



8-2023

The Applicability of Lessons from American Society for the European Union: Tolerance, Demographic Change, and Social Structure

Joseph Drew

University of Maryland Global Campus, Joseph.drew@faculty.umgc.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/ccr>



Part of the [Comparative Literature Commons](#), [History Commons](#), [International and Area Studies Commons](#), [Political Science Commons](#), and the [Sociology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Drew, Joseph (2023) "The Applicability of Lessons from American Society for the European Union: Tolerance, Demographic Change, and Social Structure," *Comparative Civilizations Review*. Vol. 89: No. 89, Article 13.

Available at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/ccr/vol89/iss89/13>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Comparative Civilizations Review* by an authorized editor of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

The Applicability of Lessons from American Society for the European Union: Tolerance, Demographic Change, and Social Structure

Joseph Drew

University of Maryland Global Campus
joseph.drew@faculty.umgc.edu

While Americans have long tended to see our society and civilization as exceptional, in fact the civilization is primarily based on European precedent. We see ourselves, in the words of one of our most significant poets, Emma Lazarus, as the new colossus, “Keep, ancient lands, your storied pomp cries she... I lift my lamp beside the golden door.”¹ We claim to be an exception; that means that we are unique, different, what many, alluding to the New Testament as viewed by the Pilgrim founding fathers, have called “a shining city upon a hill.”² And as “a beacon of hope.”

To be exceptional, however, one must be compared to others. In fact, there has been a long tradition of Europeans who have written meaningfully about America, the most significant of whom was Alexis de Tocqueville.

In his two volume masterpiece, entitled *Democracy in America*, the import of which can be grasped by reading the titles of his dozens of chapters, de Tocqueville first analyzed the anomalies which the laws and customs of the Anglo-Americans presented, and the unique aspects of the prevalent “equality of condition” which have shaped American democracy.³

This basis of equality led to the tendency toward almost universal suffrage; it undergirded the nature of American elections, the instability of the administration of the United States, the advantages to society of our democracy, our public spirit, the unlimited power of the majority, the checks on the tyranny of the majority (especially what we call today Madisonian federalism), and the nature of American trials by jury. He listed the factors that had led to the maintenance of the republic, and, of great interest today, the relations among what he called the three races of America.

Then, in his second volume, de Tocqueville moved on to consider the influence of democracy upon the action of intellect, including our tendencies in philosophy, our aptitude for general ideas, the importance of religion, our idea of the indefinite perfectibility of man, and our propensity to be more attuned to practical science than to theoretical science.

De Tocqueville noted that we lean more to equality than to liberty, that we tend to oppose individualism, that we are oriented toward physical wellbeing, and that we respect all types of work as honorable. He wrote about how democracy in America affects our relations with each other.

In sum, his pioneering work explored our American society and civilization better than almost all rivals. It laid the foundation for ideas which were strengthened and inculcated as a result of the civil war which followed his analysis by three decades, and his thought stands today as a great guidebook to the American people and our civilization.

To de Tocqueville, however, the purpose of this massive study of American democracy was to illuminate by contrast conditions in Europe; it was to serve as the backdrop for examining the French Revolution and the social and political changes in France wrought by the revolution. Although death cut short his plans, his incisive work, *The Ancient Regime and the French Revolution*, was intended as the beginning of an analysis of the French Revolution and its consequences for France and Europe.⁴

Many others have followed de Tocqueville. They have come from Europe to explain American civilization to us and often to amplify and advance our ideas. These include writers of nonfiction as well as fiction.

To me, one of the most prescient of these works, from the social perspective, was written by Gunnar Myrdal of Sweden in 1944. This trenchant study was entitled *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and American Democracy*. It examined the hypocrisy, the unresolved tension, between the basic American creed resting on equality, one that de Tocqueville had so clearly outlined, and the existence of deep and persistent racism in the American society of the mid-Twentieth Century.⁵

This, too, presaged what was to come, the American Civil Rights Movement, the greatest post-War social change in modern America. In his Gettysburg Address, Lincoln saw the result of the Civil War as a new birth of freedom; some have seen in the Civil Rights Movement a third new American birth of freedom and democracy.

So, we cannot consider our understanding of the American civilization complete without knowing the great works by European analysts of our people. But here, I would like to propose that there are insights from our colossus, lying to the west of Europe, across the Atlantic Ocean, that would benefit this continent. There are lessons we have learned that would illuminate the way forward for the European Union.

