

Progressive Manifesto – Version II  
Worldview, Policy Objectives, and Implementation Strategy  
2020

Thomas A. Burns Ph.D.

Klamath Falls, Oregon

I am offering a Progressive Manifesto in two versions. Version One focuses more on the specifics of the progressive perspective at the individual, social and institutional levels together with a number of recommended specific implementation strategies. The emphasis in this version is to demonstrate the complexity and grand scope of the progressive/liberal perspective/agenda. Version One of the Manifesto can be found under the Politics topic on my website: [www.dynamic-humanis.com](http://www.dynamic-humanis.com) . Version Two of the Manifesto, which is presented here, considers the progressive manifesto at a more general level and focuses more on identifying 1) what distinguishes the progressive and conservative perspectives/worldviews, 2) the hierarchical nature of progressive objectives and what should be understood as their relative priority, and 3) major strategic principles that should inform efforts to implement a progressive agenda.

I offer the present Manifesto – Version Two in three parts. Part One describes the opposed worldviews along with their respective values and ideals of the progressive/liberal versus the conservative perspectives. The policy positions of progressives only make sense when this high order distinction is clear. And only when we realize that it is an entire worldview that is involved can we appreciate that the progressive agenda is in fact society and ecology wide in its scope. It is my view that Progressives need to start with an awareness of this Grand Liberal Point of View rather than constantly dropping into a few areas of immediate focus [eg. health care, child care, college tuition, wealth tax, incarceration, etc.]. Part Two of this essay is concerned with identifying the comprehensive array of progressive policy positions, goals and objectives. It is this full array that informs the progressive agenda as a Whole. Understanding the fullness of the progressive policy agenda that emanates from the liberal “worldview” reveals that there are a great many changes in most institutions that need to be achieved before a progressive agenda will have been implemented. Parts One and Two constitute the statement of the Progressive Manifesto – Version II. Part Three of this essay identifies the Major Strategic Principles that should be recognized and followed if the progressive agenda is to be successfully implemented at the most rapid pace.

## **PART ONE - PROGRESSIVE VERSUS CONSERVATIVE WORLDVIEWS**

### **Values and Ideals**

The fundamental distinction between a progressive/liberal worldview and a conservative worldview is the emphasis liberals place on social/communal values versus the emphasis conservatives place on individualistic values.

Liberals focus on the common identity that all humans share and the responsibility that follows for all humans to care for one another, to assist one another, and to promote the common good of one another. For progressives this perspective applies at all social scales from families, to villages, to cities, to states, to nations, to the global network of nations. Security for liberals rests in the strength of the bonds of social commitment that humans share at all of these scales. Accordingly, cooperation among humans who are regarded as equals at all societal levels and scales is a central value for liberals. For progressives, government at all levels exists to promote these social values and to direct all resources to be used equally to the benefit of all individuals and groups at all social scales regardless of what define their differences [sex, ethnicity, nationality, language, religion, age, ecological niche, etc.].

Conservatives focus on individual identity and the freedom of the individual to pursue personal success through the competitive exercise of skills, talents, knowledge, industry, and persistence. Success is defined in terms of the acquisition of prestige, power, and the control of resources/wealth. For conservatives, individuals have only limited and relatively immediate social responsibility for one another – family first. In the conservative perspective, competition among individuals and human groups is inherent, and humans can not be expected to cooperate very far beyond the family and small local community. Accordingly, security only exists at the individual and small group levels and resides in these individuals and small groups and their enterprises controlling the surrounding social and ecological realms to bring the benefits of these resources to these deserving individuals and small groups. For conservatives, only social institutions that support this overall point of view are regarded as legitimate. Government at all levels should be limited to guaranteeing mostly individual rather than social objectives.

Of course, the above is a representation of the extreme versions of these two worldviews/perspectives. Neither individuals nor groups define themselves exclusively in terms of one or the other of these extremes. All individuals and groups locate themselves somewhere on the continuum between these extremes – more liberal or more conservative in general and more liberal or more conservative in specific social domains and on particular issues. And most societies that are successful in the longer term define their system of institutions

in an effort to balance the input of these two perspectives.

