

Scott Pruitt's First Address to the EPA:

As Annotated by a Group of Academics, Social Scientists, Historians, and Environmental Researchers (EDGI).

February 21, 2017

Tuesday at noon in the EPA Headquarters in Washington, the new EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt addressed the agency's employees for the first time. The speech was notable for what it said, from the history it cited to the principles it enunciated to its choice of words. Most significantly the address left unsaid the legacies and obligations and thorny implications of EPA's mission and history. The address did not mention any of the many EPA programs nor the federal laws EPA is charged with enforcing. To help explicate and decode the messages sent by the new Administrator, EDGI offers the following annotated commentary. This commentary is not meant to be exhaustive or provide evidence of intention, but rather to provide further information where it may have been in short supply.

Overall the speech offered little encouragement to citizens, scientists, regulators, and communities concerned about the future of EPA's mission to protect human health and the environment or its commitment to evidence-based governance. Pruitt said nothing about the history that actually gave rise to the EPA, but instead invoked a much more distant past, shaped by backroom deals among "great men" and an ethno-nationalist "Anglo-Saxon exceptionalism." The mid-20th century failures of the states to effectively control pollution catalyzed a broad bi-partisan consensus around federal Clean Air and Water Acts, along with a new federal agency to interpret and enforce them.¹ Pruitt's speech, on the other hand, lauded federalism and suggested a return of these powers back to the states. Pruitt's declaration that "regulation exists to give certainty to the regulated" ignored the frequent failures of businesses and markets either to acknowledge or address their environmental impacts, a blind spot which has compelled support of the EPA's work over many decades by Republicans and Democrats alike. Finally, Pruitt's emphasis solely on statutory law neglected just how dependent the agency's mission has been--and continues to be-- on science, scientists, and evidence. Historically these have served as the EPA's chief window into what environmental impacts actually are, and how they should be addressed.

Black/yellow annotations: factual points

Red/yellow annotations: on word choice and phraseology

Blue/yellow annotations: more general analysis

Comment [1]: May include links to further information.

Comment [2]: Rhetorical and linguistic analysis.

Comment [3]: We analyze and interpret.

¹ Scott Dewey, *Don't Breathe the Air: Air Pollution and U.S. Environmental Politics, 1945-1970* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2000); Donald Carr, *Death of the Sweet Waters* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1966); Christopher Sellers, *Crabgrass Crucible: Suburban Nature and the Rise of Environmentalism in Twentieth-Century America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012), esp. 260-65.

Speech:

Administrator Scott Pruitt:

Thanks, (Catherine). Thank you so much. Well, thank you, (Catherine), it's been a joy to meet (Catherine) today and spend some time with her and I do thank you for the hat. I am excited about being in a city that actually has a Major League Baseball team because that's going to be exciting to be able to exit the – you know, in the evening and enjoy some good baseball.

And I'll make sure that I wear this hat as we attend those games. And the parent club of my AAA team was the Texas Rangers and so they're an American league. We're going to be OK to cheer for the Nationals here in the National League, so excited about that. It's been an honor and a joy to be with you this morning. I got a chance to meet some of you and it's an honor and a joy to be with you in this setting.

And as I spent time with you this morning, it was something that was abundantly clear to me that you love what you do. There's an old saying that if you love what you do, you never work a day in your life and I want to say thank you to (Catherine), I want to say thank you to her for her leadership in the last month or so. It took us a little while to get here so I was thankful for her leadership during that timeframe.

But I want to say thank you to each of the (current) individuals that have been serving this agency for quite some time. Most of the people I met this morning, I think the least amount of years that I heard was 19 years. That's quite something. That says a lot about the mission of the agency and the people that are here. And I want to commend you for your service to this country and service to this agency and thank you for that.

