

**Chapter 1 : I Luv SA: Meritocracy and Brain Drain**

*The eclipse of the meritocratic moment; Conclusion. Editorial Reviews "The Two Cultures Controversy provides a full and persuasive account of Snow's public roles during his years of fame and a thoughtful exploration of the ramifications of the debate surrounding his celebrated lecture.*

Groucho Marx, the famous Jewish-American comedian, once said: All modern states and societies belong to one of these two categories: In both cases, the social and economic structures are controlled by elites. In this complex world, the rule of elites is inevitable. The amount of knowledge needed in order to exercise effective government has become so large - that only a select few can attain it. What differentiates meritocracy from oligarchy is not the absolute number of members of a ruling or of a leading class - the number is surprisingly small in both systems. The difference between them lies in the membership criteria and in the way that they are applied. The meritocratic elite is an open club because it satisfies four conditions: The rules of joining it and the criteria to be satisfied are publicly known. The application and ultimate membership procedures are uniform, equal to all and open to public scrutiny and criticism transparent. The system alters its membership parameters in direct response to public feedback and to the changing social and economic environment. To belong to a meritocracy one needs to satisfy a series of demands. Whether he or she satisfies them or not - is entirely up to him her. In other words, in meritocracy the rules of joining and of membership are cast in iron. The wishes and opinions of those who happen to belong to the club at a given moment are of no importance and of no consequence. In this sense, meritocracy is a "fair play" approach: Meritocracy, in other words, is the rule of law. To join a meritocratic club, one needs to demonstrate that he is in possession of, or that he has access to, "inherent" parameters: An inherent parameter is a criterion which is independent of the views and predilections of those who are forced to apply it. All the members of a certain committee can disdain an applicant. All of them might wish not to include the candidate in their ranks. All of them could prefer someone else for the job because they owe this "Someone Else" something, or because they play golf with him. Does he contribute to his workplace, community, society at large? They are, therefore, subject to human failings. Can qualifications be always judged "objectively, unambiguously, unequivocally"? These are vague enough to hide bias and bad will. Still, at least the appearance is kept in most of the cases - and decisions can be challenged in courts. What characterizes oligarchy is the extensive, relentless and ruthless use of "transcendent" parameters to decide who will belong where, who will get which job and, ultimately, who will enjoy which benefits instead of the "inherent" ones employed in meritocracy. A transcendent parameter does not depend on the candidate or the applicant. It is an accident, an occurrence absolutely beyond the reach of those most affected by it. Race is such a parameter and so are gender, familial affiliation or contacts and influence. To join a closed, oligarchic club, to get the right job, to enjoy excessive benefits - one must be white racism , male sexual discrimination , born to the right family nepotism , or to have the right political or other contacts. Sometimes, belonging to one such club is the prerequisite for joining another. The drive for privatization of state enterprises in most East and Central European countries provides a glaring example of oligarchic machinations. In most of these countries the Czech Republic and Russia are notorious examples - the companies were sold to political cronies. A unique amalgam of capitalism and oligarchy was thus created: The national wealth was passed on to the hands of relatively few, well connected, individuals, at a ridiculously low price. Some criteria are difficult to classify. Does money belong to the first inherent or to the second transcendent group? After all, making money indicates some merits, some inherent advantages. To make money consistently, a person needs to be diligent, hard working, to prevail over hardships, far sighted and a host of other - universally acclaimed - properties. On the other hand, is it fair that someone who made his fortune through corruption, inheritance, or utter luck - be preferred to a poor genius? That is a contentious issue. In the USA money talks. He who has money is automatically assumed to be virtuous and meritorious. To maintain money inherited is as difficult a task as to make it, the thinking goes. An oligarchy tends to have long term devastating economic effects. The reason is that the best and the brightest - when shut out by the members of the ruling elites - emigrate. This is the phenomenon known as "Brain Drain". It is one of the

