DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 868 SO 012 203

AUTHOR Rosenau, James N.
TITLE Toward a New Civics: Teaching and Learning in an Era of Fragmenting Loyalties and Multiplying Responsibilities.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 21p.: Prepared for Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association (Washington, DC, August 31-September 3, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Citizen Role: *Citizenship Responsibility: *Civics: Decision Making Skills: Democracy: *Educational Responsibility: Elementary Secondary Education: Futures (of Society): *Global Approach: Political Issues: Political Science: Self Actualization: Social Problems: Social Studies: World Affairs

ABSTRACT

The author contends that concepticns of citizenship education must be updated to prepare students for participation in an increasingly interdependent, complex, and changing world. Good citizenship refers to the degree to which decisions regarding public affairs are undertaken self-consciously and purposively. Responsible citizenship involves a sensitivity to the ways in which decisions and actions may become part of the aggregative processes that give direction and structure to public affairs. Increasing interdependence has complicated the citizenship process through the advent of an era of scarcity, the growing demands of the disadvantaged for a redistribution of wealth, the mushrooming of subgroup loyalties and divisiveness in national communities, the declining capacity of governments to govern, and the shift of attention in world affairs from military-security issues to social-economic issues. Thus, education must provide students with the ability to assess unintended circumstances, see behavior as the result of role expectations, recognize patterned behavior and the social systems which create the patterns, differentiate historical trends from current dynamics, discern the limits of historical patterns, appreciate the power of industrialization and large-scale organizations, and know when to be outraged and when to suspend judgment. (Author/KC)

TOWARD A NEW CIVICS:

TEACHING AND LEARNING IN AN ERA OF FRAGMENTING LOYALTIES AND MULTIPLYING RESPONSIBILITIES*

James N. Rosenau

University of Southern California

Prepared for delivery at the 1979 Annual Meeting of The American Political Science Association, The Washington Hilton Hotel, August 31-September 3, 1979.

TOWARD A NEW CIVICS:

TEACHING AND LEARNING IN AN ERA OF FRAGMENTING LOYALTIES AND MULTIPLYING RESPONSIBILITIES*

James N. Rosenau
University of Southern California

The title of this paper is intended to suggest irony. Or at least tension: tension between the mounting burdens of good citizenship and the splintering orientations of those who are supposed to practice good citizenship.

And this tension is, in fact, the central thesis of what follows. I shall argue that the tasks of educators have undergone change as the world becomes more interdependent. I shall seek to show that mounting interdependence has so transformed world affairs as to alter profoundly the nature of democratic citizenship, the dynamics of national loyalty, and the structures whereby authority is acquired and exercised. I shall contend that high levels of information and interest are no longer sufficient to the practice of good citizenship. I shall suggest that modern citizenship now requires of individuals that they relate themselves to the remote worlds of public affairs with the same sensitive and sophisticated sense of self that makes for good ties to their personal worlds. If these contentions are correct, it follows that those of us who teach the young, and thereby participate in the complex processes whereby new generations of Americans are socialized politically, must ponder anew the content of our courses and the kind of learning we want our students to experience.

Put in more dire terms, it is my central thesis that our conceptions of citizenship need to be updated, that the responsibilities of citizenship in these complex times are far more extensive and elaborate than our textbooks, mass media, and civic action groups appear to realize. Indeed, I would contend that the United States is unlikely to make a thoroughgoing adaptation to the changing circumstances of our ever-more interdependent world unless the conception of citizenship to which succeeding generations of students are exposed is brought into line with the choices that greater interdependence imposes on individuals in all walks of life.

