Paragraphs for Are You Saying . . . ?

From a Fox News panel on the causes of Islamic radicalism

WILLIAM COHEN, FORMER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE: What we have to do is to go after the hard core, to root out the hard core terrorists who are inflicting these terrible, terrible crimes against humanity . . . [and] then look to how can we help elevate the people in various parts of the world so that the jihadists aren’t able to really manipulate and exploit them. So I think we have to have a two-pronged attack. Go after the terrorists and root them out as best we can and then try to raise the level of civil support and social support for those groups so they aren’t vulnerable to the jihadist (Fox News Channel, 2008b).

From a Fox News panel on the causes of Islamic radicalism

WILLIAM COHEN, FORMER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE: British Prime Minister Tony Blair, for example, indicated that this is not a clash of civilizations. It’s a clash within a civilization. Namely you’ve got elements in the Muslim community that are waging war against those Muslims who want to stay in the 21st century and embrace modernity. And it’s going to take not just the United States. . . . Other countries have to come to the bar now and . . . we’ve got to approach this on a global basis because the terrorism is not regional, it’s global (Fox News Channel, 2008b).

From Chrysler’s report to the federal government, requesting bailout funds following the economic crash of 2008

Chrysler anticipates that the Federal loan will function as an additional adequate assurance to our suppliers, customers and employees that the Company will make it through this extraordinary time in our nation’s economy, assuming, among other things, that Chrysler Financial has financing capacity at the wholesale and retail level sufficient to support Chrysler’s production volumes. At Chrysler, 75 percent of our dealers rely on Chrysler Financial to finance their business, and 50 percent of all customers finance their vehicle purchases through Chrysler Financial. With credit markets frozen, our customers—average working Americans—do not have access to competitive financing to purchase or lease vehicles . . . our dealers do not have access to market competitive funding to place wholesale orders for new vehicles . . . resulting in the constriction of cash inflows to Chrysler. Chrysler Financial is in need of immediate liquidity support (Nardelli, 2008, p. 5).

From Chrysler’s report to the federal government, requesting bailout funds following the economic crash of 2008

Mr. Nardelli [CEO of Chrysler] receives an annual salary of $1 from Chrysler. In addition, Mr. Nardelli receives no health care, insurance or similar benefits from the Company. On average, Chrysler’s executive salaries are in the 2nd quartile when compared to similarly situated companies, which in general, is below competitive market levels. Furthermore, the Company did not pay salaried merit increases or performance bonuses in 2008, and has not planned salaried merit increases or performance bonuses for 2009. Management has no options or restricted stock units. Top management will continue to share in the sacrifices of the salaried workforce and bear 100% of their healthcare premium costs (Nardelli, 2008, p. 6).
From Chrysler’s report to the federal government, requesting bailout funds following the economic crash of 2008

Providing Cars and Trucks People Want to Buy: Chrysler has made substantial progress in its product line to improve fuel efficiency, quality, technology and consumer appeal. . . . Chrysler's viability plan includes 24 major product launches through 2012, including a wide portfolio of hybrid electric-drive vehicles within several categories: Neighborhood Electric Vehicles (NEV), City Electric Vehicles (CEV), Range-extended Electric Vehicles (ReEV), and full-function battery electric vehicles (BEV) (Nardelli, 2008, p. 6).

From an episode of *Larry King Live* on the subject of the economic crash in 2008

JEAN CHATZKY, MONEY EXPERT, AUTHOR, *PAY IT DOWN*: Even if you don’t feel as if your job is potentially at risk, it is. And that means you have to take a good, hard look at your finances at home. And if you don’t have a six month emergency cushion or even a nine or 12-month emergency cushion, now—before you lose that job—is the time to stop spending and start putting away as much money as you can, because not only are we losing more jobs, it's taking more time to get the next one. So people really have to learn how to pull back, scale it in like our grandparents did, so that we can weather this storm (Hirzel, 2008).

From an episode of *Larry King Live* on the subject of the economic crash in 2008

DAVID THEALL, PRODUCER, *LARRY KING LIVE*: [Reading comments from viewers] Eric thinks it is the unemployed . . . who should be helped first. He said they suffer the most, so they should be the first priority. Matthew, on the other hand, thinks homeowners need the help first because—his logic—people need a place to live before they need an overpriced American car. Now, the majority of the comments support the auto industry. Amber says—she asked this question: “Doesn’t anyone realize what will happen if the big three go under?” And Hillary also thinks that the auto industry should be helped first with government funds. She says: “Only for the employees’ sake, let’s keep what little we have left in America” (Hirzel, 2008).

From an episode of *Larry King Live* on the subject of the economic crash in 2008

LARRY KING, HOST: Jean, with a lame duck president, are we kind of in a vacuum at the worst possible time?

JEAN CHATZKY, MONEY EXPERT, AUTHOR, *PAY IT DOWN*: Washington may be in a vacuum, but I don’t think that means that individuals sitting at home need to be in that vacuum. There are very many things, as Ali [Velshi, CNN Correspondent] has been pointing out, that are really within our control. If you still have a job, then you save. If you still have a 401(k) that is matching your contributions . . . get in there and grab every last one of those matching dollars, before they start taking them away (Hirzel, 2008).