biggest migratory tidal waves in human history. Capable, well-trained, educated, young people leave their oligarchic, arbitrary, countries and migrate to more predictable meritocracies mostly to be found in what is collectively termed "The West". This is colonialism of the worst kind. The mercantilist definition of a colony was: The Brain drain is exactly that: Yet, while in classical colonialism, the colony at least received some income for its exports - here the poor country pays to export. The country invests its limited resources in the education and training of these bright young people. When they depart forever, they take with them this investment - and award it, as a gift, to their new, much richer, host countries. This is an absurd situation: Ready made professionals leave the poor countries - embodying an enormous investment in human resources - and land this investment in a rich country. This is also one of the biggest forms of capital flight and capital transfers in history. Some poor countries understood these basic, unpleasant, facts of life. They imposed an "education fee" on those leaving its border. This fee was supposed to, at least partially, recapture the costs of educating and training those emigrating. Others just raise their hands up in despair and classify the brain drain in the natural cataclysms department. Very few countries are trying to tackle the fundamental, structural and philosophical flaws of the system, the roots of the disenchantment of those leaving them. The Brain Drain is so serious that some countries lost up to a third of their total population Macedonia, some under developed countries in South East Asia and in Africa. Others lost up to one half of their educated workforce for instance, Israel during the 60s. This is a dilapidation of the most important resource a nation has: Brains are a natural resource which could easily be mined by society to its penultimate benefit. Brains are an ideal natural resource: It tends to grow exponentially through interaction and they have an unparalleled economic value added. The profit margin in knowledge and information related industries far exceeds anything exhibited by more traditional, second wave, industries not to mention first wave agriculture and agribusiness. What is even more important: Poor countries are uniquely positioned to take advantage of this third revolution. With cheap, educated workforce - they can monopolize basic data processing and telecommunications functions worldwide. True, this calls for massive initial investments in physical infrastructure. But the important component is here and now: To constrain them, to disappoint them, to make them run away, to more merit-appreciating places - is to sentence the country to a permanent disadvantage.

Chapter 2 : Best Moments of the Solar Eclipse in  $\hat{A}^\circ$  - CNN

*The Two Cultures Controversy Ever since the scientist-turned-novelist C.P. Snow clashed with literary 7 The eclipse of the meritocratic moment Conclusion*

Reno May A young writer in Australia recently sent me an essay that ended with an arresting sentence: We have reached a series of dead ends in the West. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, Americans thought the world stage had been cleared for our benevolent power to lift others to the broad, sunlit uplands of liberal democracy and free-market prosperity. The European Union moved from strength to strength, heralding an era of international cooperation and soft power. But the hoped-for utopias have not come about, and what we once thought the ideal and even inevitable future now brings frustration, disgruntlement, and incipient rebellion, not just from non-Western forces that resist our triumphalism, but within our own countries and among our own people. For good and for ill, the last century is finally ending. One sure sign is the eclipse of the classic structure of modern Western politics. Since the Industrial Revolution, the fault line running through partisan politics has been the diverging interests of labor and capital. This is no longer the case. In Europe, establishment parties on the left and right frequently cooperate to fend off anti-establishment challengersâ€”not always successfully, as recent votes for Brexit and against Italian constitutional reform indicate. The American constitutional system stands in the way of coalition governments, but our last presidential election featured an anti-Trump consensus among elites that transcended traditional left vs. The wheel of history seems to be turning. In this changing political environment, the central and divisive issue is almost always the role and future of the nation. Will we enter into the shining future of a prosperous, globalized world without borders, managed by experts and guided by the high ideals of human rights? Or will we return to the dark days of racism, nationalism, war, and concentration camps? To put our present political situation in these terms is, of course, tendentious, though this is how the establishment side tends to express what is at stake. More than tendentious, it is also metaphysically insufficient. The analytical capacities and expanding technical expertise of modern intellectuals do not help us answer the pressing questions of how we should live and what we should live for. Weber knew that during his own lifetime, his severe intellectualism did not hold sway in public affairs, and he warned of the growing desire for prophecy and political commitment among young students. His forebodings were well-founded. In , strong gods of nationalism drove Europe into a terrible and pointless war. Then, after a brief interlude, these gods and others roused themselves for still another round of violence and bloodshed on a global scale that ended with Europe in ruins. The strong gods discredited themselves in the first half of the twentieth century. Three decades of mass mobilization left Europe exhausted, and a consensus formed that the West could not endure another round of nationalist zealotry. The way forward would require weakening the powerful loyalties that bound men to their homelands. In some circles, this consensus also held that communist totalitarianism suffered from the same dark disease. Ideological commitment and passion lead to brutality and moral blindness. Here again many political and cultural leaders assumed that restoration of a more humane way of life in the West would require softening and weakening. Accordingly, in the initial years of the postwar era, steps were taken to disenchant and desacralize public life. The European Coal and Steel Community was established in order to apply the soothing balm of commerce to the wounds that had historically divided Europe. This initiative was part of a large and powerful cultural trend in the postwar era that involved rejecting more than nationalism. It made strong claims of many sorts taboo. The popular influence of French existentialism is a case in point. Albert Camus sought to articulate a humanism that required no authoritative tradition, institution, or form of life. His selection for the Nobel Prize in was an official endorsement of this effort to defend the human person against the claims of strong gods in any guise, even in the garb of moral truth. That a man who proclaimed morality without truth became a secular saint is not surprising. In the aftermath of the civilizational crisis of  $\hat{A}^\circ$ , the imperative of weakening affected everything. The Second Vatican Council, which met in the early s, was widely interpreted as liberalizing and secularizing once authoritative dogmas. Catholicism too was swept up into the imperative of disenchantment, which also characterized a great deal of Protestantism. Even within the

