Anger and Division in American Politics: How concerned should we be about the health of our democracy?

As I write this, we are in the middle of an exceptionally nasty presidential campaign. We are told that former Secretary of State and First Lady of the United States, Hillary Clinton, is “a bigot” and “world class liar” who “should be locked up,” according to Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump. Yet Trump is supported by a “basket full of deplorables” and running a campaign around “prejudice, paranoia, and taking hate mainstream.” Senator Ted Cruz (R-TX) thinks Trump is a “sniveling coward” and an “amoral, sociopathic narcissist.” But it turns out “Lying Ted” can’t be trusted either; he is nothing more than a “big cheater,” “a liar,” and, “let’s face it, a real basket case,” according to Trump.

No wonder a recent CNN headline called this “The worst election, ever.” The Washington Post opined that the “campaign is on track to be the crudest, most vulgar and most thoroughly disgusting in our nation’s history...a new low in political discourse.”

Even before the 2016 campaign was in full swing, a poll found that 95 percent of Americans believed incivility in politics is an important problem. Three-quarters (74 percent) think civility has dramatically declined in recent years, and 70 percent believe the state of civil discourse is now at a “crisis level” threatening American democracy. I wish to use my director’s note in the newsletter to talk a little about the incivility we are seeing in our politics today and try to put it into a broader historical context.
Sam Reed Distinguished Professor of Civic Education and Public Civility

We are pleased to announce that the first Sam Reed Distinguished Professorship in Civic Education and Public Civility was awarded to WSU Professor Carolyn Long.

Carolyn was joined by three of Washington’s Secretaries of State recently at a ceremony in the office of current Secretary of State Kim Wyman to award the professorship.

Pictured here left to right are Foley Institute Director Cornell Clayton, Kim Wyman, former WSU President Sam Smith, Carolyn Long, former Secretary of State Sam Reed, and former Secretary of State Ralph Munro.

Reed, a WSU alumnus, served 12 years as Secretary of State, using his tenure to encourage younger generations to engage in politics and public service. In honor of his commitment, WSU created the Sam Reed Distinguished Professorship to support research and teaching efforts that advance civic education, moderation, civility, and bipartisanship in politics.

Long is a political science professor at WSU’s Vancouver campus and has an extensive history of research within the field of civics. Long will receive $12,000 in funding to continue her work in civility and says she intends to use this professorship to expand her work on the Initiative for Public Deliberation.

Alaska Politics

Congratulations to Senior Foley Fellow Clive S. Thomas, whose edited volume on the politics of Alaska was published in September 2016 by the University of Alaska Press.

Drawing on a range of authors, including many past and present Alaska politicians, lobbyists, and journalists, the book focuses on the human side of politics, including political beliefs and political power, as well as government organizations and operations.

Thomas taught political science at the University of Alaska in Juneau for thirty years, and has been a Senior Foley Fellow since 2011.
Thanks to the generous support of donors each year, the Foley Institute is able to offer scholarships to our interns, including the Lance LeLoup Congressional Scholarship for internships in the U.S. Congress. Please contact us or visit us online at foley.wsu.edu if you would like to know more or are interested in contributing to our scholarship funds.

The Foley Institute is responsible for running political science and public policy internships at Washington State University.

This past year Sophia Steele (pictured left with Congresswoman Cathy McMorris Rodgers) interned with the House Republican Conference, as well as in the Congresswoman’s office in Washington, D.C. Her duties included working in communications, dealing with constituent concerns, giving tours of the capitol, attending briefings, and generally assisting both offices.

Slightly further away, Daniel Purkeypyle served as a research assistant at the University of Bath in the United Kingdom. He is pictured at right presenting a paper at the 2016 meeting of the International Political Science Association in Poznan, Poland.

We are pleased to regularly send WSU students to Olympia to take part in an exciting internship opportunity. The Legislative Internship Program at the Washington State Legislature has long been recognized as one of the leading such programs in the country, offering around 75 paid internships during the legislative session.

This past year, a total of nine WSU students participated in the Washington State Legislative Program: Holly Cocci, Kathran Dean, Laura Guido, Kathryn Kincaid, Jesse Martarano, Olivia Parish, Sarai Salgado-Miranda, Jillian Scott, and Reed Simode. Also based in Olympia, Emily Strode, director of legislative affairs for the Associated Students of Washington State University, helped lobby the legislature with representatives from other public four-year universities in Washington.
At the Foley Institute, our senior interns in 2015–16 were Rebekah (Bekah) Young and Jacob (Jake) Montaño, who were joined by Kevin Schilling and Shantara Pintak, all pictured right.

Bekah graduated with a major in political science and minors in economics and sociology. Her plans are to pursue a career in law, and she will be attending the University of California, Hastings law school in the fall.

Jake double majored in political science and criminal justice with minors in sociology and Spanish. He plans to attend law school after spending a year traveling the world.

Shantara is a junior majoring in comparative religious studies with a minor in political science, and Kevin is a senior majoring in history with a concentration in political science. Both plan to continue at the institute next year.

Also in Pullman, Molly Gingerich interned as a research assistant to WSU faculty member Ashly Townsen, Ruphina Abdugaparova and James Allsup worked on the Students for Rand Paul campaign, and Paige Campbell interned for the ASWSU Lobby Team.

Help an Undergraduate Scholar

Help the Foley Institute provide scholarships to support undergraduate internships.

Yes, I would like to support Foley public presentations, events, and student internships in public service:

Name(s): ____________________________________________________________

Address: _____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

City, State, Zip: _______________________________________________________________________________________________________

Email: _________________________________________________________________ Phone: _________________________________________________________

Enclosed is my tax-deductible gift of:                                      Method of payment:

❖ $25   ❖ $50   ❖ $100   ❖ Other                                  ❖ Check payable to Washington State University Foundation

❖ Visa   ❖ Mastercard   ❖ AMEX

Credit Card #: ____________________________ Exp. Date: __________

Signature: __________________________________________________________________________________________________

Thank you!
Graduate Fellowships

The institute awarded five graduate fellowships during the 2015–16 academic year.

