Mila Atmos: [00:00:01] Thank you to Inkl for supporting Future Hindsight. Inkl curates ad-free news from the world’s best sources. Get 25% of your subscription at INKL.com/hopeful. That’s I N K L.com/Hopeful. Thanks also to The Jordan Harbinger Show, a podcast you should definitely check out since you’re a fan of high quality, fascinating shows. You know, like this one. We’re enjoying Jordan’s show, and we think you will as well. Search for the Jordan Harbinger Show, that’s H-A-R-B, as in Boy, I-N, as in Nancy, G-E-R on Apple Podcasts, Spotify, or wherever you listen to podcasts.

Mila Atmos: [00:00:49] Welcome to Future Hindsight, a podcast that takes big ideas about civic life and democracy and turns them into action items for you and me. I'm Mila Atmos. We're now past the halfway point of the season of Future Hindsight, and we've been looking at so many aspects of our current reality through the lens of our central theme, the social contract. And every conversation we've had so far, whether it's been about climate or public health, the economy or our working lives, has been overwritten and underlined by race. America's social contract has always excluded people on the basis of race, and it was designed to do that from the very start. But in recent years, we've doubled down. The election of Donald Trump was both a symbol and an acceleration of that exclusion and animus. Today's guest argues that American racism has broken the country's social compact, eroded America's common goods, and damaged the lives of every American. Eduardo Porter is a journalist at The New York Times and the author of American Poison: How Racial Hostility Destroyed Our Promise. Thank you for joining us.

Eduardo Porter: [00:02:15] Hey, thank you for having me, Mila.

Mila Atmos: [00:02:17] So as I was reading your book, I was wondering what was the moment for you when you decided to take these years of reporting on the social contract on economics and turn it into a book?

Eduardo Porter: [00:02:30] So I am Mexican-American, right? And I have a Mexican mother and my father was American. I grew up mostly in Mexico. And I want to share my Mexican is with my son. I want him to kind of like, understand himself also as partly Mexican, partly American, like I do. So we speak in Spanish at home, and he's gone to
Mexico several times. And what happened the day after the election of Donald Trump, I was with my kid in the subway and as usual, we're chatting about whatever in Spanish. And suddenly he kind of like looked around and leaned into me a little bit and kind of like whispered, "you know, dad, maybe we shouldn't be speaking in Spanish, in public." And I was like, Whoa, I got really angry. I mean, not at him, but at the fact that he was suddenly feeling vulnerable because he spoke Spanish. And this was coming from the election rhetoric, right? I mean, right around that same time, at a playground near his school, there were some swastikas like drawn on the school equipment with "Go Trump" written underneath. And so this whole sense of suddenly you are vulnerable because of your ethnic identity struck me like so weird in 21st Century America, but also: so yeah, no, that's right. That is how this country has evolved over time. That is this country. And so that was a very, very striking moment. I mean, that is kind of like one of those moments that made me think that I had to write this book.

Mila Atmos: [00:04:06] Yeah, that's very powerful. I mean, I, as you know, I'm Asian, and so I have similar encounters all the time on the subway in New York. And I also feel like, you know, being in public is kind of a vulnerable spot in ways that sometimes you don't think about. So three issues really stood out while I was reading your book, and those were the ways in which race intersects with labor, incarceration and education. But let's start with incarceration. It's actually key when we're talking about the social contract and in your book, you seem to think so too, when you write that the prison system has actually displaced the social safety net in some ways. You say that's thanks to the tough on crime messages that have been sold to voters for decades, leading to an explosion in incarceration, which is not cheap and which puts the squeeze on funding for public goods. And the numbers are just staggering, with the budget for federal and state and local prisons increasing four-fold between 1987 and 2015. Can you talk about these parallel tracks with growing incarceration on one track and a shrinking social safety net on the other?

Eduardo Porter: [00:05:19] Well, let's like ground this in in history. It's interesting that the moment that we really decide to deploy the criminal justice system in this kind of like massive way and start incarcerating enormous quantities of young men of color mostly coincided pretty closely with the moment in which the United States for the first time opened up some of the opportunity for prosperity to people of color. So let me let me explain the story of the American safety net, which starts in the Great Depression with
FDR and the New Deal is essentially, it's first of all, it's a safety net for white people. So FDR, in order to get a lot of his New Deal legislation passed by white southern Democratic senators, he needs to really make this a white program. There's all these instances in where, you know, you find him kind of like struggling with the fact that if it becomes more of a universal program, it will probably be defeated. And so things like, you know, Social Security excludes household workers and agricultural workers, and these two sectors happen to be the sectors that employ, I don't know, two thirds of African-American workers. So there's all these moments where you can see, like African-Americans being excluded from the formation of our social safety net.