Let me acknowledge at the outset that there are good reasons to wonder whether a modernized conception of citizenship can be developed in time to prevent the breakdown of community. Loyalties may prove to fragment more rapidly than our capacity to highlight multiplying responsibilities. On the other hand, the analysis that follows is essentially upbeat. It discerns unique opportunities for a new civics in the very same processes that are fragmenting loyalties and multiplying

*This is a considerably revised version of a paper, previously entitled "Teaching and Learning in a Transnational World", presented to the First Assembly of the Institute for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning, California State University, Northridge, December 9, 1977.

responsibilities. The dynamics of complex interdependence are brilliantly exposing to the naked eye the aggregative processes through which individuals are being ever more closely linked to the worlds around them. While the life of communities have always been founded on the aggregation of individual actions, never before has the transformation of individual behaviors into collective problems been so plainly and so poignantly self-evident. There are a multitude of occasions each day to be aware of ourselves as links in causal chains, as contributors to aggregative processes. Whether it be when we start our cars, turn on our air conditions, or buy our groceries, it is hard not to have a fleeting thought that the very act of pressing the accelerator, raising the thermostat, or purchasing bread is part of a worldwide process. To be sure, some among us repress such thoughts. It is easier to blame oil companies or incompetent politicians for problems than to acknowledge that one is part of the problem. And it is also true that others among us are keenly aware of the aggregative processes, but seek to insulate ourselves from them by ignoring, cheating, hoarding, or otherwise acting irresponsibly with respect to them and then justifying the self-serving behavior on the grounds that everyone else is doing it and thus no one individual can turn the tide. But such scapegoating and self-serving responses are, of course, what makes our tasks as educators so challenging. If relevant civic education means anything, surely it means that we must highlight the multiplying responsibilities that attach to life late in the Twentieth Century.

To grasp this educational challenge one needs a clear-cut conception of democratic citizenship on the one hand and an understanding of the sources and ramifications of global interdependence on the other. Once one begins to specify the nature of responsible citizenship and the dynamics of complex interdependence, it should become clear that the fit between the two is extraordinarily intricate and is far removed from long-standing and conventional notions of what constitutes good citizenship training.

Citizenship As Participation in Aggregative Processes

Citizenship, be it before or after the advent of complex interdependence, refers to the decisions and actions through which individuals link themselves, knowingly or otherwise, to public affairs. The degree to which these decisions and actions are undertaken self-consciously and purposively determines whether or not the individual is practicing good or poor citizenship. Good citizens are those who seek to be aware of their ties to the community and act to sustain the ties in terms of their own values. Poor citizens are those whose decisions and actions relating to public affairs are made unknowingly and unintentionally.

By public affairs and the community (I treat these terms as synonymous and use them interchangeably) I mean those arenas of action and interaction where the collective needs and wants of individuals who do not know each other converge, are recognized, addressed, and managed. One involves the actions through which citizens serve their needs and wants: these are experienced by community leaders (through direct observation,

Individual citizens are tied to these arenas in two basic ways.

statistics, journalistic accounts, pressure tactics, etc.) and then aggregated by the leaders (through public speeches, policy proposals, stubborn demands, tough bargains, etc.). Secondly, the resulting conflicts and decisions that comprise public affairs shape the quality and pace of daily life and, in turn, alter or sustain the needs and wants of citizens that are aggregated at the next moment in time. Thus do the processes of aggregation whereby the collective needs and wants of those encompassed by the community come into existence, persist, and change form a seemless web. They are constantly unfolding and, as such, give direction and structure to public affairs. They set the limits beyond which community leaders cannot extend their management of public affairs. Whether it be democratic or authoritarian, in other words, the community could not exist without the aggregative processes that link the collectivity to the individuals who comprise it.

Thus citizenship, being the contribution that individuals necessarily make to the aggregative processes, is always present for each member of the community. He or she may not be aware of all the arenas to which his or her actions are linked and the impact of the decisions made in those arenas may not always intrude on personal affairs in highly visible ways. Nevertheless, the links do exist. The remote worlds of public affairs are aggregations, the terminal points of a chain that originates in the close-at-hand world of daily life. The links that forge the chains may be frayed or they may be firm, but they are always operative. Accordingly, neither through ignorance nor disdain can the individual get out of citizenship, if only because noninvolvement and inaction also have consequences for the processes of aggregation. This is why the key difference between good and bad citizenship lies in the self-consciousness and purposiveness of the individual's behavior. Since participation in the aggregative processes of public affairs is unavoidable, the manner of the participation is a critical factor in determining the shape of public issues and the course of public affairs. Little wonder, then, that training for citizenship has traditionally focused on alerting individuals to their responsibilities to become informed about and active in politics. Information and involvement were considered the prime prerequisites to participation in the aggregative processes. As will be seen, the prerequisites to good citizenship have expanded considerably with the advent of complex interdependence.

