

The Curse of Reason is first and foremost a survey history of this great tragedy. In part The Great Irish Famine of was the defining event in the history of modern Ireland. In proportional terms one of the most lethal famines in global history, the consequences were shocking: at least one million people died, and double that number.

The royal progenitor of this family, Tantalus, committed such an atrocity against the gods that his descendants were cursed forever. King Tantalus was beloved by the gods, who came to dine with him at his home on earth. But out of secretly held spite against the immortals, Tantalus murdered his son and fed the Olympians cooked human flesh. But the gods were not fooled. They brought the boy back to life and punished Tantalus by placing him in Tartarus, the Underworld. There he stands in a pool of water that evaporates when he leans down to take a drink. Above him is a vine blooming with fruit that the wind moves out of reach whenever he reaches up to take a bite. Pelops is sometimes credited with starting the family curse because of the way he won his wife, the princess Hippodamia. Pelops won the race and married Hippodamia, but he had to kill Myrtilus when the servant tried to sleep with his new wife. Regardless, the family of Pelops would endure terrible tragedy. Vase painting of Pelops escaping with Hippodamia. Leto only had two children, the Olympians Apollo and Artemis, where Niobe herself had fourteen. Surely she was more worthy of worship. They came with bows and arrows and shot to death all of her sons and daughters. Ovid captures her heartbreak in an episode from his catalogue of myths, the *Metamorphoses*: Bereft, she sits among the dead, her sons, daughters, And husband, and she stiffens with grief. She is said to have transformed into a cliff side with a gushing waterfall, forever weeping. Pelops also had two sons, Atreus and Thyestes. Atreus became king of the region called Mycenae. Meanwhile, his younger brother Thyestes betrayed him by seducing his wife. Once Thyestes had finished eating, Atreus told him he had just eaten his own children. The House of Atreus family tree. The Greeks felt their cause for war was just, but the winds would not propel the sails of their warships. Agamemnon summoned his daughter with promises that she would marry the Greek soldier Achilles, but when she arrived, his friends seized her and slit her throat over the altar. Greek playwright Aeschylus writes: Aeschylus, Agamemnon The winds became favorable and the Greeks sailed to Troy. After ten years of fighting, they razed Troy to the ground and kidnapped Helen back. Agamemnon sailed home victorious and brought with him the Trojan princess Cassandra. Cassandra was not only a princess, but also a seer, having been endowed with the gift of divine sight by the god Apollo, who loved her. Once Agamemnon entered his palace, his wife and her lover Aegisthus stabbed him to death in the bathtub. This murder was the inheritance of the previous generation. Aegisthus, the son of Thyestes, murdered Agamemnon, the son of Atreus. Each of the three great Greek dramatists, Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, wrote a version of this story. Orestes learns that his mother has killed his father and, encouraged by Electra and the god Apollo, he vows revenge. Orestes fulfills his filial duty to his father and murders his mother Clytemnestra. In doing so, he awakens the Furies of the Underworld. The Furies are monstrous women with snakes for hair who avenge family murders. These creatures pursue Orestes across Greece to Athens. There, in Greek fashion, the Furies take Orestes to trial with Apollo as defense counsel and Athena as judge. In the end, Orestes is acquitted and the family curse finally dies. In the fifth century BC, Greece was a mix of the magical and the rational. Myths with creatures like Furies abounded, but were tempered by the Greek desire for justice and rationality. Even though Greeks were embracing logic, the belief persisted that the guilt of a family member could be inherited by his descendants. We see this trend again in the story of Oedipus, whose crime of marrying his own mother leads to his sons killing each other and his daughter being buried alive. The belief in inheritable guilt was popular because very ancient societies considered the wellbeing of the family unit to be above the wellbeing of the individual; what belonged to one member of the household belonged to every member. Over centuries, society shifted to focus more on the needs and desires of the individual and the belief in inheritable guilt died out.

This bar-code number lets you verify that you're getting exactly the right version or edition of a book. The digit and digit formats both work.