From an episode of *Larry King Live* on the subject of the economic crash in 2008

BEN STEIN, ECONOMIST, AUTHOR: It’s . . . unthinkable—in the midst of a jobs deterioration, such as we’re having now, to kick another two or three million people out of work right away—you can be an ideological purist about the auto industry and their failings. You can be as ideologically pure as you want when we get back to full employment. But right now, we cannot lose any more jobs. We’ve got to keep the auto industry going. . . . I completely agree the auto companies have made big mistakes. I completely agree they’ve got to streamline themselves. You do not yell at a patient who’s had a heart attack on his way to the coronary care unit. You get him fixed, then deal with his moral problems later (Hirzel, 2008).
From an episode of *Larry King Live* on the subject of the economic crash in 2008

ROBERT LUTZ, VICE CHAIRMAN OF DEVELOPMENT, GENERAL MOTORS: We are on the brink. And what everybody has to understand is that this is not a question of everybody in Detroit suddenly becoming stupid. We have excellent executives in Detroit. Alan Mulally is the gentleman who saved . . . the Boeing commercial airline business. Bob Nardelli has a terrific background as CEO of Home Depot. Before that, he was a senior executive at General Electric. . . . This industry in Detroit does basically a terrific job. We matched the Japanese on productivity. We match them on quality. We have highly fuel efficient vehicles. General Motors has more vehicles that get over 30 miles per gallon on the highway than any other car. We have the most efficient trucks and so forth (Hirzel, 2008).

From Larry King's interview with Paula Deen

LARRY KING, HOST: Paula Deen. By the way, Michelle Obama was a guest on your show, “Paula's Party,” back in September. . . . What was that like? Did you feed her?

PAULA DEEN, CHEF: Honey, she can eat. I was so thrilled. I fried her shrimp, Larry. And she ate even all through the commercial break. And you know I said, I like this girl. I believe she's real (Hirzel, 2008).

From Larry King's interview with Paula Deen

LARRY KING, HOST: What makes southern cooking different?

PAULA DEEN, CHEF: Well, we—we’re not afraid to season our pots. We love the use of ham hock. We love the use of butter and bacon. And my grandmother, Larry, cooked that way until she was 91 years old and then it finally got her but you know at 91, I’ll take that, honey. I will take 91 (Hirzel, 2008).

From CNN news anchor Fareed Zakaria's remarks on U.S. involvement in the Middle East

FAREED ZAKARIA, NEWS ANCHOR: By every account, the situation there and in Pakistan’s tribal areas is deteriorating fast. The Taliban are getting stronger, taking more territory, becoming more powerful politically. Obama's solution to the problem—which is also John McCain's solution, and has also been proposed by Secretary of Defense Robert Gates—is to send in more troops—20,000, 30,000. But will that work? The Soviet Union, after all, sent in 150,000 troops into the country, and it couldn’t end the rebellions against it. More likely, we will have to try to make deals with local warlords, some of whom will be Taliban figures—if they will agree to turn on al Qaeda and make peace with us. But that means slowing down on the nation-building and modernization of the Afghan state, which tends to take power away from traditional tribal leaders (CNN, 2008).

From Fareed Zakaria's interview with Al Gore on the future of the American auto industry, following the economic crash in 2008

AL GORE, FORMER U.S. VICE PRESIDENT, NOBEL PEACE PRIZE WINNER: Well, I think the whole industry should be transformed. It’s really tragic that General Motors, for example, allowed Toyota to get a seven-year head start on the hybrid drive train in the Prius that is now positioned to really be a dominant feature of the industry in this century. I personally believe that the U.S. auto fleet should make a transition as quickly as possible toward plug-in hybrid electric vehicles. I think that the twin problems of the climate crisis and the economic crisis can both be addressed by investing in a transformation of our energy and transportation infrastructure to focus on renewable sources of energy. And at the same time, our security vulnerability to a potential cutoff of the world’s access to Persian Gulf, Middle East oil should be addressed, at long last, without delay. And shifting to electric vehicles instead of petroleum vehicles is the best way to do that.

FAREED ZAKARIA, NEWS ANCHOR: If you look at the situation right now with oil prices down to $50 a barrel—the lowest in two or three years—are we back to a familiar cycle where once the price of oil gets back down, the impetus for these alternate energies will dissipate (CNN, 2008)?
From Fareed Zakaria’s interview with Al Gore on the future of the American auto industry, following the economic crash in 2008

AL GORE, FORMER U.S. VICE PRESIDENT, NOBEL PEACE PRIZE WINNER: China and India, and other developing countries, all have exactly the same excuse for not moving on the climate crisis. Their common excuse is, “Wait a minute. The United States hasn’t done anything. It’s the wealthiest country in the world, the natural leader of the world. Why doesn’t the U.S. act?” And I think that when the U.S. acts, it will be by far the most effective way to improve the odds that China and India, and other smaller developing economies, will also act. They know that it’s in their own interest to tackle this problem (CNN, 2008).

From Fareed Zakaria’s interview with Tom Friedman on the future of the American auto industry, following the economic crash in 2008

TOM FRIEDMAN, FOREIGN AFFAIRS COLUMNIST, NEW YORK TIMES: [U.S. car companies] didn’t come to Washington and say, “We have a plan. We have a plan to make General Motors, Chrysler and Ford the best auto companies in the world. We’re going to make the cleanest, greenest, most competitive, high design cars. We’re going to make the Apple iPod of cars. This is so exciting.” No, they came and said, “Give me some money, or I’ll die on your doorstep, and bring down three million more Americans with me” (CNN, 2008).

From Fareed Zakaria’s interview with Tom Friedman on the future of the American auto industry, following the economic crash in 2008

TOM FRIEDMAN, FOREIGN AFFAIRS COLUMNIST, NEW YORK TIMES: The fatal thing is for us to think, “Wow. This $700 billion sounds like a big number. We should be able to help everybody in trouble.” But everybody’s in trouble, because the banking system has broken down. Until we fix the banking system, we’re going to be running around treating the symptoms (CNN, 2008).