churches, repudiation of strong and transcendent truths seemed necessary after Auschwitz. In the United States, the cultural and political context was different. Our leadership of the West during the Cold War required commitment and resolve. Nevertheless, America also participated in the banishment of the strong gods from public life. He expressed the concern that liberal democracy becomes vulnerable if it loses touch with deeper metaphysical warrants. Liberals did not receive the book well. A number of reviewers recognized that Lippmann dissented from the postwar consensus of disenchantment. Some suggested that his call for a renewed moral basis for liberal democracy had authoritarian implications. The disenchanting imperative broadened dramatically in the s. For Europeans, the decisive moment came in May It meant that everything strong and limiting goes. We must weaken social authority so that we can live more fully. The notion that there are no solid, enduring truths was for them a gospel of freedom. Before the fall of the Berlin Wall, the existential threat posed by communism pressured the West to maintain consolidated political and cultural loyalties. We had to steel ourselves to speak forcefully about the virtues of a free society. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, America and Western Europe relaxed, confident that our way of life had been vindicated. To a great degree, we now think that securing a better future no longer requires strenuous efforts to muster a strong political will; nor does it need philosophical justification. The project of making the world a better place will be carried forward by global capitalism, which has an intrinsic momentum, along with the legal and bureaucratic apparatus of transnational institutions and structures, which have their own logic of expansion and colonization. If there are no strong truths, nobody will judge others or limit their freedom. If nothing is worth fighting for, nobody will fight. The great commandment is not to love our neighbor as we love our self. Instead, it is to go easy on our neighbors as we go easy on ourselves. Vattimo speaks in the patois of postmodern philosophy. Most contemporary economists take a more straightforward approach, but they say pretty much the same thing. Yale economist Robert J. Globalization evolves in accord with reliable economic laws that are more powerful than partisan politics”and more objective, rational, and neutral, and thus at once inevitable and morally superior. We only need statesmanship to blunt the misguided popular resistance to the emerging empire of utility. In the place of the strong gods of traditional culture, the globalized future will be governed by the hearth gods of health, wealth, and pleasure. Our high priests will be medical experts, central bankers, and celebrity chefs. To a great extent health, wealth, and pleasure already govern in the United States and Europe. The left and right in Europe and America are united in a common meta-politics that promotes the general pattern of weakening and the rule of the hearth gods. The right adopts the libertarian logic of market-based thinking and regards the removal of all obstacles to the free flow of labor, capital, and goods as the best way to serve the common good. As much as possible needs to be disenchanted so that the benevolent invisible hand can work its magic. They represent a revolt against the imperative of disenchantment. The reasons for these rebellions are no doubt multifaceted, complex, and influenced by the unique circumstances that obtain in different countries. For obvious historical reasons, Germans are animated by a particularly powerful fear of the return of the strong gods. Populism there will surely follow a different trajectory than in Holland, France, or the United States. But we can identify a common, underlying dynamic. It describes an economic and cultural regime of deregulation and disenchantment. The ambition of neoliberalism is to weaken and eventually dissolve the strong elements of traditional society that impede the free flow of commerce the focus of nineteenth-century liberalism , as well as identity and desire the focus of postmodern liberalism. This may work well for the global elite, but ordinary people increasingly doubt it works for them. The disenchantment and weakening that define the postwar era liberate the talented and powerful to move fluidly through an increasingly global system. But ordinary people end up unmoored, adrift, and abandoned, so much so that they are fueling an anti-establishment rebellion that demands the return of something solid, trustworthy, and enduring. These threats are brought into sharp relief by anxieties about mass immigration, especially in Europe. Our political establishments have inherited the postwar imperative of disenchantment. We are socialized to believe that we have a fundamental moral duty to resist populist calls for a more nationalist politics. Our establishment defends diversity and inclusion, promising that the world will be more at peace if we affirm multiculturalism. In the United States, the inherited fear concerns renewed racism. This is a sign of how deeply invested our establishment is in the postwar era, encouraging us to meet every

