WEBVTT

NOTE duration:"00:57:12" NOTE recognizability:0.855

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.879350323333333

00:00:00.000 --> 00:00:03.978 All right. So good afternoon, everyone.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879350323333333

 $00:00:03.980 \longrightarrow 00:00:05.660$ Thank you for being here today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879350323333333

00:00:05.660 --> 00:00:06.520 My colleague Kieran's a

NOTE Confidence: 0.879350323333333

00:00:06.520 --> 00:00:07.595 little bit under the weather,

NOTE Confidence: 0.879350323333333

00:00:07.600 --> 00:00:10.820 so I'm going to do my best to pinch it here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879350323333333

 $00:00:10.820 \longrightarrow 00:00:13.092$ So I want to thank those of you

NOTE Confidence: 0.879350323333333

 $00:00:13.092 \longrightarrow 00:00:15.623$ who are here in person and on

NOTE Confidence: 0.879350323333333

 $00:00:15.623 \longrightarrow 00:00:17.513$ zoom for today's grand rounds.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879350323333333

 $00{:}00{:}17.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}19.248$ I know that many of you are already

NOTE Confidence: 0.879350323333333

 $00:00:19.248 \longrightarrow 00:00:20.880$ connecting with your families in gratitude,

NOTE Confidence: 0.879350323333333

 $00{:}00{:}20.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}23.272$ and then I invite you all to reflect

NOTE Confidence: 0.879350323333333

 $00:00:23.272 \longrightarrow 00:00:25.768$ on doctor Mays's message this morning.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879350323333333

 $00:00:25.770 \longrightarrow 00:00:27.170$ I also want to let you know that

 $00:00:27.170 \longrightarrow 00:00:28.645$ our next grand rounds will feature

NOTE Confidence: 0.879350323333333

 $00{:}00{:}28.645 \to 00{:}00{:}29.995$ Doctor Aaron Dunn from Harvard,

NOTE Confidence: 0.879350323333333

 $00:00:30.000 \longrightarrow 00:00:32.440$ and she'll be describing biological

NOTE Confidence: 0.879350323333333

 $00:00:32.440 \longrightarrow 00:00:34.301$ embedding of adversity. So.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879350323333333

 $00:00:34.301 \longrightarrow 00:00:37.429$ For those here, and for those on zoom,

NOTE Confidence: 0.879350323333333

 $00:00:37.430 \longrightarrow 00:00:40.326$ I also want to take a moment of

NOTE Confidence: 0.879350323333333

 $00:00:40.326 \longrightarrow 00:00:42.220$ silence to honor the lives sensibly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.879350323333333

00:00:42.220 --> 00:00:44.420 senselessly taken in Colorado Springs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

00:00:51.730 --> 00:00:53.911 The amount of hate that lives in our

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

00:00:53.911 --> 00:00:56.010 world is actually rather heartbreaking,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00{:}00{:}56.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}58.596$ and I'm saddened by safe spaces

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:00:58.596 \longrightarrow 00:01:01.398$ that I'm unsafe and fear that this

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

00:01:01.398 --> 00:01:03.283 evokes in the LGBTQ community,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

00:01:03.290 --> 00:01:05.370 their parents, partners, and friends.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:01:05.370 \longrightarrow 00:01:07.250$ You deserve to feel safe,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:01:07.250 \longrightarrow 00:01:08.900$ and if I can be of support to you or

 $00{:}01{:}08.950 \to 00{:}01{:}10.648$ help you connect with other supports,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:01:10.650 \longrightarrow 00:01:13.120$ please know that I'm here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

00:01:13.120 --> 00:01:15.440 And so it is my pleasure to introduce

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

00:01:15.440 --> 00:01:17.479 you to doctor Darren Burani.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:01:17.480 \longrightarrow 00:01:19.095$ He's a professor of sociology

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:01:19.095 \dashrightarrow 00:01:20.387$ at La
Guardia Community College

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

00:01:20.387 --> 00:01:22.198 at City University of New York.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:01:22.200 \longrightarrow 00:01:24.438$ He earned his PhD from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

00:01:24.438 --> 00:01:26.883 CUNY Graduate Center and has an

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00{:}01{:}26.883 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}28.639$ MPA from Columbia University.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:01:28.640 \longrightarrow 00:01:30.380$ His work has primarily focused on

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00{:}01{:}30.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}31.955$ how special interest groups and

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

00:01:31.955 --> 00:01:33.775 intellectuals shape the political culture,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00{:}01{:}33.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}35.980$ especially in relation to welfare

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:01:35.980 \longrightarrow 00:01:36.860$ state policy.

00:01:36.860 --> 00:01:39.035 His most recent project explores

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:01:39.035 \longrightarrow 00:01:41.218$ how the food industry influences

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

00:01:41.218 --> 00:01:42.970 public thinking on nutrition.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

00:01:42.970 --> 00:01:44.510 Public health and the environment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:01:44.510 \longrightarrow 00:01:47.317$ with a focus on the harmful consequences

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

00:01:47.317 --> 00:01:49.380 of industrial animal agriculture,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:01:49.380 \longrightarrow 00:01:51.546$ disproportionately experienced by

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00{:}01{:}51.546 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}54.434$ frontline and marginalized communities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

00:01:54.440 --> 00:01:57.056 So I've known Doctor Virani D,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:01:57.060 \longrightarrow 00:01:59.724$ as I call him, for about 20 years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00{:}01{:}59.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}01.596$ And my first introduction to his

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:02:01.596 \longrightarrow 00:02:03.445$ brilliance was when he married a

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

00:02:03.445 --> 00:02:05.482 dear friend of mine from high school,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:02:05.482 \longrightarrow 00:02:08.112$ both because of who he chose to marry

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:02:08.112 \longrightarrow 00:02:10.639$ and from the conversations that we had.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:02:10.640 \longrightarrow 00:02:12.190$ So for years we've engaged

00:02:12.190 --> 00:02:13.120 in deep analytical.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:02:13.120 \longrightarrow 00:02:14.808$ Conversations about the world

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:02:14.808 \longrightarrow 00:02:16.496$ and our evolving perspectives

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:02:16.496 \longrightarrow 00:02:18.588$ as young adults and parents.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:02:18.590 \longrightarrow 00:02:19.678$ And I was excited.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00{:}02{:}19.678 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}22.296$ It was exciting to know that he was going

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

00:02:22.296 --> 00:02:24.445 to publish an analysis of anything like.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:02:24.450 \dashrightarrow 00:02:26.242$ I was just excited because we've had

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

00:02:26.242 --> 00:02:27.730 so many wonderful conversations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:02:27.730 \longrightarrow 00:02:29.452$ let alone on a topic of such

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:02:29.452 \longrightarrow 00:02:30.630$ relevance to our center.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:02:30.630 \longrightarrow 00:02:32.628$ And so at the time that it was published,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00{:}02{:}32.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}34.894$ I actually didn't have any way of knowing

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:02:34.894 \longrightarrow 00:02:36.731$ how relevant and important his work

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:02:36.731 \longrightarrow 00:02:38.555$ would become to our community until

 $00:02:38.609 \longrightarrow 00:02:40.545$ my role at our at the center shifted.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:02:40.550 \longrightarrow 00:02:42.674$ And so as part of our commitment to DI,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:02:42.680 \longrightarrow 00:02:43.588$ we're consistently.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:02:43.588 \longrightarrow 00:02:45.404$ Working toward understanding how

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:02:45.404 \longrightarrow 00:02:47.678$ structures and systems have created

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:02:47.678 \longrightarrow 00:02:49.663$ and sustained narratives and policies

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00{:}02{:}49.663 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}51.761$ that continue to oppress populations

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

00:02:51.761 --> 00:02:54.449 and that have populations that have

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00{:}02{:}54.449 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}\:} > 00{:}02{:}55.793$ been historically marginalized.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:02:55.800 \longrightarrow 00:02:58.166$ So we've all heard the narrative of

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00{:}02{:}58.166 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}00.498$ pulling oneself up by their bootstraps,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:03:00.500 \longrightarrow 00:03:02.535$ but we rarely acknowledge that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

00:03:02.535 --> 00:03:04.960 many have been denied access to

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:03:04.960 \longrightarrow 00:03:06.565$ boots in the first place.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:03:06.570 \longrightarrow 00:03:07.311$ And so today,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00{:}03{:}07.311 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}08.793$ let's listen to Doctor Perini with

 $00{:}03{:}08.793 \mathrel{--}{>} 00{:}03{:}10.463$ open minds and hearts to understand

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:03:10.463 \longrightarrow 00:03:12.135$ how the narrative of poverty and

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

00:03:12.135 --> 00:03:13.885 welfare has been framed in our country,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:03:13.890 \longrightarrow 00:03:15.906$ to continue to oppress and see how

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00{:}03{:}15.906 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}18.210$ we're able to disrupt this narrative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:03:18.210 \longrightarrow 00:03:19.547$ And so for those who are here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:03:19.550 \longrightarrow 00:03:20.770$ we also have planned for,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

00:03:20.770 --> 00:03:23.186 we noticed that every time after a speaker,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:03:23.190 \longrightarrow 00:03:25.014$ people linger and want to ask more questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:03:25.020 \longrightarrow 00:03:25.790$ So we actually did it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:03:25.790 \longrightarrow 00:03:28.240$ Plan fully this time and we'll have

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:03:28.240 \longrightarrow 00:03:30.431$ some vegan treats coming in and

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00{:}03{:}30.431 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}32.573$ also the opportunity to continue to

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00{:}03{:}32.573 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}34.581$ chat with Doctor Burani after you

NOTE Confidence: 0.7077882

 $00:03:34.581 \longrightarrow 00:03:37.013$ hear what he has to share with us.

 $00:03:37.013 \longrightarrow 00:03:38.740$ Now, Darren Doctor Virani, please join us.

NOTE Confidence: 0.749946745

 $00{:}03{:}53.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}55.136$ You're all set. You just gotta click

NOTE Confidence: 0.749946745

 $00:03:55.136 \longrightarrow 00:03:56.665$ on it first and then you can use

NOTE Confidence: 0.749946745

00:03:56.665 --> 00:04:01.060 the arrow keys. Gotcha. Oh, OK.

NOTE Confidence: 0.897761158

 $00:04:03.610 \longrightarrow 00:04:04.800$ I knew that would happen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860374974

 $00:04:06.910 \longrightarrow 00:04:07.990$ Thank you so much, Tara,

NOTE Confidence: 0.860374974

 $00:04:07.990 \longrightarrow 00:04:11.270$ for that lovely introduction.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860374974

 $00:04:11.270 \longrightarrow 00:04:12.686$ I hope I can live up to that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860374974

 $00{:}04{:}12.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}15.746$ But I I, I share your opinion that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.860374974

00:04:15.750 --> 00:04:17.340 you know, I think my my

NOTE Confidence: 0.860374974

 $00:04:17.340 \longrightarrow 00:04:18.400$ brightest moment of brilliance

NOTE Confidence: 0.860374974

 $00:04:18.459 \longrightarrow 00:04:21.580$ was my partner of choice, so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860374974

00:04:21.580 --> 00:04:22.750 Who I think is watching.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:04:25.030 \longrightarrow 00:04:26.278$ It's a pleasure to be here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:04:26.280 \longrightarrow 00:04:28.296$ and thank you so much for the opportunity

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:04:28.296 \longrightarrow 00:04:30.367$ to speak with all of you about my work.

00:04:30.370 --> 00:04:32.946 And thank you for the important work you

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:04:32.946 \longrightarrow 00:04:35.747$ do here at the Yale Child Study Center.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:04:35.750 \longrightarrow 00:04:38.942$ You know, the title of today's talk is

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:04:38.942 \longrightarrow 00:04:42.176$ what I. Kind of wish the book was titled.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

00:04:42.180 --> 00:04:43.940 If I could do it all over again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

00:04:43.940 --> 00:04:45.800 I probably wouldn't choose the name,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:04:45.800 \longrightarrow 00:04:47.558$ the new welfare consensus, and I'll

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00{:}04{:}47.558 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}49.620$ explain kind of what that term means.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

00:04:49.620 --> 00:04:51.228 But this, I think,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00{:}04{:}51.228 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}53.238$ is a better characterization of

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00{:}04{:}53.238 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}55.436$ where the book is coming from.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

00:04:55.440 --> 00:04:56.796 You know, I did some thinking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:04:56.800 \longrightarrow 00:04:59.176$ I've never, I haven't done this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:04:59.180 \longrightarrow 00:05:01.742$ The book talk actually in in

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:05:01.742 \longrightarrow 00:05:04.419$ a minute as the kids say.

 $00:05:04.420 \longrightarrow 00:05:05.735$ And I've certainly never done

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:05:05.735 \longrightarrow 00:05:07.050$ it in a healthcare setting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00{:}05{:}07.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}08.658$ So I'm really delighted to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00{:}05{:}08.658 \longrightarrow 00{:}05{:}11.042$ able to do this and it, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:05:11.042 \longrightarrow 00:05:14.098$ it got me thinking at 1st and how

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

00:05:14.098 --> 00:05:15.486 this material relates directly

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:05:15.486 \longrightarrow 00:05:17.648$ to the work that you all do.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

00:05:17.650 --> 00:05:18.190 You know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00{:}05{:}18.190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}20.080$ it tells a story of how intellectuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:05:20.080 \longrightarrow 00:05:21.842$ and interest groups have shaped the

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00{:}05{:}21.842 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}23.722$ debate and sort of the discourse

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:05:23.722 \longrightarrow 00:05:25.667$ around welfare and related issues,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

00:05:25.670 --> 00:05:27.686 things like family and work and

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:05:27.686 \longrightarrow 00:05:29.356$ personal responsibility and the role

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

00:05:29.356 --> 00:05:31.267 of the state in providing a minimum,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:05:31.270 \longrightarrow 00:05:31.966$ you know,

 $00:05:31.966 \longrightarrow 00:05:33.358$ standard of living outside

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:05:33.358 \longrightarrow 00:05:35.120$ of Labor markets and such.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:05:35.120 \longrightarrow 00:05:37.836$ And over a long period of time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00{:}05{:}37.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}39.628$ narratives related to race

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:05:39.628 \longrightarrow 00:05:40.969$ and class demeaning,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:05:40.970 \longrightarrow 00:05:43.205$ narratives that demonized sexual behavior

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

00:05:43.205 --> 00:05:45.900 attributed to poor women of color,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

00:05:45.900 --> 00:05:47.600 drummed up hostility and

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00{:}05{:}47.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}49.300$ opposition to these programs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00{:}05{:}49.300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}51.898$ So while it's in particular social

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00{:}05{:}51.898 \to 00{:}05{:}53.984$ environments that people develop a

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:05:53.984 \longrightarrow 00:05:55.972$ sense of what one or another program

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00{:}05{:}55.972 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}58.100$ or or policy initiative does,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

00:05:58.100 --> 00:05:59.764 we're crucially it's people,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:05:59.764 \longrightarrow 00:06:00.180$ families,

 $00:06:00.180 \longrightarrow 00:06:00.544$ children,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:06:00.544 \longrightarrow 00:06:02.364$ already subject to the cold

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:06:02.364 \longrightarrow 00:06:04.250$ disaffection of the market and

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:06:04.250 \longrightarrow 00:06:06.100$ struggling to overcome the effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

00:06:06.100 --> 00:06:07.704 Of poverty and exploitation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:06:07.704 \longrightarrow 00:06:10.110$ who bear the brunt of punitive

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:06:10.179 \longrightarrow 00:06:13.175$ policy and who are demeaned by the

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:06:13.175 \longrightarrow 00:06:14.870$ hurtful characterizations of them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00{:}06{:}14.870 --> 00{:}06{:}15.181 \ \mathrm{Also},$

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:06:15.181 \longrightarrow 00:06:17.047$ I'm really glad that in recent

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00{:}06{:}17.047 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}19.098$ years there's been a growth of

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:06:19.098 \longrightarrow 00:06:20.502$ interest in having conversations

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00{:}06{:}20.502 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}22.070$ around equity and justice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00{:}06{:}22.070 --> 00{:}06{:}22.865$ So, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:06:22.865 \longrightarrow 00:06:23.925$ another thread connecting this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00{:}06{:}23.930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}26.030$ I think is how when we interrogate

 $00:06:26.030 \longrightarrow 00:06:28.223$ the origins of what we think

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:06:28.223 \longrightarrow 00:06:29.863$ and sometimes uncritically and

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

00:06:29.863 --> 00:06:31.650 unconsciously take for granted,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:06:31.650 \longrightarrow 00:06:33.715$ this can help us address forms of

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00{:}06{:}33.715 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}35.511$ implicit bias and how we engage

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325439

 $00:06:35.511 \longrightarrow 00:06:37.209$ with the people that we serve.

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

00:06:40.340 --> 00:06:42.860 All right, method to do that this time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

 $00:06:42.860 \longrightarrow 00:06:44.760$ So the investigation mainly covers

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

 $00:06:44.760 \longrightarrow 00:06:47.150$ the period from the interwar period,

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

 $00:06:47.150 \longrightarrow 00:06:50.139$ the 1930s, to the signing of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

 $00:06:50.139 \longrightarrow 00:06:52.136$ personal responsibility and Work

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

 $00:06:52.136 \longrightarrow 00:06:54.059$ Opportunity Reconciliation Act.

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

 $00{:}06{:}54.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}56.195$ Or perwira might be the most clumsy

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

00:06:56.195 --> 00:06:58.579 name for a piece of legislation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

 $00:06:58.580 \longrightarrow 00:07:00.908$ So and that was in 1996,

 $00:07:00.908 \longrightarrow 00:07:03.680$ but for the remainder of the talk I'll refer

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

 $00:07:03.743 \longrightarrow 00:07:06.224$ to it as the welfare reform bill of 1996.

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

 $00:07:06.224 \longrightarrow 00:07:08.168$ And you know, this period saw

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

00:07:08.168 --> 00:07:09.648 the sequence of legislative

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

 $00:07:09.648 \longrightarrow 00:07:12.264$ developments leading up to the bill.

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

00:07:12.270 --> 00:07:13.314 But it also,

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

00:07:13.314 --> 00:07:14.706 and probably more importantly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

 $00:07:14.710 \longrightarrow 00:07:16.816$ as one where an emerging social

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

 $00{:}07{:}16.816 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}18.220$ policy narrative was solidified

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

 $00:07:18.284 \longrightarrow 00:07:20.174$ in the public consciousness and

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

 $00{:}07{:}20.174 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}21.686$ with informal policy circles.

