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The ‘Eternal Vigilance’ of Democracy

DEMOCRACY INITIATIVE ANTICORRUPTION LAB LAUNCHED FROM MILLER CENTER STAGE

By Lorenzo Perez

“I myself have been subjected to death threats, kidnapping threats,” U.S. businessmen and vocal anticorruption activist William Browder said as he unmasked, unpinning the shroud, the human cost of a well-documented saga of Russian fraud and oppression.

Speaking via video link to a Miller Center audience in November because he lives under constant threat of assassination, Browder continued: “The Russian government has issued eight Interpol arrest warrants to get me back, and I’ve been sentenced in absentia to 18 years in Russian prison. Everybody involved in it has paid a very dear price.”

Browder had been invited to the Miller Center by University of Virginia professor studying corruption and its global threats as part of the Democracy Initiative’s Corruption Lab on Ethics, Accountability, and the Rule of Law (CLEAR). “While bringing greater attention to the robust research being done by the CLEAR Lab’s talented faculty, postdoctoral fellows, and visiting professors, the event also provided a riveting account of the real-world implications of corruption on democratic institutions,” said Melody Barnes, co-director for policy and public affairs for the Democracy Initiative.

Before a packed house, Browder told the story of how his company, Hermitage Capital Management, went from being the largest foreign investor in Russia in the 2000s to being dismantled on fraudulent charges. Browder and Hermitage became reacquainted with Russia’s president, Vladimir Putin, as their efforts to expose the massive fraud of Russian oligarchs and senior government officials grew.

With David George, CNH senior political analyst and founding director of the Harvard Kennedy School’s Center for Public Leadership, moderating, Browder described how his lawyer, Sergei Magnitsky, was jailed for his efforts exposing a massive fraud involving senior Russian officials. Magnitsky died 10 years ago, a victim of brutal torture and medical neglect while in Russian custody.

Browder later persuaded Congress to pass the 2012 Magnitsky Act. The law, which has versions in effect now in Canada, the United Kingdom, and several Eastern European countries, empowers the United States to sanction human rights offenders by freezing their assets and barring entry to the country.

The Magnitsky Act’s passage has led to sanctions against numerous officials in the Putin clique. In an attempt to get these sanctions lifted, the Putin government has tried to portray Browder as the criminal, repeatedly and unsuccessfully seeking his arrest by Interpol.

Like other research efforts within the Democracy Initiative, the new CLEAR Lab aims to support public conversations and new scholarship on pressing global threats to democracy. As the lab develops, faculty members, including politics professor Daniel Gingerich, law professor Michael Gibert, and economics professor Sandu Lahkar, will plan academic courses, research, and events exploring the causes, methods, and consequences of corruption.

“Browder’s retelling recounting of his experience made plain that corruption leads to insecurity,” said Deborah Heilman, CLEAR Lab faculty member and professor at UVA School of Law. “And that when corruption by powerful political actions is backed by violence. A puts those who seek to check or expose it in very real danger.”

Watch a video of the event at miller.clr.cn.
Our aim is not only to relieve the symptom of poverty, but to cure it and, above all, to prevent it.

President Lyndon Johnson and his "War on Poverty" Legislation

By Guian McKee

“Our aim is not only to relieve the symptom of poverty, but TO CURE IT and, above all, TO PREVENT IT”

Guian McKee is an associate professor in Presidential Studies at the Miller Center.

For grassroots activists in poor communities around the country, community action would soon come to mean something very different: providing poor people themselves with the authority and resources to challenge the same local administrators whom Johnson saw as the core of his program.

In a series of four lengthy telephone calls on February 1, the president cajoled and even bullied Peace Corps director R. Sargent Shriver into accepting a second position heading the task force that would write the antipoverty legislation.

Johnson selected Shriver for two reasons. As the husband of Eunice Kennedy—the sister of John and Robert Kennedy—Shriver provided a link to the Kennedy clan and their supporters, many of whom were deeply alienated from the new president and posed a potential political threat.

