

## Democracy in Danger S6 E1: “Disunion Runs Deep”

### [ THEME MUSIC ]

[00:00:04] **Will Hitchcock:** Hello, I’m Will Hitchcock.

[00:00:05] **Siva Vaidhyanathan:** And I’m Siva Vaidhyanathan.

[00:00:06] **WH:** And from the Nau Hall Auditorium at the University of Virginia, welcome to *Democracy in Danger*.

[00:00:15] **SV:** Yeah, we’re launching season six of the show with a live recording from our classroom at UVa. We are in front of an audience of 120 students. Our listeners might remember this is the second time that we have taught a course inspired by the show.

[00:00:31] **WH:** That’s right, Siva. The last time we did this, there was an insurrection at the U.S. Capitol, and it kind of confirmed why we felt the class was quite urgent.

[00:00:40] **SV:** Yeah, we’re hoping that doesn’t happen again.

[00:00:42] **WH:** No, but the storming of Brazil’s government offices by election deniers last month shows how fragile, tenuous democracy continues to be around the world. For our part, we still think the best way to ensure the survival of government by the people is to keep the people informed, chipping away at efforts by powerful forces to undermine democratic institutions and the rule of law and truth itself.

[00:01:08] **SV:** Yeah, that’s a big reason why we have student voices in this room with us. We would like to bring the next generation of decision makers into these very conversations. We’ll be asking them to do this with us throughout the season and ask them to pose some questions of their own to our guests.

[00:01:26] **WH:** Well, today we’re joined in the lecture hall by our colleague Elizabeth Varon, one of the country’s foremost scholars on the Civil War and the legacy of slavery in America. Liz is the author of numerous award winning books. And full disclosure, she and I happen to be married. But the real reason we invited Liz here is to help us get at the deep roots of political polarization in the United States.

Liz, welcome to *Democracy in Danger*!

[00:01:54] **Elizabeth Varon:** Delighted to be here. Thank you, Will. Thank you, Siva. Thank you to our audience.

[00:01:58] **WH:** So over the past years, Liz, a lot of people, a lot of people, including us, have said, man, we are so polarized these days, it’s probably worse now than it’s ever been. And your answer to that line has usually been, allow me to introduce you to early American history. So take us back a little bit to the founding era and to the road to the Civil War. Talk a little bit about what you think of as the sources of this polarization. And is it right to say that Americans have sort of always felt that their democracy was in danger?

[00:02:32] **EV:** Absolutely. So early Americans were profoundly anxious about the fate of their young republic. We are anxious, as you’ve said. We feel that our nation is vulnerable. At this point we’re 200 years into this experiment. We’ve survived a civil war, world wars. I’m asking us to think now about the mindset of people for whom the experiment was ten years old, 30 years old, 50 years old in the early days of the republic. At a time when they felt the republic’s very survival -- would it take? Would it put down roots? Was up in the air. So early Americans were haunted by anxiety about the survival of what they felt was a singular experiment in representative government in the world.

[00:03:15] So they felt that the union was beset by all kinds of enemies, external and internal. They had a word that they used to conjure all of these threats, and that word was disunion. For them, it was a fraught word that literally struck fear in their hearts. It referred to internal divisions, factionalism, which was their way of referring to excessive partisanship, class war, class tension, race, war, anarchy. That word disunion referred to fears of moral failings. They believed that this young Republic’s survival depended on the virtue of its citizenry, and they feared that vanity, greed, envy, ambition, that these things might undermine the moral foundations of the union. So partly because it was so potent, Americans could not resist using disunion as a political weapon against their enemies. So it was very, very common for people to accuse their political rivals of being disunionists, a big insult at the time, and to accuse someone of being a disunionist was to say, if your side comes into power, the consequences will be apocalyptic. We will fall into the abyss and therefore we have at all costs to make sure your side doesn’t. So

[00:04:33] **WH:** Thank God we’ve solved that problem.

[00:04:34] **EV:** Yeah, right. So in some sense, the story of the coming of the American Civil War is a story of how the issue of slavery becomes the most potent source of disunion, potent enough to actually split the union in two. And those divisions over slavery go back to the very beginning, to the time of the drafting of the constitution.

[00:04:55] **SV:** So, I mean, the first words of the Constitution, are “We the people in order to form a more perfect union.” I suppose that was a nice rhetorical move. It doesn’t accuse those of being against a union. This is just a way to get a more perfect union.