Comment [4]: Pruitt was co-owner and managing partner from 2003 to 2010 of the Oklahoma City Redhawks. Their best annual record during this time was 81-63 (2005) and worst was 69-75 (2009).
<http://www.baseball-reference.com/register/team.cgi?city=Oklahoma%20City&state=OK&country=US>

Comment [5]: Nineteen years of service means they joined in 1998 during the Clinton administration; so all these employees have served at least beginning then. Thus, all have worked under administrators appointed by Clinton, G.W. Bush, and Obama.
<https://www.epa.gov/history/chronology-epa-administrators>

You know, I know it's very difficult to capture in one speech the vision and direction of an agency and I also recognize that you don't know me very well. In fact, you don't know me hardly at all other than maybe what you've read in the newspaper and seen on the news and I might suggest to you that just like (Paul Harvey) used to say, I look forward to sharing the rest of the story with you as we spend time together.

Comment [6]: The EPA website actually accomplishes this in a single sentence, thusly: "The mission of EPA is to protect human health and the environment." Nowhere in the speech is there any mention of "health," human or ecological. <https://www.epa.gov/aboutepa/our-mission-and-what-we-do>

But this is a beginning. It's a beginning for us to spend time and discuss certain principles by which I think this agency should conduct itself and I look forward to leading this agency with these following principles in mind. There was a book several years ago that I read called *Founding Brothers*. I don't know if you've had the pleasure of reading that book, it's actually a book by (Joseph Ellis), an historian from the University of Vermont.

Comment [7]: Paul Harvey was a radio commentator "known for his patriotism and his conservative politics" (<http://conservativetribune.com/paul-harvey-americas-future/>) whose "gentle storytelling program was the launching pad for an entire cast of well-known faces from today's conservative movement, from Mitt Romney to Mike Huckabee to Fred Thompson." <http://www.npr.org/2014/10/09/354718833/the-rest-of-the-story-paul-harvey-conservative-talk-radio-pioneer>

Comment [8]: As for the rest of Pruitt's own story, some of it can be gleaned from Pruitt's bio for Federalist Society, a "group of conservatives and libertarians interested in the current state of the legal order": "Pruitt is a leading advocate against the EPA's activist agenda, and he is leading the charge against the EPA's proposed Clean Power Plan and "Waters of the U.S." rules for their unlawful attempt to displace state sovereignty in the environmental regulatory context." <http://www.fed-soc.org/experts/detail/scott-pruitt>

Comment [9]: The Amazon.com description: "how a group of greatly gifted but deeply flawed individuals—Hamilton, Burr, Jefferson, Franklin, Washington, Adams, and Madison—confronted the overwhelming challenges before them to set the course for our nation." <https://www.amazon.com/Founding-Brothers-Revolutionary-Joseph-Ellis/dp/0375705244>

And it's a book about a series of historical encounters with the founding generation and there's one particular chapter called the dinner, a historical vignette that took place between Thomas Jefferson and James Madison and Alexander Hamilton. And the dinner took place as a result of something that was going on in Congress in 1790. It was a very difficult and challenging issue called the Assumption Bill.

Comment [10]: From historian David Waldstreicher's review of Ellis' book: "...despite his recognition that democracy and nationalization were the key issues of the early republic's political culture, Ellis insists on defining them as issues dealt with decisively by his eight statesmen—rather than by a larger polity or society...[His is] a decidedly elite definition of "political culture"—and one that goes against the grain of the way the term has been used since the sixties..." *Reviews in American History*, Vol. 29, No. 2 (Jun., 2001), p. 199.

Comment [11]: The EPA was founded 180 years later, on December 2, 1970, by a Republican President, Richard Nixon. <https://www.epa.gov/history>

As you know as the colonies came out of the revolutionary war, the (eventual) states, there was

tremendous debt that the states had incurred and they could not pay the debt. And Alexander

Hamilton had a wonderful idea, he thought. He thought this new found federal government should

assume that debt, consolidate all that debt and seek to pay it off, in behalf of the states.