From Fareed Zakaria’s interview with Tom Friedman on the future of the American auto industry, following the economic crash in 2008

TOM FRIEDMAN, FOREIGN AFFAIRS COLUMNIST, NEW YORK TIMES: The first [key aspect of the financial crisis] is the degree of leverage that’s out there. Second is the globalization of it. The third is the complexity of it—the fact that . . . people didn’t understand how [the financial markets] worked on the upside, let alone the downside. And it started in America. When one of these crises starts in Thailand, when it starts in Mexico, we can insulate ourselves from it. When it starts in America, no one can insulate themselves (CNN, 2008).

From the General Motors report to the federal government, requesting bailout funds following the economic crash in 2008

GM is woven into the very fabric of America. It has been the backbone of U.S. manufacturing, is a significant investor in research and development, and has a long history of philanthropic support of communities across the country. The auto industry today remains a driving engine of the U.S. economy, employing 1 in 10 American workers, and is one of the largest purchasers of U.S. steel, aluminum, iron, copper, plastics, rubber, and electronic and computer chips. Indeed, GM’s “Keep America Rolling” sales campaign, following the September 11 attacks, is credited by many as having prevented an extended recession in 2001 (General Motors Corporation, 2008, p. 7).

From the General Motors report to the federal government, requesting bailout funds following the economic crash in 2008

Therefore, GM must reluctantly, but necessarily, turn to the U.S. Government for assistance. Absent such assistance, the company will default in the near term, very likely precipitating a total collapse of the domestic industry and its extensive supply chain, with a ripple effect that will have severe, long-term consequences to the U.S. economy (General Motors Corporation, 2008, p. 8).
From the General Motors report to the federal government, requesting bailout funds following the economic crash in 2008

The company also sees significant potential to engage in broader industry collaboration on a number of important fronts. For example, we see benefits accruing to the economy and the environment with U.S. automakers and suppliers teaming with the U.S. Government to create shared production joint ventures for first- and second-generation technology commercialization. The U.S. Government could also play a key role in providing the needed “venture capital” and become a major customer for these early generation vehicles, paving the way for the commercially high sales volumes necessary for new technology to deliver cost-effective, societal benefits. The U.S. taxpayers would also benefit from the “spin-off” value of the United States-based technology production ventures that would result. Strategic partnerships among Government, industry and academia to develop appropriate green mobility products in response to shifting energy resources, consumer demand for greener transportation, promising advanced technology and new community design will be key to meeting the Nation’s energy and environmental objectives (General Motors Corporation, 2008, p. 27).

From a speech by Barack Obama announcing his economic recovery plan

We won’t do it [economic recovery] the old Washington way. We won’t just throw money at the problem. We’ll measure progress by the reforms we make and the results we achieve—by the jobs we create, by the energy we save, by whether America is more competitive in the world. . . . We need to act with the urgency this moment demands to save or create at least two and a half million jobs so that the nearly two million Americans who’ve lost them know that they have a future (Obama, 2008b).

From a speech by Barack Obama announcing his economic recovery plan

Third, my economic recovery plan will launch the most sweeping effort to modernize and upgrade school buildings that this country has ever seen. We will repair broken schools, make them energy-efficient, and put new computers in our classrooms. Because to help our children compete in a 21st century economy, we need to send them to 21st century schools (Obama, 2008b).

From a speech by Barack Obama announcing his economic recovery plan

As we renew our schools and highways, we’ll also renew our information superhighway. It is unacceptable that the United States ranks 15th in the world in broadband adoption. Here, in the country that invented the internet, every child should have the chance to get online (Obama, 2008b).

From Barack Obama’s speech to the National Governors Association

As President, I will not simply ask our nation’s governors to help implement our economic recovery plan. I will ask you to help design that plan. Because if we’re listening to our governors, we’ll not only be doing what’s right for our states, we’ll be doing what’s right for our country. That’s how we’ll grow our economy—from the bottom up. And that’s how we’ll put America on the path to long-term prosperity (Obama, 2008a).

From Barack Obama’s speech to the National Governors Association

I won’t stand here and tell you that you’ll like all the decisions I make. You probably won’t. But I promise you this—as President, I will seek your counsel. I will listen to you, especially when we disagree. And we will once again be true partners in the work of rebuilding our economy, strengthening our states, and lifting up our entire country (Obama, 2008a).
From Barack Obama’s speech to the National Governors Association

To solve this crisis and to ease the burden on our states, we need action—and action now. That means passing an economic recovery plan for both Wall Street and Main Street that jumpstarts our economy, helps save or create two and a half million jobs, puts tax cuts into the pockets of hard-pressed middle class families, and makes a down payment on the investments we need to build a strong economy for years to come (Obama, 2008a).

From a Fox News panel discussing terrorist attacks in India

YOUSAF RAZA GILLANI, PAKISTANI PRIME MINISTER: Pakistan has nothing to do with this incident. Pakistan has no link with this act. We condemn it, and we condemned it. The whole nation condemns it. We are already the victim of terrorism and extremism (Fox News Channel, 2008a).

From a Fox News panel discussing terrorist attacks in India

CHARLES KRAUTHAMMER, SYNDICATED COLUMNIST: [This is] an American issue as well, because part of our objective in the region is to get India and Pakistan to stop facing off against each other as they have for 60 years. They have had three wars, a lot of terror activity coming out of Pakistan over the Kashmir issue—and to try to get India and Pakistan, who are each our allies, to face the real issue, which is Islamic radicalism, especially in Afghanistan and in the wilder territories of Pakistan (Fox News Channel, 2008a).