To cite Windelband's construction of Kant's analytical approach, we should ask: is our social analysis simply ideographic – with reference to our situation alone – or may it be employed profitably and in a nomothetic way – generalizable and, in this case, applicable to the young, dynamic, powerhouse that is the European Union?⁶

Three such American practices which are generalizable for European adoption are our encounters with the idea of tolerance, huge demographic change, and continual social and political change.

But first, an objector might question whether the experiences of a single country and society can be valid when we project lessons from the United States onto the entire 27 member contemporary European Union. In the *World Congress for the Comparative Study of Civilizations*, entitled *The New Enlightenment between Traditions and Challenges – Crossroads of Civilizations*, we could begin by defining three central terms: state, nation, and civilization.

A “state” may be described according to contemporary political science as an entity that has people, territory, government and sovereignty. By this definition, strengthened by Westphalia, both the United States and the European Union would constitute states, although the definition of sovereignty is complex regarding both.

Next, does the United States consist of a “nation”? Every school child in America recites, generally on a daily basis, the Pledge of Allegiance, asserting that we are “one nation” and “indivisible” with “liberty and justice for all.”

But you can argue the issue either way – that we are or that we are not one nation. Similarly, we may ask: Is Europe becoming “one nation”? Well, that may depend on how we define a “nation.”

According to the *American Political Dictionary*, a nation is “any sizable group of people united by common bonds of geography, religion, language, race, custom and tradition, and through shared experiences and common aspirations.” Here the nation is related to the more easily understood term “nation state.”

The nation has provided in the modern era the unifying concept with which the individual can identify, the political dictionary states.⁷ In my footnotes below I list several definitions of this most powerful, yet debatable, concept, the analysts of which run, in the modern period, all the way from Abbé Sieyès, Rousseau and von Herder through to Michelet, Lord Acton, and the present-day Putin. So, let's temporarily conclude here that it is debatable what a nation actually is.

Finally, are we both “civilizations” – or members of the same one? As the Editor-in-Chief of the *Comparative Civilizational Review* for 26 years, and as a board member of the International Society for the Comparative Study of Civilizations for many years, too, I can say without fear of contradiction that scholars disagree on what constitutes a civilization.

Famously, a founder of our society stated that civilizations are the largest units or “intelligible fields of historical study;” in my opinion the term is never fully defined in D.C. Somervell’s abridgement of Arnold Toynbee’s magisterial work on the subject, *A Study of History*.⁸

Everyone prepares lists of civilizations, but the definition remains debatable; it’s like the famous statement of the U.S. Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart about the subject of pornography: I shall not today attempt further to define the kinds of material, but I know it when I see it.⁹

In his list of famous students of civilization, the late Samuel P. Huntington includes Max Weber, Emile Durkheim, Oswald Spengler, Pitirim Sorokin, Arnold Toynbee, Alfred Weber, A. L. Kroeber, Philip Bagby, Carroll Quigley, Rushton Coulborn, Christopher Dawson, S. N. Eisenstadt, Fernand Braudel, William H. McNeill, Adda Bozeman, Immanuel Wallerstein, and Felipe Fernandez-Armesto.¹⁰

An excellent introduction is *The Boundaries of Civilizations in Space and Time*, edited by Matthew Melko and Leighton Scott, (Lanham, Md: University Press of America, 1987). In this work several authors define worldview, *weltanschauung*, as essential to the definition of what a constitutes a civilization.¹¹

If we can agree that “civilization” means the “broadest cultural entity,” to employ the words of Huntington again, then to a greater or lesser extent, both the United States and the European Union are members of the Western Civilization.¹² Perhaps this is especially important today, as the fight over Ukraine, just east of us here today in Bucharest, may be motivated, at least in part, by the struggle of the Orthodox Russian or Byzantine Civilization to maintain what it perceives as its borders against the Western Civilization.

The first lesson from American civilization deals with the idea of tolerance. This is the *sine qua non* of a modern representative democracy; it has marked our country’s political climate for many years, broken only by the Civil War period from 1860 to 1865, and then, again, perhaps, recently.

For students of world civilizations, an understanding of how the American democracy has continued to operate with only one internal rupture must rest on our valuation of tolerance.