These fellowships are available thanks to the generosity of Scott and Betty Lukins, Alice O. Rice, and the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway Foundation.

Kakali Chakrabarti, communication and media studies, is researching arsenic contamination of groundwater in the Bengal Basin, which is a serious environmental risk. She is using her fellowship funds for fieldwork in the Bengal Basin/lower Ganges Basin (West Bengal India) to conduct interviews in village communities and focus group discussions. Ultimately, the research seeks to develop a working model for a community-based, culture-centered participatory public education campaign for environmental risk perception, mitigation, and adaptation.

Brenden Higashi, a Ph.D. candidate in political science, is using his Foley Fellowship to conduct fieldwork and data collection for his dissertation, which focuses on the connection between judges’ social backgrounds, especially their class backgrounds, and how judges conceive of their professional role in the legal system. Brenden’s goal is to use his dissertation as an opportunity to expand knowledge on the role social and class backgrounds play in an important institution of American government.

Armando Medinaceli, a Ph.D. student in cultural anthropology, is using his fellowship to complete the first phase of his research into traditional hunting techniques and the effects of national and international regulations on cultural practices. He will be visiting a Q’eqchi’ village in the tropics of Guatemala, where he will gather information regarding the traditional and historical ways of hunting and fishing for subsistence living, and the social and environmental changes in the region.

Samuel Rhodes is a third year Ph.D. student in the School of Politics, Philosophy, and Public Affairs. His research centers on political communication and behavior relating to voting and elections. He is interested in televised political advertising, as well as campaign activity on websites and social media. He is currently engaged in a project on the geo-targeting of campaign email in the 2016 presidential election, the results of which will be presented at the annual conference of the American Political Science Association.

Hans Schmidt is a Ph.D. student in political science, whose research interests focus on the ways in which states cooperate to achieve particular goals. These goals range from improved security to the removal of restrictive trade barriers. His research involves an examination of the factors that perpetuate the disparities in international tax regimes and looks at possible areas of improvement in policy. The Foley Fellowship will enable him to use archival materials from the United Nations relating to negotiations on tax treaty frameworks. Hans received approval to visit the UN library in Manhattan, and the relevant committee also agreed to grant him special access to documents that would normally be restricted for the next 20 years.
Foley Graduate Fellows | Where are they now?

The Foley Institute recently caught up with Cam Caldwell, who was a Foley Graduate Fellow in 2000–2001.

Since graduating from WSU in 2004, with a Ph.D. in business administration, Cam has enjoyed academic positions all over the country, while also publishing over 70 academic papers. Cam’s work has focused on business ethics and ethical leadership. He says that the challenges he has personally seen and encountered have encouraged him to work towards making the world a better place for others. Cam is especially proud of the fact that he has coauthored many of his papers with students. The Foley Fellowship, Cam says, is part of what made it all possible.

“I’ve been having so much fun! I began my doctoral program at Washington State University when I was 52,” he says. “I started one day with funding, only to be told the following day that the funding was no longer there. Being awarded the fellowship made it possible to survive. It really was a lifesaver!”

Cam currently resides in Alexandria, Louisiana, and is guest editing a special edition of the International Journal of Public Leadership, focused on “Ethical Leadership in Troubled Times.”

“I’ve been having so much fun! Being awarded the fellowship made it possible to survive. It really was a lifesaver!”

—Cam Caldwell
The Foley Institute welcomed director of the National Institute of Justice, Nancy Rodriguez, on March 28. Dr. Rodriguez is a WSU alumna, and received her Ph.D. from Washington State University in political science in 1998.

In addition to serving as director of the NIJ, a position to which she was appointed by President Obama in 2014, Rodriguez is on the faculty of Arizona State University’s School of Criminology and Criminal Justice. Presenting for the Distinguished Lecture Series, Dr. Rodriguez spoke about utilizing scientific research in criminal justice reforms.

Speaking to a large audience in the CUB Auditorium, Dr. Rodriguez drew upon her own academic work on how to implement change in the world of criminal justice. Focusing on the issue of sexual assault on college campuses, the director discussed many issues around the subject. “Science is helping us find more effective ways to help victims,” Rodriguez remarked. Noting that there is a need to revolutionize the speed and efficacy of testing rape kits, she said a new NIJ program, the Not Alone campaign, combines the resources of government agencies with research being conducted by the Institute on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault at the University of Texas at Austin, which has produced a science-based, victim-centered blueprint for law enforcement to respond to sexual assault cases.

Dr. Rodriguez also stressed the importance of building a better relationship between police and the community, especially when training law enforcement officers for sensitivity with victims. The recent climate of racial injustice has incited distrust in law enforcement, Rodriguez noted, so there is a need to ensure that research addresses this problem. Efforts to reform the relationship between police and minority communities would only succeed with data to help us understand the perceived distrust.

Despite current limitations, Rodriguez suggested that such efforts to collect data are the stepping stones for reform. “The main mission of NIJ,” she said, “is to develop partnerships and invest in research across disciplines that can strengthen science and advance justice.”
American Politics

Fighting for Equality Then and Now with James Meredith

Activist James Meredith, a civil rights icon and the first African-American student to integrate the University of Mississippi in 1962, came to speak at Washington State University on October 19. Meredith discussed his 220 mile march from Memphis to Jackson in 1966 protesting voting rights for African-Americans. In a packed CUB Auditorium, Meredith recounted that when he was passing through Hernando, Mississippi, people lined the streets to support his march. When Meredith left the city limits, he was shot by a white man waiting to assassinate him. Several members of the march, including Martin Luther King Jr., remained with Meredith before rejoining the march.

Since those events of the 1960s, Meredith has focused his efforts and action on advancing equality for the African-American community and to eliminate injustices.

Visit from Congresswoman Cathy McMorris Rodgers

The highest ranking Republican woman in the House of Representatives, Representative Cathy McMorris Rodgers, returned to visit Washington State University for a town hall forum at the Foley Institute on May 3.