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

 $00:07:21.690 \longrightarrow 00:07:24.534$ In other words, a new welfare

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

 $00{:}07{:}24.534 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}27.510$ consensus over time had solidified.

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

 $00{:}07{:}27.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}29.478$ And the study traces the origins

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

 $00:07:29.478 \longrightarrow 00:07:30.790$ of today's political debates

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

 $00:07:30.851 \longrightarrow 00:07:32.626$ around things like social policy,

00:07:32.630 --> 00:07:34.064 equality, distributive justice,

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

 $00{:}07{:}34.064 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}37.410$ both between the right and and left,

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

 $00:07:37.410 \longrightarrow 00:07:39.250$ but also within the right and left too.

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

00:07:39.250 --> 00:07:40.093 As you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

00:07:40.093 --> 00:07:41.779 there was often debates and and,

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

00:07:41.780 --> 00:07:43.985 you know, conflict within those

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

 $00:07:43.985 \longrightarrow 00:07:45.308$ those political formations.

 $\begin{aligned} & \text{NOTE Confidence: } 0.74659778375 \\ & 00:07:45.310 --> 00:07:45.618 \text{ Also,} \end{aligned}$

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

 $00{:}07{:}45.618 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}47.774$ and of particular interest is how a

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

 $00:07:47.774 \longrightarrow 00:07:50.163$ set of ideas went from the political

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

 $00:07:50.163 \longrightarrow 00:07:52.747$ fringe in the 1930s and 40s to

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

 $00:07:52.747 \longrightarrow 00:07:54.772$ mainstream thinking on welfare policy

NOTE Confidence: 0.74659778375

 $00:07:54.772 \longrightarrow 00:07:57.130$ and related issues by the 1970s.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

 $00:08:00.580 \longrightarrow 00:08:03.520$ So. It's hard to see, apologies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

 $00:08:03.520 \longrightarrow 00:08:05.338$ But you more or less just need to see

 $00:08:05.338 \longrightarrow 00:08:07.020$ the relationship as it goes down.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

 $00{:}08{:}07.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}09.762$ And I'll explain, but the investigation

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

00:08:09.762 --> 00:08:11.940 mainly covers whoops, wrong part.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

 $00{:}08{:}11.940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}13.940$ But unlike our European counterparts,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

 $00:08:13.940 \longrightarrow 00:08:15.805$ the US has not maintained

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

 $00:08:15.805 \longrightarrow 00:08:17.297$ an extensive safety net.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

00:08:17.300 --> 00:08:18.889 You know, it's often taken for granted

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

 $00:08:18.889 \longrightarrow 00:08:20.558$ that this is just part of America,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

00:08:20.560 --> 00:08:22.420 you know, rugged American culture,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

 $00:08:22.420 \longrightarrow 00:08:24.322$ or that we're just more inclined

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

 $00{:}08{:}24.322 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}25.880$ towards self-sufficiency and hard work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

00:08:25.880 --> 00:08:27.756 Some see it as a superior arrangement,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

 $00:08:27.760 \longrightarrow 00:08:30.760$ more lean than our European counterparts,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

 $00:08:30.760 \longrightarrow 00:08:31.984$ but rather than uncritically.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

00:08:31.984 --> 00:08:33.395 Saying that, that's just how

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

 $00:08:33.395 \longrightarrow 00:08:34.985$ things are in the United States,

 $00:08:34.990 \longrightarrow 00:08:36.663$ the study set out the trace of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

 $00{:}08{:}36.663 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}38.180$ the origins of such ideology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

 $00:08:38.180 \longrightarrow 00:08:40.343$ So it sees the new welfare consensus

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

 $00:08:40.343 \longrightarrow 00:08:42.730$ as the product of particular historic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

 $00:08:42.730 \longrightarrow 00:08:44.778$ political, social, ideological currents.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

 $00:08:44.778 \longrightarrow 00:08:47.850$ And there's many myths in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

00:08:47.927 --> 00:08:50.047 popular discourse on welfare,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

 $00:08:50.050 \longrightarrow 00:08:50.742$ for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

 $00:08:50.742 \longrightarrow 00:08:52.818$ that the United States directs a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

 $00:08:52.818 \longrightarrow 00:08:54.584$ significant portion of its resources

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

 $00:08:54.584 \longrightarrow 00:08:55.944$ to welfare state expenditures

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

 $00:08:55.944 \longrightarrow 00:08:57.450$ compared to other nations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

 $00:08:57.450 \longrightarrow 00:08:58.970$ And as I said, it's a bit hard to see.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

 $00:08:58.970 \longrightarrow 00:09:00.020$ But if you look at the slide,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

 $00:09:00.020 \longrightarrow 00:09:02.547$ there's a list of 29 O ECD.

00:09:02.550 --> 00:09:04.860 Countries in order of the percent of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

 $00:09:04.860 \longrightarrow 00:09:07.084$ their gross domestic product that they

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

 $00:09:07.084 \longrightarrow 00:09:09.039$ they contribute to welfare programs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8824582

 $00:09:09.040 \longrightarrow 00:09:10.776$ and the United States is at the bottom.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856444456842105

 $00:09:13.740 \longrightarrow 00:09:15.652$ And on this next slide is a list

NOTE Confidence: 0.856444456842105

00:09:15.652 --> 00:09:18.222 of 18 OCD countries in order of

NOTE Confidence: 0.856444456842105

00:09:18.222 --> 00:09:19.842 per capita welfare expenditures.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856444456842105

 $00:09:19.850 \longrightarrow 00:09:21.896$ That is the total amount contributed

NOTE Confidence: 0.856444456842105

00:09:21.896 --> 00:09:22.919 towards welfare programs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856444456842105

 $00:09:22.920 \longrightarrow 00:09:24.996$ but then divided by the population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856444456842105

 $00:09:25.000 \longrightarrow 00:09:28.978$ And again, we see the US at the bottom.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856444456842105

 $00:09:28.980 \longrightarrow 00:09:30.702$ So one of the questions that

NOTE Confidence: 0.856444456842105

 $00:09:30.702 \longrightarrow 00:09:32.872$ inform this study is why is the

NOTE Confidence: 0.856444456842105

00:09:32.872 --> 00:09:34.144 United States so different,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856444456842105

00:09:34.150 --> 00:09:36.220 compared again to our European counterparts,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856444456842105

 $00:09:36.220 \longrightarrow 00:09:38.690$ with regard to prioritizing benefits

 $00:09:38.690 \longrightarrow 00:09:41.860$ and services for those most in need?

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

 $00:09:44.600 \longrightarrow 00:09:46.628$ So another question that informed the

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

 $00:09:46.628 \longrightarrow 00:09:48.774$ study was why attitudes toward welfare

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

00:09:48.774 --> 00:09:50.976 in the United States shifted overtime.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

 $00:09:50.980 \longrightarrow 00:09:53.796$ And these tables just sort of show how,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

00:09:53.800 --> 00:09:56.075 you know, opposition or support

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

00:09:56.075 --> 00:09:58.932 to to welfare spending and welfare

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

 $00{:}09{:}58.932 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}01.417$ policy shifts over the period.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

 $00{:}10{:}01.420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}03.926$ The least opposition was in the decades

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

00:10:03.926 --> 00:10:06.858 after FDR rolled out the Social Security Act,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8598675944444444

 $00:10:06.860 \longrightarrow 00:10:08.912$ which was in 1935 in response

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

 $00:10:08.912 \longrightarrow 00:10:10.280$ to the Great Depression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

 $00{:}10{:}10.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}12.260$ And we see little opposition to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8598675944444444

 $00:10:12.260 \longrightarrow 00:10:15.720$ welfare in 1939 and 1946, for example.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

00:10:15.720 --> 00:10:16.716 Oh, and you specifically told me

 $00:10:16.716 \longrightarrow 00:10:17.918$ not to look up at the screen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444 00:10:17.920 --> 00:10:19.800 Sorry. NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

00:10:19.800 --> 00:10:23.450 Cameras over there with 23 and 19\% saying

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

 $00:10:23.450 \longrightarrow 00:10:25.680$ that the government should not provide

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

 $00:10:25.680 \longrightarrow 00:10:28.350$ for people without means of subsistence,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

 $00:10:28.350 \longrightarrow 00:10:30.050$ meaning that close to 80%

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

 $00:10:30.050 \longrightarrow 00:10:31.070$ were in support of it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

 $00:10:31.070 \longrightarrow 00:10:34.670$ And this changes over time, as you'll see.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

 $00:10:34.670 \longrightarrow 00:10:36.428$ So the 1960s.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85986759444444400:10:36.428 --> 00:10:37.600 Look there,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

 $00{:}10{:}37.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}39.508$ the 1960s are significant because what

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

00:10:39.508 --> 00:10:42.376 you see is over the course of that decade,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

 $00:10:42.380 \longrightarrow 00:10:45.172$ a real shift in terms of public opposition

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

00:10:45.172 --> 00:10:47.240 with regard to welfare programs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

 $00:10:47.240 \longrightarrow 00:10:50.910$ So in 1961 and 64, we see respondents

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

 $00:10:50.910 \longrightarrow 00:10:52.660$ to the general Social Survey,

 $00:10:52.660 \longrightarrow 00:10:55.278$ and the former data was from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

 $00:10:55.278 \longrightarrow 00:10:57.239$ Roper polls from that time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

00:10:57.240 --> 00:10:59.976 And you know, over all of these decades,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

 $00:10:59.980 \longrightarrow 00:11:01.816$ the wording of the questions they

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

 $00:11:01.816 \longrightarrow 00:11:04.338$ ask on the surveys kind of change a bit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

00:11:04.340 --> 00:11:05.642 And, you know, and depending on

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

 $00:11:05.642 \longrightarrow 00:11:07.440$ what it is that you're looking for.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

 $00{:}11{:}07.440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}09.498$ Sometimes you have to look at different

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

00:11:09.498 --> 00:11:11.747 opinion surveys so you know it's not perfect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

 $00{:}11{:}11.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}15.478$ Apples to apples, but it tells a story.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

00:11:15.480 --> 00:11:17.454 So by the end of the 60s,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

 $00{:}11{:}17.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}19.266$ forty 4 and 45% reported that

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

 $00{:}11{:}19.266 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}21.249$ too much is spent on welfare,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444 00:11:21.250 --> 00:11:21.519 right? NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

00:11:21.519 --> 00:11:23.402 Seeing more than a doubling in opposition

 $00:11:23.402 \longrightarrow 00:11:25.697$ from the beginning of that decade to the end.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

00:11:25.700 --> 00:11:27.562 And what we'll kind of like focus

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

 $00:11:27.562 \longrightarrow 00:11:29.807$ in on the 60s in a in a bit and

NOTE Confidence: 0.859867594444444

 $00:11:29.807 \longrightarrow 00:11:30.788$ why that's important.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888397894285714

 $00:11:32.870 \longrightarrow 00:11:35.278$ By the late 1970s, in the years leading

NOTE Confidence: 0.888397894285714

00:11:35.278 --> 00:11:39.176 up to the election of Reagan in 1978,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888397894285714

00:11:39.176 --> 00:11:42.070 and 198062 and 59% respectively responded

NOTE Confidence: 0.888397894285714

 $00:11:42.070 \longrightarrow 00:11:44.889$ that too much was spent on welfare.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888397894285714

00:11:44.890 --> 00:11:46.370 And in the Clinton years,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888397894285714

 $00:11:46.370 \longrightarrow 00:11:47.930$ the years leading up to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.888397894285714

 $00:11:47.930 \longrightarrow 00:11:49.418$ welfare reform bill of 1996,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888397894285714

 $00:11:49.418 \longrightarrow 00:11:51.476$ sixty two and 58% responded

NOTE Confidence: 0.888397894285714

 $00:11:51.476 \longrightarrow 00:11:52.806$ that too much was spent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888397894285714

 $00:11:52.810 \longrightarrow 00:11:54.966$ So we see that same level of

NOTE Confidence: 0.888397894285714

00:11:54.966 --> 00:11:56.826 opposition kind of stabilizing and

NOTE Confidence: 0.888397894285714

 $00{:}11{:}56.826 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}59.424$ that 60 ish percent number stays

00:11:59.424 --> 00:12:01.209 consistent pretty much ongoing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888397894285714

 $00:12:01.210 \longrightarrow 00:12:03.149$ give or take like. 5 to 7%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.71438193

 $00:12:05.770 \longrightarrow 00:12:06.220$ Oops.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82904852

 $00:12:10.560 \longrightarrow 00:12:13.860$ That's it. So.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82904852

00:12:13.860 --> 00:12:15.140 New welfare consensus refers

NOTE Confidence: 0.82904852

 $00:12:15.140 \longrightarrow 00:12:17.524$ to a new way of thinking about

NOTE Confidence: 0.82904852

00:12:17.524 --> 00:12:19.120 welfare and related issues,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82904852

 $00{:}12{:}19.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}21.680$ and that have particular consequences.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82904852

 $00{:}12{:}21.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}23.224$ The parameters around acceptable

NOTE Confidence: 0.82904852

 $00:12:23.224 \longrightarrow 00:12:24.768$ policy discourse and legislation

NOTE Confidence: 0.82904852

00:12:24.768 --> 00:12:26.810 as a result of the emergence

NOTE Confidence: 0.82904852

 $00:12:26.810 \longrightarrow 00:12:28.628$ of a new welfare consensus have

NOTE Confidence: 0.82904852

 $00{:}12{:}28.689 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>}\ 00{:}12{:}30.399$ been significantly constrained,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82904852

 $00:12:30.400 \longrightarrow 00:12:32.367$ and this has produced a welfare state

NOTE Confidence: 0.82904852

00:12:32.367 --> 00:12:34.438 that had become more fiscally austere,

 $00:12:34.440 \longrightarrow 00:12:36.288$ demeaning and coercive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00:12:39.980 \longrightarrow 00:12:41.700$ Now historically the attack

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00:12:41.700 \longrightarrow 00:12:44.280$ on welfare is rooted in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00:12:44.363 \longrightarrow 00:12:47.180$ conservative intellectual tradition.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00{:}12{:}47.180 \rightarrow 00{:}12{:}49.532$ So the attack on the safety net was

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00:12:49.532 \longrightarrow 00:12:51.245$ initially waged by conservative

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00:12:51.245 \longrightarrow 00:12:52.838$ politicians and intellectuals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00{:}12{:}52.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}54.892$ And this isn't meant to alienate

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

00:12:54.892 --> 00:12:56.260 anybody or their worldviews,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00:12:56.260 \longrightarrow 00:12:58.353$ but simply a way of tracing where

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00:12:58.353 \longrightarrow 00:13:00.050$ you know where anti welfarism

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00:13:00.050 \longrightarrow 00:13:01.875$ as an ideology comes from.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00:13:01.880 \longrightarrow 00:13:04.064$ So looking at how it evolved and essentially

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00:13:04.064 \longrightarrow 00:13:05.618$ what mainstream in the United States.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00:13:05.620 \longrightarrow 00:13:07.092$ And to be fair,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00:13:07.092 \longrightarrow 00:13:08.564$ the attack on welfare

 $00:13:08.564 \longrightarrow 00:13:10.240$ definitely became a bipartisan.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

00:13:10.240 --> 00:13:13.507 Effort by the 1970s and going into the 90s,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

00:13:13.510 --> 00:13:15.370 after all, it was Bill Clinton,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00:13:15.370 \longrightarrow 00:13:17.728$ someone seen as a kind of a moderate liberal,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00:13:17.730 \longrightarrow 00:13:20.388$ who signed the bill into enthusiastically

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00:13:20.388 \longrightarrow 00:13:22.520$ signed the bill into law.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

00:13:22.520 --> 00:13:24.686 So many who didn't identify with

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00:13:24.686 \longrightarrow 00:13:26.576$ conservative politics and saw themselves

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00{:}13{:}26.576 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}28.850$ as moderate or pragmatic or centrist

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00{:}13{:}28.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}31.203$ Democrats or even mild liberals would

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00:13:31.203 \longrightarrow 00:13:33.128$ later become vociferous critics of

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

00:13:33.128 --> 00:13:35.300 the welfare state by the late 60s,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00:13:35.300 \longrightarrow 00:13:38.114$ around 6869 and going into the 70s.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00:13:38.120 \longrightarrow 00:13:41.258$ And this was the group that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00:13:41.260 \longrightarrow 00:13:43.366$ Came to be known as the

 $00:13:43.366 \longrightarrow 00:13:44.419$ new the neoconservatives.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

00:13:44.420 --> 00:13:46.340 It was a label that was used pejoratively

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

00:13:46.340 --> 00:13:48.260 at first, but then folks like Irving,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

00:13:48.260 --> 00:13:49.919 Crystal and others kind of embraced it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00:13:49.920 \longrightarrow 00:13:51.775$ and I'll go into a little bit

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00:13:51.775 \longrightarrow 00:13:53.578$ of detail on that bit later.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

00:13:53.580 --> 00:13:54.960 But it included our Irving,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

00:13:54.960 --> 00:13:57.680 Crystal, Nathan Glazer, Daniel Bell,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

00:13:57.680 --> 00:13:59.720 politicians like Daniel Patrick Moynihan,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00:13:59.720 \longrightarrow 00:14:02.060$ the late New York senator,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00{:}14{:}02.060 --> 00{:}14{:}02.960$ and you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00{:}14{:}02.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}05.060$ I'll be mentioning names through the talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

00:14:05.060 --> 00:14:06.878 I didn't list them on slides.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00{:}14{:}06.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}08.968$ If anyone has any questions later

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00:14:08.968 \longrightarrow 00:14:10.706$ or wants any clarification on

NOTE Confidence: 0.871373729230769

 $00:14:10.706 \longrightarrow 00:14:12.398$ any of these concepts or names,

 $00:14:12.400 \longrightarrow 00:14:13.660$ please feel free in the Q&A.