But he may as well haveâ€™ Rogoff â€™ big brain, Harvard economist and card-toting member of the global monetary elite â€™ has just released a brand-new book called *The Curse of Cash*. The massive quantities of cash circulating todayâ€™ are a huge public policy problem that needs to be urgently discussed, not taken as an immutable fact of life. The angels themselves holler against it. Rogoff wraps his case in the flag. To hand central banks complete control of the economy. Give them the power to make negative interest rates work. The purpose of negative interest rates is to turn money into a hot potato. Hold it for more than a second and get burned. So you spend it, just to avoid the burn. Enough people do it and the economy roars back to life. Cash pays zero interest. Withdrawing cash and getting nothing beats the daylights out of keeping it in the bank and being charged for the privilege. So cash â€™ your cash â€™ is the shackle that binds them. Break the shackle and the central banks are free. Rogoff wants to break the shackles. Rogoff, minus the crocodile tears about crime and terrorism: Your money would no longer be yours in the ultimate sense. And central banks would have the power of kings. Noâ€™ a king is an ant in comparison. No king ever had this sort of power. But few people do. The real reason is the power elite want to abolish currency so they can force everyone into the digital bank system. Paper money is the best way to avoid negative interest rates. So paper money must be abolished before the elite plan can be implemented. A cashless society forces everyone into digital bank accounts than can be taxed, frozen or stolen by negative rates. Getting savers into digital accounts is like rounding up cattle for the slaughter. A leading question, of course: Presented in an entertaining style few can match.

Chapter 3 : The Curse of the House of Atreus | Ancient Origins

The Curse of Reason focuses primarily on the years to By then, Irish society was shattered and rebellion rent the air. By then, Irish society was shattered and rebellion rent the air. Mitchel increased his seditious writings and was arrested, tried and dispatched to Bermuda, and the remaining Young Irelanders organised a pathetically.

Our abilities to model reality in our minds, to detach from our immediate sensations and experiment on mental representations, to apply abstract categories with language, and to think logically or holistically and so discover how our environment works, are largely why humans presently flourish. But knowledge can be a blessing or a curse, depending on what there is to be known. Take any highly specialized form of complexity, like a biological adaptation. Granted, the adaptation enables the giraffe to survive by affording it access to highly-placed food, but the narrowness of that way of life simultaneously takes the giraffe out of countless other races. Language and culture, too, become absurd when viewed by an outsider. The symbols that carry meaning to a language speaker are so many noises or curious squiggles to anyone else. But someone who views a game objectively, from the position of nowhere in particular, thereby prevents herself from identifying with its dynamics or its symbols. Complex forms are often inflexible and thus unstable. In so far as you depersonalize yourself and view something critically or scientifically, you cease to care about it and are bent on understanding the mechanisms that make the thing work. The more you understand, the more power you have over the thing, and that power further deprives the thing of its dignity. Reason transforms the natural into the artificial, making nature our playpen. We turn members of other species into toys, domesticating or consuming artistically-prepared portions of them. Thus, we share with the giraffe the embarrassment of overspecialization. While reason obviously makes us much more flexible than the giraffe, our evolutionary gift becomes just as much of a curse when certain circumstances change. In our case, we change our own environment, creating a feedback loop as we use technology to customize natural processes, and as we adapt to the newly-created artificial environment, thanks to our ever-flexible capacity for reason, we become alienated from the way of life that insulated most of our ancestors. To wit, we become postmodern, mythless cynics or arrogant, reactionary zealots. Having lost touch with a childlike perception of nature and been corrupted by the technological prison with which we surround ourselves, we exacerbate our beastly instincts and head out on a path towards inevitable cultural implosion. Replacing childlike creativity and optimism with cold, calculating reason, with impersonal instrumentalism and materialistic consumerism, we build a high-tech society but strip ourselves of the innocence and the passion that might fruitfully direct our godlike power. Ironically, then, the society that becomes outwardly godlike, using science and other modern institutions to acquire power over nature, also becomes inwardly more beastly so that the godlike shell, consisting of the military-financial-industrial-governmental complex and the postmodern lifestyle of disenfranchisement, suffocates the beast within. Our greater beastliness lies not in a penchant for brute force, but in our greater corruption, nihilism, and decadence; in our servitude to the overwhelming systems we create; in the sociopathic rationalism we adopt to master natural forces and to compete with the machines we build; and in the scientific idolatry that co-opts the religious impulse. Of course the ancients resorted more to brute force: As an example of the curse of reason, consider the mundane task of editing a piece of writing. While in the midst of constructing sentences, a writer feels emotionally connected to the words as brainchildren, and editing them is more difficult. The objective criticism can improve the writing, but the distance needed to view the text from nowhere precludes an emotional connection to it. Now, the value of something is more felt than puzzled out by logic, experiment, or any cognitive algorithm. We value what we care about, and objectivity is the opposite of caring. Thus, we care less about what we most understand. In the former case, passions arise more easily, because more is at stake and the critics may be emotionally invested participants in the society in question. Just as the emotional bonds to something must be at least temporarily severed to take up a detached perspective and to master the thing, the lack of such bonds invites objectivity which establishes a master-slave relationship between the objective observer and the passive subject matter. There are, after all, roughly two levels of explanation that can be given of human behaviour, the commonsense and the scientific ones. We