In my opinion most foreigners think they understand American culture and politics but there is more complexity to it than meets the eye. *The New York Times* and other media report that immigrants and others from outside America often misunderstand our culture and practices of administration and politics.

Tolerance has an American application. We often cite a sentence from the French Enlightenment, misattributed to Voltaire: I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it.¹³ We also frequently say: Let us agree to disagree. Or, you don't have to be disagreeable to disagree. Except for one time, when a great Civil War divided the nation, we have always been able to tolerate wild swings in political leadership of the country.

Politically, the population is almost equally divided between two sides: the liberal or progressive side, led by the Democrats since, at the latest, 1932 and the conservative or right wing side, led by the Republicans, beginning with the McKinley administration, around 1896. Even during the recent 2000, 2004, and 2016 elections, and most notably during the 2020 national Presidential elections, when to some misinformed Americans the Presidency actually was stolen, there has not been a military coup or army intervention.

We don't have the prevailing idea of a "loyal opposition" very much anymore, and tolerance is being stretched to new limits today. It still is present, though. Just a few weeks ago, at a conference in Savannah, Georgia, held in June, some right-winger objected to remarks I made about democracy and the expulsion of two African American members, both Democrats, from the Tennessee state legislature. She then basically forced me to shake her hand and to "agree to disagree."

Tolerance is seen in the U.S. especially in the area of religion; we are a nation of many religions, yet these generally do not engage in physical or any other form of hostility with each other. Eisenhower said a month before his inauguration, "In other words, our form of government has no sense unless it is founded in a deeply felt religious faith, and I don't care what it is."¹⁴ This may be due, among other reasons, to the fact that the original colonies were all led by different faith groups: Congregational in New England; Dutch Reformed in New York; Episcopal in Virginia; Catholics in Maryland; and Quakers in Pennsylvania. Our Constitution mentions no deity at all, and the First Amendment outlaws "an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

This is also the case with our multicultural groups; tolerance increasingly dictates respecting every American's national origins and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex or national origin.

The changing nature of American demographics directly depends on this, as does our judgment of each other. Prejudice may exist in the breast of mankind; discrimination is not allowed.

President Trump's views made matters worse over the last decade, when he attacked Mexicans the day of his announcement of candidacy and then as he ruled by division, even calling some neo-Nazis "good people" and purposely destroying the families of refugees. Of course, his facilitation of a possible coup d'état in January of 2021 ran against the tradition of tolerance most dramatically, but its lack of success, and the presiding role of Vice President Pence at the successful counting of the electoral votes, and subsequently on the platform for the inauguration, mitigated the damage and showed that this tradition prevails.

Further, until Trump we could say that every President since Andrew Johnson in 1869 has attended the inauguration of his successor as power transfers peacefully every four years on January 20 at high noon. Both individuals have stood on the ceremonial stage for the formal transfer of power. This has been so even in the case of open hostility between the two individuals; President Truman, whom I consider one of the greatest Presidents in our history, said of his successor, President Eisenhower, that "the General doesn't know any more about politics than a pig knows about Sunday." Yet, they rode together in the car to the inauguration of Ike, without talking, and they sat together on the ceremony's stage.¹⁵

I would add that tolerance of differences has affected every aspect of our life, especially public education. Educational leaders have to consider the differences of others and respect them. In the United States, there would simply be no way to operate K-12 and higher education institutions or systems without very wide consultation and continual, tolerance-based compromise.

Demography is destiny for the American people. American independence was declared in 1776 by our founding fathers, a group which perhaps represented a minority of Americans. But, after the War of Independence, the British government accepted separation, as contained in the Treaty of Paris, in 1783.

Immigration has been part of our national history from the beginning. The Declaration of Independence accused the British of endeavoring "to prevent the population of these states, for that purpose obstructing the laws for naturalization of foreigners (and) refusing to pass other (laws) to encourage their migrations hither...."

Then, as noted by the official “*Brief History of United States Immigration Policy*”: The mass migration of the 19th century was the result of a near perfect match between the needs of a new country and Europe. Europe at this time was undergoing drastic social change and economic reorganization, compounded by overpopulation. America needed immigrants for settlement, defense and economic well-being. During the period 1820 -1880, Germany, Great Britain and Ireland accounted for the largest numbers.¹⁶

The official history also notes:

In the last two decades of the 19th century, the volume of immigration continued to increase, and the main sources shifted from Northern and Western to Southern and Eastern Europe. . . . While the United States remained willing and able to absorb the mass migration during the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries, the country’s needs had changed.