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

 $00:14:18.980 \longrightarrow 00:14:20.975$ So there's terms I'll use that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

 $00:14:20.975 \longrightarrow 00:14:22.726$ synonymous with each other and that

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

00:14:22.726 --> 00:14:24.406 have a particular meaning that I'd

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

 $00:14:24.406 \longrightarrow 00:14:26.139$ like to establish ahead of time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

00:14:26.140 --> 00:14:27.166 So economic conservatism,

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

 $00:14:27.166 \longrightarrow 00:14:29.560$ one of the major sort of strands

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

00:14:29.622 --> 00:14:31.477 of conservatism that becomes part

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

 $00:14:31.477 \longrightarrow 00:14:33.332$ of the new welfare consensus,

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

 $00:14:33.340 \longrightarrow 00:14:34.870$ will be used interchangeably in

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

 $00:14:34.870 \longrightarrow 00:14:37.205$ the talk and more or less means

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

00:14:37.205 --> 00:14:39.055 the same thing as libertarianism,

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

 $00{:}14{:}39.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}40.572$ laissez-faire individualism,

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

00:14:40.572 --> 00:14:42.840 classical liberalism, etcetera.

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

00:14:42.840 --> 00:14:44.150 And it might seem confusing,

 $00:14:44.150 \longrightarrow 00:14:45.458$ like how could a tradition of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

00:14:45.460 --> 00:14:47.492 Liberalism be connected to

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

00:14:47.492 --> 00:14:48.508 economic conservatism,

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

 $00:14:48.510 \longrightarrow 00:14:50.170$ and that's actually a

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

 $00:14:50.170 \longrightarrow 00:14:51.415$ really interesting history,

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

 $00:14:51.420 \longrightarrow 00:14:52.590$ and that's something we could

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

 $00:14:52.590 \longrightarrow 00:14:54.030$ talk about later if you want.

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

 $00{:}14{:}54.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}55.968$ But classical liberalism at one point

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

 $00{:}14{:}55.968 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}14{:}58.687$ used to be the term used to describe,

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

00:14:58.690 --> 00:14:59.542 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

 $00:14:59.542 \longrightarrow 00:15:01.246$ the libertarians or economic

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

00:15:01.246 --> 00:15:03.410 conservatives prior to the 1950s.

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

 $00:15:03.410 \longrightarrow 00:15:05.438$ Now for economic conservatism,

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

 $00{:}15{:}05.438 \to 00{:}15{:}08.480$ the key political questions are economic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

 $00:15:08.480 \longrightarrow 00:15:10.880$ They tend to be philosophically

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

 $00:15:10.880 \longrightarrow 00:15:11.360$ individualist.

00:15:11.360 --> 00:15:13.346 Champions of the free market with

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

 $00{:}15{:}13.346 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}15.839$ emphasis on things like individual liberty,

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

00:15:15.840 --> 00:15:16.832 private property,

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

00:15:16.832 --> 00:15:18.816 limited government and their

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

 $00:15:18.816 \longrightarrow 00:15:20.800$ anti collectivist and anti

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

 $00:15:20.868 \longrightarrow 00:15:22.344$ communist and by collectivism.

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

00:15:22.344 --> 00:15:25.023 It's a term that's used a lot in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

00:15:25.023 --> 00:15:27.299 political discourse up to the early 1950s,

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

 $00:15:27.299 \longrightarrow 00:15:30.512$ and it simply means the drive toward

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

 $00{:}15{:}30.512 \rightarrow 00{:}15{:}32.731$ central planning and government

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

 $00:15:32.731 \longrightarrow 00:15:35.179$ control over public institutions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

00:15:35.180 --> 00:15:36.080 Umm, now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

 $00{:}15{:}36.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}39.230$ this included the early kind of economic

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

 $00:15:39.230 \longrightarrow 00:15:41.438$ conservatives or libertarian thinkers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

00:15:41.440 --> 00:15:44.038 included people like Albert J Knock,

00:15:44.040 --> 00:15:46.360 HL Mencken, Frank Chodorov,

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

00:15:46.360 --> 00:15:47.520 Milton Friedman,

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

00:15:47.520 --> 00:15:50.957 who becomes really a kind of premier,

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

 $00{:}15{:}50.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}53.300$ you know, a free market intellectual

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

 $00:15:53.300 \longrightarrow 00:15:55.960$ in the in the Reagan years,

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

00:15:55.960 --> 00:15:59.758 Ludwig von Mises, Friedrich von Hayek,

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136

 $00:15:59.760 \longrightarrow 00:16:01.540$ and others.

NOTE Confidence: 0.872157136 00:16:01.540 --> 00:16:02.220 Now.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00:16:05.320 \longrightarrow 00:16:08.236$ Social conservatism, the other major strand.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00:16:08.240 \longrightarrow 00:16:09.662$ And there's a lot of disagreement

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00{:}16{:}09.662 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}11.200$ over what the major strands are.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00:16:11.200 \longrightarrow 00:16:12.632$ Should religious conservatism be

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

00:16:12.632 --> 00:16:14.340 its own thing? And, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00:16:14.340 \longrightarrow 00:16:15.810$ if you've looked at the literature and

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00:16:15.853 \longrightarrow 00:16:17.599$ political science or political sociology or,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00:16:17.600 \longrightarrow 00:16:19.024$ you know, political theory,

 $00:16:19.024 \longrightarrow 00:16:21.108$ etcetera, there are a lot of ways

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00{:}16{:}21.108 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}22.260$ these discussions are framed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

00:16:22.260 --> 00:16:24.115 But I don't want to get so

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00:16:24.115 \longrightarrow 00:16:27.840$ bogged down in all of that. But.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00{:}16{:}27.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}30.025$ Social conservatism is also known

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00:16:30.025 \longrightarrow 00:16:31.336$ as traditional conservatism,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

00:16:31.340 --> 00:16:33.152 traditionalism, moral conservatism,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

00:16:33.152 --> 00:16:34.863 moral values, conservatism,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00:16:34.863 \longrightarrow 00:16:36.372$ classical conservatism, etcetera.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00:16:36.372 \longrightarrow 00:16:39.897$ And the key questions for this strand

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

00:16:39.897 --> 00:16:42.495 of conservatism are religious and moral,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00:16:42.500 \longrightarrow 00:16:43.900$ and the principles include that

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00{:}16{:}43.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}45.300$ morality should be the guiding

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

00:16:45.353 --> 00:16:46.439 principle of government,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00:16:46.440 \longrightarrow 00:16:48.785$ that government should play a role in

00:16:48.785 --> 00:16:50.658 regulating moral conduct in the society,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00{:}16{:}50.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}52.944$ and that traditional judeo-christian

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00:16:52.944 \longrightarrow 00:16:56.370$ values represent an absolute moral truth.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

00:16:56.370 --> 00:16:58.330 So with regard to the welfare state,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00:16:58.330 \longrightarrow 00:16:59.694$ the economic conservatives or

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00:16:59.694 \longrightarrow 00:17:01.399$ libertarians would really want to

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

00:17:01.399 --> 00:17:03.329 see the government out of the way,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

00:17:03.330 --> 00:17:04.866 right to don't interfere with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00:17:04.866 \longrightarrow 00:17:06.270$ invisible hand of the market.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00:17:06.270 \longrightarrow 00:17:07.634$ Whereas the social conservatives

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

00:17:07.634 --> 00:17:09.339 thought the government should play

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00{:}17{:}09.339 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}11.410$ a role with regard to such programs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

00:17:11.410 --> 00:17:13.405 If it meant that they could encourage,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

00:17:13.410 --> 00:17:14.026 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00:17:14.026 \longrightarrow 00:17:15.874$ the right kind of morality or

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00:17:15.874 \longrightarrow 00:17:17.050$ behaviors among the poor.

 $00:17:17.050 \longrightarrow 00:17:18.436$ And they disagreed over this a

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00{:}17{:}18.436 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}20.118$ great deal and it would become kind

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00:17:20.118 \longrightarrow 00:17:21.770$ of an issue going into the 50s.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

00:17:21.770 --> 00:17:23.940 But it resolves and then the movement

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00:17:23.940 \longrightarrow 00:17:26.360$ becomes a real driving force directing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

00:17:26.360 --> 00:17:29.579 A policy discourse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00:17:29.580 \longrightarrow 00:17:33.437$ They were also seen as anti collectivist.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00:17:33.440 \longrightarrow 00:17:35.195$ And the influential thinkers in

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00{:}17{:}35.195 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}37.434$ this camp included folks like the

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

00:17:37.434 --> 00:17:39.440 Southern agrarian, Richard Weaver,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00{:}17{:}39.440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}41.760$ Austrian emigre, Eric Vogelin,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00:17:41.760 \longrightarrow 00:17:43.640$ and Leo Strauss and others.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00:17:43.640 \longrightarrow 00:17:46.140$ And it's the the classical,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00:17:46.140 \longrightarrow 00:17:48.350$ the sort of classical social

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00:17:48.350 \longrightarrow 00:17:50.118$ conservative literature as it

 $00:17:50.118 \longrightarrow 00:17:52.377$ addresses issues related to equality.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

00:17:52.380 --> 00:17:53.995 It's actually a really fascinating

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

00:17:53.995 --> 00:17:55.012 literature, and I'd be again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

00:17:55.012 --> 00:17:56.338 I'd be happy to take any questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.84384539

 $00:17:56.338 \longrightarrow 00:17:57.079$ on that later.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842684347142857

00:18:01.460 --> 00:18:03.860 Now, I found in my research that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.842684347142857

 $00:18:03.860 \longrightarrow 00:18:06.000$ emergence of a new welfare consensus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842684347142857

 $00{:}18{:}06.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}08.316$ It was related to several factors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842684347142857

 $00:18:08.320 \longrightarrow 00:18:09.908$ For one, the successful

NOTE Confidence: 0.842684347142857

00:18:09.908 --> 00:18:11.496 consolidation and organization of

NOTE Confidence: 0.842684347142857

 $00{:}18{:}11.496 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}13.219$ several strands of conservatism.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842684347142857

 $00:18:13.220 \longrightarrow 00:18:15.565$ So fusing these different traditions

NOTE Confidence: 0.842684347142857

 $00:18:15.565 \longrightarrow 00:18:18.619$ together into more cohesive and organized

NOTE Confidence: 0.842684347142857

 $00:18:18.619 \longrightarrow 00:18:21.159$ intellectual and political movement.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842684347142857

00:18:21.160 --> 00:18:23.200 The decline into two parent family

NOTE Confidence: 0.842684347142857

 $00:18:23.200 \longrightarrow 00:18:24.980$ ideal beginning in the 1960s.

 $00:18:24.980 \longrightarrow 00:18:26.714$ This was something that was very

NOTE Confidence: 0.842684347142857

 $00:18:26.714 \longrightarrow 00:18:29.051$ much latched on to and exploited to

NOTE Confidence: 0.842684347142857

 $00:18:29.051 \longrightarrow 00:18:30.794$ stoke resentment toward populations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842684347142857

 $00:18:30.794 \longrightarrow 00:18:32.782$ We utilized public assistance

NOTE Confidence: 0.842684347142857

 $00:18:32.782 \longrightarrow 00:18:34.770$ on the programs themselves,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842684347142857

 $00{:}18{:}34.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}37.332$ racist and nativist reactions to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.842684347142857

 $00:18:37.332 \longrightarrow 00:18:39.408$ migration of African Americans from

NOTE Confidence: 0.842684347142857

 $00:18:39.408 \longrightarrow 00:18:41.501$ the rural S to urban centers mostly

NOTE Confidence: 0.842684347142857

00:18:41.501 --> 00:18:43.827 in the industrial Midwest and NE,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842684347142857

 $00:18:43.830 \longrightarrow 00:18:46.536$ and to the influx of immigrants

NOTE Confidence: 0.842684347142857

 $00:18:46.536 \longrightarrow 00:18:47.889$ from Latin America.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842684347142857

 $00:18:47.890 \longrightarrow 00:18:50.335$ Also, the decentralization of welfare

NOTE Confidence: 0.842684347142857

 $00{:}18{:}50.335 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}52.291$ program financing at administration

NOTE Confidence: 0.842684347142857

 $00:18:52.291 \longrightarrow 00:18:54.247$ was relevant for this too,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842684347142857

 $00:18:54.250 \longrightarrow 00:18:56.266$ but I'm going to probably go

 $00:18:56.266 \longrightarrow 00:18:57.610$ into that the least.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842684347142857

 $00{:}18{:}57.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}00.214$ But again, if anyone has questions and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.890900146842105

00:19:02.660 --> 00:19:03.752 Probably most importantly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.890900146842105

 $00:19:03.752 \longrightarrow 00:19:05.572$ the paradigm shift with regard

NOTE Confidence: 0.890900146842105

00:19:05.572 --> 00:19:07.591 to poverty that went from seeing

NOTE Confidence: 0.890900146842105

00:19:07.591 --> 00:19:09.136 poverty as a structural issue,

NOTE Confidence: 0.890900146842105

00:19:09.140 --> 00:19:10.848 right that that individuals,

NOTE Confidence: 0.890900146842105

 $00:19:10.848 \longrightarrow 00:19:12.983$ families fell through the cracks

NOTE Confidence: 0.890900146842105

 $00:19:12.983 \longrightarrow 00:19:15.019$ of the market and it wasn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.890900146842105

 $00:19:15.019 \longrightarrow 00:19:17.105$ their fault to a more behavioral

NOTE Confidence: 0.890900146842105

00:19:17.105 --> 00:19:19.029 framing of poverty right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.890900146842105

00:19:19.030 --> 00:19:19.948 And given this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.890900146842105

00:19:19.948 --> 00:19:21.478 appealing to things like racial

NOTE Confidence: 0.890900146842105

 $00:19:21.478 \longrightarrow 00:19:23.426$ fear and patriarchal and class

NOTE Confidence: 0.890900146842105

 $00:19:23.426 \longrightarrow 00:19:25.130$ insecurity and representing the

NOTE Confidence: 0.890900146842105

 $00:19:25.130 \longrightarrow 00:19:26.842$ problems associated with poverty

 $00:19:26.842 \longrightarrow 00:19:28.702$ as the result of individual

NOTE Confidence: 0.890900146842105

 $00:19:28.702 \longrightarrow 00:19:30.190$ familial and cultural pathology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

 $00{:}19{:}33.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}36.306$ Now, these two strands of conservatism

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

 $00:19:36.306 \longrightarrow 00:19:38.310$ come together in the 1950s.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

00:19:38.310 --> 00:19:40.886 At first, it's known as Fusion Fusionism,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

 $00:19:40.890 \longrightarrow 00:19:42.828$ quite literally, because the two strands

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

00:19:42.828 --> 00:19:44.869 fused together to create a new kind of,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

 $00:19:44.870 \longrightarrow 00:19:46.865$ you know, syncretic tradition that

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

00:19:46.865 --> 00:19:49.310 included aspects of both of these,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

 $00:19:49.310 \longrightarrow 00:19:51.186$ you know, smaller movements.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

 $00{:}19{:}51.186 \rightarrow 00{:}19{:}54.925$ And it's really a progenitor of today's

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

 $00:19:54.925 \longrightarrow 00:19:57.448$ contemporary conservative movement.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

 $00{:}19{:}57.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}59.396$ It was a generative moment of folks

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

00:19:59.396 --> 00:20:01.130 like William F Buckley Junior,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

00:20:01.130 --> 00:20:02.544 who's a Yale alum, by the way,

 $00:20:02.550 \longrightarrow 00:20:04.530$ and Russell Kirk put together the

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

 $00:20:04.530 \longrightarrow 00:20:05.850$ Conservative journal of Opinion,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

00:20:05.850 --> 00:20:07.036 National Review,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

00:20:07.036 --> 00:20:09.408 which becomes wildly popular,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

 $00:20:09.410 \longrightarrow 00:20:11.270$ huge readership at that time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

00:20:11.270 --> 00:20:13.790 and still is a pretty prominent

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

00:20:13.790 --> 00:20:15.449 conservative outlet today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

 $00:20:15.449 \longrightarrow 00:20:17.108$ In the beginning,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

00:20:17.110 --> 00:20:19.036 it included work by prominent libertarians

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

 $00:20:19.036 \longrightarrow 00:20:21.130$ as well as social conservatives,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

 $00:20:21.130 \longrightarrow 00:20:22.488$ and it was part of a growing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

 $00:20:22.490 \longrightarrow 00:20:23.326$ Conservative press,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

 $00:20:23.326 \longrightarrow 00:20:24.998$ along with other publications

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

00:20:24.998 --> 00:20:27.030 like human events, the Freeman,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091 $00:20:27.030 \longrightarrow 00:20:27.800$ and others, NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

 $00:20:27.800 \longrightarrow 00:20:29.725$ and there was conflict among

 $00:20:29.725 \longrightarrow 00:20:30.919$ conservatives at this time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

 $00{:}20{:}30.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}32.632$ So the social conservatives

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

 $00:20:32.632 \longrightarrow 00:20:34.344$ thought the libertarians lacked

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

 $00:20:34.344 \longrightarrow 00:20:36.500$ a kind of moral framework,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

 $00:20:36.500 \longrightarrow 00:20:38.215$ and the libertarians thought the

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

 $00{:}20{:}38.215 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}39.930$ social conservatives were were too

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

00:20:39.991 --> 00:20:41.519 worried about regulating people's

NOTE Confidence: 0.915057030909091

 $00:20:41.519 \longrightarrow 00:20:43.429$ lives and were too authoritarian.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88889187555555

 $00:20:48.400 \longrightarrow 00:20:50.480$ But it was the anti communism of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.88889187555555

 $00{:}20{:}50.480 \longrightarrow 00{:}20{:}52.889$ new right and in each of these groups

NOTE Confidence: 0.888891875555555

 $00:20:52.889 \longrightarrow 00:20:54.784$ and anti collectivism that kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.88889187555555

 $00:20:54.784 \longrightarrow 00:20:56.575$ like brings them all together, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88889187555555

 $00{:}20{:}56.575 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}58.360$ Because they can focus their energies on

NOTE Confidence: 0.88889187555555

 $00:20:58.360 \longrightarrow 00:20:59.818$ something that they both agreed upon.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88889187555555

 $00:20:59.820 \longrightarrow 00:21:01.695$ And ultimately as people were

00:21:01.695 --> 00:21:03.195 joining this growing movement,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88889187555555

 $00{:}21{:}03.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}04.645$ people were picking up different

NOTE Confidence: 0.888891875555555

 $00:21:04.645 \longrightarrow 00:21:06.454$ aspects of each of these political

NOTE Confidence: 0.88889187555555

00:21:06.454 --> 00:21:08.589 formations and it more or less became,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88889187555555

00:21:08.590 --> 00:21:09.424 even if contradictory,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88889187555555

00:21:09.424 --> 00:21:10.814 it kind of cohesive movement

NOTE Confidence: 0.88889187555555

 $00:21:10.814 \longrightarrow 00:21:12.546$ on at least the veneer of it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9027021

00:21:18.530 --> 00:21:20.870 So. Internationally, right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9027021

 $00{:}21{:}20.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}23.030$ they were certainly opposed to the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9027021

 $00:21:23.030 \longrightarrow 00:21:24.242$ to Communist Russia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9027021

00:21:24.242 --> 00:21:26.439 But domestically, they targeted welfare

NOTE Confidence: 0.9027021

00:21:26.439 --> 00:21:28.754 state programs and often portrayed

NOTE Confidence: 0.9027021

 $00:21:28.754 \longrightarrow 00:21:30.805$ welfare bureaucrats as either liberals

NOTE Confidence: 0.9027021

00:21:30.805 --> 00:21:32.923 who'd been duped by communist plants

NOTE Confidence: 0.9027021

00:21:32.923 --> 00:21:35.574 or actual communists working, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9027021

 $00:21:35.574 \longrightarrow 00:21:37.506$ undercover to destroy America from within.