challenge with still further disenchantment. The populist rebellion is likely to intensify. As it does, establishment resistance will increase as well. The postwar consensus marshals cultural and political power to condemn the return of the strong gods in the strongest possible terms—racist, xenophobic, fascist, bigoted. Political correctness has many forms, but they are united in a shared repudiation of anything solid and substantial in public life, whether in the form of nationalism or strong affirmations of constraints that human nature places on any healthy society, constraints that get articulated by all forms of traditional morality. This dynamic of redoubled disenchantment designed to discredit a growing populism will precipitate a series of political crises in the West. What forms the crises will take I cannot predict. The EU Court of Human Rights may reverse a national vote in the next few years, declaring the election of a right-wing candidate a violation of human rights. Or perhaps there will be some other nullification of populist sentiment. But crisis is coming. Put simply, populism wishes for something sacred in public life. National heritage is the obvious example.

Chapter 3 : The Two Cultures Controversy, Guy Ortolano - Shop Online for Books in Australia

*The first moment of totality during the solar eclipse in Oregon.*

Share on Twitter Click me! Copy Link On Sunday, Oct. There are many, but let me give the top two. One of them had to do with Kareem Abdul-Jabbar. People who are fans of his know he actually cameoed in a couple of movies. Childhood wonder about the unknown. Kids who never really grew up. But we did grow up, and we just have more expensive tools to satisfy that curiosity – the microscope, the telescope, the particle accelerator, the space telescope, the Petri dish, the geologic survey, whatever it is. Her last year in school was when she was 15, having graduated with a GED. I was delightfully surprised. We do have sex, drugs, and rock and roll occasionally, and it airs very late at night at 11 p. Do you know who is heeding the warnings of scientists? If you come for the celebrity and you stay for the science, the science is attached to things that you otherwise care about deeply – be it the celebrity him- or herself or some other pop culture subject that you care about that then gets infused with all the ways science affects it. You can turn a sleepy country into an innovation nation by accomplishing this. But we came together for the eclipse. Whatever force I am in this landscape, I am not not the biggest force. And look at the people who attend ComicCon: Hundreds of thousands of people in multiple cities. These are people who know science, who care about science, and enjoy fantasy and science fiction. Neil deGrasse Tyson and Kevin Smith. The Earth has spent 10, years or so with relatively stable climate, which is the conditions under which we develop this civilization that we now enjoy. But as waters become more ferocious, and tidal swells become higher, as storms intensify, our cities become at risk, and low-lying countries become at risk. Things will get worse before they get better. Who thinks that way? What does that even mean? So, oh yeah, you put the knife in my back six inches. No need to pull it out because the hole has already been cut into my body. Also, a scientifically objective truth is never established by a single paper, contrary to what journalists would have us all think. If you want to base policy on those singular papers, then you do not understand what science is and how it works. As an educator, I would encourage schools to think about this. Science is not a body of knowledge. It is a system of thought and of checks and balances. You know what the scientific method is? And the National Academy of Sciences compiles and digests multiple scientific papers, and the press should be talking about what comes out of the National Academy of Sciences because it is their job to advise Congress and the executive branch on all the ways that emergent science can influence policy as well as laws. No, I would say the eclipse. We have planes, trains, and automobiles. I wanted to add something, though. The rise of science and every case I gave you goes beyond me or anything I could have possibly orchestrated or influenced. You can still get out. Not only that, my most recent book was No. It means there is more than just the politics of this world that people are caring about. Because we seem small in comparison? How many days can you sustain that? Do you need or want something else to think about? You can ignore the rest of the book if you want! This interview has been edited and condensed. Top image by Taylor Mooney and share image by Brandon Royal. All images via National Geographic Channel.