From a Fox News panel discussing terrorist attacks in India

CHARLES KRAUTHAMMER, SYNDICATED COLUMNIST: There obviously are Pakistanis involved here. I'm sure something as sophisticated as this attack is not home grown in India. Only the terrorists trained in Pakistan and elsewhere would have the wherewithal to pull it off. However, by sending their official head of ISI [Pakistan's intelligence service], and by the statement that we saw of the elected officials of Pakistan, it's a way of saying that it perhaps is a wrong element, but it's not [their] government (Fox News Channel, 2008a).

From a Fox News panel discussing terrorist attacks in India

JEFF BIRNBAUM, MANAGING EDITOR DIGITAL, THE WASHINGTON TIMES: I think there is actually the chance here that once the smoke clears initially, that India and Pakistan will work together along with the West to understand that the enemy here is al Qaeda or its elaborated cells around the world. That's clearly where this came from. Even if we learn that the actual terrorists were based in Pakistan, which is perfectly possible here, it's clear that they were inspired not by the Pakistan government or the Pakistanis so much as a worldwide system of terror that is come next through the Internet and directed against western countries (Fox News Channel, 2008a).

From a Fox News panel discussing terrorist attacks in India

FRED BARNES, EXECUTIVE EDITOR, THE WEEKLY STANDARD: In the short run—and I don't know what the short run is, but probably several years—Indian and Pakistani relations will get worse. You notice the Indian prime minister wasn't accusing the Pakistani government [of supporting terrorists], but he was saying you have these safe havens. And you haven't wiped them out. That's where these people probably came from, and maybe they did. Look, it is bound to get worse. . . . Worsening relations between India and Pakistan means that the terrorists achieve one of their aims. Another one was to stir more hatred between Muslims in India, 140 million of them . . . and Hindus in India. What will probably happen next year as a result will be there will be a Hindu nationalist government elected there that will be less likely to have good relations with Pakistan (Fox News Channel, 2008a).
From a Fox News panel discussing terrorist attacks in India

FRED BARNES, EXECUTIVE EDITOR, THE WEEKLY STANDARD: As far as the U.S. is concerned, our aim has been to ease relations between the two countries [India and Pakistan] so the new Pakistani government can focus on these safe havens in northern Pakistan and rout the terrorists from out of there. And they were beginning to do a little of that, but I don’t think we’re going to see much more of that now. . . . I think this means that Obama will have to devote more money not just to Afghanistan, as we know, but also towards Pakistan to rout out these terrorists (Fox News Channel, 2008a).

From Barack Obama’s 2012 campaign speech in Newton, Iowa

Newton knows something about . . . the trends that we had seen even before the financial crisis hit. . . . When you hear somebody say we should cut more taxes, especially for the wealthiest Americans . . . we did that—2000, 2001, 2003. When you hear people say that we should cut back more on the rules we put in place for banks and financial institutions to avoid another taxpayer bailout—well, we tried that. When people say that we should just wait until the housing market hits bottom and hope that it comes back . . . that’s not an answer for people. . . . We’ve tried . . . these ideas for nearly a decade. It did not work. We saw manufacturing moving offshore. We saw a few people do very well, but too many families struggling just to get by (Obama, 2012).

From Barack Obama’s 2012 campaign speech in Newton, Iowa

We have done a whole lot to make sure that those men and women who have served us in Iraq and Afghanistan, that we are serving them as well as they’ve served us—treating them with the honor and respect that they have earned when they come home. So we put together the Post-9/11 GI Bill so they’re able to go back and get some training and skills. . . . Congress should create what we’re calling a Veterans Jobs Corps, so that we can help communities across America put our returning heroes back to work as police officers and firefighters and park rangers (Obama, 2012).

From a speech by Barack Obama regarding oil and gas subsidies

Today, members of Congress have a simple choice to make: They can stand with the big oil companies, or they can stand with the American people (Obama, 2013).

From a speech by Barack Obama regarding oil and gas subsidies

We all know that drilling for oil has to be a key part of our overall energy strategy. We want U.S. oil companies to be doing well. We want them to succeed. . . . The fact is, we’re producing more oil right now than we have in eight years, and we’re importing less of it as well. For two years in a row, America has bought less oil from other countries than we produce here at home. . . . American oil is booming (Obama, 2013).

From a speech by Barack Obama regarding oil and gas subsidies

I don’t want folks . . . to have to pay more at the pump every time that there’s some unrest in the Middle East and oil speculators get nervous about whether there’s going to be enough supply. I don’t want our kids to be held hostage to events on the other side of the world (Obama, 2013).

From Mitt Romney’s 2011 campaign speech in Bedford, New Hampshire

We are Americans. And we will not surrender our dreams to the failures of this President. We are bigger than the misguided policies and weak leadership of one man (Romney, 2011).
From Mitt Romney's 2011 campaign speech in Bedford, New Hampshire

Just a couple of weeks ago in Kansas, President Obama lectured us about Teddy Roosevelt’s philosophy of government. But he failed to mention the important difference between Teddy Roosevelt and Barack Obama. Roosevelt believed that government should level the playing field to create equal opportunities. President Obama believes that government should create equal outcomes (Romney, 2011).

From Mitt Romney's 2011 campaign speech in Bedford, New Hampshire

And tonight, I ask each of you to remember how special it is to be an American. I want you to remember what it was like to be hopeful and excited about the future, not to dread each new headline. When you spent more time looking for a house to buy than searching for a new job; when you spent more time thinking about a vacation with your family than how to make it to the next paycheck. That America is still out there. An America when you weren't afraid to look at your retirement savings or the price at the pump. An America when you never had to wake up to hear a President apologizing for America. I say let’s fight for that America. The America that brings out the best in each of us, that challenges us to be better and bigger than ourselves. This election, let’s fight for the America we love (Romney, 2011).