 $00:21:37.510 \longrightarrow 00:21:39.380$ They had some conspiratorial narratives

NOTE Confidence: 0.9027021

00:21:39.380 --> 00:21:41.682 like that, but by and large,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9027021

00:21:41.682 --> 00:21:44.342 Buckley and others sort of, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9027021

 $00:21:44.342 \longrightarrow 00:21:46.478$ working within the conservative press at

NOTE Confidence: 0.9027021

00:21:46.478 --> 00:21:49.069 the time and reaching out to to people,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9027021

 $00:21:49.070 \longrightarrow 00:21:50.288$ you know, policymakers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9027021

00:21:50.288 --> 00:21:52.724 And and folks with actual power,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9027021

 $00:21:52.730 \longrightarrow 00:21:54.236$ they're able to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9027021

00:21:54.236 --> 00:21:56.400 You know, remake conservatism

NOTE Confidence: 0.9027021

 $00:21:56.400 \longrightarrow 00:21:59.300$ into more of an intellectual,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9027021

00:21:59.300 --> 00:22:01.940 more of a respectable movement,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9027021

 $00:22:01.940 \longrightarrow 00:22:03.350$ and one that was more

NOTE Confidence: 0.9027021

 $00:22:03.350 \longrightarrow 00:22:04.478$ organized politically as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:22:07.910 \longrightarrow 00:22:10.458$ Now National Review and the new right

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:22:10.458 \longrightarrow 00:22:13.108$ at the time really stick to the,

00:22:13.110 --> 00:22:14.594 the economic conservative script

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:22:14.594 \longrightarrow 00:22:16.449$ when attacking the welfare state.

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:22:16.450 \longrightarrow 00:22:18.520$ So it's wasteful in terms of

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:22:18.520 \longrightarrow 00:22:20.590$ spending and allocation of resources.

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

00:22:20.590 --> 00:22:22.708 And they were certainly concerned that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

00:22:22.710 --> 00:22:24.810 you know, the consolidation of power by

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:22:24.810 \longrightarrow 00:22:27.454$ the state in terms of administering welfare

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:22:27.454 \longrightarrow 00:22:30.686$ state programs could be a slippery slope to,

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00{:}22{:}30.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}32.832$ you know, a totalitarian system and

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:22:32.832 \longrightarrow 00:22:34.750$ regulating the lives of people.

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00{:}22{:}34.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}36.686$ And this was more or less the economic

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:22:36.686 \longrightarrow 00:22:38.184$ conservative or libertarian. Argument.

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:22:38.184 \longrightarrow 00:22:41.576$ And it's the argument that the new right

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:22:41.576 \longrightarrow 00:22:44.497$ largely sticks to up until the early 60s.

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:22:44.500 \longrightarrow 00:22:47.410$ So in 1960 and 61, there's some test

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:22:47.410 \longrightarrow 00:22:49.230$ cases which happened that that kind of

 $00:22:49.280 \longrightarrow 00:22:51.000$ start pushing against that narrative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286 00:22:51.000 --> 00:22:52.623 So in 1960, NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

00:22:52.623 --> 00:22:56.379 the Governor of Louisiana had cut 23,000

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:22:56.379 \longrightarrow 00:22:58.924$ mostly African American children from

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:22:58.924 \longrightarrow 00:23:02.529$ the AFDC roles or the welfare rolls.

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:23:02.530 \longrightarrow 00:23:04.186$ And the rationale for the cuts,

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286 00:23:04.190 --> 00:23:04.938 you know, NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:23:04.938 \longrightarrow 00:23:06.808$ he deliberately tried to racialize

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:23:06.808 \longrightarrow 00:23:08.684$ the discourse and he argued

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:23:08.684 \longrightarrow 00:23:10.409$ that homes where families had,

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:23:10.410 \longrightarrow 00:23:12.510$ where children had been born

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

00:23:12.510 --> 00:23:14.190 outside of marriage were,

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00{:}23{:}14.190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}16.446$ should be considered as unsuitable and

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:23:16.446 \longrightarrow 00:23:18.389$ therefore their benefits should be cut.

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

00:23:18.390 --> 00:23:20.568 Which is kind of contradictory, right?

00:23:20.568 --> 00:23:22.312 If you were thinking of a home as

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00{:}23{:}22.312 \rightarrow 00{:}23{:}24.009$ being unsuitable and unfit for kids,

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

00:23:24.010 --> 00:23:25.760 why would you want to cut resources

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:23:25.760 \longrightarrow 00:23:27.560$ going to those homes to be able to,

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

00:23:27.560 --> 00:23:29.464 you know, make ends meet and so forth?

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

00:23:29.470 --> 00:23:31.846 But nonetheless, that was the narrative,

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00{:}23{:}31.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}33.254$ but ultimately the Louisiana.

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:23:33.254 \longrightarrow 00:23:36.040$ Cuts are reversed by the federal government.

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

00:23:36.040 --> 00:23:37.798 The media pushes back against it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

00:23:37.800 --> 00:23:41.913 At that time, the public largely sees it as,

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:23:41.920 \longrightarrow 00:23:42.928$ as, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

00:23:42.928 --> 00:23:44.944 as a wrongheaded and mean spirited

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:23:44.944 \longrightarrow 00:23:46.300$ kind of thing to do.

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

00:23:46.300 --> 00:23:48.463 And it was framed as hurting innocent

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:23:48.463 \longrightarrow 00:23:50.340$ children and starving babies and so on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:23:50.340 \longrightarrow 00:23:52.380$ So it's able to be reversed and and

 $00:23:52.380 \longrightarrow 00:23:54.200$ most people are on board with that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:23:54.200 \longrightarrow 00:23:56.713$ However, just the next year in 1961,

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

00:23:56.713 --> 00:23:58.365 the Newburgh controversy takes

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

00:23:58.365 --> 00:23:59.604 place in Newburgh,

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00{:}23{:}59.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}02.301$ NY and this is a kind of historical pilot

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:24:02.301 \longrightarrow 00:24:04.690$ case illustrating the effectiveness.

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:24:04.690 \longrightarrow 00:24:06.270$ Of exploiting the public's

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00{:}24{:}06.270 \longrightarrow 00{:}24{:}08.245$ disdain toward poor black mothers

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:24:08.245 \longrightarrow 00:24:10.100$ with disgusting stereotypes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:24:10.100 \longrightarrow 00:24:12.878$ calling their sexual morality into question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:24:12.880 \longrightarrow 00:24:14.376$ So whereas the Louisiana,

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00{:}24{:}14.376 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}16.246$ Louisiana controversy was framed in

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00{:}24{:}16.246 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}18.300$ terms of hurting innocent children,

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

00:24:18.300 --> 00:24:19.168 in Newburgh,

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

00:24:19.168 --> 00:24:21.338 the city manager Joseph Mitchell,

 $00:24:21.340 \longrightarrow 00:24:23.265$ he scapegoated the city's growing

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00{:}24{:}23.265 \longrightarrow 00{:}24{:}25.190$ black population for the city's

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:24:25.254 \longrightarrow 00:24:27.330$ industrial decline and joblessness.

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

00:24:27.330 --> 00:24:28.410 And, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:24:28.410 \longrightarrow 00:24:30.570$ instead of thinking about it as

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

00:24:30.570 --> 00:24:32.741 hurting innocent people who who were

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:24:32.741 \longrightarrow 00:24:35.150$ in need of benefits and services.

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00{:}24{:}35.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}37.244$ He put forward the narrative that

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:24:37.244 \longrightarrow 00:24:39.206$ black mothers were being subsidized

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:24:39.206 \longrightarrow 00:24:40.697$ for their promiscuity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00{:}24{:}40.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}42.368$ He also implied that having children

NOTE Confidence: 0.881466670714286

 $00:24:42.368 \longrightarrow 00:24:43.979$ while poor was akin to abuse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888543593333333

 $00:24:46.140 \longrightarrow 00:24:49.024$ So the attitude of the public unfortunately

NOTE Confidence: 0.888543593333333

00:24:49.024 --> 00:24:52.177 kind of follow in kind through the 1960s,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888543593333333

 $00:24:52.180 \longrightarrow 00:24:54.133$ and this is reflected in the opinion

NOTE Confidence: 0.888543593333333

 $00:24:54.133 \longrightarrow 00:24:56.078$ polls that I showed before Mitchell

00:24:56.078 --> 00:24:58.166 capitalized on hit on the publicity

NOTE Confidence: 0.888543593333333

 $00:24:58.166 \longrightarrow 00:24:59.998$ he was getting at that time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888543593333333

 $00:25:00.000 \longrightarrow 00:25:02.205$ He was extensively covered in the growing

NOTE Confidence: 0.888543593333333

 $00:25:02.205 \longrightarrow 00:25:04.433$ body of of conservative literature as

NOTE Confidence: 0.888543593333333

 $00:25:04.433 \longrightarrow 00:25:07.275$ well as mainstream outlets at that time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888543593333333

00:25:07.280 --> 00:25:10.880 And he developed a 13 point plan for reform,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888543593333333

 $00:25:10.880 \longrightarrow 00:25:12.760$ reforming the welfare state that

NOTE Confidence: 0.888543593333333

 $00:25:12.760 \longrightarrow 00:25:14.640$ included things like child caps,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888543593333333

 $00{:}25{:}14.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}16.408$ time limits, work requirements.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888543593333333

 $00:25:16.408 \longrightarrow 00:25:18.618$ Things that are strikingly familiar

NOTE Confidence: 0.888543593333333

 $00:25:18.618 \longrightarrow 00:25:20.444$ features of contemporary welfare

NOTE Confidence: 0.888543593333333

 $00:25:20.444 \longrightarrow 00:25:22.204$ reform discourse and aspects,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888543593333333

 $00{:}25{:}22.210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}23.935$ actually, that are included in

NOTE Confidence: 0.888543593333333

 $00:25:23.935 \longrightarrow 00:25:26.592$ the 1996 welfare reform bill.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888543593333333

 $00:25:26.592 \longrightarrow 00:25:30.060$ And it's not that Clinton and.

00:25:30.060 --> 00:25:30.742 You know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888543593333333

 $00:25:30.742 \longrightarrow 00:25:32.447$ the House and Senate Republicans

NOTE Confidence: 0.888543593333333

 $00:25:32.447 \longrightarrow 00:25:34.249$ and Democrats who are supportive

NOTE Confidence: 0.888543593333333

 $00:25:34.249 \longrightarrow 00:25:36.397$ of welfare reform looked back to

NOTE Confidence: 0.888543593333333

00:25:36.397 --> 00:25:37.953 Joseph Mitchell in 1961 and said

NOTE Confidence: 0.888543593333333

 $00:25:37.953 \longrightarrow 00:25:39.500$ we're going to do what he said.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888543593333333

 $00{:}25{:}39.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}40.716$ But Rather Mitchell's proposal

NOTE Confidence: 0.888543593333333

 $00:25:40.716 \longrightarrow 00:25:42.952$ of this and the the extensive

NOTE Confidence: 0.888543593333333

 $00{:}25{:}42.952 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}45.076$ coverage that he was getting indicated

NOTE Confidence: 0.888543593333333

 $00:25:45.076 \longrightarrow 00:25:47.608$ that there was a shift in in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.888543593333333

00:25:47.608 --> 00:25:49.013 public's thinking on this issue.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93252153

 $00:25:55.270 \longrightarrow 00:25:56.968$ So after saying all of this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93252153

 $00:25:56.970 \longrightarrow 00:25:59.554$ it should be noted that it was intellectuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.93252153

 $00:25:59.554 \longrightarrow 00:26:01.607$ who were on the political left,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93252153

 $00:26:01.610 \longrightarrow 00:26:05.946$ self identified as liberals and so on who?

NOTE Confidence: 0.93252153

 $00{:}26{:}05.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}08.354$ Really gave social scientific

00:26:08.354 --> 00:26:10.758 credibility to behavioral analysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.93252153

 $00{:}26{:}10.758 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}13.536$ of poverty that explicitly evoked

NOTE Confidence: 0.93252153

 $00:26:13.536 \longrightarrow 00:26:16.524$ race and gender and family roles.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93252153

 $00:26:16.530 \longrightarrow 00:26:18.020$ And again, these were figures

NOTE Confidence: 0.93252153

00:26:18.020 --> 00:26:20.042 like Irving Crystal, Daniel Bell,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93252153

00:26:20.042 --> 00:26:22.286 Norman Podhoretz, Earl Rabb,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93252153

00:26:22.290 --> 00:26:24.770 Nathan Glazer and a whole host of others,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93252153

00:26:24.770 --> 00:26:25.892 Daniel Patrick Moynihan,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93252153

 $00:26:25.892 \longrightarrow 00:26:27.388$ as I mentioned before,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93252153

 $00:26:27.390 \longrightarrow 00:26:30.702$ who later again come to be identified with

NOTE Confidence: 0.93252153

 $00{:}26{:}30.702 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}33.419$ this political label of neoconservative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93252153

 $00{:}26{:}33.420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}35.355$ These critics of welfare state

NOTE Confidence: 0.93252153

 $00{:}26{:}35.355 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}36.903$ programs illustrated concern for

NOTE Confidence: 0.93252153

 $00:26:36.903 \longrightarrow 00:26:38.163$ preserving traditional institutions

NOTE Confidence: 0.93252153

00:26:38.163 --> 00:26:40.599 like marriage and the nuclear family,

 $00:26:40.600 \longrightarrow 00:26:42.604$ and we're very concerned with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.93252153

 $00{:}26{:}42.604 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}44.839$ effects of welfare state programs in

NOTE Confidence: 0.93252153

 $00:26:44.839 \longrightarrow 00:26:46.934$ terms of disrupting these institutions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93252153

 $00:26:46.940 \longrightarrow 00:26:49.106$ And they highlighted this again by

NOTE Confidence: 0.93252153

 $00:26:49.106 \longrightarrow 00:26:50.938$ demonizing poor black communities and

NOTE Confidence: 0.93252153

 $00:26:50.938 \longrightarrow 00:26:53.220$ framing their economic poverty in terms like,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93252153

00:26:53.220 --> 00:26:53.682 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93252153

 $00:26:53.682 \longrightarrow 00:26:54.837$ referring to children as quote,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93252153

00:26:54.840 --> 00:26:56.550 UN quote, illegitimate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93252153

00:26:56.550 --> 00:26:59.400 using terms like cultural pathology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93252153

 $00{:}26{:}59.400 \to 00{:}27{:}01.208$ community and family disorganization,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93252153

 $00:27:01.208 \longrightarrow 00:27:02.564$ etcetera and etcetera.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91366201

 $00:27:05.540 \longrightarrow 00:27:07.430$ They were very active in magazines

NOTE Confidence: 0.91366201

00:27:07.430 --> 00:27:09.399 and journals of opinion at the time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91366201

 $00:27:09.400 \longrightarrow 00:27:11.780$ as well as academic journals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91366201

 $00:27:11.780 \longrightarrow 00:27:13.620$ They published in magazines

00:27:13.620 --> 00:27:15.142 like Commentary, The Atlantic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91366201

 $00:27:15.142 \longrightarrow 00:27:16.948$ which was a very different magazine

NOTE Confidence: 0.91366201

00:27:16.948 --> 00:27:18.478 back then than it is today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91366201

 $00:27:18.480 \longrightarrow 00:27:19.251$ The public interest,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91366201

00:27:19.251 --> 00:27:20.793 the New York review of Books,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91366201

 $00:27:20.800 \longrightarrow 00:27:24.356$ also a bit different back back then.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91366201

 $00:27:24.360 \longrightarrow 00:27:26.484$ Now the public interest was founded

NOTE Confidence: 0.91366201

 $00:27:26.484 \longrightarrow 00:27:29.198$ by Irving Crystal and Daniel Bell and

NOTE Confidence: 0.91366201

 $00{:}27{:}29.198 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}31.253$ was presented as scholarly discourse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91366201

00:27:31.260 --> 00:27:32.644 It wasn't peer reviewed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91366201

 $00:27:32.644 \longrightarrow 00:27:34.374$ but it was editorial reviewed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91366201

00:27:34.380 --> 00:27:36.612 Um, and they would later link up with

NOTE Confidence: 0.91366201

 $00{:}27{:}36.612 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}38.480$ editors and and associates at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.91366201

 $00:27:38.480 \longrightarrow 00:27:40.358$ Wall Street Journal and it really

NOTE Confidence: 0.91366201

00:27:40.417 --> 00:27:42.608 became a kind of mouth piece for the

00:27:42.608 --> 00:27:44.723 growing supply side economics kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.91366201

 $00:27:44.723 \longrightarrow 00:27:47.069$ Reaganomics frame that would come later.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825519765333333

 $00:27:50.590 \longrightarrow 00:27:53.327$ Umm. And in the public interest they

NOTE Confidence: 0.825519765333333

 $00:27:53.327 \longrightarrow 00:27:55.582$ regularly talked about things like so