Eduardo Porter: [00:06:39] And then you fast forward to the 1960s, the civil rights movement and Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty and the combination of a lot of the civil rights legislation and a lot of the war on poverty programs amounted to, for the first time, allowing people of color, allowing notably Black Americans to benefit from some of the protections of the American social contract. And so what happened at that moment is that political support for the safety net entirely pretty much collapsed, and it was replaced by the use of criminal justice as a tool for social management. So instead of, you know, dealing with the problems that marginal communities face by offering them child care and offering them income supports and offering them housing supports, we instead decided, well, let's use prison. Young men from these kind of like more impoverished communities, let's just put them in jail. And so that became the main strategy for managing marginal, destitute communities of color from the certainly the 1970s all the way into the 21st century.

Mila Atmos: [00:07:49] Right, right. Well, what I like about how you explain this incarceration system is how it really exemplifies how policies that were targeted towards people of color is now also affecting rural white people. So in fact, the number of rural white people in prison has also mushroomed. So it isn't only and I feel like this illustrates so well how these policies that were intended for one racial group is actually affecting us all. Is there a way to talk about criminal justice that communicates how this system is destroying low income communities, regardless of color?

Eduardo Porter: [00:08:30] Well, I think that that idea is kind of percolating through the political system. I mean, if you think of the last, say, five years or so, there has been kind of like a bipartisan movement towards less draconian, less punitive criminal justice
policies. You know, replacements of three strikes laws and these very restrictive sentencing policies are kind of like slowly falling by the wayside. And if you look at the overall at the headline stats of incarcerated people, they are coming down ever so slightly. So I do think that there's an awareness that the U.S. just went overboard, that, you know, having an incarceration rate on par with like Rwanda's was not the place for this country to be. Now what motivates that, I think, is primarily fiscal. States have to pay for for this. And as you pointed out earlier, we're spending so much money on incarceration. I think that states figured out, "Oh, maybe you know, we could spend that money elsewhere, better." And so I think that some of the motivation comes from states, you know, running out of money to put more people in jail. But I also think that that has allowed us to rethink a little bit to what extent we have deployed incarceration just to basically to deal with poverty and that it's not a good tool to deal with poverty and the consequences of poverty and the consequences of social marginalization. It's a really dismal tool for that. So I have some hope that that particular element of our dysfunction might improve in the medium term.

Mila Atmos: [00:10:15] Yeah, I'm hopeful also that that will change. Well, at least in the medium term, if not the long term. Although I think at this point we can only hope for long term solutions because everything looks like super slow moving, you know, despite the change in the administration.

Eduardo Porter: [00:10:30] I mean, we did get a trillion dollar bill passed just the other day, so, you know, everything is not horrible.

Mila Atmos: [00:10:35] Yes, everything is not horrible.

Eduardo Porter: [00:10:37] But by the way, I realize that I skirted your last question, that this is not just affecting communities of color, that this, you know, stingy social contract that we have built for ourselves also hurts, you know, white people. And basically, it hurts everybody is absolutely true. There are more poor white people than there are poor Black people. And those folks are really, really, really hurt when we build a society that that is unable to, or unwilling, to invest in public goods. I visited Harlan in Kentucky a couple of years ago for a story. Harlan is kind of like famous in labor lore. It's a coal mining area in Appalachia, and there is a very famous battle to unionize that got immortalized in this really wonderful movie called Harlan County, USA about the
struggles to unionize this region. And it's super poor and in it's super white. The reason I went down there was that it is one of only 10 counties, maybe 11 counties in the country, where federal government dollars account for at least half of personal income on average of the peoples in the county. So, you know, half of the money that people have in the county comes from food stamps or Social Security or Medicare or some combination of those. So I went down there, you know, just to experience this, what is it like to be in this sort of place? And I happened to be in a town hall meeting where the governor at the time, Matt Bevin, a Tea Party stalwart, he was there holding this town hall.