Chapter 4 : Eclipse and Social Coding FAQ | The Eclipse Foundation

@prefix schema. @prefix library. @prefix genont. @prefix void. @prefix rdf. @prefix bgn. @prefix xsd. @prefix dterms.  
@prefix wdrs. @prefix pto.

Rather, they reflect a broader shift in the balance of power within the party. While suburban knowledge workers make up a small portion of the electorate and an even smaller percentage of the national population, they have come to hold a disproportionate amount of political power — especially within the Democratic Party. This cohort tends to vote in high numbers, contribute to campaigns, engage in issue-based advocacy, and receive outsized media attention. Engineers, tech executives, scientists, lawyers, and academics in postindustrial, high-tech enclaves across the country — from the Route to the Research Triangle and Silicon Valley — broadly share a political agenda that combines economic and cultural issues. They generally favor environmental protection, low taxes, freedom of choice, promotion of high-tech industry, education as a means to advancement, and expertise as a solvent for social problems. In fact, they go back to the New Deal itself. Often depicted as the heyday of social democracy in the United States, the New Deal did consist of initiatives such as the National Labor Relations Act, the Social Security Act, and the Works Progress Administration, which brought factory workers under the Democratic tent. But at the same time the New Deal solidified support from generations of industrial workers, it also initiated a set of policies and ideas that would eventually empower suburban knowledge workers by giving them substantial privileges and resources. These policies exacerbated forms of structural inequality that have defined and plagued American society ever since. In the effort to create economic security and opportunity and stabilize market forces, bureaucrats under Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman developed a range of public policies to encourage single-family homeownership for whites outside central cities. Black and brown families received no such privileges. As historians and other scholars have carefully documented, the result — postwar suburbanization — was systemic residential segregation by race and class. Though a creation of state intervention, the invidious consequences of these policies were framed within a free-market discourse by the real-estate industry, popular culture, and even the government. Such obfuscation of the actual causes of continued segregation encouraged white suburbanites to understand their decisions about where to live as individual choices and rights. They were less likely to see how their own actions took advantage of state subsidies that perpetuated forms of racial and economic inequality. The New Deal agenda also placed technocratic ideas at the heart of its programs. The Roosevelt administration substantially increased the funding of science-based research at universities like MIT, Harvard, and Stanford for military purposes. During the Cold War, the government further boosted this funding in the form of federal research and development grants, which swelled the size of universities and spawned numerous technological breakthroughs along the way. Beyond the ivory tower, the rising outlays fueled the explosion of technology and electronics companies in office parks and labs in the metropolitan rings of cities, which physically, economically, and socially reshaped areas ranging from Boston and New York to Atlanta, Los Angeles, and the Bay Area. The rise of these new businesses and labs laid the foundation for the high-tech revolution. These developments also precipitated a shift in the politics of labor. In addition, an increasing political divergence grew between labor leaders and rank-and-file members. This combination of factors led unions to gradually lose their influence within the Democratic Party. At the same time, a new kind of liberal and Democratic politics began emerging within suburban office parks and single-family homes. White-collar knowledge professionals were employed in overwhelmingly non-unionized fields such as engineering, law, and academia that emphasized the meritocratic principles of expertise and advancement through individual skill — principles some saw as antithetical to trade unionism. This rejection of the social-democratic ideal of collective bargaining did not entail a rejection of liberalism. Residents in these affluent, highly educated communities supported, and often organized, around civil rights issues. They tended, however, to advocate for causes such as fair housing, which was premised on the meritocratic ideal that anyone with means deserved the right to live where they chose. In fact, these liberal suburbanites often opposed construction of low-income housing in their own communities. By the late s and early s, the priorities