Second, as the director of the successful and popular Peace Corps, Shriver had great credibility with Congress, the media, and, to a lesser extent, the public. He would be a valuable ally in securing passage of the bill. Having just returned from a tour of Peace Corps sites around the world, Shriver felt exhausted and rushed, telling the president at one point, “The more I really think about this, the more I really would like to suggest . . . that you give me a few more days to get this thing straightened out, so that when it is announced, I can make some sense about it.” Johnson relented and announced Shriver’s appointment at a press conference.

Despite his initial reservations, Shriver threw himself into the planning work and quickly became the public face of the War on Poverty.

On March 16, 1964, Johnson delivered his message on poverty to Congress, and with it he officially submitted the antipoverty bill. In the message, the president noted that the War on Poverty would be “a struggle to give people a chance . . . to allow them to develop and use their capacities, as we have been allowed to develop and use ours, so that they can share, as others share, in the promise of the nation.”
ON THE DAY OF THE 9/11 ATTACKS

Stephen Hadley, national security advisor: [My wife] Ann tells me that I called in the afternoon about three o’clock and simply said, “Are you okay?” She said, “Yes, I’m okay. I’ll talk to you when I can talk to you.” But there are a million stories. Ann’s story is, she’s at work and she learns that there have been the attacks. She learns somehow, whether it’s over the radio or someone comes in and tells her that there’s a report, that there’s a plane headed toward the White House—heading to Washington and it may be headed to the White House. What she does is she leaves her job, goes down, gets in the car to go pick up our two daughters, one who’s at, I think, I have to work the dates, but I think they’re at two different schools. Maybe they’re both at St. Patrick’s or maybe one is at St. Patrick’s and one is at Holton-Arms. She says, “If the White House is going to be hit and the girls’ father is going to be killed, I don’t want them to hear about it at home with me.”

ON THE IMMEDIATE AFTERMATH OF 9/11

Robert Gates, later secretary of defense: Who thought, on September 12th, that we would go more than 10 years without another successful attack? Nobody believed that. All Americans believed there was going to be another attack. Much of what has been written about those months—the interrogations and the wiretaps and all those things—was a manifestation of the belief that the country was at war, was under attack, and we were going to be attacked again, and how you present that. The reality is that on 9/11 we didn’t know jack s—t about al-Qaeda. That’s the reason a lot of this stuff happened and the interrogations and everything else—because we didn’t know anything. If we’d had a great database and knew exactly what al-Qaeda was all about, what their capabilities were and stuff like that, some of these measures wouldn’t have been necessary. But the fact is that we’d just been attacked by a group we didn’t know anything about. In a way, the failure to appreciate Islamic fundamentalism is a far more valid criticism of the intelligence community in the ’80s and ’90s than the collapse of the Soviet Union.

Saddam was pretty clear with his U.S. interrogators that these weapon systems, or the thought that he had these weapon systems, was important to sustaining him in power. He was diverting tens of millions of dollars from the Oil-for-Food Program to keep together the system of weapons that were important to sustaining him in power. But the fact is that we’d just been attacked by a group we didn’t know anything about. In a way, the failure to appreciate Islamic fundamentalism is a far more valid criticism of the intelligence community in the ’80s and ’90s than the collapse of the Soviet Union.

10 years without another successful attack? Nobody believed that. All Americans believed there was going to be another attack. Much of what has been written about those months—the interrogations and the wiretaps and all those things—was a manifestation of the belief that the country was at war, was under attack, and we were going to be attacked again, and how you present that. The reality is that on 9/11 we didn’t know jack s—t about al-Qaeda. That’s the reason a lot of this stuff happened and the interrogations and everything else—because we didn’t know anything. If we’d had a great database and knew exactly what al-Qaeda was all about, what their capabilities were and stuff like that, some of these measures wouldn’t have been necessary. But the fact is that we’d just been attacked by a group we didn’t know anything about. In a way, the failure to appreciate Islamic fundamentalism is a far more valid criticism of the intelligence community in the ’80s and ’90s than the collapse of the Soviet Union.