naive folk think instinctively or in ways we inherit from our amateur training. This level of explanation is drenched in normativity, since the talk of beliefs, desires and of much of the rest presupposes standards of behaviour and the special value of human beings. And so we establish the famous Cartesian divide between humans and the rest of nature, since while we may still animistically import psychological categories to the nonhuman world, we more readily take up a scientific attitude in our dealings with that world. Scientists ignore these considerations and use impersonal and more precise, mathematical language to understand nature, on the pragmatic assumption that nature ultimately consists of impersonal entities and processes. Of course, psychologists, economists, anthropologists, and other social scientists have turned their attention to human beings and so have undermined the traditional, commonsense level of explanation. While the latter presupposes moral bonds and capacities such as autonomy, which dignify us, a scientific explanation reduces a person to much more abstract categories. When we understand human behaviour in terms of causes, whether these causes are found in physics, the brain, the genes, the environment, or in evolutionary history, we inevitably dehumanize the person and think of her, in effect, as a ridiculous puppet. Even if we retain some form of dualistic worldview, according to which the levels of explanation are all valid because reality can be understood in many ways, depending on our interests, the Scientific Revolution compels us to assume that some levels are deeper than others. Reason is thus the messenger that reports our foolishness, our ridiculous existential predicament. This is human life in a nutshell: In the film, *The Truman Show*, the protagonist learns [Warning: But we have no exit, no means of cutting the puppet strings that incarnate us as natural beings. Dawkins on Scientific Wonder The biologist Richard Dawkins responds to this sort of criticism of reason, in his book *Unweaving the Rainbow*. More specifically, he responds to the charge that science takes the wonder out of life and provides little material for great poetry. By explaining how light works, for example, Newton spoiled only the fairytale of rainbows and leprechauns, but allowed us to learn about electromagnetism, special relativity, and the immense size of the universe and the properties of other star systems. Science thus replaces minor wonders with major ones. Scientists are not like Sherlock Holmes in that respect. Much of nature is unexplained prior to scientific investigation, but the metaphor of the intrepid British detective who tracks a murderer by following clues left unwittingly behind, is as anthropocentric as any monotheistic fairytale. The philosophical upshot of scientific theories is the Nietzschean and Lovecraftian one, that no one else cares whether humans explain and master natural processes or succumb to them. There is no Mother Nature who hides from the scientist like a guilt-ridden temptress. As to whether disenchanted nature is beautiful, the question is trivial since beauty is subjective. Since aesthetic criteria are normative, there is no factually correct set of them. Even if natural selection biases us to prefer symmetrical faces and hourglass figures, for example, no judgment of beauty is proven correct or incorrect just by citing that evolutionary fact. Biologists can explain why certain aesthetic judgments are normal, in the sense of being prevalent, but not why anyone ought to favour a prevalent standard. Scientific theories have no normative implications. Thus, biologists may find insects beautiful, while others may have a different opinion. Scientific wonder is also normative and thus subjective. A patron of a zoo feels this wonder, this delightful mixture of shock and admiration, when beholding a caged lion. In this sense, a religious person is said to fear God, because God would have power over us and not the other way around. With this distinction in mind, we can see that Dawkins is right to some extent: And, of course, scientific theories are filled with information that should terrify us. For example, scientists learned that the dinosaurs were probably wiped out by a meteor, and nothing prevents the same from happening to us except chance. In his book, Dawkins criticizes astrology and talk of psychic and other paranormal phenomena for encouraging people to indulge themselves in unscientific wonder, but for most people these are at best entertainments. And the problem with that philosophy is that it conflicts not just with frivolous supernaturalism, but with the socially-necessary assumption that humans have dignity as rational, free, elevated beings. Dawkins distinguishes between the mystic and the scientist. These caricatures of mystics and of scientists follow from scientific mythology, but are embarrassing when read outside of that context. What Dawkins misses is that while mystical consciousness alienates the mystic from secular society, the peace felt in meditation is spoiled as soon as the mystic is forced to confront the unenlightened masses. Far from being complacent, the mystic often leaves the cave or monastery and works tirelessly in the pursuit of moral