of suburban knowledge workers were beginning to receive a stronger hearing from Democratic politicians — especially George McGovern. The McGovern–Fraser Commission established a set of guidelines designed to promote the fair representation of minority views and ensure that elected officials, party regulars, and union leaders in smoke-filled backroom dealings could no longer dominate the delegate selection process. It simultaneously gave postindustrial professionals more political sway. In his bid for the presidency, McGovern engaged in concerted outreach to engineers and other science-based professionals. He backed it up with targeted policies, calling for research and development spending to concentrate on improving the environment, schools, and technology sectors especially small start-ups instead of on defense. Their shared platform combined liberal stances on foreign policy, civil rights, feminism, and especially the environment, with a commitment to stimulating entrepreneurship and private-sector growth. While many of these tech-minded Democrats believed in extending opportunity, they thought market-based and privatized programs were more effective in the post-industrial economy than New Deal–style remedies. This approach, however, produced an economically and geographically uneven distribution of economic growth that privileged middle-class professionals and enhanced structural inequities. The emphasis on creating jobs in high-tech companies and related service-sector businesses made employment overly dependent on the boom-and-bust cycles of the post-industrial economy. And though the high-tech industry did create a set of generally non-unionized jobs that paid well, these opportunities often demanded a high level of expertise, experience, and training. In response, many critics charged that the party had abandoned the issues of class. Few figures better personified the new orientation than Michael Dukakis. As Massachusetts governor, he made explicit overtures to the leaders of the high-tech sector, emphasizing partnership as central to fostering a healthy economic climate. His administration worked to broker deals between high-tech companies and Boston-based venture capital firms, leading to a surge of new software, data processing, and computer manufacturing corporations in the state, and helping turn around its economy. By 1980, Massachusetts had the highest percentage of service-sector workers and the highest average per capita income of any state in the country. He coupled promises of stimulating high-tech growth across the country based on the Route model with concern for quality-of-life issues like traffic and air pollution, sprawl, and rising drug and crime problems. There they have remained there ever since. This approach, however, has further alienated lower-income voters, many of whom see no reason to turn out on Election Day. The result is an even larger income gap and class bias between nonvoters — who tend to be more supportive of unions and public spending on jobs and health insurance — and higher-income voters, who are less in favor of such positions. These voting patterns, in turn, shape the strategy of the Democratic Party — ultimately amplifying the power of its affluent and educated voters. For instance, while the Obama campaign did make new voter registration a priority, it concentrated most of its attention and resources on gaining the support of upper-middle-class knowledge workers. In both elections, Obama handily won areas with a high concentration of advanced degrees and secured the support of high-tech workers nationally by an overwhelming margin. He earned at astonishingly high rates the votes and campaign contributions of workers at companies like Google and Microsoft, building on the relationships forged between tech companies and the Democratic Party. In her campaign bid, Hillary Clinton has strengthened these ties, surpassing candidates from both parties in individual donations from employees at the ten highest-grossing companies in Silicon Valley, including Google, Facebook, Apple, and eBay. Yet these relationships are proving increasingly tricky to navigate. Many Americans no longer see Silicon Valley as a symbol of opportunity and democracy but instead as a bastion of elitism. But what is certain is that the class base of the Democratic Party will continue to shape its policies and commitments. As it stands, the Democratic Party is much more than a repository of liberal values.

Chapter 5 : Return of the Strong Gods by R. R. Reno | Articles | First Things

*CNN live-streamed the solar eclipse in virtual reality, capturing the path of totality over the United States. Watch the best moments from the Eclipse of the Century.*