Since the needs and wants of individuals are aggregated at several levels, they are members of several communities. Some of these are "horizontal" communities and others are "vertical" communities. The former are presided over by governments or other public authorities at the local, national, and international levels, while the latter are dominated by nongovernmental actors. The two types of communities are distinguished by the breadth of the issues they span and process. Horizontal communities, being geographically bounded, embrace a broad range of issues and thus deal with all the concerns of citizens. Vertical communities, being comprised of such unofficial groupings as corporations, ethnic minorities, trade unions, and professional associations that are functionally rather than geographically based, span a narrow set of issues (the corporation's product, the minority's ethnic heritage, the union's trade, the association's profession) and thus focus on the same

selective needs and wants of the persons they encompass. One of the hallmarks of complex and mounting interdependence is the increasing degree to which the boundaries of horizontal and vertical communities are overlapping and conflicting, thereby confounding the practices of citizenship and the holding of multiple loyalties.[1]

Each level and type of community embraces different aggregative processes to which individuals may contribute in various ways. A few examples are suggestive of this variety. One's readiness to strike or go on "sick outs" is part of the aggregative process whereby those who preside over unions or professional associations are encouraged or hesitant to press demands. One's adherence to subcultural norms is part of the aggregative process whereby those who speak for ethnic minorities resist or acquiesce to the requirements of an industrial order. One's acceptance of new driving speed limits is part of the aggregative process whereby those who frame energy policies are made aware of the limits within which they must choose. One's purchase of a foreign-made good is part of the aggregative process whereby those who conduct international affairs are confronted with alterations in the patterns of world trade and monetary exchange. One's vote in a local election is part of the aggregative process whereby those who govern the community are selected. One's letter to a Member of Congress is part of the aggregative process whereby those who govern on the national level are apprised of public sentiment.

Whether the remote worlds of unknown others are horizontal or vertical communities, of course, their aggregative processes contrast sharply with the interactions of identifiable and known others who make up daily life in family, social, and work situations. Personal affairs are distinguishable from public affairs by their lack of an aggregative process that carries the course of events beyond the individual's scope of direct experience. The same individual action (such as the purchase of a foreign-made good) can contribute to both the patterns that make up the close-at-hand world and the processes that sustain the remote worlds, but citizenship is practiced only with respect to the latter kind of contribution. If actions designed to enhance personal affairs inadvertently have beneficial consequences for public affairs, they are not therefore viewed as reflecting good citizenship. Responsible persons are not necessarily responsible citizens. In making judgments here about responsible behavior I have in mind only the self-consciousness and purposiveness of behavior directed at horizontal or vertical communities. What individuals direct at their personal world is not of concern in citizenship training, much as one might wish that more people acted as responsibly in the public arena as they do at home or on the job.[2]

---

[1] For a more elaborate discussion of horizontal and vertical communities and the overlap between them, see James N. Rosenau, The Scientific Study of Foreign Policy (New York: Free Press, 1971), pp. 135-44

[2] While there undoubtedly is an interaction between the ways in which many people conduct themselves in the worlds of personal and public affairs, with the

Nor does the concept of good and bad citizenship refer to the content of the activities through which individuals link themselves to the various communities in which they are members. It would be sheer arrogance if as teachers we sought to train students to pursue certain goals and oppose others when they enter the public arena. Rather, to repeat, responsible citizenship involves a sensitivity to the ways in which decisions and actions may become part of the processes of aggregation that give direction and structure to public affairs. Our educational task is to highlight these aggregative processes so that students can be aware of their participation in them and, depending on their values, act self-consciously and purposively to sustain, redirect, or negate the processes. As citizens ourselves we may prefer that certain processes be ended, but as educators we will have performed our tasks well if we train our students to be cognizant of their roles in various communities and they then attempt to perpetuate the processes we oppose.