American society proposes itself as an example of this balanced societal condition where the regulated capitalistic economy and financial sectors are mostly defined by a competitive personal/corporate gain point of view while the domains of politics and law and justice are defined by principles of democracy, equality, fairness, and cooperation. Whether the current American system is actually balanced in the input of both progressive and conservative perspectives in its institutions is another question, and one at the forefront of present concerns among progressives, including myself. All societies from the smallest and simplest to the largest and most complex must manage the dynamic relationship of the individualistic, competitive, conservative perspective and the social, cooperative, liberal perspective. For more on this subject, see my essay, "Conservative Versus Liberal: What Makes the Difference?" in the Politics section on my website: [www.dynamic-humanism.com](http://www.dynamic-humanism.com) .

In this essay, I am concerned with the progressive/liberal perspective exactly because it is my view that American society today is in an unproductive state of imbalance where the competitive, self-serving forces of its economy and financial industry are dominating the cooperative, community benefit forces of its polity and judiciary.

## **PART TWO – PROGRESSIVE POLICY OBJECTIVES**

Progressive policy concerns exist at both the general and more specific levels, and most are related to one another in some way. Addressing the most general or highest order policy issues ramifies to make the more specific issues more easily addressed. The corollary of this situations is that attempting to address specific issues without dealing with the "containing" larger issues is likely to be considerably more difficult. This is one of the reasons that the tendency of progressives to focus on specific issues is so unproductive. So, I will start with high order issues and work through to the more specific issues that lie "beneath" them.

Here are what I see as the larger framing policy issues of special concern to progressives: Global Challenges, Equal Rights and Equal Opportunity for All, Representative Democracy and Election Integrity, and Sustainable Economy and the Ubiquitous Funding Issue. I will consider each of these general policy areas and the more specific issues/objectives that are located "beneath" each of them. Of course, many global issues are also national issues, but it is important to understand the interrelationship. The discussion in all sections other than the "Global Challenges" section will focus on the position of progressives at the national level in the United States.

## Global Challenges

The nations of humanity are currently connected on so many different levels that efforts to resolve many challenges/issues require a commitment to global level agreements to cooperate on both planning and support for implementing the needed actions. These areas of challenges include: international conflict and cyber warfare; pandemics; climate change; inequality in multiple respects among nations; universal human rights; rule of law and equal justice; ecological responsibility; fair international trade agreements; sustainable global financial system; advanced artificial intelligence and its effect on occupations at all scales; genetic engineering to “improve” the human species; free but responsible speech, media, and internet; regulation of public information dissemination for its accuracy, etc. Most of these areas of challenge exist at both the global and national levels. But, individual nations with their individual self interests are logically reluctant to take on responsibility for supporting solutions to these many challenges without international commitment, participation, and contribution.

The problem is that no adequate global level government currently exists that is empowered to develop and implement solutions to these challenges/issues. The United Nations is presently far too weak. The need that informed progressives support is the development of an empowered global government under the concept of federalism, which guarantees the relative independence of nations to deal with their own internal affairs. With the implementation of comprehensive reforms, the United Nations could be this global government.

Many other progressive policy goals at both the national and international levels will be supported if this empowered global government comes into being and if it is capable of addressing and resolving humanity’s present and future global challenges. Without such a government, the effort to gain separate commitment to most other high order and more specific progressive goals within each state/nation will be more difficult. For more on this subject, including existing organizations supporting this matter, see the essays under the “Global Challenges – Global Government” topic on my website: [www.dynamic-humanism.com](http://www.dynamic-humanism.com) .

## Equal Rights and Equal Opportunity for All

Progressives support the commitment of governments and institutions at all societal levels to the basic Social Contract: The community guarantees Equal Rights and Equal Opportunity for All in exchange for the individual’s commitment

to contribute to the Common Good to the best of his or her abilities. This is the fundamental social contract that informs all human societies from small aboriginal bands to huge complex societies. Social security and all social benefits for every member of the group at any and all levels exist under this social contract. Individual talents and efforts are recognized and rewarded under this contract, but the pursuit of personal gain without adequately sharing the results is unacceptable. And in aboriginal groups such behavior, if not corrected, is usually regarded as cause for exclusion, which can mean death.

Under this basic social contract, there are no free rides; everyone contributes throughout their lives to benefit the community. Without contribution at a significant level there is no access to benefits. Children participate incrementally as they learn how to become productive members of society, while older group members may carry reduced loads and take on the role of elders, but there is no vacuous “retirement.” “From each according to his/her abilities to each according to his/her needs.” Note, this virtually universal statement does not include “wants.” A society’s guarantees of Equal Rights and Opportunities provide a framework of equality, but in application these guarantees really amount to privileges that must be continuously earned by individuals and the different groups within societies. Progressives support this overall framework of equality in its many specific manifestations at all societal scales. Categorical degradation or exclusion of individuals or groups due to sex, age, ethnicity, religion, language, dress, race, nationality, etc. is forbidden, but access to social benefits depends on sustained contribution by all members of society.