**Eduardo Porter:** [00:12:11] And, you know, he talked about bears and trash and everybody was like, ho-humming. And suddenly he started railing against Medicaid and people got out of off their chairs and they clapped. And there was this round of applause for his attack on Medicaid. And the funny thing is that I'm guessing that everybody in that room was on Medicaid. And so there's this weird disconnect. The programs that would help this kind of community were reviled by this community. And so when I went around and asking people, why is this kind of like hostility towards Medicaid? And it was a sense that, you know, the government being involved in your life. And also the notion was very, very strong that there was some other person out there that would be abusing the program and that that other person was never really articulated. But some people would talk about immigrants. We cannot afford to pay these programs for immigrants, and I don't think there's a single immigrant in Harlan County. So these are all kind of like abstractions about some other person, some other group of people that are going to come in and abuse our taxpayer dollars and our generosity. And I think that is steeped in racial hostility, you know, understanding people, not as individuals, but as members of groups that are others. But, you know, Harlan could do with a much more robust Medicaid program because it is extremely poor and this is a program that it relies on.

**Mila Atmos:** [00:13:39] You know, one of the things that I wondered about when I was reading about Harlan County was after they elected Matt Bevin and their Medicaid benefits basically were cut back, did they connect the dots? Like, does anyone do that? Or

**Eduardo Porter:** [00:13:56] I don't think so
Mila Atmos: [00:13:57] Or is it just, they don't know that this is what's happening.

Eduardo Porter: [00:13:59] I don't think so, because ultimately, when you see folks that could benefit from very clear objective policies. Voting against these policies, there's got to be some lack of understanding here about what's actually going on. And I think that this becomes very obvious when you look at the political strategy of Donald Trump when he ran for president and then throughout his administration, when he tried to get re-elected, which was all about amassing support by demonizing some outside groups. So in his first run in 2015, it was Mexicans. And that's how he managed to whip up the passion. But we know what the stats then showed us is that in communities where there were immigrants, where there were Mexican immigrants, this kind of language didn't really work as much as it did when there were no immigrants. So again, he was speaking to abstract fears rather than to people's lived realities. That kind of, I think psychological mechanism, makes it very, very difficult to change folks' minds because you're basically reacting to something that you don't know. You're reacting to an abstract proposition that then you claim to be true, even though it is not part of your lived experience. I can't quite imagine how you use reason to change that mind, because reason doesn't seem to be part of the process in which this position is arrived at. Then when Trump didn't run for re-election, it wasn't Mexicans. It was, I guess, because of the the urban protest from the Black Lives Matter movement throughout that summer, following the murder of George Floyd. It became more about Blacks, and he had these lines about protecting white suburban women from poor Blacks that were going to move in to their suburbs. And so it went back more to the Nixonian type of racism that came out of the protests in 1968 after the killing of Dr. King. But it was always this idea of like mobilizing some inchoate fear of the other as a political tool, and I don't think reason really plays much in this kind of like psychological process.

Mila Atmos: [00:16:19] So one of the things you also talked about is the Moynihan report, which was this report on Black poverty in the U.S. that was published in 1965 under the Johnson administration. It examined the scars left by slavery and racism and argued for affirmative action to address race-based inequality beyond guaranteeing equal rights. The report also attributed Black poverty to the breakdown of Black families. Now that claim was seized upon by conservatives who used this argument to blame the
victim. It was a controversial report then. It's still controversial now. So Eduardo, can you help us understand what went on with the Moynihan report and its fallout?

Eduardo Porter: [00:17:01] Yeah. Well, so again, this fits this kind of like rethinking in American society and the American political system of why we want a safety net. And so it's this idea that we, we wanted a safety net as long as it was mostly restricted to white Americans. And once a safety net becomes opened to non-white Americans, the political support for that kind of disappears. And that change in the political proposition comes with a bunch of language and narratives about why we're doing this, right. And so one of the most important, one of the most powerful changes in the narrative or innovations in the narrative was to blame the poor for their poverty. To blame, you know, poor families for the dysfunction that many of them lived in. And so I don't think that this was Moynihan's intention. I think that Moynihan did, in fact, think that the problem stemmed from the difficult conditions in the labor market that did not allow African-American men at the time to sustain intact families. But it got red into the political system as a blame the victim sort of thing. It's "Oh, well, yeah, these these families aren't trustworthy," and that fits with so much of other kind of narratives that became popular in those years. I mean, one that I come back to a bunch is the idea of the welfare queen. That was a super powerful symbol deployed during the Reagan administration that put poor Black mothers as kind of corrupt and undeserving and abusing your taxpayer dollars. And so there's a whole bunch of different stories that basically convinced us that it's kind of the poor's fault and they must better themselves. And so that kind of like exonerates us, liberates us, from the responsibility of trying to contribute to the more generous social compact.