aims. Scientific wonder is tinged with patronizing admiration, stemming as it does from our scientific power advantage. The mystic regards as absurd the egoism at the root of power games. In this case, the anthropocentrism consists in a glorification of human nature rather than in a projection of human categories onto the nonhuman. This scientific quasi-religious confidence in technoscience is ironic, since Dawkins means to oppose secular confidence to mysticism. Dawkins condemns trust in astrology, UFOs, psychic predictions, and the Loch Ness monster, but not in secular humanistic ideology, not in the philosophical conviction that we should bravely face the unknown with science rather than shrink in fear. Part of this science-centered optimism is what the political philosopher Leo Strauss calls the modern conceit that everyone can handle the unvarnished truth. Dawkins chastises theists for their irrational religious faith, but trust in humans and in secular institutions like science, democracy, and capitalism is no less irrational. More precisely, reason is insufficient in deciding what to believe about such philosophical issues. There is no calculation proving that humans potentially can understand everything, nor is there an experiment demonstrating that capitalism is ultimately constructive rather than destructive. A secular humanist like Dawkins would insist that reason is far from a curse, since reason allows us to pacify natural forces so that we can safely marvel at their beauty.

Chapter 4 : The Curse of Oak Island Season 6: Release Date, Interview, and Updates - OtakuKart - News

Find helpful customer reviews and review ratings for The Curse of Reason: The Great Irish Famine at calendrierdelascience.com Read honest and unbiased product reviews from our users.

Huey Long, in Rod Blagojevich, the day before he and his chief of staff were arrested on federal charges of bribery and wire fraud. Politics in Illinois, as in Louisiana, has always been more evocative of devils than angels. The arrest of Blagojevich, a fellow Democrat, validates the claims about Illinois. It also gives Obama a chance to prove he has managed to tiptoe through the sewer without getting dirty. Except for something that took place in , this expose might not have happened. Peter Fitzgerald, of Patrick Fitzgerald as U. The veteran prosecutor was an unlikely choice for the job, since he grew up in New York and spent his entire career there. Patrick Fitzgerald was the best outsider he could find. Oddly enough, Blagojevich owes his rise to the U. It was Fitzgerald who convicted several associates of Gov. Ryan opened the door for Blagojevich by deciding, with his own indictment looming, not to run again. After winning the Democratic primary, Blagojevich then had the good fortune to face a Republican challenger cursed to be named Three of the last eight Illinois governors have served time in prison. So the stunning part is not that Blagojevich may be flamboyantly dishonest, but that he is such a dunce. When Obama vacated his Senate seat, the governor clumsily maneuvered to trade it for something he wantedâ€”a Cabinet post, a job for his wife, campaign contributions, or a sinecure in the private sectorâ€”even though he knew he was under federal investigation. More bizarre still was his alleged plan for better press coverageâ€”demanding that Tribune Co. My former editor Jack Fuller recalls that when Jane Byrne was mayor in the s, she came in to talk to the editorial board, which had been critical of her, and announced that the Tribune had certain things it wanted some permits related to a new printing plant and she had certain things she wanted presumably, more favorable treatment. The publisher replied that she was out of line and suggested that she start over with her presentation. Ed Vrdolyak let it be known it would require an end to editorial criticism of him. An editorial responded that the Cubs would "be playing morning games on a sandlot in Gary first. But even the most hardened locals could not have imagined the latest tale. It would make Bonnie and Clyde flip their coffins. What does all this have to do with Obama? As president, he can exercise the customary prerogative of replacing all U. During the campaign, he indicated he was willing to leave Fitzgerald in place. But he is bound to come under pressure from politicians back home to name someone less obsessive about official vice. Until this week, that option might have been appealing, since the resulting controversy would have been of interest only in Chicagoland. But now it has become a matter for national attention. For Obama to cashier Fitzgerald would make him look complicit in corruption. In truth, the Blagojevich affair gives Obama the perfect excuse to do the right thing, no matter what the cost to his political friends. Then, for a change, the sun will keep shining on Illinois. Steve Chapman is a columnist and editorial writer for the Chicago Tribune.