[00:05:10] **EV:** Those are important words and those who want to interpret the Constitution in an anti-slavery light are going to seize on that preamble. Among some other features of the Constitution.

[00:05:19] **SV:** My central question here is, like, does the Constitution in its process of trying to form a more perfect union in 1787, just kick the can down the road for what is necessarily going to be disunion over this deep moral, political and economic issue?

[00:05:38] **EV:** It’s much worse than kicking the can down the road. So the Constitution is a pro-slavery document in some fundamental ways that gives slave owners a structural advantage, that rigs the system in their favor. So at the time the constitution is drafted, it’s already quite clear that the north and south are on different trajectories. And already at the time of the revolution, we see northerners starting to dismantle slavery in the northern states. At the same time, slavery is expanding exponentially into the South, into what we’ll call the Cotton Kingdom. So at the time of the Constitutional Convention, nearly half of the delegates

to that convention representing these new states are slave owners and the delegates to the convention debate slavery and what should be said and done about it.

[00:06:26] And they arrive at some famous compromises, the notorious three-fifths compromise. Slaveholders wanted to count all enslaved people to boost their own representation so they could control the government. Some Northern delegates who had qualms about slavery said, hold on a minute, you can't count the enslaved as people and treat them as property, as chattels who have no rights, including the right to self-defense against their masters' brutality. So this debate goes back and forth, and the result is this compromise: slaveholders can count 60 percent of their slaves and boost their representation that way. Briefly, there are a few other key compromises. The constitutional delegates agree to let the African slave trade persist for another 20 years. This is a concession to Southerners who insisted on this, and they include a fugitive slave law that requires states, even in northern states that are dismantling slavery, are required to send fugitives back to Southern states, back into slavery. Now, how did slaveholders secure these compromises that tilt so clearly in their favor? And part of the way they secured them is by making threats which slave holders become past masters literally at making threats. And the threat they levy is the threat of disunion. They say we won't join a union that doesn't do our bidding.

[00:07:49] **WH:** All right. So we have a constitution and we have a rigged constitution. But, you know, the prospect of civil war is so terrifying for everybody. Were there those in the 19th century before the Civil War who said the Constitution is you know, it's not great, but it's the game we have and we have to make it work. Was there anyone who felt, even within this rigged framework, we could find a way to make progress, to make the union work?

[00:08:15] **EV:** Absolutely, 100 percent. So this era in which the government is framed bequeathed to us this document, the charter, the Constitution. It also bequeathed to us a belief that the people are going to give meaning to this document as the republic grows and develops. And so very quickly, we see competing interpretations of the Constitution, competing constitutionalisms, if you will. The Constitution is a political touchstone for everyone across the political spectrum. Everyone wants to claim it. So one of those constitutionalisms that develops is an anti-slavery constitutionalism. So an anti-slavery movement emerges in early America and the vanguard of that anti-slavery movement, the leading edge, are always African Americans: both enslaved African Americans in the South, whose resistance inspires a movement, and northern free black reformers, some of them former slaves, very important individuals we might call the black founders, people like the brilliant poet Phillis Wheatley of Boston, or the minister Richard Allen in Philadelphia who founds the AME Church, a very important institution in black life moving forward. They found a protest tradition.

[00:09:27] And the protest tradition, what does it do? It calls out the white founders says, wait a minute, you can't claim to fight a revolution in the name of liberty while you're practicing slavery. It demands that America live up to the ideals and documents like the Declaration of Independence. Imagines a union, a union that doesn't exist yet, a union of fair play and equality that could rightly command our reverence and our loyalty, and then tries to start a process of bringing that union about. So out of these seeds, an abolitionist movement grows in the north. And in answer to your question, we might note that there were some abolitionists who thought the Constitution was hopeless, that it was irredeemable. William Lloyd Garrison calls the Constitution and I quote, “a covenant with death and an agreement with hell,” because he believes the compromises are so immoral. He's countered by

abolitionists like Frederick Douglass, who argue that you can interpret the Constitution in an anti-slavery light when read in the right way. It is a glorious liberty document, as Frederick Douglass puts it.

[00:10:27] **SV:** Doesn't Douglass kind of win the argument in the sense that abolitionists who are active and become part of the Republican Party by the time of Lincoln, by the time the Civil War, are basically taking Douglass' position and immediately actually almost completely rewrite the Constitution. I mean, the Constitution didn't have anything about equality before the law, before the Civil War, and all of a sudden you get the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments, right? Doesn't that completely change the Constitution?