Well that caused certain individuals like Thomas Jefferson and James Madison to be concerned. To

be concerned about the role of this federal government and the new-found responsibilities that it

might have and so there was intractability around some very important issues debt, the role between

the federal government and the states. This sounds a little bit like today.

And they did something though that doesn't happen very much today. They actually got

together. They actually spent time together. You know this environment that we live in

this country today, it is a very, forgive the reference, but it's a very toxic environment. 11.

Comment [12]: Revising the "Great Man bvgbTheory of History," "a popular 19th century idea according to which history can be largely explained by the impact of 'great men,' or heroes: highly influential individuals who, due to either their personal charisma, intelligence, wisdom, or Machiavellianism utilized their power in a way that had a decisive historical impact." <https://www.stoa.org.uk/topics/history/Great%20Man%20theory.pdf>

Comment [13]: Emphasis on federal debt seems odd and perhaps indicates a forthcoming emphasis on the expense of agency operations as well as costs imposed by any regulations themselves.

Comment [14]: Lest we look too rosilily upon the conduct and mores of our founding brothers, it is useful to remember that Hamilton, Jefferson and Madison all purchased and probably owned slaves. It is a legacy that Pruitt's other favorite book, mentioned below, also pointedly soft-pedals. And it is one that the EPA has tackled since the 1990's through environmental justice programs, addressing how certain hazards have concentrated in minority communities. The historical vision articulated in this speech may point toward a de-prioritizing of these programs.

Comment [15]: Pruitt's own record of suing the EPA suggests that the intractability to which he is referring here may well include his own--marking a contrast with his later insistence that he will "listen." The EDF has compiled a factual list of 14 of these lawsuits, along with some description<http://www.edfaction.org/scott-pruitts-web-fundraising-and-lawsuits>

Comment [16]: "The role between the federal government and the states" was also a burning issue during the 1960s and 70s, because of how poorly some states were handling their own pollution problems, as well as how water and air pollution kept spilling beyond the bounds of individual states. The answer: empower a federal agency to tackle these problems, an "Environmental Protection Agency."

Comment [17]: Only if conservatives such as Pruitt are absolutely insistent on agendas of drastically cutting expenditures for federal regulation and returning regulation of the environment to the states, where it largely resided all the way through the mid-twentieth century.

Comment [18]: "Environment" is mentioned six times in this talk, but in these two instances it is only metaphoric, not referring to the "environment" this agency is mandated to protect.

Comment [19]: His first and only usage of any word denoting "pollution" and its dangers. But he uses it metaphorically, to refer to political toxicity, rather than referring to what EPA actually regulates.

We have jerseys that we put on, both politically and otherwise. And that's something that

I think is damaging to the **overall objective of finding results and answers** to some very

challenging issues that we face as a country.

But as they get together for dinner and they dealt with this very difficult of challenge of assuming debt and this idea that Alexander Hamilton had, they were able to work out a solution. And if you don't know, James Madison and Thomas Jefferson said we'll let the bill go forward in congress, but in exchange we want something. We want the capital of the United States government to be moved from New York City to the shores of the Potomac, near the homeland of Virginia. And we have the U.S. capital in Washington D.C. today **largely because of a dinner that took place between those three gentleman.**

Now I share that with you for these reasons. As far as principles that are important as we do our work together and as we journey together. One they lead. They actually found solutions. They worked to be problem solvers. They didn't shirk their responsibility;

Comment [20]: Might scientific research and monitoring also have a role in addressing our current challenges? Certainly they have long been central to how EPA interprets and implements its core statutes, from rule-making to enforcement. Pruitt, however, avoids any mention of science, scientists, or research in his entire peroration.