NOTE Confidence: 0.825519765333333

 $00:27:55.582 \longrightarrow 00:27:57.948$ an article by Earl Robb talked about

NOTE Confidence: 0.825519765333333

 $00:27:58.016 \longrightarrow 00:28:00.122$ liberals being and this idea again

NOTE Confidence: 0.825519765333333

 $00:28:00.122 \longrightarrow 00:28:02.086$ that like you know well-intentioned

NOTE Confidence: 0.825519765333333

00:28:02.086 --> 00:28:04.866 bureaucrats were being duped by

NOTE Confidence: 0.825519765333333

00:28:04.870 --> 00:28:07.168 people who had nefarious aims was

NOTE Confidence: 0.825519765333333

 $00:28:07.168 \longrightarrow 00:28:09.530$ very common across the literature.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825519765333333

 $00{:}28{:}09.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}11.648$ But being duped white liberals were

NOTE Confidence: 0.825519765333333

00:28:11.648 --> 00:28:14.325 being duped by quote black and Spanish

NOTE Confidence: 0.825519765333333

 $00:28:14.325 \longrightarrow 00:28:16.315$ speaking anti poverty militants that

NOTE Confidence: 0.825519765333333

00:28:16.315 --> 00:28:18.942 the slum **** is the special target

NOTE Confidence: 0.825519765333333

00:28:18.942 --> 00:28:21.610 of the anti poverty program UN quote.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825519765333333

 $00:28:21.610 \longrightarrow 00:28:23.674$ During a sit in by welfare

 $00:28:23.674 \longrightarrow 00:28:25.161$ rights demonstrators in 1967,

NOTE Confidence: 0.825519765333333

 $00{:}28{:}25.161 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}28{:}27.416$ Senator Russell Long of Louisiana

NOTE Confidence: 0.825519765333333

 $00:28:27.416 \longrightarrow 00:28:28.769$ uses really nasty,

NOTE Confidence: 0.825519765333333

 $00:28:28.770 \longrightarrow 00:28:30.134$ racialized and gendered language

NOTE Confidence: 0.825519765333333

 $00:28:30.134 \longrightarrow 00:28:31.157$ to disparage them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.825519765333333

 $00:28:31.160 \longrightarrow 00:28:32.200$ referring to them as quote,

NOTE Confidence: 0.825519765333333

00:28:32.200 --> 00:28:35.410 UN quote black brood mayors incorporated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825519765333333

 $00:28:35.410 \longrightarrow 00:28:38.086$ Moynihan in 1968 in the public

NOTE Confidence: 0.825519765333333

 $00{:}28{:}38.086 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}40.413$ interest blamed the mean spirited

NOTE Confidence: 0.825519765333333

 $00:28:40.413 \longrightarrow 00:28:43.125$ and racist tone of Russell,

NOTE Confidence: 0.825519765333333

 $00:28:43.130 \longrightarrow 00:28:44.810$ Long directed towards the

NOTE Confidence: 0.825519765333333

 $00:28:44.810 \longrightarrow 00:28:46.070$ welfare rights mothers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.825519765333333

00:28:46.070 --> 00:28:47.126 on the mothers themselves,

NOTE Confidence: 0.825519765333333

 $00:28:47.126 \longrightarrow 00:28:49.149$ saying that in truth this is a quote.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825519765333333

 $00:28:49.150 \longrightarrow 00:28:51.280$ Their tactics have invited the

00:28:51.280 --> 00:28:52.984 racial slurs End Quote.

NOTE Confidence: 0.825519765333333

 $00{:}28{:}52.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}54.555$ And Moynihan was considered a

NOTE Confidence: 0.825519765333333

 $00:28:54.555 \longrightarrow 00:28:55.807$ Liberal Democrat by them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00:28:59.490 \longrightarrow 00:29:02.330$ So in 1965, Moynihan publishes

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00:29:02.330 \longrightarrow 00:29:04.602$ the infamous Moynihan report.

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00:29:04.610 \longrightarrow 00:29:05.935$ The actual title of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00:29:05.935 \longrightarrow 00:29:07.343$ report was the **** family,

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00:29:07.343 \longrightarrow 00:29:09.401$ and it provided a moral dimension

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

00:29:09.401 --> 00:29:11.514 to the critique of the welfare

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00:29:11.514 \longrightarrow 00:29:13.209$ state and analysis of poverty.

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

00:29:13.210 --> 00:29:16.130 Like it further reinforced that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00:29:16.130 \longrightarrow 00:29:18.522$ and he appropriated what was at the time

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00:29:18.522 \longrightarrow 00:29:20.842$ called the culture of poverty argument

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00:29:20.842 \longrightarrow 00:29:22.922$ from the anthropologist Oscar Lewis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

00:29:22.930 --> 00:29:24.538 And Moynihan used it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00:29:24.538 \longrightarrow 00:29:26.950$ and and other others of his

 $00:29:27.041 \longrightarrow 00:29:29.585$ cohorts used it to under score.

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00{:}29{:}29.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}31.872$ What they saw as behavioral patterns among

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00:29:31.872 \longrightarrow 00:29:34.166$ poor among the poor that were considered

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00:29:34.166 \longrightarrow 00:29:36.860$ out of sync with white middle class values.

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

00:29:36.860 --> 00:29:38.378 Oscar Lewis, it should be noted,

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

00:29:38.380 --> 00:29:39.548 did not approve, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00:29:39.548 \longrightarrow 00:29:41.300$ He never meant for his concept

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00:29:41.363 \longrightarrow 00:29:42.605$ to be used in that way.

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

00:29:42.610 --> 00:29:45.101 But those who had more, one might say,

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00:29:45.101 \longrightarrow 00:29:46.436$ in terms of policy issues,

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00:29:46.440 \longrightarrow 00:29:47.472$ more conservative agenda,

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00:29:47.472 \longrightarrow 00:29:50.820$ used it that way and and with great success.

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

00:29:50.820 --> 00:29:52.544 Again, they used stigmatizing

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00:29:52.544 \longrightarrow 00:29:53.837$ words like illegitimacy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00:29:53.840 \longrightarrow 00:29:54.852$ welfare dependence,

 $00:29:54.852 \longrightarrow 00:29:57.382$ and highlighted especially divorce and

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00{:}29{:}57.382 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}59.800$ single motherhood as pathological.

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00:29:59.800 \longrightarrow 00:30:01.045$ Cultural patterns demonstrated

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00:30:01.045 \longrightarrow 00:30:02.290$ by black families,

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00:30:02.290 \longrightarrow 00:30:04.342$ and it should be noted that

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00:30:04.342 \longrightarrow 00:30:05.710$ single motherhood and divorce,

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889 00:30:05.710 --> 00:30:05.946 right? NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00{:}30{:}05.946 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}07.362$ The increase in those rates was

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00{:}30{:}07.362 \to 00{:}30{:}08.382$ something that was happening

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

00:30:08.382 --> 00:30:09.948 across racial groups at that time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00{:}30{:}09.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}12.482$ but it was being highlighted in

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00:30:12.482 \longrightarrow 00:30:14.660$ particular for communities of color.

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

00:30:14.660 --> 00:30:16.034 And, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00:30:16.034 \longrightarrow 00:30:17.866$ this contributed to revitalizing

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

00:30:17.866 --> 00:30:19.679 old stigmatizing labels like

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00:30:19.679 \longrightarrow 00:30:21.509$ the worthy and unworthy core,

 $00:30:21.510 \longrightarrow 00:30:22.326$ for example.

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00:30:22.326 \longrightarrow 00:30:25.590$ And while he didn't use the term culture

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

00:30:25.667 --> 00:30:28.898 of poverty verbatim in the report,

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00:30:28.898 \longrightarrow 00:30:30.666$ he described these behaviors

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00{:}30{:}30{:}670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}32.005$ with regard to black communities

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

 $00:30:32.005 \longrightarrow 00:30:33.710$ as being stuck in a quote,

NOTE Confidence: 0.829637498888889

00:30:33.710 --> 00:30:35.708 UN quote tangle of cultural pathology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

 $00:30:39.530 \longrightarrow 00:30:41.625$ So. This shift among intellectuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

 $00{:}30{:}41.625 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}44.377$ that we're looking at policy was part

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

 $00:30:44.377 \longrightarrow 00:30:46.721$ of a larger trend and that was that

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

00:30:46.787 --> 00:30:48.929 the political culture in the US in

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

00:30:48.929 --> 00:30:51.390 the 60s and although we don't usually

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

 $00{:}30{:}51.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}54.144$ associate the 60s with the with this

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

 $00:30:54.144 \longrightarrow 00:30:56.346$ was actually moving to the right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

 $00:30:56.350 \longrightarrow 00:30:58.290$ You know typically the movements

 $00:30:58.290 \longrightarrow 00:31:00.929$ for justice at the time you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

 $00{:}31{:}00.930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}03.360$ economic justice, the feminist movement,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

 $00:31:03.360 \longrightarrow 00:31:05.238$ the anti war movement, gay liberation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

 $00:31:05.240 \longrightarrow 00:31:06.146$ etcetera, they,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

 $00:31:06.146 \longrightarrow 00:31:09.317$ they get a lot of attention by

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

00:31:09.317 --> 00:31:11.778 folks as an indication that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

 $00{:}31{:}11.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}14.006$ Sort of radical left politics and reforms

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

 $00:31:14.006 \longrightarrow 00:31:16.298$ were kind of universally accepted and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

00:31:16.298 --> 00:31:19.294 and kind of you know part of how people

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

 $00:31:19.294 \longrightarrow 00:31:21.340$ were were looking at their worldviews.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

 $00{:}31{:}21.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}23.460$ But you know Nixon at that time you

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

 $00:31:23.460 \longrightarrow 00:31:25.748$ know he coined this term that when

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

 $00:31:25.748 \longrightarrow 00:31:28.049$ Trump was running for office in 2015

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

 $00:31:28.049 \longrightarrow 00:31:30.217$ and 2016 he kind of rekindled it the

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

00:31:30.220 --> 00:31:33.328 term the silent majority to actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

00:31:33.328 --> 00:31:36.609 you know highlight that you know this

00:31:36.610 --> 00:31:38.578 and I don't believe that this was the

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

 $00:31:38.578 \longrightarrow 00:31:40.620$ case but this small vocal minority right

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

 $00:31:40.620 \longrightarrow 00:31:42.710$ that was getting all the attention.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

00:31:42.710 --> 00:31:44.882 That actually most Americans were still

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

00:31:44.882 --> 00:31:46.720 traditionally conservative in their values,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

 $00:31:46.720 \longrightarrow 00:31:48.496$ and they were a silent majority.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

 $00:31:48.500 \longrightarrow 00:31:49.496$ And in fact,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

 $00{:}31{:}49.496 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}51.156$ we're probably becoming more conservative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

00:31:51.160 --> 00:31:51.948 And in that respect,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857923447333333

 $00:31:51.948 \longrightarrow 00:31:52.539$ he was right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00{:}31{:}54.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}56.867$ This was empowered by a growing sense

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00:31:56.867 \longrightarrow 00:31:58.879$ of material and social insecurity

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00{:}31{:}58.879 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}00.855$ experienced across the classes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00:32:00.860 \longrightarrow 00:32:02.230$ except for the very rich,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00:32:02.230 \longrightarrow 00:32:04.180$ which is usually the case,

 $00:32:04.180 \longrightarrow 00:32:05.800$ for example, a working or middle

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00:32:05.800 \dashrightarrow 00:32:07.867$ class family by the end of the decade.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00:32:07.870 \longrightarrow 00:32:09.788$ The end of the 1960s was feeling

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00:32:09.788 \longrightarrow 00:32:11.723$ the effects of inflation and was

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

00:32:11.723 --> 00:32:13.823 more likely exposed to print and

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

00:32:13.823 --> 00:32:15.636 broadcast media accounts of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00{:}32{:}15.636 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}17.386$ welfare poor that associated fraud

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00:32:17.386 \longrightarrow 00:32:20.728$ and abuse of the system with black

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

00:32:20.728 --> 00:32:23.343 Americans in the 1969 Life magazine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00:32:23.343 \longrightarrow 00:32:25.198$ Article and Life published a

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00:32:25.198 \longrightarrow 00:32:27.637$ lot of articles of this nature.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00:32:27.640 \longrightarrow 00:32:29.440$ They really worked to you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

00:32:29.440 --> 00:32:31.649 today we would say to get clicks

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00:32:31.649 \longrightarrow 00:32:32.909$ but to sell magazines.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00:32:32.910 \longrightarrow 00:32:35.328$ Back then they really capitalized and

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00:32:35.328 \longrightarrow 00:32:37.759$ and kind of exploited white fear.

 $00:32:37.760 \longrightarrow 00:32:39.860$ So they published a lot of articles

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00:32:39.860 \longrightarrow 00:32:41.450$ about black militants at the time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00:32:41.450 \longrightarrow 00:32:43.382$ They created the trope of the black

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

00:32:43.382 --> 00:32:44.899 sniper in cities shooting police

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00:32:44.899 \longrightarrow 00:32:46.807$ which and the pictures they use,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00:32:46.810 \longrightarrow 00:32:48.916$ it turned out later were totally

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00:32:48.916 \longrightarrow 00:32:50.756$ fabricated but in Life magazine

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00{:}32{:}50.756 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}52.940$ they had an article that said

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00:32:52.940 \longrightarrow 00:32:54.550$ quote the ordinary person.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00:32:54.550 \longrightarrow 00:32:56.998$ If not affluent, was likely unblack.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

00:32:57.000 --> 00:32:59.136 How's that for euphemism, for white,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00:32:59.140 \longrightarrow 00:33:01.680$ urban and in seething revolt?

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00{:}33{:}01.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}03.976$ If among the skilled wage earners and

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

00:33:03.976 --> 00:33:05.779 property owning middle income groups,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00:33:05.780 \longrightarrow 00:33:07.156$ they were likely white,

 $00:33:07.156 \longrightarrow 00:33:09.220$ respectable suburban and small town and

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00:33:09.279 \longrightarrow 00:33:11.274$ equally convinced that Boondoggling poor

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00:33:11.274 \longrightarrow 00:33:13.980$ welfare cheats were getting away with murder.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

00:33:13.980 --> 00:33:14.834 UN quote.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

00:33:14.834 --> 00:33:15.688 And again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00:33:15.688 \longrightarrow 00:33:17.823$ this is 1 quote that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00:33:17.823 \longrightarrow 00:33:18.920$ representative of many,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00:33:18.920 \longrightarrow 00:33:20.528$ many many articles and and again

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00{:}33{:}20.528 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}33{:}21.932$ a growing narrative in terms

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00:33:21.932 \longrightarrow 00:33:23.624$ of trying to appeal to people's

NOTE Confidence: 0.89253169125

 $00:33:23.624 \longrightarrow 00:33:25.159$ resentment and anger at that time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00:33:29.760 \longrightarrow 00:33:31.860$ So the attack on the welfare

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00:33:31.860 \longrightarrow 00:33:33.260$ state during this period,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00:33:33.260 \longrightarrow 00:33:35.396$ with the influence of this newer

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00:33:35.396 \longrightarrow 00:33:38.176$ discourse on the issue, began to shift.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00:33:38.176 \longrightarrow 00:33:41.016$ So up through the early 1960s,

00:33:41.016 --> 00:33:43.320 people like, for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00{:}33{:}43.320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}44.976$ Arizona Senator Barry Goldwater,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

00:33:44.976 --> 00:33:47.046 who ran against Lyndon Johnson

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

00:33:47.046 --> 00:33:50.940 in 64 and lost, National Review,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00:33:50.940 \longrightarrow 00:33:52.660$ the new right, human events,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00:33:52.660 \longrightarrow 00:33:54.004$ the Freeman, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00:33:54.004 \longrightarrow 00:33:56.020$ this sort of growing a body

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00:33:56.091 \longrightarrow 00:33:57.839$ of intellectuals from the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00:33:57.840 \longrightarrow 00:34:00.129$ From the 50s into the early 60s,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00:34:00.130 \longrightarrow 00:34:01.186$ they characterized the welfare

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00:34:01.186 \longrightarrow 00:34:03.574$ state as a kind of, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00:34:03.574 \longrightarrow 00:34:05.170$ socialism creeping or

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00{:}34{:}05.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}06.766$ socialism through welfarism.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

00:34:06.770 --> 00:34:07.988 But by 1990,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00:34:07.988 \longrightarrow 00:34:10.830$ and this comes from the contract with

00:34:10.911 --> 00:34:14.287 America by Newt Gingrich in the in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00:34:14.287 \longrightarrow 00:34:17.650$ Congress that then a prominent conservative,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

00:34:17.650 --> 00:34:18.404 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00:34:18.404 \longrightarrow 00:34:21.043$ politician who addressed these issues a lot,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00:34:21.050 \longrightarrow 00:34:25.220 ****$ Armey and the House Republicans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00:34:25.220 \longrightarrow 00:34:26.668$ That welfare reform should

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00:34:26.668 \longrightarrow 00:34:28.539$ set out to address, quote,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00:34:28.539 \longrightarrow 00:34:30.634$ destructive social behavior by quote

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00{:}34{:}30.634 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}32.750$ requiring welfare recipients to take

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00:34:32.750 \longrightarrow 00:34:35.048$ responsibility for the decisions they make.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00{:}34{:}35.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}35.678$ UN quote.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00:34:35.678 \longrightarrow 00:34:37.562$ So we see this decisive shift

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00:34:37.562 \longrightarrow 00:34:39.897$ in the in the narrative around,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

00:34:39.900 --> 00:34:40.544 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00:34:40.544 \longrightarrow 00:34:42.154$ the the discourse on welfare

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00:34:42.154 \longrightarrow 00:34:43.120$ policy going from,

 $00:34:43.120 \longrightarrow 00:34:43.325$ again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00{:}34{:}43.325 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}44.555$ more of an economic argument to

NOTE Confidence: 0.900093284

 $00:34:44.555 \longrightarrow 00:34:46.069$ more of a behavioral argument.

NOTE Confidence: 0.897165911111111

 $00:34:48.490 \longrightarrow 00:34:52.045$ So by 1980, Ronald Reagan

NOTE Confidence: 0.897165911111111

 $00:34:52.045 \longrightarrow 00:34:54.889$ is elected as president.

NOTE Confidence: 0.897165911111111

 $00:34:54.890 \longrightarrow 00:34:56.938$ The the Reagan Revolution

NOTE Confidence: 0.897165911111111

 $00:34:56.938 \longrightarrow 00:34:58.474$ was truly unmistakable.