The reality is that on 9/11 we didn’t know jack s—t about al-Qaeda. That’s the reason a lot of this stuff happened and the interrogations and everything else because we didn’t know anything. If we’d had a great database and knew exactly what al-Qaeda was all about, what their capabilities were and stuff like that, some of these measures wouldn’t have been necessary. But the fact is that we’d just been attacked by a group we didn’t know anything about. In a way, the failure to appreciate Islamic fundamentalism is a far more valid criticism of the intelligence community in the ’80s and ’90s than the collapse of the Soviet Union.

You’ve got to stop saying it. It was our fault. We just got it wrong. . . .

Panetta had written a little bit when he was out of government about the administration cooking the intel, and the very last thing I said to him as I left the building was, “There’s no one disagreeing that it was mishandled.” But I also point out that it’s our fault, not the president’s, not the vice president’s. This is tradition on the part of the intelligence community.

[Former Clinton chief of staff and CIA director] Leon Panetta had written a little bit when he was out of government about the administration cooking the intel, and the very last thing I said to him as I left the building was, “There’s no one disagreeing that it was mishandled.” But I also point out that it’s our fault, not the president’s, not the vice president’s. This is tradition on the part of the intelligence community.

ON THE SEARCH FOR WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION IN IRAQ

Josh Brolin, White House chief of staff: I remember a conversation with [speechwriter] Mike Gerson, who—he and I were on the perimeter of the intelligence and the Iraq decision-making. We went out for a walk or were having lunch together or something. We had gone days without the inspectors finding anything, you know, finding any evidence of weapons of mass destruction. So there was doubt beginning to creep in about the existence of the weapons of mass destruction. At that point I was still convinced that they were there, but they had done a very good job of hiding them, or the inspectors weren’t looking particularly hard.

I remember one of us making a comment that—I think I was making a political comment to the effect that if they don’t find those weapons, the president’s re-election is dead. Mike made the comment, “Reelect? If they don’t find the weapons, he’ll probably be impeached.”

General Michael Hayden, director of the Central Intelligence Agency: When we look back on it, I think no one disagreed that it was mishandled. But I also point out that it’s our fault, it’s not the president’s, not the vice president’s. This is tradition on the part of the intelligence community.

[Former Clinton chief of staff and CIA director] Leon Panetta had written a little bit when he was out of government about the administration cooking the intel, and the very last thing I said to him as I left the building was, “Leon, that’s just not right. We just got it wrong. . . . You’ve got to stop saying it. It was our fault. We just got it wrong. Nobody pressured us.”
ON THE CONTESTED 2000 ELECTION
House Minority Leader Richard Gephardt (D-MO): I’d always say to my members in Congress, in a democracy, process is everything. I said that because in a democracy if people feel there is a process that is legitimate and fair and reasonably well run, then they’ll put up with bad outcomes, even though they are very angry. If you lose that process, people resort to violence. I always would say politics is a substitute for violence. As [Winston] Churchill said, “Democracy is the worst form of government on earth except for all the others.” What he was really saying was the process allows people to govern themselves without resorting to violence.

So this [the contested outcome in Florida] was a clear, prime example of that. Even though all the cards were on the table. This was king of the hill, that’s exactly what it was. You know, I think we evolved from animals—I’m deadly serious. We’ve evolved, though, that. That’s the good news. What we’ve evolved to is self-government and a process that people can put up with when they lose. That to me was a memorable moment.

When they lose. That to me was a memorable moment democracy and a process that people can put up with, even though they are very angry. If you lose that process, people resort to violence. I always would say politics is a substitute for violence. As [Winston] Churchill said, “Democracy is the worst form of government on earth except for all the others.” What he was really saying was the process allows people to govern themselves without resorting to violence.

ON PRESIDENT BUSH’S THOUGHTS ABOUT PRESIDENTIAL Rhetoric
Ed Gillespie, counselor to the president: The first meeting I had with the president was up in his study in the Treaty Room. He was behind his desk and it was after hours, just the two of us. He was excited. He said, “I’m glad this worked out. I’m looking forward to working with you.” I said, “I’m looking forward to working with you.”