The congresswoman said that despite roadblocks to policy cooperation, she remains “inspired by those who have ideas and turn them into reality.” Asked about Congress’ low approval rating, the representative explained a bipartisan project she is working on with Seth Moulton (D-MA) called the Congress of Tomorrow. The goal, she said, is to update the “autopilot function of government” that has resulted in programs automatically being reauthorized without review of their efficacy or funding.

Representative McMorris Rodgers also addressed citizen concerns regarding climate change, the Affordable Care Act, campaign finance, gun rights, congressional term limits, and the debate about civil rights versus religious liberty.

Courtesy of the Daily Evergreen/Andrew Lang
Governing Washington in Polarized Times

The Foley Institute continued its collaboration with the Washington Secretary of State’s office to host the sixth annual public policy symposium in the state capitol on February 19. Moderated by NPR’s Austin Jenkins, the symposium addressed polarization in state government. Boris Shor of Georgetown University said his nationwide research shows that polarization is most marked in western states, and Washington is the fifth most polarized state legislature in the nation. Fellow panelist Lilliana Mason of the University of Maryland, saw the political atmosphere distorting priorities, noting that a hyper-partisan atmosphere leads to affective polarization even when the policymakers do not disagree about the substance of policy. Winning, she said, becomes more important than getting things done.

In addition to the comments of Mason and Shor, a view from inside the political process was provided by Washington Senator Ann Rivers (R-La Center) and Washington State Representative Eric Pettigrew (D-Seattle). Although many of the legislative stories that are publicized by the media showcase the conflict between the two parties, they emphasized that there is actually widespread collaboration and bipartisan agreement, noting that most legislation passes with over 90 percent support.

That said, Jenkins suggested that both chambers of the legislature were very narrowly divided, meaning that some high-visibility issues such as carbon emissions and minimum wage proposals made no progress at all.

Offshoring Profits to Avoid Corporate Taxes

On March 31, the institute partnered with the WSU Hoops Institute of Taxation Research & Policy and the WSU Carson College of Business to host the annual Business Policy Symposium, which looked at the offshoring of corporate profits.

Live at WSU Pullman were Chris Faiferlick of Ernst & Young LLP, and Leslie Robinson of Dartmouth’s Tuck School of Business. Joining the discussion remotely were Reuven Avi-Yonah of the University of Michigan, and Kimberly Clausing (pictured on the big screen) of Reed College. The panel discussed transfer pricing and multinational profit shifting, which is a process by which companies with overseas branches can potentially avoid paying taxes in countries with higher taxation levels.

Climate Change Symposium

The institute cosponsored the 2016 Inland Northwest Philosophy Conference in April. Keynote speakers were Stephen Gardiner (University of Washington), Steve Katz (WSU School of the Environment), and Andrew Light (George Mason University and the U.S. Department of State).

The focus of the conference was on “Reasoning Well in the Anthropocene” and examined issues of human influence on the Earth’s ecological and climatic systems, and the moral, political, and scientific questions involved.
Using Fetal Tissue: The ethics of scientific research

The fifth annual Science, Ethics, and Public Policy Symposium, focusing on the use of fetal tissue in scientific research, was held on February 11.

This year’s forum was moderated by Bill Kabasenche, from the WSU School for Politics, Philosophy, and Public Affairs.

Providing a biological research perspective was Terry Hassold, professor in the WSU School of Molecular Biosciences. He explained that spontaneous abortions, or miscarriages, are an “extraordinarily common complication of human pregnancies.” Conducting research on the tissue from these miscarriages is essential for scientific research into assisted reproduction, Dr. Hassold suggested. “Simple genetic testing can provide the reason for the tragic loss of a pregnancy,” he said. “The importance of studying ourselves can’t be overstated.”

Philosophy professors Christopher Tollefsen of the University of Southern California and Leslie Francis of the University of Utah offered alternative ethical perspectives on the topic. Tollefsen focused on the morality of abortion and suggest ethics require society to ask three main questions: What is the moral issue at stake in fetal tissue research? What issues of complicity arise for researchers and eventual beneficiaries? What steps can be taken to eliminate or limit these issues?

“Fetal tissue research as a part of contemporary science is anything but private,” he said. “Public science is, in great measure, publicly funded. I think that all citizens, including those morally opposed to abortion have a real stake in ensuring that public science benefits the general public and does so in accordance with norms that can be accepted by as many citizens as possible.”

Dr. Francis, on the other hand, suggested that it should be possible to limit research to those cases where the decisions of having an abortion, and the donation of aborted fetal tissue, were separated to ensure that such donations are made with informed consent. Importantly, she underscored the necessity of treating the remains of all human life with respect and in accordance with the law.
9th District Legislative Visit

On December 9, the delegation from Washington’s ninth legislative district, which includes WSU, visited the Foley Institute for their annual legislative preview. Senate Majority Leader Mark Schoesler and Representatives Mary Dye and Joe Schmick updated the audience about the upcoming legislative session in Olympia.

Senator Schoesler discussed the possible outcomes of the 2016 budget process and school funding debate. Representative Schmick also discussed revenue increases in the state and the necessary expenditures for forest fire control and the Western State Hospital. Representative Dye explained her work surrounding forest development and fire prevention.

The institute also hosted Dye and her challenger in the primary, Richard Lathim, for a candidate forum earlier in the year.

Marijuana Legalization: Implementing Initiative 502 in Washington

Rick Garza, Director of the Washington State Liquor Control Board, visited the WSU campus on October 22 to discuss the implementation of I-502 in Washington. Since I-502 passed, the amount of medical dispensaries has tripled, and 210 retail stores have been opened with 750 different producers in the state.

Director Garza spoke of the problems in implementing I-502 in Washington because the state was starting from scratch, leading to uncertainty about how the whole process would unfold.

A Carbon Reduction Initiative for Washington?

On September 14, WSU alumnus Sameer Ranade, a researcher for the Washington Environmental Council, came to campus to have a conversation about global warming and policies surrounding carbon emissions.