[00:10:53] **EV:** Well, so Douglass's position is a pragmatic position. He and others who believe that you can read the Constitution in an anti-slavery light, pick out certain of its provisions. For example, they look, even at the preamble, we talked about this, language about forming a more perfect union and securing the blessings of liberty to our cells and our posterity and so on. And they say all of that read in the right spirit can be construed as anti-slavery.

[00:11:15] Why do they do this? Because they're trying to be pragmatic and to answer the garrisons of the world by saying, if we want to end slavery, we have to control the government. If we want to control the government, we have to win elections. If we want to win elections, we have to use every political weapon at our disposal, include claiming the Constitution as our own, which is what they do, and the reconstruction amendments, ending slavery, overturning Dred Scott and giving some basic citizens' rights to African Americans, enfranchising black men. They're absolutely the outgrowth of both the protest tradition started by Richard Allen and of this pivot, this defense of an idea of an anti-slavery constitution.

[00:11:56] **SV:** Right, but we are getting like this sort of incremental work toward perhaps a realization of democracy. It's still really 100 years later. Right? It takes until the Voting Rights Act we have something like a democracy where regardless of your gender or your color, you might actually get to vote in America, right?

[00:12:13] **EV:** Well, we have, you know, intervening — the Civil War — and that journey you've just described is an incredibly hard fought, treacherous one, because standing in the way, all along, are Southern slaveholders with their pro-slavery constitutionalism, with their demands to control the government and with their own pivot — once they feel that their control of the government is slipping away — their own pivot towards destroying that government in secession.

[00:12:40] **WH:** Okay. But not to give you a spoiler here, but we do know who wins the Civil War. Right? The United States wins the Civil War and slavery is abolished. Now, my question is, did the United States, did the North really win the Civil War? That is to say, you know, so many of these issues that we're you know, that you're describing, were they fundamentally resolved by the Civil War or not?

[00:13:02] **SV:** Or even now?

[00:13:02] **EV:** Yeah, well ...

[00:13:04] **WH:** Are we still fighting over these same issues in some way? But really, you figure one side wins, they get to rewrite the rulebook. But it didn't really work out that way. Why not?

[00:13:11] **EV:** It didn't work out that way. Certainly the union and Abraham Lincoln and the Republican Party that he leads believe that they're fighting the Civil War to prevent the spread of slavery, to set it on a path to gradual extinction, to save the union against a group of slaveholding conspirators, the secessionists who they regard as oligarchs essentially. It's really important to note slaveholders had huge power in American politics. They dominated the southern states. They dominated the Senate and the Supreme Court and the presidency, and they exerted this immense power, despite the fact that they were a small minority, even of southern whites. Only one in four white Southern families owned slaves and slaveholders were a small minority of that minority. So Lincoln and the Union believe they're fighting a war in the name of majority government against, essentially, an oligarchy. They win that war in large part because Lincoln comes to recognize the logic of another brilliant thing Frederick Douglass has said: “To fight against slaveholders without fighting against slavery is about halfhearted business. We have to strike at the institution of slavery to defeat this slaveholders confederacy.”

[00:14:20] So Lincoln promulgates his Emancipation Proclamation. The union enlists 200,000 African-American men, most of them former slaves in its ranks. And it wins the war and it feels vindicated. It feels that the war is a vindication of the principle of majority rule and of this anti-slavery constitutionalism. So what happens? The recalcitrant South denies that the union has won a mandate. Robert E. Lee and Jefferson Davis and other Confederates, they will argue the union victory had been a victory of a might, over right. That the Union victory was illegitimate. And from the start we see that Southern recalcitrance takes some just utterly noxious forms, the form of so-called black codes that try to reimpose something very close to slavery on African Americans, a lost cause ideology that romanticizes slavery and romanticizes the Confederacy, and that argues, in effect, that the cause isn't really lost. That it can still be done.

[00:15:14] **WH:** Why was that still appealing? What explains the residents of the lost cause in the generation right after the Civil War?