Comment [21]: Again, the historian David Waldstreicher's review of Founding Brothers notes "the need to look at history from the perspective of more ordinary people...Once we do so, we find that they were there all along, influencing events, sometimes even leading leaders; then we can never see those events and leaders in the same way..." "Ellis ignores the interpretations and the implications of recent and not-so-recent studies of popular politics, work which not only uncovers different sites of culture and politics but also connects them to the national events-and the national men-of the early national period."

they took that very difficult challenge that they faced in 1790 and said we will do our job and find an answer to this challenge.

And as we do our work here, we deal with very important monumental issues with respect to our future environment and our natural resources. And we must have the same kind of attitude of finding answers, being problems solvers, and making decisions and leading to make those decisions.

Secondly and I think this is in short supply in this country today. They acted with civility. And civility is something that I believe in very much. You know we ought to be able to get together and wrestle through some very difficult issues and do so in a civil manner. We ought to be able to be thoughtful and exchange ideas and engage in debate and make sure that we do find answers to these problems but do so with civility. And I think that was exemplified in this story that I shared with you from founding brothers.

But thirdly, and this was something that I mentioned to (Catherine) this morning and as I met with some of you, that have been for some time I mentioned you as well, I seek to be a good listener.

Those of you that have been here for quite some time, whether it's in air area or water or whatever area that you may be in, I look forward to spending time with you. Not just to get to – get – get to address certain issues, but really spend time and dig down deep with respect to how we're going to do business in the future, and get to know you personally and how I can be a resource to you as you do your work.

Comment [22]: Nearly a century before the discovery that germs caused disease, and over a century and a half before the development of the modern environmental sciences, which have enabled of understanding of effects from chemical carcinogenicity to climate change.

Comment [23]: Harkens back an era of conservationism prior to the rise of modern environmentalism in the mid-twentieth century. That earlier effort, often elite-driven, was more inclined to speak of conserving "natural resources." But environmentalism became more of a mass movement because of concerns about pollution and other intrusions on the current environments where millions lived. It was this more environmental movement that gave rise to the EPA. See for instance Hays, S. (1982). From Conservation to Environment: Environmental Politics in the United States Since World War Two. Environmental Review: ER, 6(2), 14-41.

Comment [24]: The EPA's mission statement places a clear emphasis on the current as well as the future environment, and distinguishes "environmental protection" from that of natural resources, even as it recognizes the two as related. "...environmental protection is an integral consideration in U.S. policies concerning natural resources, human health, economic growth, energy, transportation, agriculture, industry, and international trade, and these factors are similarly considered in establishing environmental policy." <https://www.epa.gov/aboutepa/our-mission-and-what-we-do>

Comment [25]: Articulating the EPA's job in such a way as to avoid any mention of knowledge, science, research, or evidence. Phraseology raises important questions about just how Pruitt envisions these "answers" will be "found."

Comment [26]: Civility used five times. Words not used once: democracy, representation, justice, fairness, knowledge, science, health, pollution, ecology, climate change.

Comment [27]: What about those who haven't been in the EPA so long? A suggestion here that staff reductions may be in the works, starting with those who are most junior?

Comment [28]: A business-like transactional vision of regulatory work, as centered on personal dealings between individuals. As opposed to a vision based on collecting the relevant evidence, or on inviting broad stakeholder, citizen, and community participation.

And, I think that the story of listening, you can't lead unless you listen. I – I seek to listen, learn, and lead with you to address these issues that we face as a nation. Now, there's a second book that I've read, and I've read more than two, but these – these – these two books are two of my favorites.

The second book that I would highlight for you that kind of bookends our discussion this morning is a book that came out a couple years ago called *Inventing Freedom* [by Daniel Hannan]. It's a wonderful book about the uniqueness of the American experiment, about the uniqueness of how we do business as a country.

20. And so these general principles of civility, finding answers, making sure that we listen to one another as we solve problems, I think those are general principles that we should keep in mind.

That – I'd like to share two or three others with you that I think are equally important, that – that kind of flowed from this book, *Inventing Freedom*, about the impertinence and the uniqueness of the American experiment.