Ranade discussed the negative effects of the increase in greenhouse gases over the last century. He and his associates in the Washington Environmental Council have employed the use of climate listening sessions where they discuss climate issues with local communities and gain their perspective in order to craft new policies to combat climate change.
Marijuana and Public Health

Dr. John Wiesman, Washington state’s Secretary of Health, visited the Foley Institute on November 12 to speak about public health issues related to the legalization of marijuana in Washington.

Wiesman discussed the collaboration taking place between Colorado and Washington state governments in sharing information and research on the public health effects of marijuana. He also spoke about the difficulty in obtaining adequate funding to study marijuana and its impact on public health.

The De-Americanization of Latino Youth

On October 27, WSU alumna Maria Chavez visited the institute to discuss her work with Latina youth. Chavez has written several books on the topic, including Living the Dream: New Immigration Policies and the Lives of Undocumented Latino Youth.

Chavez, who recently gave a TED Talk, pointed out that children of undocumented immigrants face huge challenges, including the constant fear of deportation and an inability to obtain the identification necessary for many daily functions in American society. Immigration, especially when it is outside the law, can have detrimental effects on family development and child welfare, she said.

Advocating for Justice

Sister Simone Campbell is the executive director of NETWORK, an organization lobbying for social justice, as well as the primary organizer of the Nuns on a Bus tour, lobbying for social justice around the nation.

On October 5 she visited the Foley Institute to discuss social justice. The media today is pervasively negative and focuses on political conflict. Simone believes that “mercy needs to break open the heart of politics” if we are to avoid further polarization. She suggested that caring and love for all need to be founding principles of our society if we wish to reach agreement in politics.
Climate Change: A report from the front lines with Bill McKibben

On April 14, Bill McKibben, whom the Boston Globe calls “America’s most important environmentalist,” spoke at the institute. McKibben has helped organize more than 20,000 demonstrations around the world, with his latest campaign, the successful effort to stop the Keystone Pipeline.

McKibben argued that the success of a cause must pair justice with the knowledge of the political game. The important fights unfortunately “don’t hinge on reason but power,” he said, and that people must “build a series of movements, coalitions, and pressures” in order to make change happen. Although money and corporate lobbyists can be daunting to stand up to, he suggested, fights will only succeed if activists push against “the forces of the status quo [that] are applying enormous pressure” on a daily basis. The importance of citizen activism provides the “serious pushback” that demands change, without which “environmentalists would lose every single time.”

Attacking Judges: The politics of judicial campaigns

Melinda Gann Hall is a professor from Michigan State University who is nationally recognized for her work on state judicial politics and judicial selection.

On September 18 she spoke on the politics of judicial campaigns and elections. She discussed how negative campaigning can affect voter’s decisions. The fear is that spending large sums in negative campaigns will sway voters for or against a particular candidate, but Dr. Hall pointed out that this has not been the case. Some of the other negative results of judicial elections are declines in voter turnout and a delegitimizing of the judiciary, which she noted also do not seem to follow from judicial elections.

Law and Morality: The regulation of private behavior

Professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California, Christopher Tollefsen joined the Foley Institute on February 11 for a talk on Law and Morality: The Regulation of Private Behavior. Tollefsen centered his discussion around the question of whether the state can take an interest in private activities simply for the interest in the morality of its citizens.

The discussion led to definitions of the state as an instrument, the sovereignty of citizens, and even the lack of self-sufficiency of individuals—in other words, the reliance of people on their communities. Tollefsen explained this dependency as necessary for the advancement of society. “The classical understanding [of the state] believed that part of its purpose was to lead citizens to flourish,” and so the political state takes a direct interest in the moral quality of its citizens. The limitations on the state, however, would be that it lacks domain over the autonomy of a person’s choices (so long as the effects of personal choice must only affect that individual). According to Tollefsen, the state can only interfere with an individual’s actions in order to protect another citizen.
The Undeserving Rich

On August 31 Leslie McCall discussed U.S. attitudes towards inequality. She described three main perspectives about inequality: tolerance, ignorance, and ambivalence. Her research found that Americans agree across partisan lines that the income gap in the United States should be reduced.

McCall looked at how political parties differ in their approach to try to address economic inequality. The downside to equalizing opportunities is it cannot get at the root of the problem of inequality, McCall said. Instead, we should seek to equalize opportunities through affirmative action programs and civil rights agendas.

Can You Make a Difference? Political Engagement in Challenging Times

Citizen advocate and author Paul Loeb spoke at the Foley Institute on March 1. Acknowledging the many reasons that influence people to become involved in politics, Loeb attacked the idea of the “perfect standard.”

The perfect standard is what citizens use when they decide to not get involved in the democratic process because they claim a lack of information on the process or the candidates, the flaws of individual candidates, and even claims of it “not being the right time” in a person’s life. Loeb recognizes the assertions of the perfect standard but argues that small action can lead to big change.

Reconciling Barack Obama’s Legacy & the Rise of Donald Trump

On April 25, Justin Vaughn of Boise State University examined the legacy of President Barack Obama, the rise of Donald Trump, and if the phenomena are interrelated.

Vaughn argues that the national context of the Obama years has been surrounded by inequality, directionless foreign policy, unending war on terror, tea party cannibalism, and historic lows in trust of government. All of these sow the seeds of Trump’s candidacy. Vaughn ended with a call to action for people to strive to see the whole picture of the current political climate and to let go of assumptions.
Coffee & Politics

Politics in the United States

Drug Wars and Warriors

On February 3 the Foley Institute welcomed Suzanna Reiss, an associate professor at the University of Hawaii at Manoa. Reiss has written several books relating to drug trade and immigration, her most recent being We Sell Drugs: The Alchemy of US Empire.

During her talk, Reiss discussed the history of drug violence and its roots in drug manufacturing in the United States, suggesting that in the United States, drug policies have been manipulated by drug companies. The heroin epidemic in the United States, she said, is a direct result of prescription pharmaceutical drugs. Their role, however, has been hidden by shifting the blame away from the drug companies by means of propaganda, the media, and laws.