Later I will elaborate on this conception of citizenship and suggest how its scope has been greatly expanded by mounting interdependence. First, however, it is useful to indicate briefly where loyalty fits in the citizen's relationships to the various horizontal and vertical communities to which he or she belongs. While citizenship involves the ways in which individuals do or do not establish contacts with these communities, loyalty pertains to those attitudes whereby citizens attach priorities to the claims of the various worlds in which they live. More specifically, the loyalties of citizens provide them guidance as to which worlds they will favor with supportive behavior when confronted with conflicting demands from two or more of them. Normally it is possible to hold multiple loyalties-- to be predisposed to support, or at least not to oppose, the activities of the leaders of several communities-- and to do so without strain or calculation. Normally, too, the priorities among multiple loyalties are clear-cut and do not trouble citizens. Loyalties ordinarily become habits--unthinking inclinations to respond to and/or conform to certain community policies-- and as such there are usually no problems in knowing where to attach the highest loyalties, where to direct the next highest loyalties, and where to fix the other supportive tendencies one has.

However, these are not normal times. For reasons noted below, complex interdependence has undermined the traditional habits of loyalty, rendering the priorities among them obscure and often posing the need to reaffirm calculatively one loyalty at the expense of another. In pondering the tasks of modern citizenship training, therefore, we need to develop ways to sensitize students to their feelings of loyalty and to how they might go about resolving conflicts among them even as they preserve the capacity to maintain multiple loyalties.

---

practice of responsible citizenship feeding back to enhance (or undermine) personal life (and vice versa), this is clearly too complex a matter to be taken up here. For a formulation that posits interaction between the experiential consequences of activity in the personal and public worlds, see Harry Eckstein and Ted Robert Gurr, Patterns of Authority: A Structural Basis for Political Inquiry (New York: John Wiley, 1975).

Let me recapitulate my reasoning thus far and anticipate where it will take us. I have said that citizenship involves the degree and manner of participation in the aggregative processes that create and sustain public affairs. I have also said that good citizenship occurs when the participation in these processes is self-conscious and purposive. By the simple examples cited, moreover, I have implied that traditionally good citizenship was relatively easy to practice. Prior to the advent of complex interdependence the number of aggregative processes that meaningfully linked individuals to more remote communities were comparatively few. Public affairs were sustained mainly by governmental actors and thus a few simple acts such as voting and writing letters to officials were viewed as enough to practice good citizenship. As will be seen, however, mounting interdependence has so extensively complicated public affairs, giving rise to an enormous proliferation of relevant aggregative processes that link us to an ever-expanding range of remote communities, that good citizenship can no longer be practiced through a few simple acts. Likewise, mounting interdependence has enormously complicated the task of sorting out priorities among multiple loyalties. The number of communities claiming loyalty has proliferated and so has the overlap among them, thereby giving rise to a greater frequency of situations in which conflicts of loyalty can arise.

Mounting and Complex Interdependence

To stress that world affairs are marked by growing interdependence is not to imply that heretofore individuals and groups were self-sufficient and independent. People have always been interdependent. The tendency to rely on others for basic services that sustain individual and community life is as old as human history itself. What is new about interdependence is the global scale on which it is presently unfolding. For centuries the work and lives of people have been organized around and through the nation-state. In recent decades, however, rapid scientific and technological advances have precipitated profound changes that are transforming relations both within and among nation-states. Advances in transportation have shrunk geographic distances and advances in communications have shrunk social and political distances, making peoples and groups ever more interconnected and rendering legal and traditional boundaries ever more obsolete. Today issues are so interconnected that two states may be allies in one issue-area and antagonists in another, trading concessions in the latter for continued support in the former. Today situations are so complex that bureaucrats in several countries may form a coalition to oppose convergence among their respective chiefs of state. Today so many nongovernmental actors have become important in world affairs that we accept as commonplace such a recent development as the Navajo and 21 other American Indian tribes going to the Middle East for help and initiating talks with the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), an event that not long ago would have seemed peculiar, if not improper.