Liberty, Ambition and the Eclipse of the Common Good by John Lauritz Larson aims to give readers insights about the Market Revolution, as the name suggests, that occurred around the civil war period. The main aim of the book is to understand The Market Revolution in America: The main aim of the book is to understand what aspects of human psychology, socio-political philosophy and world history led to this economic transformation. Political and Early National, U. His book flows much like someone narrating a story to a young adult, and is hard to not recommend. In the introductory chapter of the book, Larson briefs readers about early American history. His summarizing skills are exemplary; he managed to fit every aspect of American History in a few short paragraphs. He also describes the economic conditions of the colonial era and how they compared to those of nineteenth century capitalism. He makes readers realize how different classes of people divided over public policy. While the colonists did incorporate certain aspects of capitalism such as money, for-profit motive and contracts, traders were punished for being excessively greedy and contracts that only advantaged one party or were unfair would not be enforceable. This is the opposite of what is seen in capitalism. The British crown was regulating money and the British nobility were treated preferentially, making it easier for them to make money. In the first chapter, he speaks about how the reformed constitution and the electoral college system were formed, wherein the national government took control of interstate commerce under George Washington. He then talks about how the civil war paved way for the Market Revolution with a brief narrative on all the events that led to it. The second chapter uncovers how the New York Port rose and became significant. New York had built the largest canal in the shortest amount of time for the least amount of money, as it had money saved up before the Panic of to afford the project. Craftsmen started to take notes of repetitive processes and divided labor - principles of management that are taught to this day. People started to find ways to manufacture expensive necessities for cheaper. Newspapers were in the hands of common people due to the improvement of the paper production process which boosted business overall by circulating information. Alongside the canal network, the railroad system also developed. Because of improved transportation, the postal service became available throughout the country. It talks about how capitalism impacted farmers, artisans, women and non-white peoples and also describes the challenges entrepreneurs faced as risk-takers. In the pre-modern era, it was believed that a man should only take as much risk as he could afford to lose. All of this led to the evolution of a commercial society. The final chapter answers the question of how the market revolution can be explained and interpreted, explaining the free market theory. The final chapter recaps events mentioned in the previous chapter and links them with philosophical thought to lead to what the market revolution really meant. Larson probably expects those who read this book to be somewhat knowledgeable in American history and European history. Being in an Early American History class, I found it easy to connect to the terms, events and philosophies mentioned in the book. There were some aspects I did not know about that did not hinder my ability to comprehend and read the book. Larson, being a history professor, does a great job at simplifying intense historical events. One thing the author misses, however, is illustrations. The book is structured much like a short story making it an easy read. The book also has sections that separate main topics from one another, increasing the readability overall. Despite having sections and chapters, this book needs to be read cover to cover to get the whole depth of the material, or it would be like skipping chapters of a mystery novel. I believe this approach taken by Larson is advantageous as it lets people go over everything instead of making assumptions that they already know about things. It also makes it easy for people to come back to the book to refer to specifics once they have already read it. I had no trouble reading this book non-stop for the most part. Sometimes parts of the book can get excessively informative, but that aligns with and serves the purpose of the book. Chapters at times feel overloaded with information and event after event that could be monotonous to some readers. All of this information, however, is important for one to understand the subject matter, even if it feels like too much.

Larson is right in his regard to have included every relevant element and not eliminated any big or small details, so that one can truly learn about the Market Revolution in America. The interlude sections help put all of the excessive information together. The author incorporates some sarcasm and humor here and there which keeps the momentum of the book up. The author discusses through anecdotal evidence, the conditions of women, minorities and slaves. He talks about how women would be hired in factories as they were seen as surplus, and would not be remunerated appropriately and were treated harshly. Women who did the same jobs men would do were paid half, simply due to their gender. A similar pattern followed for people of color. This made prostitution and sex trade more common. Even the Cherokees are referenced, who tried to be like white men and followed their own written law, had a constitution and were self governing; they did everything the way white men did. He also talks about slavery and its impact on slaves. The mix of philosophical point of view creates a perfect narrative. Larson references the works of various philosophers that influenced the thought and opinion of the people in the nineteenth century. This creates an impeccable representation of how the Market Revolution took place and what ran in the minds of people that caused it. I believe this book is a must-read for every budding American entrepreneur to realize what the American dream truly occurred as only a few centuries ago. This book is a reminder of the spirit of Americans of the antebellum times and helps understand the mindset and events that caused the turn of the economy from a mercantilist to a capitalist one. As a business and economics enthusiast, I am glad to have read this book to supplement my course in Early American History, as it included an economic and business perspective that went a little beyond just the social and cultural aspect of American history.

#### Chapter 6 : Atari Democrats

*C.P. Snow and the technocratic liberalism --F.R. Leavis and the radical liberalism --A tale of two colleges --The making of English social history --The rise of national 'decline' --Post-colonial developments --The eclipse of the meritocratic moment.*

#### Chapter 7 : Neil DeGrasse Tyson Says Science Isn't Dead And You're The One Who's S

*Total Eclipse of the Heart Licensed to YouTube by BYDNashville (on behalf of Big Yellow Dog Music); CMRRA, Audiam (Publishing), UMPI, Abramus Digital, and 8 Music Rights Societies.*

#### Chapter 8 : First moment of totality - CNN Video

*American Journal of Sociology phone contacts may merely be a consequence of such relationships, while their causal contribution to further reinforcement remains in the dark.*

#### Chapter 9 : Boris Bokowski: Eclipse Labs

*Sixties these meritocratic commitments came to be challenged by the advocates of more egalitarian ideals (for instance, in the areas of secondary and university education), and the currency gained by these arguments contributed to the eclipse of the reputations and arguments.*