Mila Atmos: [00:19:08] More with Eduardo Porter, author of American Poison: How Racial Hostility Destroyed Our Promise in a couple of moments. He's going to guide us through two major issues at the crossroads of race and the social contract, labor and education: how unions and school tax caps have been used to undermine our compact with each other. But right now, we're going to pause to hear from our sponsor this week: Inkl. If you're like me, keeping up with the news has become a real pain. All the best news sites are locked behind paywalls, and the free stuff is just clickbait and fake news that honestly, no one should read. Now imagine an app where you can get unlocked access to news sites that are reliable. One that shows you every story from multiple perspectives to counter bias, filters out fake news and clickbait, and where positive
stories—the actual good news—are highlighted, so you don't become despondent. In fact, it's where journalists themselves dig through news from around the world to find stories you wouldn't normally see. That's what an innovative Australian startup called Inkl, I N K L has come up with. Inkl.com has signed partnerships with a hundred plus news sources like The Economist, The Atlantic and Bloomberg, and created a unique system combining journalists and algorithms to create a "best of" News Feed. I've been using it and loving it, and I bet you will, too. The service unlocks more than $12,000-worth of premium news for $100 a year, and if you go now to Inkl.com/Hopeful, they'll give you an additional 25% discount so you can get a whole year’s worth of headache free news for just $75. That's INKL.com/hopeful.

**Mila Atmos:** [00:21:00] We're also sponsored by The Jordan Harbinger Show. Jordan's show was named by Apple as one of its best of 2018 and is aimed at making you a better informed, more critical thinker. Listening to his show can help you get a sense of how the world actually works so you can come to your own conclusions about what's happening. The podcast covers a lot, and one constant is his ability to pull useful pieces of advice from his guests. You'll find something you can apply to your own life, whether that's an actionable routine change that boosts your productivity or just a tweak to your mindset that changes how you see the world. He recently interviewed Timothy Snyder, author of On Tyranny: Twenty Lessons from the 20th Century, about how fragile a democratic republic can be in the face of the concentrated efforts of would-be tyrants, how to consume information in a post-fact world, and why democracy is an ongoing activity in our day-to-day lives. A really urgent conversation for our times that you should definitely check out. You can't go wrong with adding the Jordan Harbinger Show to your rotation. It's incredibly interesting. There's never a dull show. Search for The Jordan Harbinger Show that's H-A-R-B, as in Boy, I-N, as in Nancy, G-E-R, on Apple Podcasts, Spotify or wherever you listen to podcasts. Now, let's return to our conversation with Eduardo Porter.

**Mila Atmos:** [00:22:30] So one of the things that also struck me in the book is that you write that here in the U.S., racial animus undermines our ability to work together and to help each other out, and that it can also be seen in labor movements. You recently published a piece about construction unions in Boston and how, in spite of laws mandating racial equity, people of color continue to be underrepresented in those
unions. How does that play into this story? How does exclusion from certain unions, and we're not saying all unions, but how does that exclusion affect the social contract?

**Eduardo Porter:** [00:23:02] I mean, the most fast growing, biggest, most important unions in the country have very much come around to embrace racial diversity. And I'm thinking of unions like the Service Employees International Union, which is like basically janitors and security guards, or Unite Here, which has restaurant workers, hotel workers, those guys. They're super diverse unions. I mean, it's not by design. It's, what happens is the workforce in the industries that they cover have become extremely diverse. And so these unions became very embracing of kind of like the New America. I would say construction trades are kind of like on the other end of the line. And so the purpose of this story that I just wrote was I wanted to investigate. I know that in the past, unions had a lot of trouble in inviting people of color in because had organized labor allied with, say, the civil rights crowd with a racial justice crowd in the 1960s and 70s, I don't think that we would have so many right-to-work states in the South as we have today, but because there really was no clear alliance between Black workers and labor unions, I think it was much more politically possible to pass these bunch of anti-union laws in many of these states across the South. The interest of my story was to see, well, to what extent do some of these hostilities persist to this day. And kind of like the conclusion of my reporting is that they do persist. Those unions come from an, an older pattern of organization, you know, around that comes from medieval guilds where the union would provide the training and would be the gatekeeper to employment. A lot of the hiring happens through the Union Hall, so the union has a lot of control and it also runs the apprenticeships. So it it has control over the pipeline. And these are old white unions, and they've had a hard time in letting outsiders in. They're old white unions that are not only kind of like around a concept of race, but also around family. And so there's an insider outsider dynamic along lines of race and ethnicity in some of these unions that keeps workers of color from benefiting from the kind of jobs that will produce middle class life.

