

Forward Acknowledgements

Introduction Questions

- What were the main movements that led to “the conservative upper hand”?
- Why do they feel, as leftists, they lack adequate intellectual counter measures?
- What are their philosophies of political engagement?
- How did Presidents reel in support/inspire said engagements?

Notes

Building off the works of Antonio Gramsci, No Mercy is founded on two principles:

1. Wars of Position
2. Wars of Maneuver

Generally, the left has failed wars of position over the course of the 1960’s to present. The book seeks to outline how the conservatives, with calculating and derisive tactics, fueled academic work to embolden their positions.

It wasn’t until the late 1960’s that the main action of the book takes place, in which seven key movements will be looked at:

1. Pro-English
2. Immigration reform and Proposition 187
3. IQ and Race
4. Affirmative Action
5. Welfare
6. Tort Reform
7. Campus Multiculturalism

Key Notes

Conservatives have won wars of position, here’s how it happened (through generous donations to intellectual projects, and liberal aversion to “political” grants)

The book is written for a liberal audience, and liberal intellectuals

Chapter 1 "Official English"

Initial Questions

- Who were the groups funding Pro-English groups?

- Who were the actual Pro-English crowd?
- What were the major connections between them?
- Why did they want to enforce this movement

Notes

For the most part pro-english was a movement funded by grassroots: namely using "repeated" fear tactics.

A lot of overlap between the founding of different groups, and slight divergent interests, is the big takeaway. The community is built on main-stays.

Pinpointing countries like Yugoslavia as the deterioration of society with diversity in language spoken

Originally they attempted to go to national levels, but then switched to community and state governments after subsequently failing.

Chapter 2 "Proposition 187"

Initial Questions

- What was Proposition 197?
- How was it funded?
- Who were FAIR?
- What is the takeaway for liberal intellectuals?

Notes

Proposition 187 was an anti-immigration policy that gained traction in California, while failing at the national level– as with Official English– it was then ratcheted downward to local and state governments once again.

The same coup of political operatives have, once again, been shuffled over from the Official English crowd into immigration reform. The case made by No Mercy, or at least the history presented, showcases a common themality between reduced monetary expenditures from consistent donors across the industry. Once one campaign has been successful another is then started, the political landscape taking the gestalt of that new operation. It is then, once that is achieved that we see legal action beginning to take place.

FAIR was an anti-immigration group composed of similar members to the original Official English crowd

Conservatives weren't unanimous here— notably, Jack Kemp, William Bennet of Empower America; Linda Chavez of the Center of the New American Community; Manhattan Institute— over the ensuing battle on immigration and Republican positioning to rural arenas.

Chapter 3 "Iq, Race, and Genetics"

Initial Questions

- Who were the Pioneer Group?
- What was the history of eugenics?
- What type of movement was the eugenics movements?
- How was it funded?
- What did it accomplish?

Notes

The eugenics movement actually accomplished passage of legislation before the imminent rise of the Third Reich.

In fact, among the academic community eugenics became a hot topic, invoking many different kinds reactions, for the most part negative within the scientific community but for politicians and funding groups, it was the opposite

The Pioneer group, comprised of similar crowds to the FAIR group, funded a consortium of projects entailing eugenicism and white superiority,

Generally, it was, as No Mercy points out: a group funded by elites to then subvert university programs of affirmative action.

The legislature that was accomplished had actually inspired sterilization programs for the intellectually unfit.

Luaghlin Law: inspired Nazi leaders, so to speak

Chapter 4 "Attack on Affirmative Action"

Initial Questions

- What were the different think tanks involved?
- Differences in foreign policy?
- Affirmative Action takes?
- What were the differences between think tank expenditures and the media produced?

Notes

Financer's funding anti-Affirmative Action groups:

1. Bradley Foundation
2. Koch Foundation
3. The John M Olin
4. JM Foundation
5. JM Kaplin
6. Claude Lambe
7. Sarah Schaif
8. Robert Wilson
9. Starr
10. Montgomery
11. Gilder
12. Jaquelin
13. McCamish
14. Charles Stewart
15. JP Morgan
16. Ambrose
17. Salvatori
18. Reed Roberts
19. Richardson
20. FMC
21. Mekenna
22. Markle
23. Alcoa
24. Armstrong
25. Rose
26. Carthage
27. Samuel Roberts
28. Herrick
29. Hearst
30. Shelby
31. Conrad
32. Allegheny

Aforementioned groups:

1. Center for Individual rights
2. Heritage
3. American Enterprise institute
4. The Manhattan Group

5. The Hudson Group
6. The Pacific Research Institute
7. Independence Institute
8. Washington Legal
9. Mountain State Legal
10. Center for Equal Opportunity
11. Hoover
12. Cato
13. Rand
14. Heartland
15. Lincoln
16. Institute for Justice

The main takeaways were how widespread direct legal action and policy decisions were made and continue to be employed and various sections of legal warfare, from local governmental decisions all the way up to supreme court justices like Scalia

They differed from "briefcase" reports meant to be read in 20 minutes to policy funds, to research institutes, to lobbying interests to legal review, to policy makers

Chapter 5 "Attack on Welfare and the Poor"

Initial Questions

- What happened during the Reagan Admin in regards to the poor?
- How were the big think tanks (Heritage, AEI, Hudson, etc.) involved?
- What were the media consumption habits of conservative operatives during that era?