The frontier had closed, and the “new” immigrants, as they were characterized by the Dillingham Commission, fueled the industrialization and urbanization of America. However, there was growing ambivalence toward the urban immigrants by a predominantly rural country.

Racist bigotry on the West Coast drove the passage of the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, which remained in effect until its repeal in 1943. During World War I, legislation enacted new barriers to immigration. Thus, over the veto of President Woodrow Wilson, a Democrat, Congress in 1917 established the Asiatic Barred Zone.

Perhaps the lowest point was reached soon after the Republican Party won the election of 1920. It captured the presidency and both houses of Congress. The new Congress quickly declared, based on specious reasoning, an “immigration emergency.” This followed a decade of increasing xenophobia, mostly based on hostility to newly arriving Southern and Eastern Europeans.

The most famous book on the subject printed during this era was the 1916 volume entitled *The Passing of the Great Race: Or The Racial Basis of European History*. It was written by a proponent of the idea of eugenics, Madison Grant. Testimony before Congress claimed that the new immigrants, the Jews, the Slavs and the Italians, particularly, were incapable of being assimilated or contributing to the advancement of the country.

Congress enacted the Immigration Act of 1924, establishing quotas for immigration designed to preserve the national origins of the American people as they were in 1920. Those from the “barred zone” were inadmissible as immigrants and Africans were excluded (since African Americans were not counted in the quotas).

Hitler used this detestable National Origins Quota law as an excuse to commence the genocide of Jews in Europe and the mass murder of people deemed unfit, as Prof. Stefan Kühl has written in his work, *The Nazi Connection: Eugenics, American Racism, and German National Socialism*.¹⁷

The *Brief History* quotes one of the prominent eugenicists:

We in this country have been so imbued with the idea of democracy, or the equality of all men, that we have left out of consideration the matter of blood or natural born hereditary mental and moral differences. No man who breeds pedigreed plants and animals can afford to neglect this thing. ...

The National Origins provisions of the immigration control law of 1924 marked the actual turning point from immigration control based on the asylum idea ... definitely in favor of the biological basis.¹⁸

After the Second World War, the United States passed the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 into law. This provided for more than 400,000 displaced persons through 1951. President Harry Truman, a Democrat whose veto of a restrictionist law was overridden by Congress, noted, among other points, that “In no other realm of our national life are we so hampered and stultified by the dead hand of the past, as we are in this field of immigration.”¹⁹

In 1965, the Democrats held the Congress and the Presidency. Recalling the book by the late President John F. Kennedy entitled *A Nation of Immigrants*, President Johnson oversaw the enactment of a new immigration law. This finally abolished the disgraced National Origins Quota system and replaced it with a system based on two elements: reunification of families and needed skills.

As the *Brief History* notes:

The circumstances which led to this major shift in policy in 1965 were a complex combination of changing public perceptions and values, politics, and legislative compromise. Public support for the repeal of the national origins quota system reflected changes in public attitudes toward race and national origins. It can be argued that the 1965 immigration legislation was as much a product of the mid-1960s and the heavily Democratic 89th Congress which also produced major civil rights legislation, as the 1952 Act had been a product of the Cold War period of the early 1950s.²⁰

Now, as a result of this act, the demography of the United States – untethered as it was from the racist and ethnocentric rules and constraints of the past – began a swift change.

Today, we see a new American people emerging.

According to the American Constitution, a population count, a census, must be held every ten years. The purpose of this decennial census is to discover what population changes have occurred and, thus, what changes must be made in the size of state delegations to the U.S. House of Representatives.

Here are some data drawn from the census and contained in the reports attached to these remarks:

- In the Year 2000 census, self-reported white people constituted 75.1% of the entire population. African Americans were at 12.3% and Asians were at 3.6%. Two or more races were at 2.4%, and other races, 5.5%. Native Americans, Hawaiians / Other Pacific Islanders were .1% and American Indians and Alaska Natives made up .9%.
- From the results of the Year 2010 census, the main news was that Asians had risen by 43.3% in ten years and Hispanics by 43%. That meant that as of 2010 Asians now constituted 4.8% and Hispanics (or Latinos), 16.3%. Hispanics had by this point clearly become the largest minority ethnicity. Moreover, whites declined to 72.4%.
- Results from the recently completed Year 2020 census show that self-declared whites as of now have declined dramatically as a percent of the overall population. Non-Latino whites are presently only 57.8% of the American population.