**Mila Atmos:** [00:25:27] Right? Well, this idea of groups not recognizing where they have common ground is a recurring theme in your book. And public education is one of those core elements of the social contract that you argue is being undermined by racial hostility. And one of the areas where there's a devastating impact is in California's public education system. I was fascinated by your exploration of Prop 13. Back in 1978,
Prop 13 capped property taxes and basically sabotaged the state's public education system. Can you tell us a bit more about what happened?

**Eduardo Porter: [00:26:02]** You know, public education in most of the U.S. is funded locally by property taxes, and essentially what happened in California was... old, I mean, I'll put schematically old white voters didn't really want to pay more in taxes to fund the education of younger brown families. You know, this was a moment of very salient demographic change in California and the the racial flavor of the movement for Prop 13 was pretty obvious. It was pretty clear. And so they, they decided to block any tax increases, which essentially led to a defunding of public education in the state. There's other little kind of like bits of evidence of this kind of the kind of like racial and ethnic motivation of this kind of thing. There's an old, old study by a great economist called James Poterba that found that as people get older, they become less willing to pay for taxes that will pay for the education of a younger generation. But what I found most interesting was that when the race of the older generation and the race of the younger generation was different, the support for taxation dropped particularly precipitously. Mm hmm. And you see this as well, again, in California, there's another study done by a couple of economists at UC that found that when immigrant kids came from across the border into the public school system, the American-born kids would leave the public school system entirely and move into the private school system. So these lines of racial division, I think, were absolutely fundamental for the passage of Prop 13.

**Mila Atmos: [00:27:58]** Well, I think one of the things that people miss in this and you point out so eloquently, is that in the long term, these kids are going to be the future taxpayers who are going to help us. You know, and if they are not well educated, they make less money and pay less in taxes and therefore, you know, breaks down our social compact even further.

**Eduardo Porter: [00:28:22]** Well, sure. And you can make the same argument about the incarceration of large numbers of young Black men. You're keeping them out of the labor force. You are probably hurting their human capital development. I mean, you're basically building a poorer nation with many of these policies.
Mila Atmos: [00:28:38] Well, so how do we build a not poor nation, how do we build a new social compact? Do we need to build new institutions or relationships? Or, you know, what's your idea and what would that look like?

Eduardo Porter: [00:28:48] I mean, the real short answer is I have no idea. But having said that, I'll throw a few kind of like ideas that maybe go a little bit of a way. But I don't have like an overall thought about how do we resolve this? But one thing that to keep in mind is that in our history, we have done things to help build the social contract. It's not like we've always ignored it. There have been moments, like there's the Brown versus Board of Education and the many Supreme Court decisions that came afterwards to ensure desegregation of education. Those led to actually real important policy changes that were very, very helpful to communities of color. I mean, there's been studies looking at kids of before desegregation orders and after desegregation orders and how they fared later in life. And there's a huge improvement, not just in their educational attainment, but like in the wages that they earned after leaving school. Their incarceration rate was much, much lower. Family formation was much higher. Family stability was more stable. These are policies that actually really did move the ball. What was a problem is that, you know, political support for some of the policies to desegregate schools collapsed. You know, for instance, busing because of white opposition that many of these programs fell by the wayside and we stopped making progress. And in fact, in recent times, I think we've been regressing. But I would say that also policies about residential desegregation, trying to make people live closer together so that in Harlem, where you think of an immigrant or or an African-American and all you have to go by is kind of like some vision from television or some abstract notion. Well, you actually have a lived experience of others. But I think that these sorts of policies can help us overcome the group barriers and think of each others as individuals. And then that will allow a sense of empathy, the notion of solidarity, to break through the distrust. And you've had, there have been policies for affordable housing, and there was one particularly interesting one in New Jersey which actually forced developers that were going to bring in a ton of other development. They had to pay attention to the social composition before they moved in and ensure that there was housing to maintain elements of that previous kind of society after the development happened. And so I think that these kinds of ideas to desegregate important aspects of our lives, our education, and where we live, are good building blocks. I mean, do they put us on the other side of the river? I have no idea. And I would actually be very
skeptical. But I do think that they're worth trying. The idea of, well, what policies can we have so that people are together and experience each other as people? Somebody had mentioned creating a year of National Service might help do that. That would bring people together across lines of race and ethnicity, but also across lines of class for working on a year on, you know, some Habitat for Humanity thing or Teach For America thing or building roads somewhere.