From Mitt Romney's 2012 campaign speech at the Virginia Military Institute

Last month our nation was attacked again. A U.S. Ambassador and three of our fellow Americans are dead, murdered in Benghazi, Libya. Among the dead were three veterans. All of them were fine men on a mission of peace and friendship to a nation that clearly longs for both (Romney, 2012).

From Mitt Romney's 2012 campaign speech at the Virginia Military Institute

We’ve seen this struggle before. It would be familiar to General George Marshall. In his time, the ashes of [World War II], another critical part of the world was torn between democracy and despotism. Fortunately, we had leaders of courage and vision, both Republicans and Democrats, who knew that America had to support friends who shared our values and prevent today’s crises from becoming tomorrow's conflicts (Romney, 2012).

From Mitt Romney's 2012 campaign speech at the Virginia Military Institute

The relationship between the president of the United States and the prime minister of Israel, for example, our closest ally in the region, has suffered great strains. The president explicitly stated that his goal was to put daylight between the United States and Israel, and he’s succeeded. This is a dangerous situation that has set back the hope of peace in the Middle East and emboldened our mutual adversaries, especially Iran. Iran today has never been closer to a nuclear weapons capability. It has never posed a greater danger to our friends, our allies and to us. And it has never acted less deterred by America, as was made clear last year, when Iranian agents plotted to assassinate the Saudi ambassador in our nation’s capital. And yet when millions of Iranians took to the streets in June of 2009; when they demanded freedom from a cruel regime that threatens the world; when they cried out, are you with us or are you with them, the American president was silent (Romney, 2012).

From Mitt Romney's 2012 campaign speech at the Virginia Military Institute

I will put the leaders of Iran on notice that the United States and our friends and allies will prevent them from acquiring nuclear weapons capability. I will not hesitate to impose new sanctions on Iran and . . . will tighten the sanctions we currently have. I will restore the permanent presence of aircraft carrier task forces in both the Eastern Mediterranean and the [Persian] Gulf. And I’ll work with Israel to increase our military assistance and coordination. For the sake of peace, we must make clear to Iran through actions, not just words, that their nuclear pursuit will not be tolerated (Romney, 2012).
From a debate on the topic “America should police the world”

MAX BOOT: I think the answer’s pretty obvious. It’s the country with the most vibrant economy, the most fervent devotion to liberty, and the most powerful military. In the 19th century, Great Britain battled enemies of all mankind such as slave traders and pirates, preserved the balance of power on the continent, and kept the world’s seas open to commerce. Today the only nation that can play an equivalent role is the United States of America (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2008a, p. 6).

From a debate on the topic “America should police the world”

MAX BOOT: The US is obligated to defend civilization, and that is precisely what we are doing. That is why American troops have fought in places like Bosnia, Kosovo, Afghanistan and Iraq to . . . restore the rule of law and uphold human rights. That is why American troops are still stationed from South Korea to Germany, to prevent aggression and a return of dangerous rivalries (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2008a, p. 7).

From a debate on the topic “America should police the world”

MAX BOOT: America has been the greatest force for good in the world in the past century. Just think of what happened when we did not act as globo-cop. Think of what happened in 1914, in 1939. By contrast, think of what happened when we did act as globo-cop. Think of what happened in 1945, and 1989. American intervention made possible the defeat of Nazism, and Communism. American isolationism made possible the outbreak of two world wars (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2008a, p. 8).

From a debate on the topic “America should police the world”

MAX BOOT: During the 1990s we ignored our policing responsibilities in Afghanistan. As the civil war raged between the Taliban and the Northern Alliance, our leaders said in essence what Britain's leaders said in the 1930s—that there is no reason to be concerned about a quarrel in a faraway country between people of whom we know nothing. Well on 9-11 we found out why we should care (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2008a, p. 9).

From a debate on the topic “America should police the world”

ELLEN LAIPSON: Can we be the beat cop that Max talked about? Do we know the neighborhood? Do we speak the language? Do we know the culture so that we can diffuse [sic] conflict before it breaks into violence (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2008a, p. 13)?

From a debate on the topic “America should police the world”

MICHAEL MANDELBAUM: The world’s governments . . . could, if they chose, circumscribe or abolish altogether, by banding together to oppose it, the American role as the world’s policeman. But they have done and shown no signs of doing any such thing (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2008a, p. 19).

From a debate on the topic “America should police the world”

DOUGLAS MURRAY: America has the right to be and should continue to be . . . the world’s policeman. It’s not your force as a nation which I think allows you that right, it’s America’s virtues that allow it that right (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2008a, p. 28).

From a debate on the topic “America should police the world”

IAN BREMMER: [Americans don’t necessarily] like the idea of giving billions of dollars of aid after a tsunami in Indonesia when we can’t build our own homes in New Orleans (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2008a, p. 35).
From a debate on the topic “America should police the world”

MICHAEL MANDELBAUM: The United States as the global policeman is not as legitimate as the New York City police force is. And it cannot be because there is no global government, no global state to give it legitimacy. But it has enough legitimacy, because nobody opposes it, as they would if they didn’t like it and felt threatened by it. . . . I think there is a threat . . . to the American role as the world’s govern-
ments, but it doesn’t come from other countries. It comes from the mounting costs of social welfare, of our entitlement programs, the great threat to the American role as the world’s policeman and to global order comes not from China . . . it comes from Medicare (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2008a, pp. 49–50).