NOTE Confidence: 0.897165911111111

00:34:58.480 --> 00:34:59.920 Reagan popularized something

NOTE Confidence: 0.897165911111111

 $00{:}34{:}59.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}01.840$ called supply side economics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.897165911111111

 $00:35:01.840 \longrightarrow 00:35:02.748$ He didn't invent it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8971659111111111

 $00:35:02.748 \longrightarrow 00:35:04.600$ It's also known as trickle down economics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.897165911111111

00:35:04.600 --> 00:35:07.053 You've probably heard of it and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8971659111111111

 $00:35:07.053 \longrightarrow 00:35:09.018$ it it defined government spending,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8971659111111111

 $00:35:09.020 \longrightarrow 00:35:10.088$ social programs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.897165911111111

 $00:35:10.088 \longrightarrow 00:35:12.758$ and taxes as unnecessary evils.

 $00:35:12.760 \longrightarrow 00:35:14.920$ And it consisted of drastic

NOTE Confidence: 0.897165911111111

 $00:35:14.920 \longrightarrow 00:35:16.216$ reductions in taxes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.897165911111111

 $00:35:16.220 \longrightarrow 00:35:18.596$ especially for corporations in the affluent,

NOTE Confidence: 0.897165911111111

 $00:35:18.600 \longrightarrow 00:35:20.091$ and significant spending

NOTE Confidence: 0.897165911111111

 $00:35:20.091 \longrightarrow 00:35:22.079$ cuts to social programs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.897165911111111

 $00:35:22.080 \longrightarrow 00:35:23.560$ Now Irving Crystal against

NOTE Confidence: 0.897165911111111

 $00:35:23.560 \longrightarrow 00:35:25.040$ one of the intellectuals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.897165911111111

 $00:35:25.040 \longrightarrow 00:35:25.943$ I discussed before,

NOTE Confidence: 0.897165911111111

 $00:35:25.943 \longrightarrow 00:35:28.490$ he's still very much active in this debate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.897165911111111

 $00:35:28.490 \longrightarrow 00:35:29.998$ He's still very relevant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.897165911111111

 $00:35:29.998 \longrightarrow 00:35:31.506$ He recalled that when

NOTE Confidence: 0.897165911111111

 $00:35:31.506 \longrightarrow 00:35:33.338$ he first was exposed to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:35:35.990 \longrightarrow 00:35:37.055$ Supply side economics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

00:35:37.055 --> 00:35:38.830 He actually didn't understand it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:35:38.830 \longrightarrow 00:35:41.400$ but he immediately saw its

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00{:}35{:}41.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}42.428$ political possibilities.

00:35:42.430 --> 00:35:46.140 And, you know, he realized that this

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00{:}35{:}46.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}48.330$ critique of progressive taxes and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:35:48.330 \longrightarrow 00:35:51.432$ social policy that is centered on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:35:51.432 \longrightarrow 00:35:54.117$ idea that strategies for distributive

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

00:35:54.117 --> 00:35:55.728 justice disjoint individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:35:55.728 \longrightarrow 00:35:58.269$ from regulatory and moral norms,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

00:35:58.270 --> 00:36:00.208 such that strategies tend to weaken

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:36:00.208 \longrightarrow 00:36:02.009$ the position of elites as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00{:}36{:}02.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}04.826$ So he really, he knew that he could.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:36:04.830 \longrightarrow 00:36:06.865$ Present supply side economics as

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00{:}36{:}06.865 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}09.186$ an effective way of, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:36:09.186 \longrightarrow 00:36:11.244$ relegating the poor to the discipline

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00{:}36{:}11.244 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}13.861$ of the market and at the same time

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:36:13.861 \longrightarrow 00:36:16.516$ cutting taxes for the rich and it would

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:36:16.516 \longrightarrow 00:36:18.532$ be politically very possible to do.

 $00:36:18.540 \longrightarrow 00:36:20.570$ Poverty was being framed increasingly

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:36:20.570 \longrightarrow 00:36:23.140$ as a managerial and behavioral problem.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00{:}36{:}23.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}25.100$ Welfare reform was predicated on

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:36:25.100 \longrightarrow 00:36:27.060$ identifying the everyday behavior of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:36:27.120 \longrightarrow 00:36:29.064$ a large portion of the population

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:36:29.064 \longrightarrow 00:36:30.718$ as pathological and non productive

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:36:30.718 \longrightarrow 00:36:32.524$ and moving them off the rolls

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00{:}36{:}32.524 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}35.310$ into the low wage labor market or

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:36:35.310 \longrightarrow 00:36:37.190$ mandating behavioral compliance in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:36:37.190 \longrightarrow 00:36:39.779$ return for benefits and services.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00{:}36{:}39.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}42.020$ Reports, Books, media appearances,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:36:42.020 \longrightarrow 00:36:44.820$ congressional testimony by key scholars,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

00:36:44.820 --> 00:36:46.914 and a growing network of policy

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00{:}36{:}46.914 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}49.031$ planning groups also was a very

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:36:49.031 \longrightarrow 00:36:50.676$ significant part of the story.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:36:50.680 \longrightarrow 00:36:52.536$ It's, you know, for the sake of time.

00:36:52.540 --> 00:36:54.754 I'm not going to get into it too much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:36:54.760 \longrightarrow 00:36:55.092$ However,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

00:36:55.092 --> 00:36:57.416 you might be familiar with the work

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

00:36:57.416 --> 00:36:59.600 of Charles Murray or George Gilder.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

00:36:59.600 --> 00:37:01.880 Murray infamously wrote the Bell Curve,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:37:01.880 \longrightarrow 00:37:04.380$ which was explicitly racist book

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

00:37:04.380 --> 00:37:06.766 that claimed that, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:37:06.766 \longrightarrow 00:37:09.424$ non whites were were genetically inferior.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:37:09.430 \longrightarrow 00:37:10.910$ That had lower IQ's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:37:10.910 \longrightarrow 00:37:12.760$ And the justification was that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

00:37:12.760 --> 00:37:13.720 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:37:13.720 \longrightarrow 00:37:15.640$ welfare programs were therefore

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00{:}37{:}15.640 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}37{:}17.560$ encouraging inferior people with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:37:17.626 \longrightarrow 00:37:19.306$ lower IQ's to have more children when

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:37:19.306 \longrightarrow 00:37:21.179$ we we should be doing the opposite.

 $00:37:21.180 \longrightarrow 00:37:23.562$ And it sounds like those ideas

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00{:}37{:}23.562 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}25.651$ should have been on the fringe

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:37:25.651 \longrightarrow 00:37:27.136$ and not in the mainstream,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:37:27.140 \longrightarrow 00:37:30.218$ but by the 1980s and 90s,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:37:30.220 \longrightarrow 00:37:32.120$ scholars like Murray and others,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

00:37:32.120 --> 00:37:32.720 George Gilder,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:37:32.720 \longrightarrow 00:37:34.220$ Robert Rector, and you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:37:34.220 \longrightarrow 00:37:37.188$ the the experts who worked within the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00{:}37{:}37.188 \to 00{:}37{:}40.078$ context of the think tanks and lobbying.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:37:40.080 \longrightarrow 00:37:43.128$ Groups and other policy planning groups.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00{:}37{:}43.130 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}37{:}44.725$ Their ideas were becoming quite

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00:37:44.725 \longrightarrow 00:37:47.406$ salient in the halls of Congress and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8694939775

 $00{:}37{:}47.406 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}50.186$ informal policy circles as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00:37:57.050 \longrightarrow 00:38:01.306$ So. The debates in the Congress and

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00:38:01.306 \longrightarrow 00:38:04.342$ the 1980s and 90s revealed that

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00:38:04.342 \longrightarrow 00:38:06.834$ there was a decisive shift in the

00:38:06.834 --> 00:38:09.670 political culture in how poverty and

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00:38:09.670 \dashrightarrow 00:38:11.650$ welfare policy were conceptualized.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

00:38:11.650 --> 00:38:13.799 The idea is advocated by folks like

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

00:38:13.799 --> 00:38:15.703 Charles Murray and George Gilder and

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00:38:15.703 \longrightarrow 00:38:17.852$ others was echoed in the chambers of

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00:38:17.914 \longrightarrow 00:38:20.430$ Congress with a logic that situated

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00:38:20.430 \longrightarrow 00:38:22.490$ adversary adversity and suffering as

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00:38:22.565 \longrightarrow 00:38:24.990$ necessary for ensuring good behavior,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00{:}38{:}24.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}27.558$ especially for poor families of color.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

00:38:27.560 --> 00:38:29.864 Moynihan, the sponsor of a major

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

00:38:29.864 --> 00:38:32.960 precursor to the 96 welfare reform bill,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00:38:32.960 \longrightarrow 00:38:35.296$ the 1988 Family Support Act,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00{:}38{:}35.296 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}37.585$ and the the cover of the book where

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00:38:37.585 \longrightarrow 00:38:39.523$ Clinton and Reagan are shaking hands.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

00:38:39.530 --> 00:38:41.385 It's actually at the signing of the

00:38:41.390 --> 00:38:45.695 1988 signing of the Family Support Act.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

00:38:45.700 --> 00:38:46.981 You know, poverty.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

00:38:46.981 --> 00:38:49.543 What he continued the frame poverty

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

00:38:49.543 --> 00:38:52.379 in a behavioral context which still

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

00:38:52.379 --> 00:38:55.278 it never really departed from his

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

00:38:55.278 --> 00:38:57.258 tangle of pathology analysis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00:38:57.260 \longrightarrow 00:38:59.516$ And the focus on individual behavior,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00:38:59.520 \longrightarrow 00:39:01.644$ especially reproductive, domestic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00:39:01.644 \longrightarrow 00:39:03.060$ sexual, occupational,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

00:39:03.060 --> 00:39:05.526 was now part of mainstream policy

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

00:39:05.526 --> 00:39:09.079 discourse and was by no means the

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00:39:09.079 \longrightarrow 00:39:10.906$ exclusive intellectual enterprise

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

00:39:10.906 --> 00:39:12.124 of conservatives.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

00:39:12.130 --> 00:39:13.795 This behavioral focus and emphasis

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

00:39:13.795 --> 00:39:16.270 on the otherness of the welfare poor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00:39:16.270 \longrightarrow 00:39:18.002$ with reference to worthiness,

 $00:39:18.002 \longrightarrow 00:39:20.610$ work ethic, race, gender, role,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

00:39:20.610 --> 00:39:21.770 performance, sexuality,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00:39:21.770 \longrightarrow 00:39:22.140$ etcetera,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

00:39:22.140 --> 00:39:23.990 constructed a caricature of those

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00{:}39{:}23.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}26.385$ who relied on public assistance that

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00:39:26.385 \longrightarrow 00:39:28.525$ discouraged the general public from

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00:39:28.525 \longrightarrow 00:39:30.908$ being sympathetic with them or even

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00:39:30.908 \longrightarrow 00:39:32.990$ identifying their own hardship with them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00{:}39{:}32.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}36.238$ So the attack on the welfare state.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00:39:36.240 \longrightarrow 00:39:38.472$ Reflected that programs were seen as

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00:39:38.472 \dashrightarrow 00:39:40.373$ no longer disciplining productive and

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00:39:40.373 \longrightarrow 00:39:42.202$ reproductive norms and, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

00:39:42.202 --> 00:39:43.330 among, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00:39:43.330 \longrightarrow 00:39:46.880$ target populations for welfare programs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00:39:46.880 \longrightarrow 00:39:48.854$ And what emerged over time was a

 $00:39:48.854 \longrightarrow 00:39:50.550$ weaker and more enfeebled welfare

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00:39{:}50.550 \dashrightarrow 00:39{:}52.914$ state that could become more vulnerable

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00:39:52.914 \longrightarrow 00:39:55.552$ to attack and reform in ways that

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00:39:55.552 \longrightarrow 00:39:57.342$ were considered consistent with elite

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00:39:57.350 \longrightarrow 00:39:59.915$ prerogatives and and the economic

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00{:}39{:}59.915 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}02.570$ system and with the consequences of

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00:40:02.570 \longrightarrow 00:40:04.282$ stigmatizing and further reducing

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

 $00:40:04.282 \longrightarrow 00:40:06.349$ services and benefits for the most.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88578998

00:40:06.350 --> 00:40:08.468 Vulnerable and marginalized in our society.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905542475454545

00:40:10.810 --> 00:40:12.748 And that's it. Happy to take

NOTE Confidence: 0.905542475454545

 $00:40:12.748 \longrightarrow 00:40:14.430$ any questions at this time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859967557857143

00:40:19.520 --> 00:40:21.333 Thank you, Darren. That was you hit

NOTE Confidence: 0.859967557857143

 $00:40:21.333 \longrightarrow 00:40:23.578$ on so many different things that my,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859967557857143

00:40:23.580 --> 00:40:27.036 my brains are my brain is like spinning.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859967557857143

00:40:27.040 --> 00:40:28.996 I have one question and you,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859967557857143

 $00:40:29.000 \longrightarrow 00:40:31.282$ you began to refer to this with

 $00:40:31.282 \longrightarrow 00:40:33.472$ the the sort of liberal movements

NOTE Confidence: 0.859967557857143

 $00:40:33.472 \longrightarrow 00:40:36.118$ that were going on in the 60s,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859967557857143

 $00{:}40{:}36.120 \longrightarrow 00{:}40{:}38.288$ but I'd be curious to hear a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.859967557857143

 $00:40:38.288 \longrightarrow 00:40:40.686$ bit more about sort of. Yes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859967557857143

 $00:40:40.686 \longrightarrow 00:40:42.342$ How did the civil rights movement

NOTE Confidence: 0.859967557857143

 $00:40:42.342 \longrightarrow 00:40:44.008$ impact some of these decisions that

NOTE Confidence: 0.859967557857143

 $00:40:44.008 \longrightarrow 00:40:46.150$ were being made in the 60s as well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859967557857143

 $00{:}40{:}46.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}49.146$ if there was any like backlash and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859967557857143

 $00:40:49.150 \longrightarrow 00:40:50.165$ Just would love to hear a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.859967557857143

 $00:40:50.165 \longrightarrow 00:40:51.130$ bit more about your thoughts on

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

00:40:51.140 --> 00:40:54.560 that. That's a great question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

 $00{:}40{:}54.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}59.903$ So people like like Daniel Patrick

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

 $00{:}40{:}59.903 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}02.267$ Moynihan especially among others,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

 $00:41:02.270 \longrightarrow 00:41:04.646$ there was there was a push in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

 $00:41:04.646 \longrightarrow 00:41:06.386$ welfare rights movement to actually

 $00:41:06.386 \longrightarrow 00:41:08.899$ have folks in the communities who who

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

 $00:41:08.967 \longrightarrow 00:41:10.857$ who utilize public assistance actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

 $00:41:10.857 \longrightarrow 00:41:13.569$ have more input and to be more empowered

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

00:41:13.569 --> 00:41:15.207 in terms of the administration and

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

 $00:41:15.207 \longrightarrow 00:41:16.679$ structuring of the programs themselves.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

00:41:16.680 --> 00:41:19.110 This was called the Community Action

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

 $00:41:19.110 \longrightarrow 00:41:22.190$ programs and one thing that this emerging

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

00:41:22.190 --> 00:41:24.505 group of of intellectuals formally.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

00:41:24.510 --> 00:41:26.176 On the left, formerly on the left,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

00:41:26.180 --> 00:41:28.020 but whose politics kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

 $00{:}41{:}28.020 \mathrel{--}{>} 00{:}41{:}30.280$ migrated to the right over time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

 $00:41:30.280 \longrightarrow 00:41:33.115$ They hated the idea of non elites

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

 $00:41:33.115 \longrightarrow 00:41:35.311$ expressing any kind of collective

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

00:41:35.311 --> 00:41:37.566 political agency or having any

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

00:41:37.566 --> 00:41:40.860 kind of direct input in in program

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

 $00:41:40.860 \longrightarrow 00:41:43.656$ administration or or even politically.

00:41:43.660 --> 00:41:45.516 And you know, it was this kind of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

 $00:41:45.520 \longrightarrow 00:41:47.802$ And what's ironic is many of them

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

00:41:47.802 --> 00:41:50.028 themselves came from very working class

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

00:41:50.028 --> 00:41:52.386 origins folks like Norman Podhoretz and

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

 $00:41:52.386 \longrightarrow 00:41:54.657$ Daniel Bell and Glazer and on and on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

 $00:41:54.660 \longrightarrow 00:41:55.156$ Going on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

 $00:41:55.156 \longrightarrow 00:41:57.140$ But they saw the system as being good

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

 $00:41:57.194 \longrightarrow 00:41:58.965$ to them because they kind of played

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

 $00:41:58.965 \longrightarrow 00:42:00.920$ by the rules and they thought that

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

 $00:42:00.920 \longrightarrow 00:42:02.630$ other people should do the same.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

 $00:42:02.630 \longrightarrow 00:42:04.569$ It just so happened that they became

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

 $00:42:04.569 \longrightarrow 00:42:06.091$ very influential in the intellectual

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

 $00{:}42{:}06.091 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}07.676$ and political spheres and their

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

 $00:42:07.676 \longrightarrow 00:42:09.666$ ideas were able to, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78140126

 $00:42:09.666 \longrightarrow 00:42:10.920$ have have influence.

00:42:12.710 --> 00:42:14.218 Anyone have any questions?

NOTE Confidence: 0.90158263

 $00:42:19.550 \longrightarrow 00:42:21.482$ Yes, thank you. I think we could

NOTE Confidence: 0.90158263

 $00:42:21.482 \longrightarrow 00:42:23.470$ talk for a while about this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90158263

 $00:42:23.470 \longrightarrow 00:42:24.790$ One question I have is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90158263

 $00:42:24.790 \longrightarrow 00:42:27.588$ is as the discourse starts to shift.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90158263

 $00{:}42{:}27.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}30.355$ Do you start to see rural urban

NOTE Confidence: 0.90158263

 $00:42:30.355 \longrightarrow 00:42:31.848$ differences in that discourse?

NOTE Confidence: 0.90158263

 $00:42:31.850 \longrightarrow 00:42:33.677$ Does it become more prominent in one

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

 $00:42:33.690 \longrightarrow 00:42:36.039$ versus the other?