Then we talked about the nature of the job, what he wanted from me in it and all that. He said, “There’s something you need to understand though. You are great at understanding the domestic audience and the American people and the voters and how to communicate with them, but when you take this job, the President of the United States has more than just the domestic audience and you’re going to have to learn how to take the other audiences into account. Our enemies listen to everything the President of the United States says. If they detect weakness it will affect what they do. Our allies listen to everything I say as Commander in Chief, and if they sense any vacillation or backing away, they’ll be gone tomorrow.”

And he said, “Our troops listen to the Commander in Chief and everything I say as Commander in Chief, and if they sense that I’m in any way undercutting them, that’s bad for morale. It doesn’t help them in the theater. There will be times when you’ll want me to say something that is politically beneficial to the domestic audience but would hurt the morale of our troops in the field. You just need to know that I will never do that.”

TO OFFER FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR THIS IMPORTANT WORK, GO TO millercenter.org/donate

ON PRESIDENT BUSH’S REACTION TO THE 2008 FINANCIAL CRISIS
Ed Gillespie, counselor to the president: Bush was very jaded about the financial markets. He was mad. He has always had a strong populist streak; he doesn’t trust the bankers. He thinks the credit default swaps and these instruments that got set up were all suspect and half illogical and he was really—he was mad at the notion of having to bail these guys out and felt like there was a gun to his head so he had to. And there was a gun to his head and he did it. There was confusion around what the TARP [Troubled Asset Relief Program] was going to do. . . .

Paulson is in here telling him one day—we’re going to buy bad paper and take it off of the ledgers of these banks, and that will give everybody confidence. Then he’s back the next day saying we’re not doing that thing where we’re buying the bad paper anymore. We’re just giving them an infusion of liquidity.

I remember Bush saying, “What are we doing?” It wasn’t, “What are we doing because I don’t understand what we’re doing.” It was “What are we doing? Don’t come in here one day and tell me and tell Eddie to craft a speech based on that and then come in the next day and say we’re not doing it.” It was more that. It was a confusing situation.
Hamilton argues in Federalist No. 45 that the Senate MARCH 1788
impeachment. In 1788, North Carolina’s James Iredell was one. “When any man is
Public debates on ratification followed, and several commentators referenced
or oppression. He might betray his trust to foreign powers.”
during the Constitutional Convention in 1787. “He might lose his capacity after
was almost completely down party lines, with only three Democrats joining with
This latest impeachment was remarkable for its extreme partisanship—the vote
WHAT HAS HAPPENED WHEN CONGRESS CHARGES THE PRESIDENT WITH MISCONDUCT?
L ast December, Donald Trump became only the third president to be
impeached. The same fate befell Andrew Johnson in 1868 and Bill Clinton
in 1998. Richard Nixon was the subject of impeachment hearings in the
House in 1974 but resigned before he could be officially impeached.
To fully appreciate this moment for the U.S. presidency, the Miller Center is doing what
it does best: looking back to gain a better understanding of the present.

DEBATNG THE CONSTITUTION
“Some provision should be made for defending the Community against the
incapacity, negligence, or perjury of the chief Magistrate,” said James Madison
during the Constitutional Convention in 1787. “He might lose his capacity after
his appointment. He might prevent his administration into a scheme of peculation
or oppression. He might betray his trust to foreign powers.”
Public debates on ratification followed, and several commentators referenced impeachment. In 1788, North Carolina’s James Iredell was one. “When any man is
impeached, it must be for an error of the heart, and not of the head. God forbid that a
man, in any country in the world, should be liable to be punished for want in
judgment. This is not the case here. . . . According to these principles, I suppose
the only instances in which the president would be liable to impeachment would be
where he had received a bribe or had acted from some corrupt motive or other.”

ANDREW JACKSON
CENSURED BUT NOT IMPEACHED
President Andrew Jackson found himself in several battles with Congress, vetoing
more legislation than all six of his predecessors combined. Lacking the authority to
shut down the Second Bank of the United States, which he saw as a tool of the rich,
Jackson simply withdrew all government deposits, effectively neutering the institution.