Chapter 5 : The curse of reason : the great Irish famine (Book,) [calendrierdelascience.com]

The Curse of Reason is first and foremost a survey history of this great tragedy. In particular, the testimonies of four key contemporaries are used throughout to convey the immediacy of the unfolding disaster.

And Shem and Japheth Tanhuma 15; Genesis Rabbah Noah said to Ham: What did Ham see that he emasculated him? He said to his brothers Adam the first man had only two sons Cain and Abel yet one killed the other because of the inheritance of the world [Cain killed Abel over a dispute how to divide the world between them according to Genesis Rabbah Some biblical scholars claim that when a curse is made by a man, it could only have been effective if God supports it, unlike the curse of Ham and his descendants, which was not confirmed by God [28] or, at least, it is not mentioned in the Bible that he had confirmed it. Later, however, Jubilees explains further that Noah had allocated Canaan a land west of the Nile along with his brothers, but that he violated this agreement and instead chose to squat in the land delineated to Shem and later Abraham , and so rightly deserved the curse of slavery. According to one legend preserved in the Babylonian Talmud , God cursed Ham because he broke a prohibition on sex aboard the ark and "was smitten in his skin"; [38] according to another, Noah cursed him because he castrated his father. However, he also followed the interpretation of 1 Corinthians 7: An example is Dame Juliana Berners c. In , Annius of Viterbo claimed to have translated records of Berossus , an ancient Babylonian priest and scholar; which are today usually considered an elaborate forgery. However, they gained great influence over Renaissance ways of thinking about population and migration, filling a historical gap following the biblical account of the flood. Ham in this version also abandoned his wife who had been aboard the ark and had mothered the African peoples, and instead married his sister Rhea, daughter of Noah, producing a race of giants in Sicily. The painting depicts a black grandmother, mulatta mother, white father and their quadroon child, hence three generations of racial hypergamy though whitening. In the parts of Africa where Christianity flourished in the early days, while it was still illegal in Rome, this idea never took hold, and its interpretation of scripture was never adopted by the African Coptic Churches. The commentary further notes that Canaanites ceased to exist politically after the Third Punic War BC , and that their current descendants are thus unknown and scattered among all peoples. And not only we do not find expressed in the Scripture, that the Curse meant by Noah to Cham, was the Blackness of his Posterity, but we do find plainly enough there that the Curse was quite another thing, namely that he should be a Servant of Servants, that is by an Ebraism, a very Abject Servant to his Brethren, which accordingly did in part come to pass, when the Israelites of the posterity of Sem, subdued the Canaanites, that descended from Cham, and kept them in great Subjection. Nor is it evident that Blackness is a Curse, for Navigators tell us of Black Nations, who think so much otherwise of their own condition, that they paint the Devil White. So that I see not why Blackness should be thought such a Curse to the Negroes It explicitly denotes that an Egyptian king by the name of Pharaoh was a descendant of Ham and the Canaanites, [64] who were black, Moses 7: Kimball said he received a revelation that extended the priesthood to all worthy male members of the church without regard to race or color. The Old Testament student manual, which is published by the Church and is the manual currently used to teach the Old Testament in LDS Institutes, teaches that Canaan could not hold the priesthood because of his ancestral lineage but mentions nothing of race or skin color: Therefore, although Ham himself had the right to the priesthood, Canaan, his son, did not. Ham had married Egyptus, a descendant of Cain Abraham 1:

Chapter 6 : Strictlyâ€™s Danny John-Jules jokes that the â€™curseâ€™ was the reason he signed up - W

The Curse of Reason Reason is a double-edged sword. Our abilities to model reality in our minds, to detach from our immediate sensations and experiment on mental representations, to apply abstract categories with language, and to think logically or holistically and so discover how our environment works, are largely why humans presently flourish.