One is, is that process matters. You know, this – this is not going to sound earth shattering to you, but – but I think it's very important to say, Regulations ought to make things regular. Regulators exist to give certainty to those that they regulate.

Those that we regulate ought to know what's expected of them, so that they can plan and allocate resources to comply; that's really the job of a regulator. And – and the process that we engage in, in adopting regulations, is very, very important because it sends a message.

Comment [29]: Both books discussed here are conservative politically focused historical treatises instead of books about the environment.

Comment [30]: From Amazon.com: "British politician Daniel Hannan's *Inventing Freedom* is an ambitious account of the historical origin and spread of the principles that have made America great, and their role in creating a sphere of economic and political liberty that is as crucial as it is imperiled.

According to Hannan, the ideas and institutions we consider essential to maintaining and preserving our freedoms—individual rights, private property, the rule of law, and the institutions of representative government—are the legacy of a very specific tradition that was born in England and that we Americans, along with other former British colonies, inherited.

By the tenth century, England was a nation-state whose people were already starting to define themselves with reference to inherited common-law rights. The story of liberty is the story of how that model triumphed. How it was enshrined in a series of landmark victories—the Magna Carta, the English ... [1]

Comment [31]: Daniel Hannan is a British and European Union parliamentarian and supporter of Brexit who also wrote VOTE LEAVE and WHAT NEXT: HOW TO GET THE BEST FROM BREXIT.
http://danielhannan.info/index.php/biography_contact

Comment [32]: Review in conservative outlet THE BLAZE: "British MEP Daniel Hannan makes a spirited case for the exceptionalism of the Anglosphere, and harkens a call for its people to uphold its values, for the benefit of all of civilization."
[http://www.theblaze.com/books/blaze-books-revie... \[2\]](http://www.theblaze.com/books/blaze-books-revie...)

Comment [33]: Here is what Hannan's book about "freedom" has to say about the formative and centuries-long role of Anglo-Americans in the transatlantic slave trade: "...slavery is still thrown in the face of the Anglosphere peoples by their detractors. It cannot be stressed too often: the institution existe... [3]

Comment [34]: Long a politically benign phrase, it has lately acquired a distinctly conservative, anti-regulatory and libertarian accent:
<http://www.americanexperiment.org/>

Comment [35]: "Doing business as a country": a thin and impoverished description of American democracy. If making democracy work means "doing business," does that mean that businessmen have or should become a superior and privileged category of citizen?

Comment [36]: Pruitt's phraseology largely begs the question of just what are these problems to be solved. The ones he has actually mentioned (federal debt, respective roles of federal vs. state governments)? Or actual environmental problems, from toxic pollution to climate change?

Comment [37]: The reductive vision of regulation in this speech asserts that it mainly exists to serve those who are regulated. It blatantly ignores any mission to protect public health, communities, or the environment itself.

Comment [38]: The sense of the EPA's purpose given here only offers admission to the regulators and those they regulate. In addition to the task of protecting citizens and eco-systems threatened by activities of the regulated, regulators rely on scientific research and monitoring to assess any threats.

It sends a message that we take seriously our role of taking comment and – and offering response and then **making informed decisions on how it's going to impact those in the marketplace** to achieve the ends that we have in statute.

So, process matters and we should respect that and focus upon that and try to avoid – not try to avoid, but do avoid abuses that occur sometimes. Guidance through – through making – or **using the guidance process to do rule-making, or engaging in litigation -- regulation through litigation,** consent decrees that actually bypass the **Administrative Procedures Act.**

We need to be **open and transparent and objective** in how we do rule making and make sure that we follow **the letter of the law** as we do so because that will send, I think, a great message to those that are regulated, but more importantly, they will know what's expected of them and they can act accordingly.

Which leads me to the second point. Rule of law -- as we do rule making, as we engage in process it needs to be tethered to the (statute). The only authority that any agency has, in the Executive Branch, is the authority given to it by Congress. Sometimes those authorities are broadly stated, getting much discretion to an agency to engage in the authority given to it, granted.