From a debate on the topic “America should police the world”

MATTHEW PARRIS: America has two great weapons. One is force and the other is persuasion, the power of moral persuasion. They are not complementary. The more force is used the more the power of moral persuasion will be undermined (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2008a, p. 68).

From a debate on the topic “Ban genetically engineered babies”

NITA FARAHANY: The public can and should decide what limits if any there should be on the uses of genetic engineering. But a complete ban would just drive the practice into back alleys or overseas. Criminalizing genetic engineering will make the practice hidden from public view so that we will have no idea whether Sharon and women like her are using unsafe and unsavory practitioners to carry out genetic engineering (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2013, p. 10).

From a debate on the topic “Ban genetically engineered babies”

NITA FARAHANY: Recently new research shows the powerful effect of taking folate during pregnancy and how it reduces the incidence of autism in children. And yet no one thinks that we should ban folate (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2013, p. 9).

From a debate on the topic “Ban genetically engineered babies”

NITA FARAHANY: The United Kingdom, notoriously conservative about reproductive technologies, has given the green light in the use of these technologies (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2013, p. 10).

From a debate on the topic “Ban genetically engineered babies”

NITA FARAHANY: Now imagine just for a moment how we would enforce the outright ban that the resolution calls for. Would we forcibly genetically test all babies? . . . Would the government appear in Sharon’s hospital room or at airports with handcuffs to arrest her or her child? Would we forcibly sterilize Sharon and her baby? Is this the kind of society that you want to live in (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2013, p. 10)?

From a debate on the topic “Ban genetically engineered babies”

LORD ROBERT WINSTON: And, of course, what we have to understand is that we now know that the environmental influence on the embryo, the environmental influence on the fetus has a massive [effect on] . . . how it grows up. And, in fact, really, what we should be trying to do—rather than trying to risk making abnormal babies . . . is to improve the environment so that the DNA functions in the best possible way (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2013, p. 13).

From a debate on the topic “Ban genetically engineered babies”

LEE SILVER: You throw the dice, you hold your breath, you hope your child is healthy. It won’t have to be that way in the future when we learn how to take the genetic dice, place them on the table in the way that is going to promote health . . . for the [unborn] child (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2013, p. 17).
From a debate on the topic “Ban genetically engineered babies”

NITA FARAHANY: The most ethical thing to do in circumstances where the only way to prevent a particular type of disease where we readily have a technology available that people will avail themselves of either in this country or another one is to give the green light to proceed (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2013, p. 19).

From a debate on the topic “Ban genetically engineered babies”

SHELDON KRIMSKY: Sharon was mentioned. I don't know her personally. And I'm so happy that she had a successful pregnancy. But she had choices. One of her choices was to adopt someone else's egg and have a baby. . . . It wouldn't be her DNA but it would be somebody else's DNA. Another choice would be for her to adopt a child, which, you know, is certainly a desirable thing to do in a world where there are children who need adoption. What is the urgency of people to have their DNA in their child (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2013, pp. 19–20)?

From a debate on the topic “Ban genetically engineered babies”

SHELDON KRIMSKY: Over millions of years, mistakes have been bred out to a great extent. And it's remarkable how many children are born normally with the billions and billions of biochemical actions that take place from the fertilized egg until the child is born. So a lot of mistakes were bred out of the system, and it's taken millions of years before the human genome has evolved. Now we're saying, okay, we can get a few technologists to tinker with that and do a better job at the balancing the homeostasis of what I consider an ecosystem, a genetic ecosystem. And my colleague here has pointed out how many abnormalities occur when these genetic mice are manipulated (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2013, p. 34).

From a debate on the topic “Ban genetically engineered babies”

NITA FARAHANY: There are still uncertainties with IVF [in vitro fertilization] and yet he's in favor of going ahead with IVF. And why is that? Because we have to act in the face of uncertainty in life. I agree, there has not been a strong showing of any link between autism, maybe it has something [to do with the] age of mothers who are undergoing IVF, we don't know. But I think the much more important question to ask is, we've been using technologies that have some uncertain risks, are the lives worth living that have resulted from those technologies (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2013, p. 36)?

From a debate on the topic “Ban genetically engineered babies”

LEE SILVER: We don't stop people who are both carriers for the same mutation at reproducing, even though they have 25 percent risk of having a child with a serious disease. We shouldn't discriminate against people just because they're infertile (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2013, p. 36).

From a debate on the topic “Ban genetically engineered babies”

LORD ROBERT WINSTON: I've got no problem with genetically modified plants. I think actually it would be an important technology for the world, given the problems with water supply. I think we have to differentiate very substantially from what happens in genetically modified crops from what happens actually in human beings (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2013, p. 44).

From a debate on the topic “Google violates its 'Don't Be Evil' motto”

RANDAL PICKER: Google says, we're gonna live by a motto, and that model is . . . we're not gonna be evil. Seemingly asking us to hold Google to a higher standard, they’re very clear. There'll be times when they will sacrifice the short-run interests of Google for the public good. I don't think what's legal is the standard to evaluate for Google, Google asks us for something much more (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2008b, p. 6).
From a debate on the topic “Google violates its ‘Don’t be evil’ motto”

RANDAL PICKER: I’m a Google Ad Words advertiser. . . . You bid on keyword terms, if you win the auction your ads are supposed to show up. . . . I know my ad is out there. It didn’t show up, indeed no ads showed up, and indeed if you look at the statistics, 50 percent of the time when you run a search on Google, and they produce results, the organic search results, there are no ads next to it. . . . Why, because if very few people are bidding [on a term] then I ought to be able to buy it for a very low price and Google’s interest is not served by that (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2008b, pp. 7–8).