At the same time, the multiracial population has jumped by 276% in ten years, and “Some Other Race” or “in combination” increased 129%, thus surpassing African Americans as the second largest minority.

Today, fully one in ten Americans identify as multiracial, according to the *Washington Post*.²¹ The largest minority ethnic group as of 2020 is Hispanics/Latinos, 18.7%. The most diverse jurisdictions now are, in decreasing order: Hawaii, California, Nevada, Maryland, D.C., Texas, New Jersey, New York, and Georgia.²²

- More startling yet are the projections for 2060, as produced by the Census Bureau back in 2015. By 2060, it reports, the share of the Non-Hispanic white alone population “is projected to be just 43.6%, as its population falls from 198 million in 2014 to 182 million in 2060.”²³

Hispanics will have grown by 114.8% and will constitute 28.6% of the overall population. African Americans will grow slightly, to 17.9%, and Asians, showing a whopping 143.1% growth, will make up fully 11.7% of the population. People reporting to be of two or more races will jump to 6.2% overall, a leap of 225.5% since 2014, the fastest growing category over the next half century.

The Census Bureau says now that we will arrive at a point at which the non-Hispanic white population will comprise less than 50 percent of the nation's total population in the year 2044. Then, the country becomes a "majority minority" nation. After that point, no group will have a majority share of the total population and the United States will become a land with a plurality of racial and ethnic groups.

We see the results everywhere in the U.S. For example, in contemporary local school districts in America's urban areas, it is found often that dozens of languages are being spoken by youngsters in elementary schools. These are the voters of tomorrow.

In response to this massive demographic change, it could have been predicted that someone like Trump would arise. A number of individuals began to protest violently against these trends, especially during the period of the Obama presidency, all screaming "I want my country back!" Fox News, a popular news channel, actually has campaigned relentlessly and xenophobically against a supposed plan by American elites to replace white people with immigrants from underdeveloped countries. This is the so-called White Replacement Theory.

Nonetheless, American demography is changing inevitably. It is soon no longer going to be a "white man's country." Regardless of the protests, and the tricks and stratagems of some, the data projected in the 2060 chart are likely to be borne out in political and social orientations – perhaps even earlier than was forecast in 2015.

Parallel developments are occurring in Europe, of course. By applying America's experience to this region of the Western civilization, we can predict that, after rough patches, Europe will be emerging as a multicultural, more complex and variegated society ethnically. I urge Europeans to look at the American precedent and draw implications from it, accordingly, helping the EU to become a welcoming land of immigrants and moving away from the contemporary Hungarian model.

The third manifestation of these American challenges, and lessons, may be seen in a suite of social and political realities we have experienced. Among these are a dramatically evolving social structure, the persistence of federalism, and the role of checks and balances.

From de Toqueville on, we have realized that America, unlike Europe, has had no aristocracy *ab initio*.

Some regions perhaps had groups claiming such roles, for example, the Bourbon class of Virginia or the Southern white plantation owners, but these classes were mostly eliminated by the Civil War. In the North and the Midwest, a century ago, there were bourgeois, relatively wealthy and multi-generational upper social classes there, remnants of which remain.

We base our studies of American social structure on the six social class model presented in the mid-twentieth century by social anthropologist, W. Lloyd Warner. He laid out his analytical approach to class structure in his central work, *Social Class in America: The Evaluation of Status*.²⁴ There were the upper upper; the lower upper; the upper middle; the lower middle; the upper lower and the lower lower social classes.

These were present even though Americans routinely, traditionally, and insistently have almost always denied the presence of any inequality or social classes in the land.