With Democrats in charge of the House, Wigno in the Senate censured Jackson in
March 1834. But to the president, the move reeked of impeachment: “The resolution,
then, was in substance an impeachment of the president, and in its passage amounts to
a declaration by a majority of the Senate that he is guilty of an impeachable offense.”
In January 1837, Democrats, in control of the Senate, voted to expunge the original
censure resolution.

ANDREW JOHNSON
THE FIRST IMPREACHMENT
Like President Jackson, Andrew Johnson found himself in conflict with Congress. As
Lincoln’s vice-president, he became president after his predecessor’s assassination.
Republicans expected him to share their vision of the federal government’s role in
Reconstruction. When it turned out otherwise, Congress moved to limit his power,
passing, among other things, the Tenure of Office Act, which prohibited the president
from removing certain federal officials without senatorial approval. Understanding that
he risked impeachment, Johnson challenged the act by dismissing Secretary of
War Edwin Stanton on August 12, 1867, while Congress was out of session.
Six months later, the House voted to impeach Johnson without holding hearings
first or establishing specific charges against him. Eventually, they would draw up 11
charges against him, including that his actions had brought disgrace and ridicule to
the presidency. Just more than a month after the trial in the Senate began.
Johnson’s legal counsel argued that he had fired Stanton to test the constitutionality
of the Tenure of Office Act and that this constituted neither a high crime nor a misde-
meanor. Voting on May 16, 1868, the Senate failed to convict Johnson by one vote of
the two-thirds necessary—35 votes to 19 votes. Two subsequent ballots 10 days later
produced the same results, and the Senate adjourned as a court of impeachment.

RICHARD NIXON
THE SMOKING GUN AND RESIGNATION
Within 24 hours of a break-in at a Democratic National Committee offices in the
Watergate complex in Washington, D.C., on June 17, 1972, the FBI linked the burglars
to the Nixon-White House. Just less than five months later, President Richard Nixon
was reelected by the largest margin of victory in the Electoral College (a record eclipsed
by Ronald Reagan’s reelection 12 years later).

With the knowledge that the White House and reelection committee staff were involved in
the break-in, Nixon concealed the connection from investigators and the public.
Slowly, though, a special prosecutor and committees in both the House and Senate
began to reveal the truth. Nixon continued to deny his personal involvement in press
conferences and speeches, but everything changed when aide Alexander Butterfield
revealed the existence of a secret White House taping system.
Nixon tried to keep the contents of the tapes hidden, but as pressure continued
to mount, he released transcripts of what he claimed were all Watergate-related
meetings, including one that showed he had been discussing paying hush money to
E. Howard Hunt. By May 1974, impeachment hearings were underway in the
House Judiciary Committee, and in late July, the Supreme Court ruled unanimously that Nixon
did not have to turn over the tapes.

Finally, in August, the White House released a tape revealing that Nixon and his
chief of staff, H. R. Haldeman, had agreed to use the CIA to thwart the FBI Watergate
investigation. The “Smoking Gun” had been found.

Republican Senators warned Nixon that he would not survive a trial in the Senate, and
the president resigned on August 9, 1974.

BILL CLINTON
THE SECOND IMPEACHMENT
President Clinton’s declaration on January 26, 1998, that “I did not have sexual
relations with that woman, Miss Lewinsky” turned out to be a lie—and in light of his
later impeachment, one of the most infamous lies ever delivered from the White
House. Special prosecutor Kenneth Starr had been looking into allegations of misdeeds
related to Whitewater real estate investments, the firing of White House travel staff,
and misuse of FBI files, when a confidant of Lewinsky, Linda Tripp, informed him of
the affair. Clinton and Lewinsky had lied about it in a legal proceeding—a sexual
harassment lawsuit brought against the president by Paula Jones. With the approval
of Attorney General Janet Reno, Starr began to investigate.
Like Nixon before him, Clinton attempted to invoke executive privilege. But after
several members of his staff testified before the grand jury, he was finally forced to
admit that his relationship with the intern was “inappropriate” and “wrong” during
a nationally televised speech in August. 1998. The president admitted to misleading
lawyers—and the nation—but not to lying or asking anyone else to lie.