At a personal level, too, the interconnectedness of global life can be all-encompassing. Today an event or trend in one part of the world can have repercussions for daily routines in every other part. An assassination in Dallas is, within minutes, a searing experience in Buffalo and a painful one in Buenos Aires. A new technique of nonviolent protest in Bombay is emulated in Oakland. A presidential dinner in Peking is a vicarious culinary

experience, if not a welcome political occasion, in Tucson. A presidential speech to the Knesset in Jerusalem is, in no time, an uplifting experience in Boise and a startling one in Brussels. A distant political struggle, or a stranger's tormented psyche, results in a luggage search for plane passengers in Minneapolis. A conflict in the Middle East precipitates murder at a sporting event in Munich, an oil shortage in Muncie, and mandatory energy cutbacks in Los Angeles. An effort to enhance national security in Seoul gives rise to scandal in the U.S. Congress. A currency devaluation in Tokyo is a job threat in Trenton and a purchasing opportunity in Tampa. An upheaval in Iran is a lowered thermostat in Indianapolis.

In short, world affairs have become so much a part of personal and domestic life that the globe can fairly be said to be entering a new era as the Twentieth Century enters its final decades. It is an era in which international relations are being supplemented by transnational relations, by interactions across national boundaries that are being sustained by business firms, professional societies, labor unions, voluntary associations, and a host of other private groups as well as by governments.

To be sure, nation-states and their governments continue to be centers of decision and prime movers in the affairs of men. A day does not pass without headlines depicting the great political, economic, social, and military power of national authorities throughout the world. Yet national governments can no longer handle and channel all the relations that mounting interdependence has spawned. New ties, loyalties, and modes of interacting are proliferating among people in different cultures and professions, supplementing and (in some instances) by-passing the conduct of affairs by national governments. It is too soon to assess whether these new and expanding transnational relations will eventually foster new forms of government or whether they will continue to proliferate alongside national governments. In either event it seems unmistakably evident that the future will be marked by greater diversity and intensity in the contacts of people. The emergence of the multinational corporation, the onset of the energy crisis, and the havoc wrought by terrorism are but three of the more obvious developments that mark the world's passage into a new era of transnational relations.

Stated differently, just as mounting interdependence has fostered greater complexity within and among nations, so has it altered the identity, motives, and capabilities of those who act and interact on the world stage. The number of individuals is growing at a rapid rate and, accordingly, so are the organizations through which they seek to concert action on a large scale. The number of nation-states has tripled since World War II and, as indicated, the increase in nongovernmental actors who engage in activities within and across national boundaries is so great as to be beyond precise calculation.

To grasp the challenge we face as educators responsible for citizenship training, however, it is not enough to comprehend that human affairs have been transnationalized on a global scale. To appreciate the processes whereby technology has lessened geographic and social distances is not to be sensitive to all the dynamics presently at

work that are fostering complexity and that may thus be central to the updating of our conceptions of citizenship training. For the challenge of interdependence is multiple, deriving from a great many interactive factors and posing a seemingly endless array of interactive problems. Scientific and technological advances may be the root cause of change, but many of the ensuing changes have in themselves become sources of change and, as such, they are part of the complexity and the challenge. Stated most succinctly, five dynamics seem especially relevant to teaching and learning in a transnational world: (1) the advent of an era of scarcity; (2) the growing demands of the disadvantaged for a redistribution of wealth; (3) the mushrooming of subgroup loyalties and a corresponding growth of divisiveness in national communities; (4) the declining capacity of governments to meet challenges and, indeed, to govern; and (5) the shift of attention in world affairs away from military-security issues and toward social-economic issues.

The end of abundance and the onset of pervasive scarcities is clearly linked to the world's mounting interdependence. Not only have dynamic technologies rendered human lives ever more interwoven, so have they facilitated and encouraged faster economic development and more complex industrialization, processes that in turn have consumed natural resources at a greater rate--with the result that technological breakthroughs are then generated in order to offset the emergent resource shortages. Experts differ on the extent to which various resources are being depleted, but virtually all agree that depletion is occurring and that the future will be marked by increasing scarcities. Be it local, national, or international, every social system must thus function in situations of scarce resources. None can be self-sufficient. None can insulate itself from the outside world and at the same time move toward its goals.

