

Andre Ye

Dr. Reagan

TS History

3 March 2021

The Powell Memorandum argues that the American free enterprise system is under attack and offers suggestions for its defense. While acknowledging many origins, Powell places the source of this attack on the college campus, where he argues professors, textbooks, and the environment as a whole radicalizes students – many of which go on to influence business policy. As a defense, Powell proposes the Chamber of Commerce take a more aggressive approach towards “defending free enterprise” by arguing for greater involvement on campuses, in the media, and in politics. The Memorandum also insists on greater business support for this effort.

In “Guns and Butter”, Kohler-Hausmann argues that connecting the US carceral state with the welfare state as interrelated phenomena allows for a more complex look at the rise of new conservatism as more than simply arguing for smaller government. A punitive approach towards drugs, crime, and poverty emerged as the “tough” alternative to the portrayed failure of the welfare state. The punitive nature of these new policies led to an exclusionary campaign that also influenced the nature of welfare in this period, becoming intertwined with the penal system.

Julilly Kohler-Hausmann proposes in *Guns and Butter: The Welfare State, the Carceral State, and the Politics of Exclusion in the Postwar United States* the framework of “guns and butter” to analyze transformations in the political thought of this time. “Guns and butter” is a trade-off – in general terms – between allocating resources for militaristic or enforcement purposes and support, for example, in the form of welfare. In the context of *Guns and Butter*, this

largely refers to the carceral and the welfare state, respectively, and the punitive and rehabilitative strategies associated with each. Kohler-Hausmann details an increasing punitive approach seeping into the traditionally rehabilitative welfare state, and hence characterizes the transformation as a greater intertwining between “guns” and “butter”. This portrayal positions “guns” and “butter” as separate entities with greater reliance on one another. I argue that the rise of punitive measures – with a focus on the perspective of those at the forefront of such changes – were the result of a slightly different paradigm: the neoliberals pursuing what they saw as the merging of the “guns” state and “butter” state into one consistent state. Under the premise that “the purpose of imprisonment for crime is punishment” – an ideological position – Nixon points to a *disjuncture* between welfare and crime, arguing that crime and unrest increased as a result of social welfare¹. The two entities are argued to be working against each other. Similarly, Jerry Brown pointed at what was argued to be an even more glaring conflict: 1970s prisoners in therapeutic prisons protested what they believed was a lingering punitive spirit beneath a mask of “treatment” through revolts and organizing². This was an even clearer irony to neoliberals: the prison entity and the welfare entity, entangled but separate in each other, caused discord between each other. As such, it was not simply an intertwining – welfare should rely more on punitive methods, punitive methods should be considered in the realm of welfare methods – but a determination to merge these two entities, that drove the arguments for the embrace of new punitive measures. Policies from the AFDC revisions to the 2002 New York State job ban on people with criminal convictions, then, were efforts to merge the welfare and crime entities in ways that aligned and bolstered each other in support of neoliberal ideological notions of the

¹ Julilly Kohler-Hausmann, *Guns and Butter: The Welfare State, the Carceral State, and the Politics of Exclusion in the Postwar United States* (The Journal of American History, 2015), 95.

² Kohler-Hausmann, *Guns and Butter*, 98.

effectiveness of punishment and rehabilitation. As such, the notion of merging rather than simply intertwining further bolsters Kohler-Hausmann's argument against the proposition that conservatives aimed to curtail the government's size and role in society.