Other Red Sox players were later sold or traded to the Yankees as well. The Yankees had not played in any World Series up to that time. In the 84 years after the sale, the Yankees played in 39 World Series, winning 26 of them, twice as many as any other team in Major League Baseball. Meanwhile, over the same time span, the Red Sox played in only four World Series and lost each in seven games. Some of these instances are listed below: In the bottom of the eighth inning, with the score tied at 3â€™3, the Cardinals had Enos Slaughter on first base and Harry Walker at the plate. On a hit and run, Walker hit a double to very short left-center field. Film footage is inconclusive, except that it shows Pesky in bright sunlight and Slaughter in shadow. Boston star Ted Williams, playing with an injury, was largely ineffective at bat in his only World Series. In 1918, the Red Sox surprisingly reversed the awful results of the season by winning the American League pennant on the last weekend of the season. Louis won the deciding contest, 7â€™2, behind their best pitcher Bob Gibson; Gibson defeated Boston ace Jim Lonborg, who was pitching on short rest and was ineffective. Gibson even hit a home run against Lonborg in the game. The Red Sox won Game 6 on a famous walk-off home run by catcher Carlton Fisk, setting the stage for the deciding Game 7. Boston took a quick 3â€™0 lead, but the Reds tied the game. The memorable moment of the game came when light-hitting Yankee shortstop Bucky Dent cracked a three-run home run in the seventh inning that hit the top of the left field wall the Green Monster and skipped out of the park, giving New York a 3â€™2 lead. The Yankees held on to win the playoff game, 5â€™4, eventually winning the World Series. In Game 6 of the World Series, Boston leading the series three games to two took a 5â€™3 lead in the top of the 10th inning. Red Sox reliever Calvin Schiraldi retired the first two batters, putting the team within one out and shortly within one strike of winning the World Series. In the seventh game, the Red Sox took an early 3â€™0 lead, only to lose, 8â€™5. They were also swept by the Cleveland Indians in the AL Division Series in three games extending their postseason losing streak to a major-league record 13 games, lost again to the Indians in the ALDS three games to one, and were defeated by the Yankees four games to one in the ALCS. These included placing a Boston cap atop Mt. Everest and burning a Yankees cap at its base camp; hiring professional exorcists and Father Guido Sarducci to "purify" Fenway Park; spray painting a "Reverse Curve" street sign on Storrow Drive to change it to say "Reverse the Curse" the sign was not replaced until just after the World Series win; and finding a piano owned by Ruth that he had supposedly pushed into a pond near his Sudbury, Massachusetts farm, Home Plate Farm. That same day, the Yankees suffered their worst loss in team history, a 22â€™0 clobbering at home against the Cleveland Indians. Just after being traded to the Red Sox, Curt Schilling appeared in an advertisement for the Ford F pickup truck hitchhiking with a sign indicating he was going to Boston. When picked up, he said that he had "an year-old curse" to break. The Red Sox lost the first three games, including losing Game 3 at Fenway by the lopsided score of 19â€™8. Louis Cardinals, the team to whom they had lost in 1904, and led throughout the series, winning in a four-game sweep. In popular culture[edit] This article appears to contain trivial, minor, or unrelated references to popular culture. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. December 2014. This section does not cite any sources. Please help improve this section by adding citations to reliable sources. December 2014. Non-fiction works[edit] The Red Sox season was the subject of several non-fiction books, including Faithful: After the World Series, the ending of the documentary was re-filmed with a number of the same celebrities and it was retitled Reverse of the Curse of the Bambino, narrated by Liev Schreiber. The American adaptation was about an obsessive Red Sox fan. It was made during the World Series, which forced the filmmakers to rework the story; the Red Sox were not originally supposed to make it to the World Series. The movie was released in February and, by coincidence, the Red Sox eventually won the World Series later that year. In season 3, Ben shows the end of the game to try to convince Jack that the Others have contact with the outside world. An year curse is gone. Taylor sings "86 summers gone by. Bambino put a hex on the

Bean. We were living on a tear and a sigh. In the shadow of the Bronx machine Video games[edit] In the Fallout universe, one of the events in the Timeline Divergence is that the "curse" was never broken and the Boston Red Sox never won the World Series, even up to Newspaper articles in Fallout 4 show that the Red Sox were up against Texas in ; Game 4 was scheduled for the day the nuclear bombs would fall.

Chapter 7 : Curse of the Bambino - Wikipedia

Dufour Editions "The curse of reason" Book provides a survey history of the great Irish famine of and is written by Enda Delaney. Dufour Editions "The curse of reason" Book explains on how the misguided policies worsened the effects of a natural disaster of catastrophic proportions.