Notes

The big think tanks did mainly what they have a tendency of doing: writing long research papers and publishing books. However, included in, thinking of Empower America here, there have been counter advertisement campaigns. These are talked about peripherally.

Much of reality, the efficacy of scientific research in this manner, is dependent on the imperative nexus surrounding it and, furthermore, the ostensives consolidated. In the discussion of how, mechanistically thinking, conservative think tanks conduct themselves in operations and programmatic coordination to pre-determined goals it follows a path similar to this: research (no matter how dubious) is created, a book or two is then marketed upon this research and then subsequently advertised, from there policy requests and reforms are driven through the creation of smaller media outlets (advertising, briefcase reports, etc), and finally legislature (fought through legal networks) is then battled with state and local levels of governmental regulation

being the eventually foci of effort(national is attempted, first, which then either fails and is ratcheted downward, or wins and is then, obviously, ratched down into state-specific variants which are then in turn fought over.

This is the general themata of No Mercy. Little is wasted, between people and funding, work is done and it is done within a decade.

Chapter 6 "Tort Reform"

Initial Questions

- What is Tort Reform?
- What have think tanks done to change it and for what reason?
- What is Astroturfing?
- What are the legal ramifcance of extensive media coverage?

Notes

Tort Reform is a political stance dictating something along the lines of "people are greedy and will demand the highest payout possible in the face of reliable money" such that "lawyers are greedy mongrels who get a percentage of the payout

Overall think tanks haven't instigated many real legal battles but ones for legislature instead. Advocating and administering policies for bills on tort reform has generally been a success even among the opinions of judges,

The Manhattan institute in particular launched an ad campaign with overwhelming success, here. This is known as Astroturfing.

Chapter 7 "Campus Wars"

Initial Questions

- What is the general training program in conservative groups?
- What are the major parties involved?
- What all do they disseminate to the young?
- How are universities targets (specifically professors)?

Notes

National Association of Scholars is fairly important here.

- Generally conservative groups have amassed collective concerted efforts to enforce and advance their own agenda(rightfully or not)

- Various groups have emerged, protecting those accused of sexual harassment and other "bad speak" done on campus'
- They also funded for the lack of conservative speakers on campus'
- Along with the protection of Christian magazines, all the way up to the supreme court

"How it happened and what to do about it?"

Initial Questions

- How did the right accomplish its goals?
- Why are conservative opinions easier to enforce than progressivism?
- What was the media theory involved?
- How did hierarchy induce "shrewd" operations?
- Why will the left have to try even harder than the right to accomplish its own goals?
- Is equalism a correct world view?

Notes

Generally the conservative agenda is one of laser eyed focus

Conservative ideas have a greater hold in society, since the reformation into a previous(already known) structure of imperatives responds well with citizens

Further the employment of media tactics, teaching the youth, offering a plan towards success have essentially given them the edge in "creating a society that has always existed"

Final Remarks

One can see to these pathways as finding a general possible structure: **research is done, dissiminated, and then legalized**. The particular obstinances one encounters on each step of the process is a fair bit superfluous but the idea is the same.

Liberals can never get through the second half of part 2 and don't even come close to the feedback loop of enforcing part 3.

Conservatives run the gamut through excessive, focused, shrewd funding of particular objectives. The soiree of rhetorical challenges isn't hard to find, and often enough is the primary focus of a given year or couple, before eventually moving onwards.

For any aspirational newcomer, the most demanding aspect is that of acquiring funding and the intelligence/like-ability(networking and contracting) to then accomplish that goal. **Which, they must have a theory that corresponds to a foundational identity, particular movement and rhetoric style, to then an individual issue**. From there a game plan must be devised to correct legislation or develop materials to influence reality(large scale marketing, Astroturfing, down to

research initiatives and creation of books, reading materials for either the layman, researcher, policy fund, or Congress-man, e.g.: the most successful activation of these is a maneuver on multiple fronts at once, to induce a genuine change, like that of Heritage (*which will send the same report to Congressman and Journalists alike, who will then subsequently send a second summary to the Congressman on the issue seeming to have gained popularity. This happens rather quickly*)).

If one had the capability to think of the dissident movements among the right, it isn't hard to see many either get stuck (the aspirational that is) at the second step of dissemination. Most is spent to talkative "mental" real estate and rhetoric in the manner of supposed translational materials on research initiatives. The biggest form-factor I can think of is the lack of political initiative in the "philosophic right" and the lack thereof (if we are to exclude normie, conservatives) of political action groups in the trad-cath right wing. That isn't to say that it isn't a great thing to have so much intellectual consolidation appearing--there really isn't a lot of work to be done there, then, if an adequate theory of culture and lifestyles have already emerged--, in book reviews and political discussion, further even technologies that let "conservatives speak their mind (even if it is rather low signal, backwoods noise)". But the next step must be taken if we're to accomplish change, we can only hope that some have the capability to accomplish it and demonstrate how we can continue to advance *the dissident agenda*.