The commitment in complex societies to provide most social security and social services arises as an extension of the guarantees announced under this more general category of Equal Rights and Opportunity. Existing such provisions in the U.S. include: national defense; state, county, and municipal police protection; jails and prisons; fire protection; transportation infrastructure and maintenance; public education; libraries; health and human services; public works – water and waste management; building departments – codes and regulations; social security; medicare, etc. Progressives in general support the extension of these social services to include: universal health care, tuition free higher public education; child care; basic food needs; basic housing needs; minimum annual income; etc. In proposing these expanded services, it is important to note that access to these services only exists within the commitment to the basic Social Contract. These services/benefits are not absolutes. Members of society earn guaranteed access to these services by meeting the minimum contribution requirements of this social contract.

Especially in the United States, it is very important for progressives to expose the fallacy of the “socialism” label that is applied by conservatives to the

progressive support for expanded social services. The American public must understand that socialism is a continuum, and that all of the many existing social services that government provides at all levels – like the examples cited above - constitute an existing commitment to socialism. It is just a simple and universal fact that Americans, and citizens in all other complex societies, live under a socialistic umbrella to one extent or another. This is nothing new. But conservatives love to represent socialism as communism, which is a huge fallacy. Progressives have to aggressively challenge and expose this false representation. In proposing expanded social services at different government levels, progressives are not proposing 1) government ownership of all property, 2) government ownership and control of all industrial production and commercial activity, and 3) government ownership and control of all financial institutions. That is communism, and it is the most extreme economic form of socialism, and progressives definitely do not support it. It must be a high priority for progressives to make sure the public does not confuse the limited proposals of liberals to expand social services and to regulate the excesses of capitalism with communism!

### Representative Democracy and Election Integrity

Progressives support representative democracy as the basis for government at all levels of society. For such government to work properly, citizens must accept the responsibility to be informed on the issues and candidates and to indicate their preferences by voting. In this regard, it is shameful that 42% of eligible voters in America do not bother to vote! And yet many of these non-voters hold strong opinions on important issues. But if citizens do not vote, they have no basis for complaining about the make up of the government that arises or the policy decisions that this government implements. Complacency by citizens regarding the enfranchisement privilege of voting one's preferences in a representative democracy amounts to these citizens ignoring the very long history of citizens in authoritarian societies being systematically abused. Progressives support the effort to accurately educate voters and to encourage them to vote.

Progressives also support all efforts to guarantee citizens ready access to voting in elections. This involves eliminating all actions and conditions that curtail access or that advantage one voter or political group over another. Accordingly, progressives fight against all forms of gerrymandering and all efforts to discourage voting by targeted individuals and groups. The integrity of elections is essential to sustaining a representative democracy. For progressives, efforts to guarantee this integrity necessitate dealing with a

number of more specific issues: restricting the excessive influence of money in politics, combating the intentional manipulation of information, and identifying and blocking the campaigns from sources outside of the election domain to influence voters.

With regard to the money in politics issue, progressives support: campaign finance reform to provide for exclusively publicly financed campaigns and elections; greatly restricting PACs and requiring their funders to be identified; limiting the time devoted to campaigns; and overturning the Citizens United decision of the Supreme Court – which declared corporations to be equivalent to “people” and money to be the equivalent of speech allowing for unlimited corporate funding in elections. In addition, progressives support limiting the role of professional lobbyists in the political process; greatly restricting the revolving door between elected officials and the corporate and financial domains; and eliminating the option for public officials to participate in elaborate trips funded by corporations, the financial industry, and the super wealthy.

Progressives contend that the huge amounts of money that corporations, the financial industry, and the wealthy are being permitted to introduce into the political domain serves to “buy” representatives and subsequent legislation that favors the interests of corporations, the financial industry and the wealthy over the interests of average citizens. In addition, this huge amount of money “buys” the nomination of judges to the state and federal court systems that again favor corporations, the financial industry, and the wealthy in the decisions that they offer in court cases.