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

 $00:42:36.040 \longrightarrow 00:42:37.272$ That's an excellent question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

 $00:42:37.272 \longrightarrow 00:42:39.120$ It's interesting in that one of

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

 $00:42:39.174 \longrightarrow 00:42:41.410$ the stereo, I didn't do that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

 $00:42:41.410 \longrightarrow 00:42:44.383$ One of the stereotypes with regard to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9605269533333333

00:42:44.383 --> 00:42:46.538 folks who utilize public assistance

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

 $00:42:46.538 \longrightarrow 00:42:49.265$ is that the majority of people that

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

 $00:42:49.265 \longrightarrow 00:42:51.883$ do are live in urban communities and

 $00:42:51.883 \longrightarrow 00:42:54.915$ are and are are black and brown and

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

 $00:42:54.920 \longrightarrow 00:42:57.839$ the reality is that there are more

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

00:42:57.839 --> 00:43:00.135 rural white populations that utilize

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

 $00:43:00.135 \longrightarrow 00:43:03.045$ welfare than urban non white populations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

 $00:43:03.050 \longrightarrow 00:43:05.348$ But. You know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

00:43:05.348 --> 00:43:07.430 Finding a, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

 $00:43:07.430 \longrightarrow 00:43:09.355$ in the the folks who are crafting

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

00:43:09.355 --> 00:43:11.039 and refining the discourse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

 $00:43:11.040 \longrightarrow 00:43:13.931$ Over time it became much more effective

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

 $00:43:13.931 \longrightarrow 00:43:16.500$ to scapegoat groups that already you

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

00:43:16.500 --> 00:43:18.600 know lacked political agency because

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

 $00:43:18.600 \longrightarrow 00:43:21.330$ of you know structural inequality and

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

 $00{:}43{:}21.330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}24.500$ and systemic racism and and sexism etcetera.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

 $00:43:24.500 \longrightarrow 00:43:28.020$ So it's much more effective for them to

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

 $00:43:28.020 \longrightarrow 00:43:31.340$ highlight what they saw as being problematic.

 $00:43:31.340 \longrightarrow 00:43:33.386$ You know characteristics of of those

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

 $00{:}43{:}33.386 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}35.550$ folks and and those communities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

 $00:43:35.550 \longrightarrow 00:43:37.086$ And what's sad is it worked.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333 00:43:37.090 --> 00:43:37.612 You know, NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

00:43:37.612 --> 00:43:39.178 it really appealed to mostly folks

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

 $00:43:39.178 \longrightarrow 00:43:40.939$ who were struggling like in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

 $00:43:40.939 \longrightarrow 00:43:42.419$ middle class and working class.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

 $00:43:42.420 \longrightarrow 00:43:46.180$ And you saw going into the mid and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9605269533333333

 $00:43:46.180 \longrightarrow 00:43:48.305$ late 1970s and with the election

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

 $00:43:48.305 \longrightarrow 00:43:49.629$ of Reagan in 1980,

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

00:43:49.630 --> 00:43:52.087 a lot of working class people in

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

00:43:52.087 --> 00:43:54.285 what were considered kind of blue

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

 $00:43:54.285 \longrightarrow 00:43:56.433$ states right flipped and voted for

NOTE Confidence: 0.9605269533333333

00:43:56.433 --> 00:43:58.079 Reagan and Reagan overwhelmingly

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

 $00:43:58.079 \longrightarrow 00:43:59.975$ beat Carter in in 1980.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

 $00:43:59.975 \longrightarrow 00:44:01.830$ So you know that was an important

 $00{:}44{:}01.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}03.683$ kind of distinction and and between

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

 $00:44:03.683 \longrightarrow 00:44:05.579$ those two groups and how it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

 $00:44:05.580 \longrightarrow 00:44:06.959$ Kind of played out with regard to

NOTE Confidence: 0.960526953333333

 $00:44:06.959 \longrightarrow 00:44:08.460$ the shift in thinking on welfare.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876029255

00:44:11.560 --> 00:44:12.110 Any other?

NOTE Confidence: 0.86463687625

00:44:14.220 --> 00:44:16.770 Thank you for really fascinating talk

NOTE Confidence: 0.86463687625

00:44:16.770 --> 00:44:18.980 and history being the Child Study Center.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86463687625

 $00{:}44{:}18.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}21.440$ I'm wondering this question is about

NOTE Confidence: 0.86463687625

 $00{:}44{:}21.440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}24.206$ child focused policies, which I know kind

NOTE Confidence: 0.86463687625

 $00:44:24.206 \longrightarrow 00:44:26.126$ of welfare policies affect children,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86463687625

00:44:26.130 --> 00:44:27.850 but they're not necessarily

NOTE Confidence: 0.86463687625

 $00:44:27.850 \longrightarrow 00:44:29.628$ directed towards them explicitly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86463687625

 $00:44:29.628 \longrightarrow 00:44:33.044$ So I'm curious as the conversation on

NOTE Confidence: 0.86463687625

00:44:33.044 --> 00:44:36.420 welfare and welfare policies has changed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86463687625

 $00:44:36.420 \longrightarrow 00:44:41.142$ I guess how has that mirrored or been

00:44:41.142 --> 00:44:44.089 different from other child focused?

NOTE Confidence: 0.86463687625

00:44:44.089 --> 00:44:45.448 Policies, for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86463687625

 $00:44:45.450 \longrightarrow 00:44:48.266$ early head start or maybe free and reduced

NOTE Confidence: 0.86463687625

 $00:44:48.266 \longrightarrow 00:44:50.988$ meal programs at schools or things like that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86463687625

00:44:50.990 --> 00:44:53.174 Have they seen similar changes over time?

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:44:55.090 \longrightarrow 00:44:55.866$ It's interesting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:44:55.866 \longrightarrow 00:44:57.902$ So the expansion, for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:44:57.902 \longrightarrow 00:45:01.054$ the child tax credit has been a real

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:45:01.054 \longrightarrow 00:45:03.160$ success in reducing poverty and among

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:45:03.235 \longrightarrow 00:45:06.083$ folks of color and in communities of color.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

00:45:06.090 --> 00:45:09.290 And it's, it's, it's interesting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

00:45:09.290 --> 00:45:11.530 I think his name is Martin Gillins,

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:45:11.530 \longrightarrow 00:45:13.610$ and I think he's a Yale political scientist.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00{:}45{:}13.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}14.582$ He did a great,

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:45:14.582 \longrightarrow 00:45:17.438$ he did a great study and his book was titled

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

00:45:17.438 --> 00:45:19.929 Why Americans Hate Welfare and what he saw,

 $00:45:19.930 \longrightarrow 00:45:22.675$ he studied media representation from

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:45:22.675 \longrightarrow 00:45:26.040$ the 1960s onward into the 1990s.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

00:45:26.040 --> 00:45:27.380 If I'm remembering it correctly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:45:27.380 \longrightarrow 00:45:30.480$ I read it a long time ago and what he

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:45:30.572 \longrightarrow 00:45:33.179$ saw was that when programs were being

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:45:33.179 \longrightarrow 00:45:35.537$ featured in in media narratives that

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:45:35.537 \longrightarrow 00:45:37.458$ that addressed children specifically

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

00:45:37.458 --> 00:45:40.380 or the elderly like Social Security,

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:45:40.380 \longrightarrow 00:45:40.729$ etcetera,

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:45:40.729 \longrightarrow 00:45:43.172$ the pictures and images that tended to

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00{:}45{:}43.172 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}45.555$ go along with those stories were often

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:45:45.555 \longrightarrow 00:45:47.979$ of like white people in the suburbs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:45:47.980 \longrightarrow 00:45:49.982$ But then when they looked at

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:45:49.982 \longrightarrow 00:45:51.919$ issues like the underclass or welfare

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:45:51.919 \longrightarrow 00:45:54.292$ fraud and abuse and and wasteful

 $00:45:54.351 \longrightarrow 00:45:56.625$ spending and those kinds of narratives.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:45:56.630 \longrightarrow 00:45:59.204$ More often than not they portrayed

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:45:59.204 \longrightarrow 00:46:01.793$ those images that they they featured

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

00:46:01.793 --> 00:46:04.163 images of of folks of color.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:46:04.170 \longrightarrow 00:46:06.770$ So I mean that was a really you know I the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:46:06.770 \longrightarrow 00:46:09.990$ the. I think that as.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00{:}46{:}09.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}12.365$ As intellectuals were crafting and

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

00:46:12.365 --> 00:46:15.187 refining a narrative to convince folks

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00{:}46{:}15.187 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}18.240$ that welfare spending was a bad idea,

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:46:18.240 \longrightarrow 00:46:20.704$ they had to kind of go after those

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:46:20.704 \longrightarrow 00:46:22.270$ programs that targeted those

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

00:46:22.270 --> 00:46:24.800 populations that had less, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:46:24.800 \longrightarrow 00:46:27.495$ power and agency in in the society.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00{:}46{:}27.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}28.676$ So as you saw,

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

00:46:28.676 --> 00:46:30.440 like with Louisiana in 1960 when

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

00:46:30.507 --> 00:46:32.853 the issue was framed as hurting

00:46:32.853 --> 00:46:34.744 innocent children, it got reversed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:46:34.744 \longrightarrow 00:46:36.216$ It got rolled back.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

00:46:36.220 --> 00:46:37.645 But when Mitchell,

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

00:46:37.645 --> 00:46:40.020 Joseph Mitchell and Newberg spun.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:46:40.020 \longrightarrow 00:46:42.192$ The the narrative as where we're

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

00:46:42.192 --> 00:46:44.067 subsidizing all of this immoral

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

00:46:44.067 --> 00:46:46.559 behavior of these you know of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

00:46:46.559 --> 00:46:48.922 women quote UN quote then the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00{:}46{:}48.922 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}51.122$ opposition kind of held and and in

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:46:51.122 \longrightarrow 00:46:52.861$ many ways it was sort of the beginning

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

00:46:52.861 --> 00:46:54.909 of a new way of thinking about it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:46:54.910 \longrightarrow 00:46:56.958$ So in terms of the you know the

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00{:}46{:}56.958 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}58.798$ details of specific programs and

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:46:58.798 \longrightarrow 00:47:00.898$ how that affected those overtime,

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00{:}47{:}00.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}03.014$ I'm not sure I didn't really get

 $00:47:03.014 \longrightarrow 00:47:04.920$ granular with regard to the actual

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:47:04.920 \longrightarrow 00:47:06.485$ programs and funding for each

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00{:}47{:}06.485 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}08.317$ program but I was looking more

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:47:08.317 \longrightarrow 00:47:10.027$ at the discourses but you know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:47:10.030 \longrightarrow 00:47:11.140$ In terms of the attack,

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:47:11.140 \longrightarrow 00:47:13.330$ they they featured within their

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

00:47:13.330 --> 00:47:15.939 narratives things that they knew they

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:47:15.939 \longrightarrow 00:47:18.333$ could sort of tap into and exploit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

00:47:18.340 --> 00:47:20.250 Things like popular resentment right

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:47:20.250 \longrightarrow 00:47:22.578$ around things like the changing family

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

00:47:22.578 --> 00:47:24.906 structure and gender roles and, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

00:47:24.906 --> 00:47:26.817 the gains made in civil rights and,

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

00:47:26.820 --> 00:47:27.584 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00{:}47{:}27.584 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}28.730$ black liberation movements

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:47:28.730 \longrightarrow 00:47:30.258$ and things like that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:47:30.260 \longrightarrow 00:47:33.116$ I hope that answers your question somewhat.

 $00:47:33.120 \longrightarrow 00:47:34.910$ Thank you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

00:47:34.910 --> 00:47:35.130 Darren,

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

00:47:35.130 --> 00:47:36.890 thank you so much for that and that

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:47:36.890 \longrightarrow 00:47:38.539$ was a wonderful synthesis and I've

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:47:38.539 \longrightarrow 00:47:40.250$ certainly learned a lot from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:47:40.250 \longrightarrow 00:47:41.655$ from your presentation as someone

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:47:41.655 \longrightarrow 00:47:43.278$ who's not from America and Julia

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:47:43.278 \longrightarrow 00:47:45.270$ Zane has a question in the chat and

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:47:45.326 \longrightarrow 00:47:46.952$ she was wondering to what extent

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:47:46.952 \longrightarrow 00:47:48.758$ do you think the Immigration Act

NOTE Confidence: 0.860330336

 $00:47:48.758 \longrightarrow 00:47:51.806$ of 1965 and also played a part in

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:47:51.810 \longrightarrow 00:47:53.940$ politicians movement to attack black

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00{:}47{:}53.940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}55.644$ communities and welfare programs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:47:55.650 \longrightarrow 00:47:59.705$ You know, it's interesting. With the the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:47:59.705 \longrightarrow 00:48:01.715$ The wave of immigration that happens

 $00:48:01.715 \longrightarrow 00:48:04.352$ in the 60s and and the destination

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:48:04.352 \longrightarrow 00:48:06.344$ country are not destination the

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

00:48:06.344 --> 00:48:08.960 countries folks are coming from being

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

00:48:08.960 --> 00:48:11.192 predominantly Latin America and Asia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:48:11.192 \longrightarrow 00:48:14.419$ they're able to weave into the narrative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

00:48:14.420 --> 00:48:15.926 Um, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:48:15.926 \longrightarrow 00:48:18.436$ the issue of immigration somewhat,

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

00:48:18.440 --> 00:48:20.540 but it's not something for whatever reason

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

00:48:20.540 --> 00:48:22.966 that that is featured nearly as much as,

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

00:48:22.970 --> 00:48:25.498 you know the the culture of poverty stuff

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00{:}48{:}25.498 \to 00{:}48{:}28.187$ and black communities and all of that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:48:28.190 \longrightarrow 00:48:31.284$ I think that for a lot of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:48:31.290 \longrightarrow 00:48:33.103$ You know, a lot of these figures

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

00:48:33.103 --> 00:48:35.212 that were that were engaged in this

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:48:35.212 \longrightarrow 00:48:36.802$ discourse and in these debates,

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00{:}48{:}36.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}38.546$ they saw a lot what was happening

 $00:48:38.546 \longrightarrow 00:48:40.530$ in a lot of the immigrant

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

00:48:40.530 --> 00:48:42.490 communities actually were were they,

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

00:48:42.490 --> 00:48:44.632 they saw it as people conforming to the sort

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:48:44.632 \longrightarrow 00:48:47.007$ of achievement ethos and that kind of thing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

00:48:47.010 --> 00:48:49.074 So they didn't feature as prominently

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:48:49.074 \longrightarrow 00:48:50.450$ in their negative characterizations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

00:48:50.450 --> 00:48:51.650 And just if I may,

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00{:}48{:}51.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}52.868$ while I still have the microphone,

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

00:48:52.870 --> 00:48:54.820 I was just wondering you, you,

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:48:54.820 \longrightarrow 00:48:56.338$ you started by presenting,

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445 00:48:56.338 --> 00:48:57.186 you know, NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

00:48:57.186 --> 00:49:00.050 the kind of per capita investment in

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00{:}49{:}00.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}01.158$ welfare across different countries.

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:49:01.158 \longrightarrow 00:49:01.989$ And I'm just.

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

00:49:01.990 --> 00:49:02.946 Interested in your research?

 $00:49:02.946 \longrightarrow 00:49:05.110$ Have you looked at any kind of cross

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:49:05.110 \longrightarrow 00:49:06.854$ cultural or country specific analysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:49:06.854 \longrightarrow 00:49:09.220$ of of narratives on poverty and how

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:49:09.283 \longrightarrow 00:49:11.178$ they differ between countries that

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

00:49:11.178 --> 00:49:12.640 invest heavily in social welfare

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

00:49:12.640 --> 00:49:14.840 programs versus the United States?

NOTE Confidence: 0.75281509444444500:49:14.840 --> 00:49:15.185 Yeah,

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:49:15.185 \longrightarrow 00:49:17.945$ so the countries that are most like us

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00{:}49{:}17.945 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}20.273$ but they're still the welfare states

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

00:49:20.273 --> 00:49:23.120 of say Canada and UK for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00{:}49{:}23.120 \mathrel{--}{>} 00{:}49{:}25.045$ are still much more expansive

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

00:49:25.045 --> 00:49:27.560 than that of the United States,

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:49:27.560 \longrightarrow 00:49:29.606$ but they're closer to us than

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:49:29.606 \longrightarrow 00:49:31.590$ say our central European and

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:49:31.590 \longrightarrow 00:49:33.249$ Northern European counterparts.

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:49:33.250 \longrightarrow 00:49:35.882$ Remember in the UK when the Reagan

 $00:49:35.882 \longrightarrow 00:49:38.010$ Revolution is happening here the

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:49:38.010 \longrightarrow 00:49:40.350$ That cher revolution is happening there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

00:49:40.350 --> 00:49:42.375 And you know I I I kind of mentioned

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

00:49:42.375 --> 00:49:43.979 briefly the think tanks when I had

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

00:49:43.979 --> 00:49:45.532 to cut this down to 35 minutes

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

00:49:45.532 --> 00:49:47.210 I had a whole thing on the think

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:49:47.210 \longrightarrow 00:49:48.890$ tanks that I could get into it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00{:}49{:}48.890 \longrightarrow 00{:}49{:}51.802$ But you know there's there's a guy

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

00:49:51.802 --> 00:49:53.839 named Anthony Fisher in England he

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00{:}49{:}53.839 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}55.680$ was kind of like the Frank Perdue

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

00:49:55.741 --> 00:49:57.933 of England he he ran like a chicken

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:49:57.933 \longrightarrow 00:50:00.070$ operation and he had a lot of money and

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00{:}50{:}00.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}02.338$ he decided to get into politics and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

00:50:02.338 --> 00:50:03.946 They started the Institute

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

00:50:03.946 --> 00:50:05.340 for Economic Affairs,

 $00:50:05.340 \longrightarrow 00:50:07.223$ which was one of the first think

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

00:50:07.223 --> 00:50:09.190 tanks in England that kind of was

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:50:09.190 \longrightarrow 00:50:10.840$ looking at these sorts of issues.

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:50:10.840 \longrightarrow 00:50:12.758$ And there were a whole host of,

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:50:12.760 \longrightarrow 00:50:14.856$ and this was under the influence of one

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

00:50:14.856 --> 00:50:17.267 of the libertarians I mentioned before,

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:50:17.270 \longrightarrow 00:50:18.446$ Friedrich von Hayek.

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:50:18.446 \longrightarrow 00:50:20.014$ He told people interested

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:50:20.014 \longrightarrow 00:50:21.620$ in addressing this issue.