[00:15:21] **EV:** Well, part of what explains it is American racism. I mean, we don't want to lose sight here as we talk about the different trajectories of north and south of the fact that racism was a profound problem in the north as well as in the South, and Southerners were constantly trying to play on that racism. But again, to understand this dynamic, we have to understand the tactics of the slaveholders in victory and defeat. And those tactics were to fearmonger, to divide, to demonize change agents, to use violence, to target anyone who might be a change agent. There's no free speech in the pre-war South, and there isn't in the postwar South either, because groups like the Klan will run out of town or worse, anyone who wants to change things. So a combination of propaganda and violence creates chaos. And the position of the defeated Confederates is we can't have change because change will bring chaos. They then *create* the chaos. Preemptively. Anti-black violence sweeps over the south to preempt change. And then they say: “See, there's chaos. The only way to have peace again is to go back to the way things used to be when we held the reins of power.”

[00:16:33] **WH:** They want to protect the institutions that their forebears had created that were unfair, but gave them power.

[00:16:38] **EV:** Absolutely. There was enormous cynicism in these arguments and widespread violence. And Northerners stand up, some of them U.S. Grant as president and others try to break the back of the Klan and so on. But ultimately, Northerners are susceptible to this pressure because racism remains so strong.

[00:16:57] **SV:** I mean, it doesn't sound like much of democracy.

[00:16:59] **EV:** It's not much of a democracy in this era. I think that's a very important takeaway.

[00:17:03] **SV:** So you've talked about deep divisions, you've talked about democratic convulsions. And of course, we're going through a lot of that today. What does history have to teach us about today, about the moment of crisis we're in now? How worried should we be when we see things like we saw on our televisions in January of 2021?

[00:17:23] **EV:** Well, part of what I'm trying to argue here is that sadly and tragically, there's a playbook that opponents of change have used in American politics again and again and again. And a key part of the playbook, and we have to recognize it when we see it so that we can be smart about how we try to counter it. Part of that playbook is to demonize reformers. So pro-slavery defenders demonized abolitionists as troublemakers. You're going to stir up the pot. You're going to agitate this volatile issue. It's going to bring disunion and chaos and race war and so on. Abolitionists answered by saying: it's slavery that's the problem, not abolition. But this demonizing of reformers has been intended again and again in American history to confuse Americans about cause and effect. We see this again during reconstruction. The proponents of those reconstruction amendments will say we have to root out racism and inequality, and they propose all of these changes to the South, establishing interracial democracy there. Klansmen and lost cause types object that this radical reform is causing strife. The reformers say it's racism that's causing the strife, not the reform. But this playbook has been used again to confuse Americans about cause and effect again and again.

[00:18:36] **SV:** So during the Civil Rights era, it was these outside agitators.

[00:18:38] **EV:** We are going to see this again, again and again in American history. And part of the message here, I don't mean to end on such a sour note, part of the message is that reformers have been incredibly resilient using every tool at their disposal. And one of those tools is appeals to history to say the Constitution is ours, the declaration is ours, we can make them allies to this cause of change.

[00:19:03] **WH:** Yeah, I mean, the cool thing about having an ambiguous constitution is that you can make multiple different arguments based on it. Some of those can be in favor of change and progress, and we've seen that again and again. But of course, the opposite is true. And so this is why we still are stuck on fighting over the meaning of our founding documents. Well, why don't we turn to the audience and invite them into the dialog?

[00:19:23] **SV:** Yeah. So let's start with a question from Cameron. Cameron, will you please tell us your major and where you're from and then share your question with Professor Varon?

[00:19:33] **Cameron:** All right. So, yeah, my name's Cameron. I'm a first year from Newport News, Virginia, and my major is math actually.

[00:19:40] **WH:** Not for long.

[00:19:43] **Cameron:** And my question has to do with, you know, looking at Abraham Lincoln and obviously all the accomplishments he made towards helping democracy like the Emancipation Proclamation, he was obviously brutally assassinated. And I just wanted to get at how the period after the Civil War have been different if it weren't for his assassination? So that's really what I'm wondering.

[00:20:05] **EV:** That's a brilliant question. I'm happy to answer it. So Lincoln, as he promulgates emancipation during the Civil War and again, influenced by the black abolitionists like Douglass, makes the argument that black freedom will have broad benefits for all of American society. In making that argument on behalf of emancipation, he's going against decades, decades and decades of arguing by slaveholders and by racist white northerners as well, that you can't have change because any gains for African Americans will come at the expense of whites, that it's a zero sum game. So Lincoln challenges this. He is tragically assassinated and he is replaced, alas, by a man named Andrew Johnson. A southerner, Southern Democrat, was put on Lincoln's ticket to try to win some folks in the other party over to support the Union War effort. Johnson has a very narrow definition of African-American freedom, the right to work for wages only, not political rights. And Johnson revives the zero sum game argument. He argues that any citizenship rights is going to essentially sort of tyrannized and degrade whites.