But other times, other times, Congress has been very prescriptive. It's been very specific on what we can and cannot do as an agency. We need to respect that. We need to follow that because when we do that, guess what happens? We avoid litigation, **we avoid the uncertainty of litigation,** and we reach better ends and outcomes at the end of the day.

Comment [39]: Before this step, regulators need to also make fully informed decisions about threats imposed by market-driven activities. Most EPA rule-making over the past half-century has involved collecting scientific information on these threats, mostly only sketched by the statutes, and translating this information into regulations that fulfill statutory ends.

Comment [40]: Pruitt refers here to a rather arcane legal distinction between "guidance"--resolving a dispute with regulators through a kind of negotiated settlement--and "rule-making," which must follow a longer, formal set of procedures. He reprises here a standing critique of the regulated that EPA uses guidance only to bolster the grounds for more sweeping and robust rule-making. Another related critique is that the agency has deliberately invited litigation from environmental groups for similar purposes. On the distinction between guidance and rule-making, see <http://apps.americanbar.org/adminlaw/spring2007/Tab5Ahandyckkist.pdf>

Comment [41]: This "principle" marks a rather stunning about-face. As Oklahoma's Attorney General, Pruitt's political career turned on "regulation by litigation," as he repeatedly sued the EPA. <http://www.edfaction.org/scott-pruitts-web-fundraising-and-lawsuits>

Comment [42]: First passed in 1946 during the New Deal-WWII Era, the APA first began formalizing the way by which federal agencies could craft rules to interpret and implement laws passed by Congress. Significant expansions of these and related procedures occurred over the late sixties and early seventies, as public interest and environmental groups gain firmer legal footing to challenge agency decisions, among other places, in the courts. http://www.thecre.com/oira_reg/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/APA-at-Fifty.pdf

Comment [43]: On the same day of this speech, the Oklahoma Attorney General's office responded to an Open Records Act request and lawsuit filed by the Center for Media and Democracy for over 7,500 pages of Pruitt's emails. The week before, the Oklahoma County Court found Scott Pruitt in violation of the state's Open Records Act for improperly withholding responsive public records and ordered this release. The day after this speech, the released emails became searchable online through the Centre for Media Democracy. <http://www.exposedbycmd.org/Scott-Pruitt-Missing-Emails>

Comment [44]: Pruitt mentions "law" four times.

Comment [45]: Does avoiding uncertainty necessarily lead to better outcomes? Science is inherently uncertain, and EPA's regulations are based on risk analyses, which are inherently uncertain.

And the third thing with respect to this process and rule of law is that (federalism) matters; (federalism) matters. And as you know because you [followed?] these issues for a number of years, Congress has been very prescriptive in providing, in many instances, a very robust role, an important role of the states.

Comment [46]: In asserting a need for federalism (mentioned three times) in environmental regulation, this speech turns a blind eye to all the failures of federalism on the environmental front by the late 1960s and early 70s, stirring a broad consensus that new federal laws and a Washington-based agency were necessary.

In fact, as I met with media this morning, as I met with (Catherine), we talked about each of our regional offices and how important they are in partnering with the respective departments of environmental quality at the state level with respect to enforcement and other related issues. And I seek to ensure that we engender the trust of those at the state level.

Comment [47]: It is note-worthy that in the 1970s and 80s, many states were reluctant to craft state implementation plans that met the national standards that the EPA set.

That those at the state level see us as partners in this very important mission we have as an agency and not adversaries. So (federalism) is something that it's important, process is something important, and honestly, rule of law is important as well as we do our business. John Muir one time said, everyone needs beauty as well as bread, places to pray in and play in.

Comment [48]: Regional EPAs are charged with approving state implementation plans, and are charged with oversight of state enforcement. Hence, they need not just to "partner" with but also oversee and enforce federal standards, should state programs turn too lax.