Reiss also suggested that the mistaken belief that all drugs enter the United States from Mexico, which has heightened controversy around immigration, has shaped drug policy and the narrative surrounding legal and illegal drug markets. She noted that while the illegal drug market is exploited in politics, the legal market of pharmaceutical drugs remains one of the most profitable industries in the United States, with an environment created by the pharmaceutical industry wherein drugs have become the answer to the most common ailments, thus leading to dependency, resistance, and normalcy surrounding the use of dangerous medications.

Wildfires

The Foley Institute welcomed Matt Carroll on September 9 to discuss the wildfires ravaging western states. Carroll is a professor in the WSU School of the Environment who teaches courses in natural resources, and is an expert on forest management and fire prevention.

Fighting wildfires takes huge expenditures and eats up over half of the U.S. Forest Service’s budget. He described four community archetypes with respect to the vulnerability and capacity to fight wildfires: formalized suburban communities, working landscape communities, rural lifestyle communities, and high amenity communities.

Carroll discussed how these four archetypes are general ways of categorizing communities and could be used to think about how to make communities less vulnerable to fires, and more resilient after.

Did Darwin write the Origin backwards?

On August 10 Elliot Sober spoke about Charles Darwin and The Origin of the Species. Sober is the Hans Reichenbach Professor and the William F. Vilas Research Professor at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

He explained that Darwin’s theory centered on natural selection and common ancestry. Natural selection is an important force that contributes to evolution, while common ancestry is the idea that all species alive today come from one to a few original progenitors.

Sober questioned why, in The Origin of the Species, did Darwin organize his book by beginning with natural selection and its importance, but then later in the book defend the theory of common ancestry. Sober’s main interest was how these two parts of the theory of evolution fit together, the relation between them, and the evidence that supports each.
Global politics

Jihad in Mali: The holy war of Amadou Koufa

On January 20 the institute welcomed Peter Chilson to talk about the humanitarian crisis and tribal warfare in Mali. Chilson teaches writing and literature at WSU, and served in the Peace Corps in West Africa and frequently visits the region. Chilson’s most recent book We Never Knew Exactly Where: Dispatches from the Lost Country of Mali focuses on his experiences during his recent trip to Mali where he observed civil war and the new jihadist state that is emerging.

The Role of Public Opinion in European integration

On August 26 Christopher Williams, a researcher at the University of Mannheim, came to WSU to discuss EU integration. Williams has been collecting data to determine the role public opinion has on EU integration policy. The Lisbon Treaty was discussed and how it has changed public opinions about integration, especially in relation to the new early warning system. Williams further examined the opinion of current member states toward potential expansion of the EU. Many Eastern European countries are seeking entrance to the EU, including Turkey, but this has been a controversial issue due to their conflicting social, cultural, and political views.

Destroying Cultural Heritage: The failure to protect artifacts from extremist groups

On February 3 the Foley Institute welcomed Dr. Joris Kila, renowned researcher of cultural artifacts. Kila’s presentation focused on the rising threat against cultural heritage as a result of war. Kila asserted that the only way to protect the cultural heritage of areas suffering from war is through international cooperation and protection forces.

War Crimes: When great powers invade small countries

In collaboration with the School of Politics, Philosophy, and Public Affairs, the Foley Institute welcomed Professor Emeritus of International Relations at Duke University Ole Holsti on April 13. Focusing on the invasion of Iraq by the United States, Holsti asked whether or not such an event would be considered a war crime in the same way the Nazi invasion of Poland was deemed as such. He also discussed in detail the historical relationship between the U.S. and the Iraqi government.
A History of Incivility

It may be little comfort to know that as bad as the level of civil discourse is today, it has been worse, much worse, in the past. Even a brief history of American partisan politics illustrates how it has often ignored what Lincoln once called “the better angels of our nature.”

Take the election of 1800, which was probably the nastiest in history. Partisan newspapers during the campaign called John Adams “a hideous hermaphroditical character, with neither the force and firmness of a man, nor the gentleness and sensibility of a woman.” Thomas Jefferson, they opined, was “a mean-spirited, low-lived fellow, the son of a half-breed Indian squaw,” and if elected “murder, robbery, rape, adultery and incest will be openly taught and practiced.” The campaign was so ugly that Adams and Jefferson, close friends during the Revolutionary War, refused to speak to each other for more than 20 years after the election. Two other political rivals of that time, Alexander Hamilton and Aaron Burr, became so enraged at each other that they engaged in a duel, and Hamilton was shot dead.

During the presidential election in 1828, Andrew Jackson was accused by opponents of murder and adultery. He was called “Andrew Jackass” so frequently he adopted the moniker himself, which is why the Democratic Party is symbolized by a donkey to this day. In response, Jackson’s supporters called John Quincy Adams a tyrant and a “pimp.”

Of course, the Civil War was the most uncivil and violent period in American history. Even before the war politics was unruly. The “Know Nothing” Party in the 1850s was openly racist and bigoted, advocating violence against Catholics, Irish and Italian immigrants, and others. In 1856, Congressman Preston Brooks of South Carolina was so angered by an antislavery speech given by Senator Charles Sumner of Massachusetts that he took to the Senate floor and beat Sumner unconscious with his cane. President Lincoln was attacked in the most venomous ways, not just in the South but also by Copperhead press in the North. One Wisconsin newspaper editorialized that “The man who votes for Lincoln now is a traitor and murderer...if he is elected to misgovern for another four years, we trust some bold hand will Pierce his heart with dagger point for the public good.”

(Continued from page 2)
And Lincoln was assassinated. The Civil War produced 625,000 casualties, 2 percent of the entire U.S. population.

During the 1890s, American politics again took a turn for the worse. Democratic presidential candidate William Jennings Bryan was portrayed by his adversaries as an unhinged religious fanatic and a self-righteous zealot. His opponent, William McKinley, was derided as a stooge of corporate power, and in 1900 he was assassinated by an unemployed steel worker who blamed McKinley for the loss of his job.

