

[Transcript] The Realignment / Realignment Q&A Mailbag | The Return of Serious Politics? Speaker Drama and Realignments, ChatGPT, and more...(Supercast Exclusive)

Hey, realignment listeners, Marshall and Sager here.

We are back with exclusive content for Supercast subscribers this year.

If you'd like to get full access to the Q&A that we're about to get into here today, you could submit your own questions and upvote others at realignment.supercast.com.

There you could support the show five a month, 50 a year or 500 for lifetime membership.

I'm really excited that as part of our efforts, we're going to be upping

the amount of great exclusive content and of course, help fund the show on to the first question.

And once again, that's realignment.supercast.com or the link at the top of the show notes.

This is the free question that we're offering you all as a preview, what we're up to.

And of course, would love for you once again to offer the show some support

and to get in on all this great stuff and republishing this year on to the first question.

This is from Matt.

Hey, Marshall and Sager, you guys make the best show in my podcast feed.

Thank you, Matt, on to the question.

We have all heard the Pollyanna's idea that a common enemy such as China will somehow magically bridge American political divides.

And that's not what I want to discuss.

Instead, do you think that a rising China means an end to the growing unseriousness we've seen in politics since the end of the Cold War?

In short, is political buffoonery simply a luxury of America,

hegemony that's bound to expire as I look back on the Cold War,

political divides are a foreign policy and domestic policy.

They were just as deep as today, McCarthy hearings,

political violence, Watergate, Civil Rights, Vietnam, Iran, Contra, et cetera.

But because of the threat of the USSR, national political figures were at least serious minded statesman.

What do you guys think?

I kind of, yeah, I disagree with the premise that things

were so much better during the Cold War or even before.

I actually just think this is the natural state and that whenever we read history,

we tend to pick and choose the times when everything was actually

is kind of Pollyanna's where everybody was united.

Look, go and read about the worst crises.

There were insane and intense debates during almost all of them

while they were happening that you would shock you.

I mean, during the Civil War, during World War One, during World War Two,

like there was a tremendous amount of domestic political dissent

around even the grand strategy about what was happening abroad

and also over domestic political questions here at home.

So no, I personally don't think that it would change really anything at all.

I mean, maybe some like in terms of big questions, but even then,

I really don't know.

It's such a unique and different situation like outside of a genuinely existential

and I'm talking like existential type conflict, but even then, you know, I've gone back and I've read Marshall. I'm sure you have to like in terms of the debates in the United States over World War Two, like up until Pearl Harbor, it was not set at all. And actually, there was still quite a bit of dissent all the way up until 45. And then what happens? The moment FDR dies in the war and the war ends, there's this explosion of like McCarthyism, who lost China, the Marshall plan. Like we tend to think that these things just like sailed through Congress. And that's just like not what happened in terms of in terms of like, how it actually went down at the time. So I think there's a little bit of rose colored glasses on that question. I wonder the one point of pushback as I read the question to quickly as he was just making clear, like political buffoonery, not dissent, but here's what I'll say. The key thing is political buffoonery is a look. It's always happened, but I think it's especially heightened by like social media and entertainment incentives. Like Madison Cuthbert was always going to be a buffoon because ultimately he wanted to be a T P USA superstar and podcaster, not like an actual member of Congress. And that's going to happen whether or not we're in a cold war with China, whether or not there's a NATO Russia conflict, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. I will say what it does do. And I think this is what Matt was getting at is it provides a space for seriousness in certain categories during specific moments like this. So I think it'd be pretty easy to say, but actually, perfect step was sorry. You know, that's like, there's a bipartisan consensus on China trade policy now because there's a very serious discussion of decoupling resiliency supply chains. Like if you're a member of Congress, you have an opportunity to build and do things there in a way that would not exist without that specific issue coming to mind. So it's not to say that we're just going to see us return to like the house on days of everyone being once again, he got up this with his with question. It's not going to be peachy keen. It's just going to be that like once again, like Mike Gallagher gets to be committee chairman for the bipartisan China Commission and no one's going to be looking to Lauren Boebert for that. It just it just it just gives it gives space. I think that I think that is that that is encouraging that there be serious spaces. Yeah, maybe you're right. I hope I'm right.

[Transcript] The Realignment / Realignment Q&A Mailbag | The Return of Serious Politics? Speaker Drama and Realignments, ChatGPT, and more...(Supercast Exclusive)

Next question.

This question is covered by the supercast.

So if you'd like to subscribe, go to [realignment dot supercast.com](https://realignment.supercast.com) or click the link in the show notes.