Since the conservative perspective aligns with the competitive and self-serving point of view of corporations, the financial industry, and the wealthy, the overall result of the excessive influence of money in politics is to offer undue support for conservatives and the conservative agenda. In essence, it is the view of progressives that money is being allowed to “buy out” the egalitarian basis of the political and judicial institutions of American society. The results are seen in many places: the overall trend toward oligarchy and authoritarian rule; ever increasing economic inequality in the population; limiting social programs to assist the poor and middle class; tax cuts to benefit the moneyed interests; deregulation of controls on corporations and the financial industry which put the national and world economy at risk; multinational trade agreements that fail to consider the impact on jobs and the environment; failure to pursue white collar crime; failure to hold corporate and financial industry executives and boards responsible for the illegal activities of their enterprises; the short term focus that favors the major economic forces of the status quo – the fossil fuel industry, the financial industry, the insurance industry, the pharmaceutical industry, and the

military industrial complex.

All of the specific problems identified above, as well as many others mentioned elsewhere, can only be dealt with adequately if the money in politics problem is first addressed and resolved. As long as money is allowed to continue to “buy” conservative legislators who appoint conservative judges at the state and national levels, the progressive agenda will be left struggling in the margins. And the public will continue to be more and more frustrated. And unfortunately this public will likely continue to uncritically put their faith in populist conservative representatives who deflect attention from the real goals that they support by focusing public attention on abortion, gay marriage, “illegal” immigrants, Muslims as terrorists, and of course socialism [represented as communism].

Yes, health care is a significant progressive issue, but progressives need to put the correction of the money in politics issue as a first priority objective. A real version of universal health care is only attainable if the money issue is resolved and the excessive forces of the capitalistic American economy are appropriately restrained with balance being returned to the input of conservative and progressive perspectives in the institutions of the nation. By extension, those developing an empowered global government need to resist the influence of comparable moneyed forces from the global economy that will strive to perpetuate in that emergent global government the same preferential provisions as the ones that promote imbalance in national governments.

### Sustainable Economy and the Ubiquitous Funding Issue

Human societies up until the Industrial Revolution in the 19<sup>th</sup> century operated largely in terms of sustainable economies, NOT expanding economies. The Industrial Revolution combined with the advent of modern medicine spurred both significant population growth – increasing demand – and the development of greatly expanded monetary and financial systems. These new systems allowed commercial enterprises to take on significant debt in order to sponsor investment in the increased production of goods and services. The underlying assumption was that continuous growth of sales in the market together with the effects of inflation would significantly offset the negative influence of having to service ongoing debt. The GROWTH economy was born. And the growth dependent economy has hugely expanded to encompass virtually all nations in what has become a highly integrated global economy. The vast increase in the global population together with the “development” of “underdeveloped” nations have fueled growth in worldwide commercial markets.

So, what’s the problem? A constantly and rapidly expanding global



economy is not sustainable for various reasons. First, no sufficiently integrated global financial system exists to support this constantly expanding international global market. Under these circumstances, the risk arises that anything causing a substantial disruption of this global economy can result in the global financial system collapsing, sending the world into a major depression. Second, the natural resource demands of global business now exceed existing and potential supplies. Basics like clean fresh water and tillable land are fast being maxed out locally and globally. Third, the exclusive focus of industry on ever increasing product volume has resulted in the universal and unsustainable degradation of a great many of the essential ecological conditions of the planet from oceans to rivers to mountain tops. The uncontrolled production of CO<sub>2</sub> due to the expanding economy's energy dependence on fossil fuels has resulted in fundamental changes in Earth's climate to the point where the ecology necessary to sustain humans is under threat. The rate of extinction of non-human plant and animal species has grown exponentially in the context of this planet wide ecological degradation. Put simply, there are just too many humans placing unsustainable demands on the planet's ecology with what amount to critically degrading results.

Yes, humans must rapidly address and resolve the climate change challenge. But, if the commitment to transform the expanding economy at both the national and global levels into a sustainable economy is not a framing part of this effort, the underlying global economic condition that pushes societies to continue to abuse the planet will remain in full force.

So, the first order of business for progressives who are concerned about the financial basis for the world economy and the relationship of this economy to the state of planetary ecology is to insist on the creation of a stable and fair global financial system and the conversion of the expanding economy into a sustainable economy at all societal scales – while the causes of climate change are addressed. Following from these three high order and interrelated economic and ecological goals are the following progressive objectives: reduce the global human population by one half to no more than 4 billion; support the conversion of energy production from all fossil fuels to green energy sources; reduce all forms of pollution by all sustainable means including aggressive recycling, the reduction of pesticide use, and support for organic agricultural production; invest in restoring ecological conditions to support all ecological systems and the species that depend upon them; reduce what have become the unsustainable consumption and expected living standards of citizens in the “developed” nations; stop promoting the existing consumption and living standards of the developed nations to the less developed nations; and support efforts to meet the real needs of all citizens and not the wants of the privileged few.