Franklin Roosevelt’s political opponents called him a “communist,” a “fascist,” a “dictator,” and worse. Father Charles Coughlin, the forerunner of today’s bombastic radio talk show hosts, used his national radio program during the 1930s to inveigh against Roosevelt, whom he called a “liar” and “traitor to the country,” and used anti-Semitic slurs to attack the president.

Many of us alive today remember the 1960s. That decade began with violence directed toward civil rights protesters in the South and ended with violent antiwar protests at college campuses like Kent State where students were shot by members of the National Guard. The 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago devolved into violent riots, and three towering political figures of the twentieth century—John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King Jr., and Robert Kennedy—all were assassinated.

Political Division and the Causes of Incivility

Are we less civil today than these previous periods? Certainly not. But those were not normal periods in political history either. Each represented a critical juncture in the development of American democracy, marked by transformations in our political parties, massive social movement and conflicts over the enfranchisement of new Americans, and deep divisions over economic and social issues.

When understood in historical context it becomes clear that incivility in political discourse is a symptom, rather than a cause, of deep divisions in society. We are uncivil because we are deeply divided, not the other way around. In her book, _Rude Democracy_, Susan Herbst reminds us that the natural byproduct of conflict resolution in democratic societies is criticism, negativity, and even rudeness. The deeper the divisions, the more intense and passionate the debate.

So how divided are we today? Political scientists have analyzed roll call votes taken in Congress going back to the beginning of our nation and found that elected elites are more polarized today than at any point since the 1870s. Specifically, they found that since the 1980s, both Republican and Democratic members of Congress have moved away from the center and toward the ideological extremes when voting on legislation. This ideological polarization brought a halt to bipartisan lawmaking. Indeed, members of Congress today are less likely to vote across partisan lines, Democrats with Republicans and vice-versa, than at any point since two political parties have been in existence.

In addition, elected elites and the mass public have both sorted themselves into ideologically homogenous, tribe-like parties. This seems normal to us today, but it was not always the case. Even in the recent past, both parties were ideologically heterogeneous; the Democratic Party included a large number of southern conservative “Dixiecrats” who were more conservative than most Republicans, while the Republican Party included a large number of liberal northeastern “Rockefeller Republicans” who were more liberal than many Democrats.

The ideological heterogeneity of the parties made it easier for voters to split their tickets and for members of Congress to work across party lines to pass major legislation. Beginning in the late-1960s, however, voters began sorting themselves. Conservatives migrated into the Republican Party and liberals into the Democratic Party. Today the parties are fully sorted and ideologically homogenous.

The ideological sorting of the parties not only makes bipartisan lawmaking more difficult, it also leads to affective polarization among the public. Studies have shown that as voters sort themselves into ideologically like-minded parties the effect of group psychology takes over and the levels of trust and affect that partisans feel towards each other declines. A recent PEW study, for instance, found that fully 66 percent of conservative Republicans and 50 percent of liberal Democrats now see the other party as not just wrong in their policy views, but as posing “a threat to the nation’s well-being.”
Finally, not only is the country polarized and sorted into tribal like parties, but we are also closely divided, indeed more evenly divided for a longer period of time than ever in American history. Since the 1980s American elections have been extremely close. Indeed, according to one analysis, the difference in the total number of votes cast for all Democratic candidates versus all Republicans for all federal offices—presidency, House and Senate seats—since the 1980s is less than 2 percent. This includes presidential contests which in historic terms have been exceedingly close, and in 2000, for the first time in more than a century, resulted in the candidate who won in the Electoral College actually losing the popular vote.

The close margins in elections has produced chronic divided government. In 28 of the last 36 years since 1980, one party has controlled the presidency and the other has controlled one or both houses of Congress. The effect of divided partisan control of government, when combined with polarizion of the parties, is policy gridlock. Neither party can implement its policy agenda because the other party can utilize the checks and balances of our constitutional system to prevent it.

What does it mean?

When the electorate is deeply divided, sorted into tribe-like partisan teams, and also closely divided, the stakes grow. If a thousand votes go the other way in Florida during the 2000 presidential election, George W. Bush does not become president and there probably would be no war in Iraq. Similarly, if a few thousand votes went the other way in any of several close Senate races in 2008, Democrats would not have held the 60-seat Senate majority necessary to pass the Affordable Care Act (Obamacare). The point is not about the wisdom of either policy, but rather to suggest that they are momentous policy decisions that will shape American society for a generation or more, and they were decided by relatively few votes.

Given the nature of our divisions, it is hardly irrational for Americans today to feel passionate and vehement about politics. Americans accurately perceive there is a lot at stake in elections, and it is not surprising that they become fearful or angry when these do not turn out the way they hoped.

From there it is a short step to demonizing the other side and resorting to the apocalyptic arguments that have come to mark so much of our political debates.

Partisan divisions, however, do not come out of nowhere. They ultimately reflect substantive cleavages over which the public is divided. Today’s divisions reflect a number of major policy challenges over which Americans are divided. Globalization of markets and trade, for example, has fundamentally transformed the economy, changing the way we work, earn livelihoods, and provide for our families. Many Americans have prospered in the new economy, but others have been left behind in an economy that no longer rewards low-skilled jobs. How we think about that problem matters a great deal. Most recognize that globalization has had both positive and negative consequences, but how to respond to them remains deeply divisive.

So too does it matter how we think about the related problems of growing inequality in income and wealth in America. More than a decade ago the American Political Science Association issued a report that found we are in the midst of a new Gilded Age, with income and wealth more unevenly distributed than any time in more than a century. This level of inequality over time will have dire consequences for American democracy. Again, while most Americans recognize there is a problem, they disagree over what to do about it.
The United States is also undergoing rapid demographic change as a result of immigration. There is now a larger percentage of foreign-born Americans than at any time in more than a century. Immigrants bring dynamism to the economy and culture but also transform the complexion of America, raising deep questions about cultural identity, assimilation, and citizenship. Again, Americans disagree about how to respond to these issues.