**Eduardo Porter: [00:32:09]** That strikes me as interesting, but none of this strikes me as a solution. And one of the things that makes me feel a little despairing is that these lines that we've built have grown deeper and deeper over time. I find it kind of interesting that it seemed to me that the prevailing thought amongst white Americans was that racism had been dealt with and solved with, you know, the civil rights movement. And, you know, there's equal rights. And so now, OK, it's done. And so this desire to not look at our racial problems and the cost of our racial divisions is a very potent desire. And you see that now when the Black Lives Matter movement brought to people's TV screens, that in fact, that there is still a lot of of racial hostility that is doing a lot of damage in communities of color. The reaction of a lot of white people was of extreme hostility against these expressions of urban hurt. What we're hearing from the Republican side of the political system is that these cries from communities of colors are somehow illegitimately putting an undeserved blame among white Americans. And so, wow, we're already way into the 21st century and we don't look any way closer than we have to actually buying into the notion of a society for all of us.

**Mila Atmos: [00:33:41]** Right? Yeah. What are two things you think people can do to demand a new social contract and move towards creating one, you know, one that works for everyone?

**Eduardo Porter: [00:33:51]** Oh gosh. Two things.

**Mila Atmos: [00:33:53]** Two things. Or one. Just one. Tell me one thing.

**Eduardo Porter: [00:33:57]** No, I mean, I just, you know, this is very kind of like handwavy and corny, but just, engaging with people. I mean, looking at people. It's about talking to each other. And that's also where I feel that some of the prescriptions that come from the racial justice corner of the conversation can be counterproductive
when rightly they express their anger over decades and hundreds of years of oppression and marginalization. It's not that I don't understand where that comes from, but my sense is that the solution does not come from there. The solution has to come from talking to each other, and even though you think the other guy really sucks, you still have to talk to them. Any solution in this country is going to have to accommodate the fact that still more than half of the people in it are white. If your proposition is to try to build a more just society by some kind of hostile proposition about half the population, it's not going to work. However righteous your anger is, I do think that the solution really requires talking across lines of race to build a sense of a new American. I mean, that's essentially what this new multicultured, multiethnic country that we're in, in which unfortunately, too many people do not believe in somehow.

Mila Atmos: [00:35:27] Mm hmm. Mm hmm. Yeah, I agree that we need to have more dialogue with each other. A part of me feels like the big value in this is to hear everybody's ideas. And if we are willing to hear everybody's ideas, there may be one that we can all agree on and, you know, pursue. So now that you have written this book and you continue to write about this issue, looking into the future, what makes you hopeful?

Eduardo Porter: [00:35:52] Well, look very little. I find it really interesting that racial hostility remains today, one of the most potent forces in our political system, and I find that cause for despair. If anything makes me hopeful, is "Well, we passed an infrastructure bill." It's one little bill. Well, it's not that little. It's a decent-sized bill. It's one bill. I mean, I'm sure the Biden administration would hate me articulating it like this, but they're kind of baby steps. I do think that improving the lives of the the economic outcomes for people could help and make this conversation easier because I think that when people are stressed out economically and struggling, they are probably less open to invite others in, to be more generous against people that they do not identify with. And so increasing material prosperity, I think, is helpful. And so I think that the propositions in the Biden administration could be helpful in improving our conversation over our racial and ethnic divisions. So I think that makes me a little bit hopeful. But there's a lot of ifs in my thinking. I'm not quite sure a) that anything else is in fact going to pass. And b) you know how this filter through into people's real lives is also still a bit of a mystery. So I guess that's my little grain of hope.
Mila Atmos: [00:37:17] Hope with caveats.

Eduardo Porter: [00:37:19] Yeah, exactly.


Eduardo Porter: [00:37:31] Thanks a lot, Mila. It was great.

Mila Atmos: [00:37:33] Thank you. Next time on Future Hindsight, we get into the dollars and cents of the social contract. That's right, taxes. I'll be talking to Sarah Christopherson of Americans for Tax Fairness about what needs to change about America's baffling and skewed tax code to support a fairer future. That's next time on Future Hindsight.

Mila Atmos: [00:38:10] This podcast was produced for Future Hindsight by Sara Burningham, Reva Goldberg, Zoe Sullivan, and Bart Warshaw of the Cocoon Collective. Zack Travis is our associate producer. Until next time, stay engaged.

The Democracy Group: [00:38:36] This podcast is part of the Democracy Group.