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:50:21.620 \longrightarrow 00:50:22.700$ He said, listen,

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:50:22.700 \longrightarrow 00:50:24.500$ don't talk to the politicians,

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:50:24.500 \longrightarrow 00:50:25.880$ but talk to the professors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:50:25.880 \longrightarrow 00:50:27.220$ talk to the intellectuals,

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:50:27.220 \longrightarrow 00:50:29.230$ go into the arena of ideas,

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:50:29.230 \longrightarrow 00:50:30.290$ because that's that's where

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:50:30.290 \longrightarrow 00:50:31.615$ you can make a difference.

 $00:50:31.620 \longrightarrow 00:50:32.920$ And it was him and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

00:50:32.920 --> 00:50:34.584 And Milton Friedman and

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:50:34.584 \longrightarrow 00:50:36.248$ others who started what?

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

00:50:36.250 --> 00:50:38.490 It wasn't the first political think tank,

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:50:38.490 \longrightarrow 00:50:40.230$ but it was the first one

NOTE Confidence: 0.752815094444445

 $00:50:40.230 \longrightarrow 00:50:41.390$ that was dedicated to

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

00:50:41.457 --> 00:50:43.662 advancing a kind of singular

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

00:50:43.662 --> 00:50:44.854 political objective, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:50:44.854 \longrightarrow 00:50:46.678$ And that was the Palaran society

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

00:50:46.678 --> 00:50:48.541 and that became kind of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:50:48.541 \longrightarrow 00:50:50.026$ blueprint for later think tank.

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

00:50:50.030 --> 00:50:54.522 So the IEA in England is really

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00{:}50{:}54.522 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}57.394$ effective at demonizing, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

00:50:57.394 --> 00:50:59.386 folks who are struggling there and,

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

00:50:59.390 --> 00:51:01.575 you know, allocations for public

00:51:01.575 --> 00:51:03.323 housing get cut somewhat.

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

00:51:03.330 --> 00:51:04.675 Um, the healthcare system doesn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:51:04.675 \longrightarrow 00:51:06.020$ really get touched so much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:51:06.020 \longrightarrow 00:51:07.450$ Taxes get reduced for the

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:51:07.450 \longrightarrow 00:51:08.594$ wealthy and the affluent,

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

00:51:08.600 --> 00:51:10.854 but it's not nearly to the extent

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:51:10.854 \longrightarrow 00:51:12.338$ that happened here and there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:51:12.338 \longrightarrow 00:51:14.410$ There were at least 6 to 8 other

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:51:14.478 \longrightarrow 00:51:16.634$ think tanks after the IEA that that

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

00:51:16.634 --> 00:51:18.579 were created by Anthony Fisher that

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00{:}51{:}18.579 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}20.819$ we're doing the same kind of work

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:51:20.820 \longrightarrow 00:51:24.140$ both in the US and in in the UK

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:51:24.242 \longrightarrow 00:51:29.396$ and Canada and you know the in 19.

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

00:51:29.400 --> 00:51:30.380 Gosh, I think it was,

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:51:30.380 \longrightarrow 00:51:31.900$ this was the late 1980s.

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:51:31.900 \longrightarrow 00:51:34.720$ Margaret Thatcher actually,

00:51:34.720 --> 00:51:35.226 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00{:}51{:}35.226 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}51{:}36.997$ granted a Lordship to the director of

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:51:36.997 \longrightarrow 00:51:38.856$ the IEA saying that without them and

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

00:51:38.856 --> 00:51:40.989 without the work of the think tanks that,

 $\begin{aligned} & \text{NOTE Confidence: } 0.894092400588235 \\ & 00:51:40.990 --> 00:51:41.976 \text{ you know,} \end{aligned}$

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:51:41.976 \longrightarrow 00:51:44.934$ their revolution wouldn't have been possible.

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

00:51:44.940 --> 00:51:48.200 So, yeah, but, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:51:48.200 \longrightarrow 00:51:48.720$ it's interesting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

00:51:48.720 --> 00:51:48.986 I,

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

00:51:48.986 --> 00:51:51.889 I had a slide and I cut it again for

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:51:51.889 \longrightarrow 00:51:54.920$ time that looked at support in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:51:54.920 \longrightarrow 00:51:57.460$ European countries for welfare spending.

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00{:}51{:}57.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}59.482$ And whereas in the US we're

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:51:59.482 \longrightarrow 00:52:01.341$ consistently at about a 60%,

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:52:01.341 \longrightarrow 00:52:03.896$ sixty five sometimes close to

 $00:52:03.896 \longrightarrow 00:52:06.358$ 70% rate of opposition towards

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:52:06.358 \longrightarrow 00:52:08.306$ towards expanding welfare programs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:52:08.310 \longrightarrow 00:52:09.941$ And the the way the questions are

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:52:09.941 \longrightarrow 00:52:11.900$ worded I mean we can get granular with

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:52:11.900 \longrightarrow 00:52:13.605$ like well what does that really mean

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:52:13.605 \longrightarrow 00:52:16.214$ and all of that but it's what we have there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:52:16.214 \longrightarrow 00:52:19.238$ It's kind of the it's kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:52:19.238 \longrightarrow 00:52:22.066$ the way it looked like here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:52:22.070 \longrightarrow 00:52:24.694$ In the early 1960s.

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235 00.52:24.694 --> 00.52:26.006 So they, NOTE Confidence: 0.89409240058823500.52:26.010 --> 00.52:26.780 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:52:26.780 \longrightarrow 00:52:28.705$ some of the lowest support

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:52:28.705 \longrightarrow 00:52:30.410$ for welfare programs are in,

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

00:52:30.410 --> 00:52:31.634 if I'm remembering correctly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

00:52:31.634 --> 00:52:33.164 believe it or not Switzerland,

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:52:33.170 \longrightarrow 00:52:34.640$ even though they have an extensive welfare

 $00:52:34.640 \longrightarrow 00:52:36.090$ state and some of the other country,

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

00:52:36.090 --> 00:52:38.436 I think because it's extensive some

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:52:38.436 \longrightarrow 00:52:40.830$ there's a little more opposition,

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:52:40.830 \longrightarrow 00:52:43.605$ but that's about 65% support

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:52:43.605 \longrightarrow 00:52:45.554$ with about 35% opposition.

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

00:52:45.554 --> 00:52:48.890 That's still a drastic change from the US

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:52:48.971 \longrightarrow 00:52:52.025$ and Luxembourg actually has like 90% support.

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:52:52.025 \dashrightarrow 00:52:55.120$ And that's about the range about 65% to

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:52:55.120 \longrightarrow 00:52:58.169$ 90 compared to what it is in the US.

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

00:52:58.170 --> 00:52:59.946 Which is about 30% in any odd year,

NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235 00:52:59.950 --> 00:53:01.759 30 to 40. NOTE Confidence: 0.894092400588235

 $00:53:01.760 \longrightarrow 00:53:01.970$ And

NOTE Confidence: 0.875872766

 $00{:}53{:}01.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}03.534$ I think we have one last question

NOTE Confidence: 0.875872766

 $00:53:03.534 \longrightarrow 00:53:05.288$ that we can take sort of on this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.875872766

 $00:53:05.290 \longrightarrow 00:53:08.350$ Apologies if I rambled there, but.

00:53:08.350 --> 00:53:09.910 But remember please that Doctor

NOTE Confidence: 0.875872766

 $00{:}53{:}09.910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}11.158$ Brennan's going to linger.

NOTE Confidence: 0.875872766

00:53:11.160 --> 00:53:12.288 So if you have other questions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.875872766

 $00:53:12.290 \longrightarrow 00:53:16.808$ please stay around and ask him but this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.875872766

 $00:53:16.810 \longrightarrow 00:53:18.570$ I thank you for your talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.875872766

00:53:18.570 --> 00:53:19.764 I was curious,

NOTE Confidence: 0.875872766

 $00:53:19.764 \longrightarrow 00:53:22.152$ you mentioned a bunch about the

NOTE Confidence: 0.875872766

00:53:22.152 --> 00:53:24.738 media and control of magazines and

NOTE Confidence: 0.875872766

 $00:53:24.738 \longrightarrow 00:53:27.376$ narratives like that and I was

NOTE Confidence: 0.875872766

00:53:27.376 --> 00:53:30.070 wondering if you've noticed or you've

NOTE Confidence: 0.875872766

 $00{:}53{:}30.070 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}53{:}32.737$ seen a change in trends of public

NOTE Confidence: 0.875872766

 $00:53:32.737 \longrightarrow 00:53:35.688$ opinion with the rise of social media

NOTE Confidence: 0.875872766

 $00:53:35.688 \longrightarrow 00:53:38.251$ and having more individuals be have

NOTE Confidence: 0.875872766

 $00{:}53{:}38.251 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}40.657$ larger platforms or if that's still

NOTE Confidence: 0.875872766

 $00:53:40.657 \longrightarrow 00:53:42.948$ largely controlled by the billionaires

NOTE Confidence: 0.875872766

 $00:53:42.948 \longrightarrow 00:53:44.976$ they're owning these companies

 $00:53:45.790 \longrightarrow 00:53:47.322$ that's. An excellent question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00{:}53{:}47.322 \to 00{:}53{:}50.600$ I'm by no means a social media expert,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

00:53:50.600 --> 00:53:51.640 even though I threw my,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:53:51.640 \longrightarrow 00:53:53.080$ you know, my ads up there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:53:53.080 \longrightarrow 00:53:55.708$ But. Feel free to reach out,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

00:53:55.710 --> 00:53:56.994 but it's interesting,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:53:56.994 \longrightarrow 00:53:58.518$ you know, in 2012,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:53:58.518 \longrightarrow 00:54:01.190$ Newt Gingrich makes a run for the presidency.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:54:01.190 \longrightarrow 00:54:02.690$ He's, he's, he wants to,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:54:02.690 \longrightarrow 00:54:06.274$ he's in the the group of

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

00:54:06.274 --> 00:54:08.202 Republican presidential hopefuls to

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

00:54:08.202 --> 00:54:10.534run against Barack Obama in 2012.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00{:}54{:}10.534 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}13.548$ And he kind of gets caught up in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00{:}54{:}13.548 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}15.634$ he makes a speech somewhere and he

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:54:15.711 \longrightarrow 00:54:18.263$ and he uses the same kind of language

 $00:54:18.263 \longrightarrow 00:54:20.848$ that he and others did in the 1990s

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:54:20.848 \longrightarrow 00:54:22.790$ with regard to welfare programs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:54:22.790 \longrightarrow 00:54:24.946$ And he alluded to the fact that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

00:54:24.950 --> 00:54:26.830 Poor folks in black communities

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:54:26.830 \longrightarrow 00:54:28.334$ had used strange language.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:54:28.340 \longrightarrow 00:54:29.360$ He said something like that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:54:29.360 \longrightarrow 00:54:31.453$ They have no habituation to work and

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:54:31.453 \longrightarrow 00:54:33.530$ they don't see anybody go to work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

00:54:33.530 --> 00:54:34.286 On Monday morning,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:54:34.286 \longrightarrow 00:54:35.546$ he said something along those

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00{:}54{:}35.546 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}37.099$ lines and he got a real backlash,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:54:37.100 \longrightarrow 00:54:39.350$ actually on social media and

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:54:39.350 \longrightarrow 00:54:41.600$ and his his approval ratings.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:54:41.600 \longrightarrow 00:54:43.700$ He was considered a frontrunner in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:54:43.700 \longrightarrow 00:54:45.638$ beginning of the primaries in 2012.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:54:45.640 \longrightarrow 00:54:48.256$ His approval ratings came down somewhat

 $00:54:48.260 \longrightarrow 00:54:50.598$ with the midterm elections that just passed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00{:}54{:}50.600 \to 00{:}54{:}52.976$ You know, I I tuned into Fox News just

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:54:52.976 \longrightarrow 00:54:55.308$ to see what the discourse was and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:54:55.310 \longrightarrow 00:54:57.256$ There was a there was a particular

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:54:57.256 \longrightarrow 00:54:59.072$ analyst I can't remember his name

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:54:59.072 \longrightarrow 00:55:00.908$ who was really laboring over the

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

00:55:00.908 --> 00:55:02.891 fact that single women just didn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00{:}55{:}02.891 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}05.006$ turn out for the Republicans to and

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00{:}55{:}05.006 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}06.990$ and and the split was like 38 points

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00{:}55{:}07.054 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}08.993$ and his response to that is sounded

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00{:}55{:}08.993 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}10.824$ so much like the language around

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:55:10.824 \longrightarrow 00:55:13.008$ welfare reform years ago he said I

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00{:}55{:}13.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}14.418$ think we need he said something like

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:55:14.418 \longrightarrow 00:55:16.410$ we need to get these women married or

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

00:55:16.460 --> 00:55:18.084 something like that and I was like

00:55:18.090 --> 00:55:19.770 really that's your take home point

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:55:19.770 \longrightarrow 00:55:21.498$ and he got and what's interesting

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:55:21.498 \longrightarrow 00:55:23.648$ is is that that was very common

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

00:55:23.648 --> 00:55:25.526 discourse back when in fact the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

00:55:25.530 --> 00:55:27.119 The language of the bill has all

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:55:27.119 \longrightarrow 00:55:28.698$ of this stuff in the beginning,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:55:28.700 \longrightarrow 00:55:29.732$ where it's like.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667 00:55:29.732 --> 00:55:30.420 You know, NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:55:30.420 \longrightarrow 00:55:34.249$ whereas marriage is the cornerstone of what,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:55:34.250 \longrightarrow 00:55:35.362$ you know of society.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:55:35.362 \longrightarrow 00:55:37.030$ And this is the idea was,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667 00:55:37.030 --> 00:55:37.628 you know, NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:55:37.628 \longrightarrow 00:55:40.020$ really to encourage women to be an intact

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:55:40.086 \longrightarrow 00:55:42.726$ relationships regardless of the consequences,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:55:42.730 \longrightarrow 00:55:44.014$ regardless of the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:55:44.014 \longrightarrow 00:55:45.298$ quality of the relationship,

 $00:55:45.300 \longrightarrow 00:55:46.728$ the demonization of single

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:55:46.728 \longrightarrow 00:55:47.799$ motherhood and everything.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:55:47.800 \longrightarrow 00:55:49.655$ And it was almost refreshing

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:55:49.655 \longrightarrow 00:55:51.750$ that the day after he mentioned

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:55:51.750 \longrightarrow 00:55:53.580$ that with regard to the midterms,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667 00:55:53.580 --> 00:55:54.076 I mean,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:55:54.076 \longrightarrow 00:55:56.060$ he was crucified on social media for it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:55:56.060 \longrightarrow 00:55:58.430$ And a lot of that discourse

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

00:55:58.430 --> 00:56:00.010 now sounds just absolutely.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00{:}56{:}00.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}02.565$ You know just medieval and I think

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00{:}56{:}02.565 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}56{:}04.742$ that's because of you know people

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00{:}56{:}04.742 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}07.101$ on social media are are you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00{:}56{:}07.172 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}09.300$ the in in some ways I mean we

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:56:09.300 \longrightarrow 00:56:10.990$ all know that the downside of it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:56:10.990 \longrightarrow 00:56:13.110$ But in some ways the you know the

 $00:56:13.110 \longrightarrow 00:56:15.405$ the arena of ideas has become more

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

00:56:15.405 --> 00:56:17.100 democratized and that's a good

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:56:17.171 \longrightarrow 00:56:19.300$ thing but the narratives are still

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:56:19.300 \longrightarrow 00:56:21.546$ constrained you know the build back

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:56:21.546 \longrightarrow 00:56:23.730$ better act turned into the Inflation

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00{:}56{:}23.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}25.715$ Reduction Act and like was cut

NOTE Confidence: 0.837972474166667

 $00:56:25.715 \longrightarrow 00:56:27.654$ in more more than more more than

NOTE Confidence: 0.879140149333333

 $00{:}56{:}27.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}29.308$ by half and a lot of things taken

NOTE Confidence: 0.879140149333333

 $00:56:29.308 \longrightarrow 00:56:31.138$ out and that was mostly because of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879140149333333

00:56:31.140 --> 00:56:33.078 Disagreement among Democrats,

NOTE Confidence: 0.879140149333333

00:56:33.078 --> 00:56:35.022 not even, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.879140149333333

 $00:56:35.022 \longrightarrow 00:56:36.652$ because of the the negotiations

NOTE Confidence: 0.879140149333333

 $00:56:36.652 \longrightarrow 00:56:38.270$ happening across the party line.

NOTE Confidence: 0.879140149333333

 $00:56:38.270 \longrightarrow 00:56:40.950$ So the narratives are still

NOTE Confidence: 0.879140149333333

 $00:56:40.950 \longrightarrow 00:56:43.055$ constrained in ways that I think

NOTE Confidence: 0.879140149333333

 $00{:}56{:}43.055 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}45.010$ are important and related to this.

00:56:45.010 --> 00:56:46.426 But I think they're giving way a bit,

NOTE Confidence: 0.879140149333333

 $00:56:46.430 \longrightarrow 00:56:48.002$ and I think social media has

NOTE Confidence: 0.879140149333333

 $00:56:48.002 \longrightarrow 00:56:49.950$ played somewhat of a role. Yeah,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859026891

 $00:56:50.270 \longrightarrow 00:56:51.705$ well, clearly there's lots we

NOTE Confidence: 0.859026891

 $00:56:51.705 \longrightarrow 00:56:53.140$ can continue to talk about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859026891

00:56:53.140 --> 00:56:54.132 And again, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859026891

 $00:56:54.132 \longrightarrow 00:56:55.936$ if you're able to stay, please do.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859026891

 $00{:}56{:}55.936 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}58.510$ Thank you to everyone who tuned in on Zoom.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859026891

 $00:56:58.510 \longrightarrow 00:57:00.748$ Everyone here, please know that you

NOTE Confidence: 0.859026891

 $00{:}57{:}00.748 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>\:} 00{:}57{:}03.253$ are such an integral part to all

NOTE Confidence: 0.859026891

 $00{:}57{:}03.253 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}05.444$ of our missions here at the center,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859026891

 $00:57:05.450 \longrightarrow 00:57:07.532$ and we're so grateful to have

NOTE Confidence: 0.859026891

 $00{:}57{:}07.532 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}08.796$ such a wonderful community.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859026891

 $00:57:08.800 \longrightarrow 00:57:10.400$ And thank you for showing

NOTE Confidence: 0.859026891

 $00:57:10.400 \longrightarrow 00:57:12.000$ up and enjoy your break.