[00:21:11] So what difference could it have made if Lincoln had survived? Glass half full argument is that Lincoln was a brilliant communicator and maybe he could have kept pressing this case that civil rights will broadly benefit all Americans rather than retreating the way Johnson did. The glass half empty argument is that Lincoln was not prepared for the degree of white Southern recalcitrance and would have been deeply disappointed and somewhat confounded by it.

[00:21:41] **WH:** One of those counterfactuals that that is really provocative. Well, we have another question from Grace. A first year English and foreign affairs major from Arlington, Virginia. Grace, welcome to the show.

[00:21:52] **Grace:** Hi. I'm wondering if there's an event that you consider a tipping point, at which point the Civil War became inevitable. And if so, how would you compare that moment to recent events in American history?

[00:22:02] **EV:** Another great question. So, you know, we historians don't think anything is exactly inevitable, but close to inevitable: Lincoln's election in 1860. So Lincoln is elected on the strength of Northern votes. At this point, Southerners who have controlled the government for much of its existence, and have used every tactic they could think of to try to maintain that control, realized that there's not much incentive on the part of Northerners to reform any more. They argue that they will now be permanently on the outs now that an anti-slavery party has been elected and they treat Lincoln's election as a declaration of war. That's how secessionists describe it. Lincoln, mind you, is trying to reassure Southerners that he has no intention of disturbing slavery where it already exists. But that's a huge turning point.

[00:22:43] Are there echoes in the present day? Heck yes. I mean, you know, if you think about the January six insurrection, so 95 percent of the insurrectionists are white. They are

rejecting election results, as secessionists did back in 1860, saying that president is not our president. We don't have to follow him. Ninety percent of African Americans voted for Biden. I mean, there's clearly a story about race relations at the heart of this. Trump will tell those followers as he sends them to attack the Capitol: you're the real people. I'm quoting him. You're the real people, the people who built this country. What is he saying? He's saying some people count more than other people, which is a direct echo of the argument the secessionists made that if we can't control the union, we won't abide it anymore because we count for more than the other folks. So, yes, absolutely. They're echoes.

[00:23:38] **SV:** We have another question from a student.

[00:23:40] **Joe:** Hi, my name is Joe. I'm a third year history major. And I'm just curious, you know, we view Lincoln's election as this turning point in-- him as this radical change agent. But what was his real perspective on race and slavery, you know, immediately preceding his election and in 1860?

[00:24:04] **EV:** So Lincoln was not an abolitionist. He believed slavery was wrong. But unlike abolitionists who had a very urgent timetable for the destruction of slavery, and unlike Frederick Douglass, who believed that they were fighting a sort of two front battle against Southern slavery and its horrors and also against persistent racism in the north. Lincoln had a much more narrow brief. His target was slave holder power. He was anti-slaveholder rather than pro-slave for much of his career. He resented the way the three-fifths compromise had given the Democratic Party power. He believed its policies were sort of driving, you know, America into the ground. And he believed that a free labor system, one in which one works for wages, is more productive and modern and creates greater opportunity and so on.

[00:24:52] So he was focused on political and economic arguments. Lincoln's platform pledge was to stop the spread of slavery, not to target it where it already existed in the South. He did believe it had some constitutional protections there. He wasn't sure he had the power to use the federal government against slavery in the South. What he was hoping, and it's easy to see this, perhaps as a little naive, but it was a common perspective among Lincoln and those in his Republican Party. What he was hoping was that if they could restrict the spread of slavery, white Southerners would see the writing on the wall. This institution has no future, and they would begin to dismantle it themselves. So he clings to this idea that somehow Southerners can be persuaded to do the right thing of their own accord. That's not going to happen.

[00:25:35] **WH:** So he gets radicalized.

[00:25:35] **EV:** He gets radicalized.

[00:25:37] **WH:** In the course of the war.