From a debate on the topic “Google violates its ‘Don’t be evil’ motto”

JIM HARPER: Perhaps that phrase [“don’t be evil”] was intended in a sort of, “Let’s not be a greasy corporation” sense. Even by that standard, Google is not evil, Google is great. Google brings information and empowerment to the masses in ways we couldn’t have imagined just a few years ago (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2008b, p. 11).

From a debate on the topic “Google violates its ‘Don’t be evil’ motto”

JIM HARPER: If my colleagues at the far end of the table wish to characterize Google as evil, they should forewear the use of Google products, and find the other products, which there are, and use those instead (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2008b, p. 13).

From a debate on the topic “Google violates its ‘Don’t be evil’ motto”

HARRY LEWIS: [Google] wanted to be the number-one search engine in the world, it started to do business in China. And the Chinese said, we don’t want you to show our citizens the world as it really is . . . and, Google said, okay. . . . Google didn’t choose the lesser of two evils when faced with the Chinese ultimatum; it chose the more profitable of the two evils. . . . Google had a choice between morality and money, and it chose money (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2008b, pp. 15–16).

From a debate on the topic “Google violates its ‘Don’t be evil’ motto”

HARRY LEWIS: Suppose Google were not a search engine company, but a pharmaceutical company. And it was told by the Chinese government that it could sell aspirin in China, only if it also made certain forms of brainwashing drugs and thought control medications. And that was the condition on which it could sell aspirin in China. No responsible American company would make that deal with the Chinese authorities, and that is exactly what Google is doing in the digital realm (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2008b, pp. 17–18).

From a debate on the topic “Google violates its ‘Don’t be evil’ motto”

JEFF JARVIS: The real purpose of the “Don’t Be Evil” pledge is to give employees the license to remind their bosses of this in meetings. So, a geek can stand there and say, is that evil? . . . It’s useful. Imagine, ladies and gentleman, if we had that phrase, “don’t be evil,” chiseled over every door on Wall Street. Would we not have a better world today? . . . So, I think it’s important to just recognize that the rule itself is good. The fact that Google asks it is good (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2008b, p. 29).

From a debate on the topic “Google violates its ‘Don’t be evil’ motto”

KEVIN WILLIAMSON [audience member]: For those who are arguing for the motion, aren’t you arguing that Google is in fact violating a different motto, which would say “don’t do evil,” versus a motto that says “don’t be evil.” Every business makes some sort of compromise, every business makes a mistake. Everybody who’s ever paid a dollar in taxes has made a compromise with evil at some point (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2008b, p. 57).
From a debate on the topic “Google violates its “Don’t be evil’ motto”

JIM HARPER: You should oppose the motion . . . because Google is, at its heart, a good company that provides extraordinary services to the public, and makes extraordinary amounts of information available to the public, and is working around the world to make information available (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2008b, pp. 66–67).

From a debate on the topic “Good riddance to mainstream media”

JIM VANDEHEI: Mainstream media, for the longest time, I don’t think it was always as good as portrayed or always as great as we sort of mythicize. And, for the longest time it was basically run by old white men who are [politically] left of center who are deciding how all of us view the news (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2009, p. 15).

From a debate on the topic “Good riddance to mainstream media”

JIM VANDEHEI: And I can tell you there’s probably a lot of businessmen and women in the audience because this is New York (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2009, p. 16).

From a debate on the topic “Good riddance to mainstream media”

JIM VANDEHEI: What new media’s done is it’s ripped down that wall, between the institution and the reader, and it’s opened up, I think it’s made it more transparent and it’s allowed you the reader to participate more in what we’re doing and even some of you to participate in the journalism that we’re doing (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2009, p. 17).

From a debate on the topic “Good riddance to mainstream media”

KATRINA VANDEN HEUVEL: The fact is that nobody but [mainstream media] institutions like the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Wall Street Journal . . . and a small group of regional papers do most of the reporting in this country that the rest of us depend on to try to hold power accountable (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2009, p. 23).

From a debate on the topic “Good riddance to mainstream media”

JOHN HOCKENBERRY: Those in the corporate for-profit media in the music business that said somehow the means of distribution being freed from the record companies to people who actually play and use music was going to destroy music in some sense: that if the record business went away somehow music would be affected, that somehow the art form of music and the quality of music would be affected. . . . The technology enabled people suddenly to be a part of something that they were not permitted to be a part of. Why? Because the for-profit structure of mainstream media prevented them. It’s an old story in America. When the means of distribution goes out of the hands of the small set of individuals and individual institutions that control it, change is afoot. This is a moment we should embrace (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2009, p. 27).

From a debate on the topic “Good riddance to mainstream media”

JOHN HOCKENBERRY: At the height of the war in Iraq . . . the number one news broadcast reporting on that war was owned by a defense contractor (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2009, p. 28).

From a debate on the topic “Good riddance to mainstream media”

JOHN HOCKENBERRY: The best journalists are people who don’t do it for the money. We want to create institutions that are all about doing it for the money and then we expect that the values of journalism and reporting are going to be maintained in that structure (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2009, p. 29).
From a debate on the topic “Good riddance to mainstream media”

DAVID CARR: Balloon Boy [a falsified news story] was a trending topic on Twitter for four days straight. It’s all Twitter could talk about. They weren’t talking about the elections in Iraq, the elections in Afghanistan that have gone wrong. They weren’t talking about the bombings in Iraq. They were talking about John and Kate [reality television stars] (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2009, p. 31).

From a debate on the topic “Good riddance to mainstream media”

KATRINA VANDEN HEUVEL: We do need large, powerful institutions, barnacles attached, to take on powerful forces, whether corporate or government . . . . Not to demean the new media, but we need to find ways of working together to salvage quality journalism, which I believe is a public good in a society where there are too many voiceless and powerless (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2009, p. 87).