I really believe we can be better as a country. I believe that we as an agency, and we as a nation, can be both pro-energy and jobs and pro-environment. But we don't have to choose between the two. I think our nation has done better than any nation in the world in making sure that we do the job of protecting our natural resources and protecting our environment, while also respecting the economic growth and jobs our nation seeks to have.

Comment [49]: The speech's references to the history of environmental advocacy skip over the widespread concerns and agitation over pollution during the middle of the twentieth century, as well as the widely accepted sciences that then arose to understand its effects. Out of these came the politics that created the EPA, to regulate them. Instead, what history there is here reaches back to the 1910s and John Muir, who called themselves "conservationists" and only concerned themselves with natural resources and national forests and parks.

Comment [50]: It is worth noting again that the mission of the EPA is to protect human health and the environment; it has no statutory directive to facilitate energy production. Additionally, decades of research and technological development have made feasible several pro-energy paths that include renewable energy sources, which are significantly better for the environment than fossil-fuel industries that Pruitt championed throughout his tenure in Oklahoma."

Comment [51]: Heretofore, "protecting natural resources" has been relatively peripheral to the EPA's mission of protecting health and the environment, more the province of the Departments of the Interior and perhaps Energy. The speech may augur a reversal of these priorities, especially if Pruitt steers the agency away from regulating energy industries.

And I hope that as we journey together, that we will [establish places to pray in and places to play in](#) for our citizens and do the very important work as an agency. Thank you very much for coming today. I look forward to serving you in the future. Thank you

Comment [52]: This notion of "pray and play" melds support for an evangelical religious mission with a commitment to recreational spaces. It appears a deliberate reduction of the environmental justice dictum that the environment is where we live, work, and play. Leaving out where pollution actually happens, it only acknowledges the conservationist goal of preserving natural areas for beauty and recreation. It may thereby augur a shift away from what has long been more paramount to the EPA's mission: preserving human and ecosystemic health and survival.

From Amazon.com: "British politician Daniel Hannan's *Inventing Freedom* is an ambitious account of the historical origin and spread of the principles that have made America great, and their role in creating a sphere of economic and political liberty that is as crucial as it is imperiled.

According to Hannan, the ideas and institutions we consider essential to maintaining and preserving our freedoms—individual rights, private property, the rule of law, and the institutions of representative government—are the legacy of a very specific tradition that was born in England and that we Americans, along with other former British colonies, inherited.

By the tenth century, England was a nation-state whose people were already starting to define themselves with reference to inherited common-law rights. The story of liberty is the story of how that model triumphed. How it was enshrined in a series of landmark victories—the Magna Carta, the English Civil War, the Glorious Revolution, the U.S. Constitution—and how it came to defeat every international rival.

Today we see those ideas abandoned and scorned in the places where they once went unchallenged. *Inventing Freedom* is a chronicle of the success of Anglosphere exceptionalism. And it is offered at a time that may turn out to be the end of the age of political freedom."

https://www.amazon.com/Inventing-Freedom-English-Speaking-Peoples-Modern/dp/006223174X/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1487728253&sr=8-1&keywords=inventing+freedom

Review in conservative outlet THE BLAZE: "British MEP Daniel Hannan makes a spirited case for the exceptionalism of the Anglosphere, and harkens a call for its people to uphold its values, for the benefit of all of civilization." <http://www.theblaze.com/books/blaze-books-review-inventing-freedom-a-spirited-case-for-the-superiority-of-the-anglosphere/>

Here is what Hannan's book about "freedom" has to say about the formative and centuries-long role of Anglo-Americans in the transatlantic slave trade: "...slavery is still thrown in the face of the Anglosphere peoples by their detractors. It cannot be stressed too often: the institution existed in every age, in every society, on every continent. What distinguished the English-speaking nations was not that they practiced slavery, but that they crushed it." Location 4271, Kindle edition.