Above I have discussed a high order progressive objective at both the global and national economic levels – conversion of the expanding economy into a sustainable economy – together with some of the desirable ecological and social ramifications. Now, we can examine the hobby horse of conservatives when it comes to proposals by progressives for expanded social services: FUNDING. The complaint of conservatives is always the lack of affordability for existing as well as proposed social service programs. And it is certainly the case that all citizens need to be realistic when it comes to funding for social services – no matter how noble the objectives are of both these existing and proposed social programs. So, what is the answer progressive can offer?

First, government policy and legislation at all levels can implement a fair taxation policy: to include individual and corporate property and income taxes, and inheritance taxes for individuals. In short, Americans can stop feeding the condition of economic inequality in the citizenry that currently exists. In every case, the primary principle should be: the greater the value in property, in income – including benefits, and in inheritance, the greater the percentage of the tax contribution should be. In short, progressive taxation is the only way to fairly assign responsibility for both individuals and business enterprises to contribute to the overall governmental funding budget. This policy assures that “those with the greatest assets make the greatest contribution to the social good” – period, no exceptions!

The specifics of this comprehensive, progressive property, income and inheritance taxation policy can be determined in part by examining comparable tax policies of developed countries where the citizens are most satisfied/happy with the quality of their lives. The 2019 survey by the United Nations of the citizens of 154 countries reveals the happiness quotient for each country on their overall quality of life as determined by looking at several significant variables. The results reveal the following five nations at the top of the ratings: Finland, Denmark, Norway, Iceland, and The Netherlands. The United States ranked 19<sup>th</sup> after nearly all other northern European countries as well as Canada, New Zealand, Australia, Israel, and even Costa Rica. Americans will be very surprised at what the level of financial obligation is in the tax policies of most of these countries. But they need to keep in mind that these high levels of assigned tax obligation support a great many social services that Americans do not enjoy. In addition, Americans should appreciate that the super wealthy do not exist and are not celebrated in most of these countries, and that corporations are required to share their income more equitably with their employees and to demonstrate an overall positive influence on the communities in which they operate. Progressives support this kind of taxation policy; and if it is implemented in the U.S., and if all of the special privileges and conditions are

eliminated that have been written into current tax policy to benefit special interests, a very large amount of additional funding should emerge – lightening the load of the average citizen.

So, progressives address the funding issue by first identifying what constitutes a reasonable tax policy for themselves and the businesses that operate in the U.S. Next, progressives look to where existing financial resources can be reallocated to better meet community benefit goals. Assessments can begin by focusing on efficiency within all government departments and programs. Bloated government bureaucracies are inexcusable, and progressives support ongoing efficiency assessments government wide. No doubt there are existing funds to be found that can be better distributed.

If the annual U.S. federal budget is examined, one outstanding fact emerges: in one form or another, this budget assigns just under one half of its total financial resources to the military. This amounts to over \$1 trillion. The Defense Department budget itself is the largest part of this – at about \$725 billion for 2019, but there are many other “off line” military expenditures that add up to the remaining \$75+ billion. If only the budgets of the defense department among the nations of the world are considered, the U.S. level of financial commitment to its defense department is equal to the combined total of the military budgets of the next 7 nations in the world with the highest financial commitment to their militaries: China, Saudia Arabia, Russia, the United Kingdom, India, France, and Japan. Why is the U.S. spending so much on its military? Because it is trying to “police the world.” Accordingly, the U.S. supports full force contingents in the form of five “unified commands” [army, air force, navy, marines, special forces, etc.] that collectively cover most of the world. And the U.S. expends huge financial resources on the development and maintenance of arms and a wide variety of weapon systems.

Progressives reasonably question whether this level of budgetary commitment to the military in the U.S. is really necessary or justified. In this regard, it is worth pointing out that one of the major causes for the collapse of nations and civilizations is an over extension of their military forces. Progressives also point out that if the nations of the world support a truly empowered global government, one of the key functions of that government will be to support a military sufficient to guarantee the security of all nations by eliminating the option for conflict to escalate to the level of warfare. With such a global government in place, progressives contend that the overall financial contribution that America would be expected to make in supporting that global government would be equal to about one third of its current military budget. The result would be for the U.S. to have the opportunity to reallocate an enormous

amount of money to support many other programs.