To immortalize this historic treaty, they establish a new statutory holiday called Unity Day—a kind of centrist Bastille Day—commemorating the end of political contention and marking the eternal reign of Reason. In an image that will surely echo throughout the ages, a bespectacled David Brooks stands atop the National Mall to unveil a towering monument to moderation. So does Republican Senator Lamar Alexander. So does Donald Trump! The basic story generally goes like this: Reckless partisanship prevents compromise on the issues that matter and most people, who are manifestly non-ideological whatever this entails, simply want to see their out-of-touch political representatives work across the aisle for a change. There are no unbridgeable divides, only needlessly inflamed rhetoric. Politics is not a contest of right and left, rich and poor, insiders and outsiders, exploiters and exploited, just a meritocracy of discourse and ideas. Hillary Clinton and Rupert Murdoch The bipartisanship fable is one with a real, if superficial appeal. For one thing, one part of its critique is true: But it also offers temptingly simple solutions to what ails American politics: Then we could reach the hypothesized bipartisan promised land: The most glaringly obvious hole in the anti-partisanship story is that those at the top of American politics and culture already, often visibly, get along pretty well. They exchange banter at the same awards dinners, appear on the same late night talk shows, occupy the same area codes, and tend to pay the same, criminally low, rates of income tax. They even enjoy the same shitty musicals. Despite the supposedly unbridgeable chasm of the partisan divide, examples of elite chumminess abound. Only four short years ago, Ivanka Trump was fundraising for Cory Booker. All of the ex-presidents, Republican and Democrat alike, are close friends. The presidential election, which supposedly brought to the surface a uniquely divided America, is perhaps the perfect case in point. Even the election and its aftermath have failed to fully corrode these bonds. It should come as no surprise that people closest to the center of power are often the ones fondest of extolling the virtues of bipartisanship and consensus. This is, after all, more or less the reality many of them already inhabit, and the one they more or less need to inhabit if they want to be upwardly mobile—genuinely controversial ideas are unlikely to get you a promotion. Debates with outcomes that potentially affect millions of lives can provide raw material for jocular cocktail chatter at the nearest capitol bar or even become an occasion for the affable exchange of baked goods. Even the most loathed former presidents can be afforded the equivalent of secular sainthood, so long as their successors prove to be even worse. Given the stakes, we can understand why bipartisanship is so appealing. In identifying the source of this pathology, though, we risk overlooking its most glaring contradictions and most dangerous implications. In the wake of Trump, high profile Democrats have taken to evangelizing bipartisanship in increasingly absurdist fashion. Bipartisan posturing of this kind would be absurd in a healthy democracy, even at the best of times—after all, one of the reasons we elect people is so that they can debate and disagree. But given the stated agenda of the current administration, not to mention countless other Republican-led administrations across the country, bipartisanship is perilous and counterproductive almost by definition. Joe Biden with virulently racist senator Jesse Helms. Great Moments In Bipartisanship — The Gulf of Tonkin resolution, authorizing use of conventional military force in Vietnam, leading to a war that killed over 1,, Vietnamese people and nearly 60, U. Both parties have largely promoted a corporatist agenda and their respective leaderships have been united in their mutual support for policies of unending war, mass incarceration, means-testing, and privately-administered, for-profit healthcare. Hedge fund managers vastly preferred Clinton over Trump, and Wall Street can go back and forth depending on who seems marginally more favorable to their interests. They adored Obama in, but switched to ex-private equity executive Romney in. When the existing consensus is oppressive and exploitative, bipartisanship is simply partisanship for an unjust status quo. Put another way, the operating premise of those who promote bipartisanship is flawed. Current Affairs is not for profit and carries no outside advertising. We are an independent media institution

funded entirely by subscribers and small donors, and we depend on you in order to continue to produce high-quality work.

Chapter 8 : Rants Within the Undead God: The Curse of Reason

An engraving of Bridget O'Connell and her children that appeared in the Illustrated London News in December put names and faces on the victims of Ireland's Great Famine. It remains one of the most widely recognised images of the crisis: a woman in rags, with sunken face and limbs emaciated.

Chapter 9 : The Curse of Reason: The Great Irish Famine by Enda Delaney

The Curse of Reason. Average rating: 0 out of 5 stars, based on 0 reviews Write a review. Walmart # This button opens a dialog that displays additional.