[00:25:37] **EV:** He gets radicalized in the course of the war. And, you know, people argue that by the end of the war, when he's giving his famous second inaugural a kind of private Lincoln that loathes slavery in a public Lincoln, a pragmatic politician, have kind of fused and he's able to speak from the heart. But for much of his career, he's a very cagey, pragmatic politician.

[00:25:57] **SV:** Of course, he also gets radicalized about the use of federal power, of course, and he has no interest in paying attention to the limits of the Constitution by the end of the Civil War.

[00:26:05] **EV:** Well, I mean, I wouldn't put it that way, you know? I would say that he

[00:26:09] **SV:** The Southerners would.

[00:26:10] **EV:** Well, the Southerners would, and his northern Democratic opposition party said, “You've thrown the Constitution out the window.” But Lincoln says, “No, I can interpret the Constitution in an anti-slavery way. Among other things, my war powers as commander in chief give me the right to do what is militarily necessary to save the union.” And his first defense of emancipation is as a military necessity within his powers as commander in chief.

[00:26:33] **SV:** Okay, well, we have time for one more question. And this one comes from Degen. Degen, please introduce yourself.

[00:26:40] **Degen:** Hi, I'm from Boulder, Colorado, and I'm a second year and my major is media studies. And I was wondering — so, in the Gettysburg Address, Lincoln described the war as a test for democracy that would determine the fate of representative government for the entire world. Do you feel that he was correct in this statement? And how do you think the Civil War and its outcome affected other countries?

[00:27:03] **EV:** So Lincoln absolutely believed America was, as he eloquently put it, the last best hope of earth, a beacon of democracy, and that it could only be this in an honest and meaningful way if it struck at the root of this Central American sin of slavery and abolish slavery. The most profound way in which America has been has lived up to this kind of last best hope ideal is as a beacon of immigration. Just a little factoid that people don't know. Twenty-five percent of the Union Army were immigrants. Another 18 percent were first generation Americans. Forty-three percent of the Union Army had these roots elsewhere. And these people would come to America believing that, for all its flaws, it represented a refuge from political persecution and a source of economic opportunity. And as we've perfected the union, attempted to, again a huge uphill battle against so many obstacles. Immigrants then and now have believed that to come here is not only to benefit from the experiment, but to shape it themselves, which of course they've done in profound ways. So it's just a way of saying, think about the impact of Lincoln's “last best hope” mentality on the world — thinking about immigration, the world coming to America — is one angle on this question. Very good question.

[00:28:23] **SV:** Well, we're going to have to wrap up our conversation with that answer. Thank you very much to all of our students who have been so helpful and helping us put this show together, and especially to the students who asked these wonderful questions.

And thank you very much, Elizabeth Varon, for joining us on *Democracy in Danger*.

[00:28:42] **EV:** Thank you. It's been a pleasure.

[ **APPLAUSE / THEME MUSIC** ]

[00:28:50] **SV:** EV: is the Langbourne M. Williams professor in American history at the University of Virginia. She’s the author most recently of *Armies of Deliverance: A New History of the Civil War*.

**[ THEME MUSIC ]**

[00:29:03] **WH:** That’s all we have time for on this show. Stay with us this season, as we speak with scholars, writers and a number of activists helping us save democracy one podcast episode at a time.

[00:29:13] **SV:** And please stay in touch. You can shoot us a tweet [@DinDpodcast](https://twitter.com/DinDpodcast) — that’s at D-I-N-D podcast. Or you can leave a review wherever you find this show.

[00:29:25] **WH:** There’s lots more to read and see on our webpage, [dindanger.org](http://dindanger.org). Our show pages provide virtual syllabi for every episode.

[00:29:32] **SV:** *Democracy in Danger* is produced by Robert Armengol and Rebecca Barry. Elie Bashkow engineers the show. Our interns are Eva Kretsinger-Walters, Ellis Nolan and Bea Webster.

Special thanks this time to Audrius Rickus, Jake Calhoun, Preston Godfrey and the entire classroom support team at the University of Virginia.

[00:29:53] **WH:** Support comes from the University of Virginia’s College of Arts and Sciences, and the show is a project of UVA’s Karsh Institute of Democracy. We belong to The Democracy Group podcast network, and we’re distributed by the Virginia Audio Collective of WTJU Radio in Charlottesville.

I’m Will Hitchcock.

[00:30:09] **SV:** And I’m Siva Vaidhyanathan. Until next time.

**[ APPLAUSE ]**