Digby Baltzell, in his book *The Protestant Establishment: Aristocracy and Caste in America*,²⁵ explored the great leadership exhibited by America's upper upper class in the past but showed how racism and antisemitism led to its functional demise by the mid-1900s, since merit was not rewarded socially. Another book of his, *Philadelphia Gentlemen: The Making of a National Upper Class* laid out much of the groundwork for a study of this class, both locally and nationally.²⁶

Today, we probably have a weakening five social class structure, made all the more universal by the continuing and powerful presence of a national media and the emerging social media. This has diminished many local deviations from the national social norms. The social integration of newcomers and of those who were previously prevented from entering the mainstream, African Americans, Asians, Native Americans and others, has reinforced the system, allowing for upward social mobility over the years. The better educated nationwide have tended to support Democrats while the lesser educated have tended to support Republicans.

Finally, as to fundamental governmental structures, I would point Europeans to two persistent and lasting American practices, both inherited from Europe and often seen in Europe but fundamental to the American culture.

The American political system since the 18th century has been built upon a version of the doctrine of federalism. Separate powers are allocated to the national government, the state government, and local governments, with room for argument as to the extent of powers of each level. The principle of federalism was expressed forcefully in *The Federalist Papers*, a series of essays by James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, and John Jay; these arguments convinced state legislatures to approve the Constitution.

Since then, our public discourse has been occupied by a great deal of argument over the allocation of proper powers awarded to each level. Elementary and secondary education, for example, remains a state and local function, not a federal function.

However, the role of the national government has increased gradually, starting with the passage of laws relating to allocation of new land for public purposes in the Continental Congress under the Articles of Confederation, our first Constitution. These laws required, for example, that public land must be used for education, among other functions. Also, we passed the State University and Land Grant legislation under Abraham Lincoln, again an educational thrust exerted by the federal government.

The powers of the federal government in national domestic programs were greatly expanded during the Roosevelt administration, from 1932 to 1945, and subsequently by most administrations. This has led to decreased differences between states in many ways, especially in terms of standards of living.

Nonetheless, today many right wing states and localities continue to put the tenets of federalism to the test. They often incorporate strong statutes at variance with national norms, facilitating, for example, anti-immigrant laws, or anti-abortion laws, or voter suppression laws, or anti-LGBTQ powers, denying many the right to vote, and fighting for the repression of a wide range of views in school textbooks. Nonetheless, the federal government has been working for the opposite.

A final significant feature of American political life is the fact that we, following Montesquieu, have built in political checks and balances to our system, leading to a spirit of forcing compromise, within each branch of our federal government. The Congress is divided into two houses, each of which must agree on legislation before it can be forwarded to the President. The Executive struggles with its powers against the Legislative Branch, that is, the Congress, and the Judicial Branch, that is the Supreme Court. And the Supreme Court is a politically charged body which checks the powers of both other branches via a finding that a law or act is or is not Constitutional.

As a result, through most periods of our history, this has meant that both stability and change can occur in a peaceful way, with the major exception being during the Civil War period. Then, there was so much conflict within each branch, between the branches of the national government, and among the various state and local levels, that violence could not be contained. Some speculate that such a situation might be returning now.

In spite of these controversies, checks and balances, meaning forced compromise, combined with federalism, and tolerance, have been the basic mechanisms by which America has been able to operate successfully as we move through major demographic changes.

In some countries the national government can decide to act, say to build a new road, on its own; in the U.S., the planning must involve many more partners, actors and interests. We are less efficient but more democratic than many other countries, as a result.

Nonetheless, from the New Deal on, change can occur in America, and these social and political changes reflect the ability of the population to adjust to new situations.

In this paper I have tried to argue that as Europeans have studied the American system, we Americans can study and then contribute to European ways. We have drawn much of our intellectual grounding from the great scholars of Europe but have developed a somewhat different society.

Three results that show it have been (1) the incorporation of tolerance in American social interaction, (2) cultural responses to demographic changes based on the continual revision of our laws, and (3) the maintenance of social and political changes such as the evolution and restructuring of our social class system amidst the continuing adaptation of federalism, and the enforcement of checks and balances in government.

Notes

¹ For one of our greatest poems, see <https://genius.com/Emma-lazarus-the-new-colossus-annotated>. Or, just go to the Statue of Liberty, where it is emblazoned.

² <https://ourlostfounding.com/ronald-reagan-and-the-shining-city-upon-a-hill/>

³ There are many printings of this wonderful work. See, for example, *Democracy in America*, by Alexis de Tocqueville, *The Henry Reeve Text As Revised by Francis Bowen*. New York: Vintage Books, A Division of Random House, 1945. Note, especially, the extensive historical essay which runs from Page 389 to Page 487 of the second volume. For a list of other works by foreign observers similar to de Tocqueville, see, footnote 6.

