particularly understand the Clinton world, but to me, one of the things she could do on the trust side would be to say, “If I’m elected I’m only going to serve one term.” That way, a whole bunch of people would look up who are doubtful about where she wants to head, and they’re worried about the impact of the left on her governance, and you can look glass-half empty, glass-half-full because the glass-half-full side is, you know what – if she’s not going to run again and she’s not worried about what comes next, maybe she actually could govern to the center. Maybe she actually starts dealing with real problems in a way that rallies the American people rather than divides the American people.

**Baddock:** The millennial voter block may be a deciding factor in the election. What can the conservative movement do to bring in those votes?

**Jackson:** You know, I think the first thing: We’ll see if they’re going to be a deciding factor. When you look at the polls, the discontent about the choices is as strong with millennial voters as it is any place else. For the conservative ideology, where technology has brought us ought to allow us to emphasize some of the principles about individualism. And your contributions to the greater good. Because these are all value sets, and I don’t pretend to quite understand the millennial brain, but all of the literature and what I witness with my own nephews and nieces – that seems to be an organizing principle I think that conservatives can grab hold of. A lot of the great social debates that have defined politics for the last twenty years, and they’re never going to be completely settled, but they don’t carry the same impact. When you’re able to turn to things about the economy and you’re able to turn to things about rules and responsibilities of citizens, I think that’s a place where we can say – you have a home here. That’s why I go back to the very first thing I said – those bedrock principles are who we are as conservatives. I don’t care what generation it is, and I don’t care what problems you have, if you stick to these core bedrock fundamentals, you’re going to be able to articulate a case and I think that right person can bring voters along.

**Baddock:** In closing, any advice for a young person trying to establish themselves in politics or in the conservative movement?

**Jackson:** Be involved. I got my start – I was student body president in high school, I went to college at University of Iowa, which is a wonderful school. You know Iowa is such a great laboratory for participatory democracy. I ended up being the youngest country chairman in the state of Iowa, Republican. It was Johnson County, so about the most liberal place you could possibly be, but whatever. The great thing about it though, was that it gave me an appreciation of – if you want to get involved, there are all kinds of opportunities for you. All you gotta
Interview with Tony Podesta

Baddock: Thank you again for agreeing to speak with me for an interview for CIRP Journal. This issue will focus on the future of conservatism and liberalism. What’s your take – what does the future of liberalism look like, and how is the younger generation affecting that?

Podesta: Well, I think the so-called millennials, of which I suppose you are one – you know, they have a very different worldview from their elders, and a very different life experience. They’ve sort of become mature in an era when the economy wasn’t working that well, and now it is again, but still, there are issues there when people are crushed by mountains of educational debt, which is a generational experience that people from my generation don’t experience. My going to a state university cost me $240 a year, which is probably less than the daily tuition here.

I also think that you’ve grown up in a time in which – when I was growing up, it was all about race, and Martin Luther King was marching in the streets of Chicago and people were throwing rocks at him. And now marriage equality - which was unthinkable ten to fifteen years ago - is now part of the ethos of the millennial generation. So whether its multicultural or acceptance of different, of all sort of different people, you are growing and coming to maturity and will be running the country with a whole different set of experiences and values than we, a couple generations earlier, had.

Baddock: Well again, thank you Mr. Jackson for those words of wisdom – I’m sure a number of our CMU students will take them to heart.

Jackson: I hope so, thanks for having me.
Podesta: Well, I think you’re seeing this already. Secretary Clinton and Senator Sanders are campaigning at the University of New Hampshire tomorrow; they’re running - all of the big name Democrats are running around and speaking at college campuses. Elizabeth Warren, Michelle Obama, you know, the President, the former President. You name it – Chelsea Clinton is going – everyone is going to college campuses as a sort of surrogate marker for the younger generation. And I think they’re talking more about [millennial issues], you know, Hillary Clinton - there was like a brief moment, she didn't develop the point very much in the debate last night, in which she talked about free college. You know Bernie Sanders would talk about it so often, but now Secretary Clinton is touching on these issues that are especially important to millennial voters.
Podesta: Whatever you’re into – you have to do something. Get involved in something you’re passionate about and you’ll find a space. Just start – do something!

Baddock: Mr. Podesta, thank you for the words of wisdom, and thank you for joining me and *CIRP Journal* – we’re looking forward to your discussion with Mr. Jackson later this afternoon.

Podesta: Thank you, thanks for having me.