From a debate on the topic “Good riddance to mainstream media”

JIM VANDEHEI: You can’t do public service journalism, investigative reporting or foreign policy unless you make money or unless you have government subsidy or unless you have a not-for-profit status. You have to make money to be able to support doing the foreign coverage, to support doing the investigative coverage (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2009, p. 89).

From a debate on the topic “Snowden was justified” (National Security Agency system administrator Edward Snowden released thousands of classified documents to media outlets)

BEN WIZNER: Edward Snowden is justified because he provided to journalists and through them to us information that we had a right to know and that we had a need to know. The government had not just concealed this information, it had lied to us about it (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2014, p. 8).

From a debate on the topic “Snowden was justified” (National Security Agency system administrator Edward Snowden released thousands of classified documents to media outlets)

R. JAMES WOOLSEY: Mr. Snowden pledged to protect the Constitution against enemies foreign and domestic, but he didn’t do that. What he did was release—steal and release—material that went to, among others, Hezbollah, al-Qaeda, Hamas, Pyongyang, Tehran and so on. In the real world, you can’t have a principle that it is really important to release material, but you’re only going to release it to nice people; you’re not going to let terrorists and dictators peruse it and use it (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2014, p. 11).

From a debate on the topic “Snowden was justified” (National Security Agency system administrator Edward Snowden released thousands of classified documents to media outlets)

ANDREW MCCARTHY: We actually set up this system with exactly the checks and balances that were at issue . . . when too much power was reposed in one person. And now where are we with Edward Snowden? We are right back to one person who’s judge, jury, lawgiver, one person who decides what American secrets get kept and what gets exposed to our enemies (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2014, p. 17).
From a debate on the topic “Snowden was justified” (National Security Agency system administrator Edward Snowden released thousands of classified documents to media outlets)

BEN WIZNER: [The court that approved NSA surveillance] is a court that quite properly was set up to hear warrant applications in secret. When you’re seeking a warrant, you don’t need an adversarial process. We don’t want the person who we’re conducting surveillance on to know that we’ve sought a warrant. What this court started to do over the last decade was to write long opinions—30, 50, 80 pages long—ruling on whether whole programs of surveillance were consistent with federal statutes and consistent with the Constitution. They did that without the benefit of any adversary. They did that without anybody arguing the other side in front of these courts. Many of these judges who have left the court have said they would have benefited from an adversary (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2014, p. 26).

From a debate on the topic “Snowden was justified” (National Security Agency system administrator Edward Snowden released thousands of classified documents to media outlets)

BEN WIZNER: [Edward Snowden] certainly has told Barton Gellman of the Washington Post that he did complain regularly internally. . . . He did report his concerns to superiors. . . . One time when he reported concerns to superiors in a posting in Geneva, he was reprimanded and punished for it. This is the experience of people who complained in the intelligence community is that they either get ignored or they get crushed (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2014, pp. 31–32).

From a debate on the topic “Snowden was justified” (National Security Agency system administrator Edward Snowden released thousands of classified documents to media outlets)

ANDREW MCCARTHY: If we were going to have effective counterterrorism, we needed the cooperation of our allies because there were many, many places in the world where they had good sources, and we didn’t. And we couldn’t protect the country without that. When you reveal not only our secrets, but their secrets, and you convince them that they might as well not tell us anything because we can’t keep a secret, then we lose that cooperation (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2014, p. 44).

From a debate on the topic “Too many kids go to college”

CHARLES MURRAY: Knowing what major a person had doesn’t tell you very much. Yeah, if it’s math, if it’s hard sciences, if it’s engineering, okay. But what does it mean if you have a political science degree . . . if you’re going to an employer and saying you ought to hire me. It doesn’t really mean anything (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2011b, p. 12).

From a debate on the topic “Too many kids go to college”

VIVEK WADHWA: Peter, you didn’t know what you wanted to be when you were young. Most children don’t know. They’re muddling through it. . . . They learn by interacting with other people and getting ideas from other students who have diverse backgrounds. That’s how they decide what they’re going to be (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2011b, p. 33).

From a debate on the topic “The two-party system is making America ungovernable”

ARIANNA HUFFINGTON: There is huge mistrust of our national institutions, politicians, business people, the media. And the rise of social media, the rise of the Internet has made it possible for young people especially to connect with each other, to reject the existing system, to opt out of politics and try to find solutions in their own communities, bypassing the political system. That’s not ultimately healthy because democracy is not a spectator sport (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2011a, p. 5).
From a debate on the topic “The two-party system is making America ungovernable”

ZEV CHAFETS: Compared to [a] utopia, [the American system is] a replaceable system. If you compare it to the rest of the systems of the world, it’s a pretty good system (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2011a, p. 15).

From a debate on the topic “The two-party system is making America ungovernable”

ZEV CHAFETS: There was a time when there was slavery. And there was a time when women couldn’t vote. And there was a time . . . when African-Americans couldn’t vote. And all those things no longer are the case. They all changed. And they all changed under the two-party system (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2011a, p. 18).

From a debate on the topic “The two-party system is making America ungovernable”

ARIANNA HUFFINGTON: Well, the primary way [to “shake up a dysfunctional and stagnant two-party system”] is to allow more competition. All of us believe in competition, right? It’s the essence of a private enterprise, freedom-based system. We believe in competition in everything except politics. When it comes to politics, you’ve got to pick your party and run with your party, and actually espouse whatever the party stands for at that particular moment (Intelligence Squared U.S., 2011a, p. 25).