So, with respect to the outsized current U.S. military budget, there is first an immediate opportunity to shrink that budget to a level comparable to other major nations and second the opportunity in the long run with an adequate global government in operation to eliminate most of the military budget apart from the National Guard. In either case, a clear and reasonable option exists to gain very substantial financial resources to fund programs that directly benefit the nation's citizens by reallocating funds currently assigned to the military.

In reality, available funding to support extended social services is not an issue if the taxation system is overhauled so all individual and commercial parties pay their fair share, if government agencies operate efficiently, and if the bloated U.S. military budget is at a minimum reduced to free up very large financial resources to be reallocated. Progressives support all of these funding related actions, which can make available financial resources sufficient to fund a wide range of social services, infrastructure improvements, the conversion to green energy, climate change mitigation, and ecological restoration. In reality, conservatives have no legitimate argument that the country can not afford the cost of expanded social services of the kind that progressives propose.

### **PART THREE: MAJOR STRATEGY PRINCIPLES**

Hopefully what is clear from the discussion in the sections above is that: 1) There are a very large number of objectives covering the scope of societal institutions that follow from the worldview, ideals and values that liberals hold, 2) These objectives are interrelated with some being more comprehensive/higher order in nature, 3) Since many specific objectives nest under higher order, more general objectives, it is logical that these higher order objectives should be addressed before the more specific, underlying objectives are pursued.

There are direct implications from these three general conclusions that help to define what an effective, progressive implementation strategy should look like. First, any proposed implementation strategy that is designed to achieve progressive goals must respect the fact that there will be no "all at once" complete creation of an empowered global government or the transformation of the many American institutions that will be involved to implement the comprehensive progressive agenda. Only a worldwide or national revolution could achieve this result, and revolutions carry with them very high risks. Realistically, implementing a progressive agenda will be gradual, which means that it is critical that it be very strategic. This is a lesson that many liberals seem to ignore. Instead, they are inclined to jump to propose many specific programs in a wide variety of institutions of government without considering the necessary

conditions that must be in place for these programs to be realistically supported and funded.

Second, implementation of the progressive agenda must be staged so that the highest order objectives at the global and national scales – the ones upon which the greatest number of other objectives depend – are identified and pursued first. These objectives are: At the global level: Defining and fully implementing a truly empowered global government that is able to rapidly and effectively address and enforce solutions for all current and future global challenges; At the national level: Totally resolving the issue of the negative impact of money in politics. Success in pursuing virtually every other high order and more specific progressive objective at the global and national levels depends on these two highest priority progressive goals being pursued and achieved. It is also worth noting that resolving the high priority, national “money” goal will facilitate pursuit of the highest priority global objective. If this strategic priority principle of working down the levels of objectives is respected, it will greatly assist the subsequent implementation of the underlying, more specific objectives.

I will offer two examples. One, if the progressive goal of creating an empowered global government is addressed and achieved, the door will be opened for nations to effectively deal with many of the more specific, significant global challenges including: climate change, pandemics, international conflicts, human rights, rule of law, etc. And, attaining this higher order objective will result in the global community of nations operating more efficiently which will free up huge financial resources that can be employed/reallocated to support other, more specific, global objectives. Two, if the highest priority objective at the national level – the money in politics matter – is addressed and resolved, the option will be eliminated for conservatives to “buy” legislative representatives who block implementation of progressive objectives and who appoint conservative judges to the courts where they rule against progressive principles. If the “money” problem is solved, the positive political and judicial consequences will make it much more possible to reallocate funds in the overall budget to realistically support specific progressive objectives in many other areas.

Both of these “highest” priority progressive goals involve removing obstacles to create a positive political path that makes it possible for other higher order and more specific liberal objectives to be implemented. The principle of focusing on highest priority objectives and working down the objective spectrum is key to developing a successful progressive implementation strategy.

Of course, there are a great many specific strategic principles that define the likelihood of success in any particular implementation campaign. I will

conclude by mentioning only two, which progressives too often ignore to their detriment: 1) repeat, repeat, repeat in all media modes and markets, and 2) educating the public to gain support is not just a matter of presenting the positive social, economic and political facts. Effective appeals to the public must also be grounded in illustrative supporting narratives to which positive emotions attach!