There are other substantive policy disputes dividing the nation too, but while a more respectful tone might make us less cynical about today’s politicians, it will not itself reduce partisan polarization or resolve these deeper conflicts. For this we must focus less on who wins and loses in our elections and focus more on what we argue about, the substance of our disagreements.

If we place today’s raucous political behavior into historical context, we will see that it is less the result of a general decline in civility and manners than it is part of the cyclical process of democratic self-governance. Democracy is about conflict resolution: the deeper the divisions, the more unruly the debate. If passions spill over into violence, threats, or other efforts to exclude voices from our democratic process, then we have cause to worry.

But passionate, rude, even angry argument, while usually ineffective as a tactic for persuading fellow citizens, is usually less a threat to democracy than a byproduct of democratic conflict resolution. It is an indication that the country is divided over important challenges. So we would do well to focus more of our attention on these and a little less on the style of our political discourse.

—Cornell W. Clayton
thank you to

our supporters

$250,000–$999,999
The Boeing Company

$50,000–$249,999
Tom and Heather Foley
Henry M. Jackson Foundation
Martha Mullen

$25,000–$49,999
Harriet Beckett
BNSF Foundation
Mary W. Johnson
Scott and Betty Lukins
Alice O. Rice
Wasserman Foundation

$5,000–$24,999
Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer, & Feld, LLP
Archer Daniels Midland Foundation
Aven Foundation
Bill and Paula Clapp
Community Foundation for Southwest Washington
General Motors Corporation
Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees International Union
Charles A. Kimbrough
Frank and Diana Kirkbride
Charles and Lynn Pennington
United States-Japan Foundation
Orin C. Smith
Hayden Stephen
Mikal J. and Lynn C. Thomsen
American Council of Life Insurance
AAFL-CIO
Washington Mutual Foundation

$1,000–$4,999
AAFL-CIO
Kenneth and Marleen Alhadeff
American Council of Life Insurance
Ned and Jean Bandler
Nancy R. Bayley
Jeff Bell
Michael Berman
William and Suzanne Cannon
Chicago Board of Trade
Ronald S. Chow
Cornell Clayton and Susan Servick
Margaret Jean Crane
Mac and June Crow
Crow Farms, Inc
Nancy Talbot Doty
Ken and Debra Jo Dzuck
Steven Elk
Daniel J. Evans
Barbara Feasey
Federal Express
Marilyn V. Gearhart
Neal P. Gillen
Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corporation

David and Karen Bell King
Gus and Connie Kravas
Jean LeLoup
Lance LeLoup
Pamela LeLoup
Carolyn Long
Christopher and Susan Marker
Morgan Stanley & Company, Inc
William and Madeline Morrow
National Association of Broadcasters
Gary Cameron Neill
Mary McColl Neilson
Krist Anthony and Darbury Novoselic
Patrick Dunn & Associates Ltd.
Irving Paul and Beverly Lingle
John and Arthid Pierce
Project Vote Smart
Paul Agostino Razore
Ron and Debbie Reed/PacifiCAD
Joel B. Resnick
Kirk W. Robbins
Schorno Agri-Business
Lawrence and Gail Schorno
Seattle Foundation
D. Rennee Sinclair
Sterling Bank
Edwin B. Sterner
Clive Thomas
Martin and Judy Verbrugge
Jim Waldo
Edward and Andrea Weber

$500–$999
American International Group, Inc
David Ammons
Anonymous
Robert and Wendy Bates
Battelle Memorial Institute
Bell Atlantic
Robert and Judith Bor
Robert J. Burnett
Jerry and Angelina Burttenshaw
Julia Cannon
Hans and Mary Carstensen
Casey Communications
Steven Champlin
Paul and Barbara Couture
CSX Corporation
Don and Joyce Dillman
Stephen Dynon
Eastern Washington University Foundation
James Estep
Leander and Mary Foley
Paula Freer
Joel Glassman and Katherine Cochrane
Robert and Marilyn Greenway
Eric Grulke
Anthony R. Hemstad
Brady Horenstein
Glen Hudson
Patrick and Marti Hughes
Gary and Alice Hymel
ITEX Corporation
C. James Judson
Sean Kelly
Marla M. Kentfield
Fred and Delores Kirk
Ronald David Larson
Matthew LeBo
Laurel LeLoup
Robert Lemmon
Charles Leonard
Ron Lucas
Lyne Cheney Charitable Fund of the Community Foundation of Jackson Hole
Christopher and Susan Marker
Donald and Marianna Matteson
Douglas and Susan McLeod
Jeff McMorris
Microsoft Corporation
David and Victoria Miles
Stafford and Louise Miller
Stephen Moore
Eugene Moos
NAC International
National Association of Wheat Growers
Christine Newbold
Mark Morris Newbold
Joseph K. Nichols
Gary Nichols
Krist Anthony and Darbury Stenderu Novoselic
Merrill and Muriel Oaks
Frances Owen
Nels Palm
Alphanassios Papagiannakis and Sarah Brandt
PEMCO Foundation, Incorporated
Sherri Peters
V. Lane and Mary Jo Rawlins
Nancy Rodriguez
Susan Ross
Gayle Rothrock
Sarkowsky Family Charitable Foundation
Eileen Schlee
Steven and Janice Shull
Christopher Simon
D. Rennee Sinclair
Wendell Smith
Steven Stehr
Mark Stephan and Kari McFarlan
Elizabeth A. Stricklin Harvey
Kathleen Taft
Quintard Taylor
Maurice Tempelsman
C. Jane Threlkeld
Dennis Verhoff and Donna DeAngelis
Dennis Weber
Clifford and Karen Webster
Douglas and Ellen Wertman
Steven Jeffrey White