⁴ *The Old Regime and the French Revolution*, Alexis de Tocqueville: *New Translation by Stuart Gilbert*. Garden City: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1955.

⁵ Gunnar Myrdal, *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and American Democracy*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1944.

⁶ See: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/heinrich-rickert/>

⁷ Jack C. Plano and Milton Greenberg, *The American Political Dictionary*, Ninth Ed. Ft. Worth, Texas: Holt, Rinehart and Wilson, 1993. See Page 19. See also, *Dictionary of American Politics*, by Edward C. Smith and Arnold J. Zurcher. New York: Barnes and Noble Books, 1968. Page 252. Nationality: “A numerous group of people with similar racial background and common language, history, traditions, and customs, who may aspire to, or achieve, statehood; called also nation.” This book defines nation as “1. A numerous nationality, q.v., which occupies a definite territory and possesses some form of political organization, usually as a state.” Three other definitions follow.

None of these are adequate, to me, at least. For a better analysis of this term, see Volume III of the *Dictionary of the History of Ideas: Studies of Selected Pivotal Ideas, Vol. III*, Philip P. Wiener, Editor-in-Chief. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, Publishers, 1973. Especially relevant are "Medieval and Renaissance Ideas of Nation" and "Nationalism" from pages 318 to 339. Nationalism can be regarded as the first universal motivating force, one which acts to organize all peoples into nation-states, the authors state.

⁸ *A Study of History* by Arnold J. Toynbee, abridgement of Volumes I – VI by D.C. Somervell. New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.

⁹ An excellent introduction is *The Boundaries of Civilizations in Space and Time*, Ed. by Matthew Melko and Leighton Scott, Lanham, Md: University Press of America, 1987. In this work several authors define worldview, *weltanschauung*, as essential to the definition of what constitutes a civilization.

¹⁰ See, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, by Samuel P. Huntington. New York: Touchtone Books, 1997. Page 40 and also, see Chapter 2, Footnote 1. Page 324-5, for a more extensive list.

¹¹ Huntington praises, on Page 325, *The Nature of Civilizations* by Matthew Melko, (Boston: Porter Sargent, 1969). The late Prof. Melko was president of the International Society for the Comparative Study of Civilizations.

¹² Huntington, Page 43.

¹³ <https://quoteinvestigator.com/2015/06/01/defend-say/>

¹⁴ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/And_I_don%27t_care_what_it_is

¹⁵ <https://www.nps.gov/eise/blogs/ike-and-trumans-strained-and-tumultuous-relationship-on-inauguration-day-1953.htm>

¹⁶ *Brief History of United States Immigration Policy (Prepared by Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; #91-141 EPW, January 25, 1991)*. This document runs from Pages 548 to 562 and is included in a committee print entitled "Immigration and National Act (Reflecting Laws Enacted As of April 1, 1992)." It is the 9th Edition, dated April 1992, and prepared for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives. It is also marked 102nd Congress, 2d session, Serial No. 6.

¹⁷ Stefan Kühl, *The Nazi Connection: Eugenics, American Racism, and German National Socialism*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).

¹⁸ *Brief History*, page 556. The quote is taken from Abba Schwartz, *The Open Society*. (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1968), pages 105-6.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, page 557.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, Page 559.

²¹ "Multiracial Americans are Driving Change," *Washington Post*, front page story, Saturday, October 9, 2021.

²² See: <https://www.census.gov/library/visualizations/interactive/racial-and-ethnic-diversity-in-the-united-states-2010-and-2020-census.html>

²³ <https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2015/demo/p25-1143.pdf>

²⁴ *Social Class in America: The Evaluation of Status*, by W. Lloyd Warner, Marchia Meeker, and Kenneth Eells. (Chicago: Harper Torchbooks / The Academy Library, 1960), first published in 1949 by Science Research Associates, Inc.

²⁵ *The Protestant Establishment: Aristocracy & Caste in America*, by E. Digby Baltzell (New York: Random House, 1964).

²⁶ *Philadelphia Gentlemen: The Making of a National Upper Class*, by E. Digby Baltzell (New York: The Free Press, 1958).