By early October, however, Clinton had agreed to pay Paula Jones $850,000 to drop
her suit and forgo an apology, and an impeachment investigation was underway in the
House Judiciary Committee. With the Starr Report, Clinton’s own testimony in the
Senate case, and records from previous grand jury proceedings as evidence, the House
voted to reject a Democratic proposal to censure the president. And on December 19, 1998,
he became the second president ever impeached on the counts of lying under oath and
obstructing justice.

The Senate trial featured no public testimony, though excerpts from Lewinsky’s closed-
door deposition were played by House prosecutors. On February 12, 1999, Clinton was
acquitted on both counts, with neither earning the necessary two-thirds supermajority.

Our faculty and staff have been commenting on President Trump’s impeachment
proceedings in real time. Here, Miller Center experts gathered at UVA’s Rotunda
in January.

FOR A COMPREHENSIVE COLLECTION OF IMPEACHMENT RESOURCES, VISIT
MILLERCENTER.ORG/IMPEACHMENT
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THE GREATEST GENERATION

Saying goodbye to some of the Miller Center’s most influential benefactors

ROSEMARY GALBRAITH and her husband, John, were honored for their support in 2008, when the Miller Center’s Forum Room was named in their honor. Together they grew and developed their mutual fund business, and also immersed themselves in philanthropic work, including John’s service on the Miller Center’s Governing Council and Foundation Board from 2002 to 2007.

ANDREW S. (L. ELLIOTT) MARSH, JR., was a member of the Miller Center’s Governing Council from 2002 until 2012. He was a founding partner and advisory director of Russell Reynolds, a global recruiting firm.

ELIZABETH SCOTT was a member of the Miller Center’s Governing Council from 1994 to 1996. In 2003, in recognition of her longtime support, the Miller Center dedicated its north terrace garden to her and honored her as the first recipient of the Elizabeth Scott Award for Exemplary Leadership, which is awarded annually. She was also a recipient of the Center’s Burkitt Miller Presidential Award.

ANNIE K. WORRELL was a former newspaper executive and noted community leader with a strong interest in historic preservation. She and her late husband, Gene, established the Genan Foundation in 1986. The Center recognized Worrell’s philanthropic commitment and dedication by naming the building’s atrium in her honor in 2009.

IN MEMORIAM

Sadly, over the past year, we marked the passing of many of the Miller Center’s founding supporters and leaders. “We at the Center, were interested in the founding fathers of the United States because we’re interested in how our government works in the constitutional structure,” said director of Presidential Studies Barbara Perry. “But in this esteemed group, we get to focus on the kinds of issues that mattered to voters watching at home. He did it all with humor and grace. And did it so well that in future years, the Commission on Presidential Debates invited Jim to be the sole questioner. Jim was a constant North Star—not only on the air, but over a friendly informal dinner or at the boardroom table as the Miller Center faculty, staff, and Governing Council worked on important presidential projects. He was an invaluable mentor and friend.”

“In the Commonwealth, we knew Governor Baliles as a public servant, a leader, and co-author Charles Wald.

“Before [the Oscars], winning best picture seemed like an "in the public interest, is allowable." “Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society can achieve and how grassroots action can help move Washington toward a better place if animated by a clear purpose,” wrote Melody Barnes—a Miller Center professor of practice and co-director of ODI’s Democracy Initiative—and Princeton University’s Julian

GERALD BALLES: 65TH GOVERNOR OF VIRGINIA

Former Miller Center director passes at age 79

A look back on his life and career reveals a steadfast dedication to public service. His term as governor featured a particular focus on education—culminating in a historic National Summit on Education at the University of Virginia in 1989. He also established the National War Powers Commission, cochaired by James Baker and Warren Christopher. The group developed a proposed revision of the War Powers Act, which was submitted for consideration by Senators Tom Keating (D-RI) and John McCain (R-AZ). Balles also initiated the David R. Goode National Transportation Policy Conference, which led to a commission report presented to President Obama in the White House Rose Garden.