$100–$499
Merrilyn Alkire
Julie Anderson
Margaret Andrews
Andrew Appleton
Susan Armitage
Thomas Eugene Armstrong
James and Nancy Ashmore
Richard and Nancy Backes
Jerry D. Barney
Chris Bayley
Wallis Beasley
Paul and Kathleen Beckett
Patricia M. and Peter K. Bergman
Kenton Bird and Gerri Saylor
Catherine and Grant Blinn
J.A. and Judy Bricker
Sharon M. Bruce
Louis and Norma Brummett
Robert and Mary Burroughs
Dennis W. Carlson
Paul Edward Casey
Gail Chermak
Roland J. Cole
Yvonne A. Collins
David Cotton
Robert Curry
John Damgard
Helen Davis
M.J. Delabarre
Phil and Sandra Deutchman
Daryll and Rebecca DeWalde
Keith Dolliver
Riley Dunlap
Reagan Dunn
Bobbie J. Egan
Richard Elgar
Sandra Ellersick
Karen Hanson Ellick
Mark P. Elliott, DVM
James R. Ellis
H. Stuart Elway
Mary Lou Enberg
Jeffrey T. Even
Bill Finkbeiner
Frederick and Barbara Finn
Pamela A. Floyd
H. Eugene Forrester
Catherine D. Foster
Marcia Garrett
Roberta J. Giovannini
Trey and Nancy Grayson
Robert Greenway
Elie R. Halpern
Raymond W. Haman
Nick Handy
Val Handfield
Nels Hanson
Jane Haque
Harris & Smith Public Affairs
Alex B. Hays
Troya Hefferman

22
Up to $100

Jack Arends
Ellen and Kent Arnold
D. LeRoy and Mary Ashby
William and Martha Ballard
Benjamin and Orma Stout Bedzis
Leon and Frances Bennett
Ann and Loren Berry
Richard G. Bockmuehl
Janet S. Borgen
Donald and Ann Boriske
Lyla Brekke
Nelsa Kay Brodie
Violet C. Brooks
Peggy J. Bryan
Todd and Dawn Butler
Roger Campana and Ellen Drumheller
Melvin and Zilda Carlson
Tamsin O. Clapp
Thomas and Ruth Cobb

Co-Gov

Bradley Collins
Jacob Day
Pedro and Juliana de Magalhaes Castro
Eugene and Janet Dolan
Zheng-Min Dong
Ann Donnelly
John Ehrstine
Ronald Faas
Matthew H. Grant
Judy Hart
Allen W. Hayward
Kathleen J. Hieronymus
Michael and Carol Hinderstein
Kimikazu and Marje Hirose
Thomas and D. Lee Hoemann
Gregory Hooks and Jane Rosenberg
George C. Houck
Stacy Johnson
Laurel D. Juergens
Karen Keegan

John and Diane Kicza
Laurel A. Juergens
Kirk and Diana Rowlands

Peter R. Rosenblatt
Gene Rosa
Peter R. Rosenblatt
Kirk and Diana Rowlands
Thomas and Patricia Ryan
Mike and Ann Ryherd
Ruth Self
Michelle Sender
Charles and Patricia Sheldon
Mauri Moore Shuler
Timothy Alexander Shustoff
Robert J. Silverman
Daniel and Annette Simonson
Lawrence and Sandra Small
Patricia W. and Samuel H. Smith

Robert terWillingher
Quintard Taylor
Robert terWillingher
Matthew terWillingher
David terWillingher and Deborah Haynes
Earl F. Tilly
Sam Sumner and Margery Ann Reed
Mathew Tomaskin
Marvin and Karen Vialle
Pote Videt
Peta Walker
Stephen Wasby
Mark Steven Wasowitz
Michael Watson
Ricci Ray and Lesley J. Weatherman
Isaac Justin Wells
Carol Wendle
Wendle Motors, Incorporated
Susan White
George W. and Jimi Wilson
Norman and Joan Willson
Allan and Florence Wood
Craig Wright
Peter R. Wyman
John C. Wynne
Yakima County Democratic
Central Committee
Christine Torozu

Joan D. Kraft
Roger and Brenda Larson
Sandra Lewis
Danielle Lively
Barbara Lopiccolo
F.L. and Sarah Love
Holly Jo Love
Robert L. Lovelace
James O. Luce
Arnold Mayer
Matt McCoy
Stephanie Mizrahi
Joyce Motherway
Mary Darlene Mueller
Michael Myers
Craig and Margaret Nicolson
Junko Nozaki
Betty Ostheller
Frances M. Pettit
David and Valerie Pietz
David and Kristin Prieur
Travis Ridout and Carolyn Ross
William Schreckhise and Janine Parry
Kathleen Searles
Dean and Sharon Short
Jim and Kelma Short
Harry and Lorinda Silverstein
Gary T. Smith
Julianne Smith
Bob and Sylva Staab
Mike Stall
Durwood and Joyce Stewart
Tony Stewart
Jeremy Syme
Marshall and Teri Lynn Thomas
Marina Tolmacheva
Char Tolnie
State of Washington
Patrician Watson
Robert Wilson
Pat and Judy Winsor
James W. Young
Jeanne M. Youngquist
Bernice L. Youstz

The Foley Institute on the Web

For links, updates, upcoming events, videos, pictures, and much more: foley.wsu.edu.
BE A PART OF THE FOLEY LEGACY

The Foley Institute is dedicated to providing high quality programs for students, faculty, and the public. Your support can help bring high profile public speakers to campus.

Yes, I would like to support Foley public presentations, events, and student internships in public service:

Name(s): ________________________________________________________________
Address: __________________________________________________________________
City, State, Zip: _____________________________________________________________
Email: ____________________________ Phone: __________

Enclosed is my tax-deductible gift of:
○ $25  ○ $50  ○ $100  ○ Other __________________________

Method of payment:
○ Check payable to Washington State University Foundation  ○Visa  ○Mastercard  ○AMEX
Credit Card#: __________________________ Exp. Date: ________ CVV: __________
Signature: ________________________________________________________________

Thank you!

Please return this completed form to:
WSU Foundation, PO Box 641927, Pullman WA 99164-1927
You can also make your gift online at give.wsu.edu.
Questions? Call 800-448-2978 or email foundation@wsu.edu.