In 2010, the Miller Center established the Gerald L. Baliles Professorship in Presidential Studies to honor his service and to promote nonpartisan study of the institution of the presidency. “To have an endowed chair is the highest honor a professor can have,” said Barbara Perry, the Miller Center’s director of Presidential Studies, when she became the first to hold the title. “I had two chairs previously, but this is the first I’ve had that is named for someone who not only held me at the Miller Center but whom I considered to be a mentor and friend.”

To Build a Better World

RICE: I think we are in a period in which we’re facing a new systemic crisis. The reason that we wanted to write this book was that we wanted to reassure people that we have seen ourselves and the world come through crises that in retrospect might have ended in conflict, might’ve ended in violence. When you think about the collapse of a country with 30,000 nuclear weapons and four million men under arms, when you can think about the decision to reunify Germany with all of that history and concern on all sides, when you think about the liberation of Eastern Europe, there was no certainty that this was going to turn out to be peaceful. Philip makes the point that there were five great transformations in recent times. All of them were transformed by war, with the exception of this one. It was peaceful.

ZELIKOW: The Marshall Plan [$12 billion American initiative passed in 1948 to aid Western Europe after World War II] wasn’t a military strategy at all. So when we think about the kind of investments that we need to make to help a broken society slowly heal and without withdrawing that prevention tool too quickly, we need to think about investments that are sustainable over the long haul with the American people. But investments that aren’t just confined to thinking about military hammer, because there are going to be other tools needed in the mix. These countries are going to need to become more resistant and stable amid the implosion of the Arab and Muslim world.

SCHOLARS

Zelikow’s new book provides the press and the Great Society.

“WHAT TO WATCH FOR DURING TRUMP’S 2020 STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS,” CNN, FEBRUARY 4

A Former speechwriter for President George H.W. Bush and a Miller Center practitioner senior fellow, Mary Kate Cary reminded CNN viewers that President Trump’s 2020 State of the Union address would potentially be his largest audience between now and election night, other than the Republican National Convention address.

IN THE MEDIA

To Make a Gift to the Miller Center, visit millercenter.org/donate

MILLER CENTER EXPERTS CONSISTENTLY ADD CRITICAL PERSPECTIVE TO CURRENT EVENTS, APPEARING IN THE MEDIA ON AVERAGE ALMOST TWICE A DAY. HERE ARE SOME RECENT EXAMPLES. TO SEE THE LATEST, VISIT MILLCR.ORG/MILLER-NEWS.

MARY KATE CARY

To Build a Better World

“WHERE TRUMP’S ACQUITTAL FITS INTO THE HISTORY OF IMPEACHMENT, ACCORDING TO HISTORIANS,” TIME, FEBRUARY 6

As one of a panel of distinguished scholars, Barbara Perry, the Center’s director of presidential studies, noted the implications of President Trump’s legal arguments during his Senate trial: “The result would seem to be that whatever noncriminal action a president defines as beneficial to his election, and therefore automatically in the public interest, is allowable.”

“GREECE IS AT THE NEXUS OF AMERICA’S NATIONAL INTEREST, FEBRUARY 7

Greece aspires to replace Turkey as a regional diplomatic and economic hub, wrote Practitioner Senior Fellow Eric Edelman and co-author Charles Wald. “The United States must take advantage of this budding relationship, as part of a renewed strategic focus on the region.”

“WHAT DEMOCRATS CAN LEARN FROM LYNDON JOHNSON’S GREAT SOCIETY,” CNN.COM, FEBRUARY 3

*Yonat Johnson’s Great Society offers a compelling case study of what the federal government can achieve and how grassroots activists can help move Washington toward a better place if animated by a clear purpose,” wrote Melody Barnes—a Miller Center professor of practice and co-director of ODI’s Democracy Initiative—and Princeton University’s Julian
Before he became president, Theodore Roosevelt owned two ranches in Dakota Territory, allowing his cattle to roam free. In *Ranch Life and the Hunting Trail*, Roosevelt wrote, “[A]ll the land north of the Black Hills and the Big Horn Mountains and between the Rockies and the Dakota wheat-fields might be spoken of as one gigantic, unbroken pasture, where cowboys and branding-irons take the place of fences.” This White House note is from January 20, 1902.