From a citizenship perspective, increasingly acute resource shortages mean more and more points at which sensitivity to aggregative processes can occur. There is a limit beyond which blaming nature's calamities or the oil companies begins to ring hollow and an awareness of what depletion implies begins to intrude. And to begin to appreciate the processes of depletion is to begin to understand a system at work and to project into the future a picture of one's self as a system participant, as a part of the aggregative process that sustains the depletion. A resource scarcity, in short, is an incisive and profound form of citizen education, albeit the lessons it teaches may be as much those of heightened self-interest as those involving the need for collective endeavor and individual restraint.

Partly as a consequence of mounting resource scarcities and partly for a variety of other reasons, the motives of actors on the world stage have proliferated as much as have their numbers. Most notably, the underprivileged are no longer content with their lot. They want the affluent to start sharing their wealth and both within and among nations their demands for redistribution of resources and status mount steadily. The poor and minorities within nations are increasingly restless and their restlessness has brought them together in organizations

that are increasingly effective. Similarly, the nations of Africa, Asia, and Latin America have become increasingly aware of their poverty and have organized to press those in the West for a new economic order. And as motives change and become more self-conscious, so do long-established relationships among individuals, groups, communities, and states undergo both subtle and radical shifts. Oft-times it is no longer clear who is leading and who is following, who is dominant and who is subordinate, who is astride the wave of the future and who is riding the crest of the past.

With the proliferation of actors and the changes in their motives, and with the continued advances of technology and the unending cunsumption of resources on which its advances rest, comes equally profound alterations in the capabilities through which the various actors pursue their goals, reinforce their motives, and maintain their relationships. More organized and more cohesive, many subgroups in many societies are better able than ever before to back up their demands with the subborn persistence that accompanies a sense of purpose and a confidence that goals are attainable. And as the capabilities and dedication of subgroups grow, corresponding declines often follow in the authority of governments, reducing their capacity to govern and further altering the pace of change and the relative strength of the actors contesting its direction. Thus many governments are increasingly less able to maintain order, solve problems, plan ahead, or otherwise cope with the transformations at home and the challenges from abroad.

In a like manner the relative capabilites of nation-states have undergone profound alteration. The superpowers are not as super as they once were and some of the small powers are not as small as they once were. Oil, its availability and its scarcity, has altered the balance among the strong and the weak, and the distribution and utilization of a number of other resources bid fair to further transform such balances in the future. Likewise, the breakdown of authority within nation-states is paralleled by the fragmentation of ties among them, so that grand alliances are no longer grand and their leaders can no longer be sure their allies will follow their leads. The bipolar world has thus given way to the multipolar world and to the possibility of forms of world order that have yet to mark human history.

From a citizenship perspective, the growing demands of the underprivileged, the increased coherence of subgroups, and the changing capabilities of governments and nation-states also mean a heightened awareness of the processes of aggregation and disaggregation. Whatever else they may portend, the swelling chorus of claims in the Third World and the splintering of subgroups in the First World is good civic education. Fragmentation highlights the dilemmas of conflicting loyalties and multiplying responsibilities. It forces citizens to ponder their priorities; it sensitizes them to ask where they fit and where their sympathies lie as collective entities get restructured and communities get restratified. The bumper stickers recently affixed by independent truckers blockading truck stops in protest against high fuel prices exemplify the dilemmas of fragmentation as they carry word of conflicting loyalties across the nation's highways: "I'm fed up, but I love America."

And to all the emergent changes in historic values, perceptions, motives, capabilites, and relationships must be added those generated by the new issues of interdependence. Indeed, by virtue of being new, the problems of monetary stability, of pollution, of energy shortage, of terrorism, of ocean jurisdictions and space exploration, of weather control--to mention but a few of the myriad issues spawned by mounting interdependence--are perhaps especially challenging. Many political actors have had some experience in responding to the rising demands of subgroups and the declining competence of governments, to the shifting structure of alliances and the realignment of the international pecking order, but there are few precedents for coping with currency devaluations, lines at gas pumps, air hijackings, and the many other events that seem to originate in far off places and yet daily seem to intrude on the routines of life.

One consequence--and to some degree a source-- of all this change is the dislocation of economies. At local, national, and international levels economic growth rates have slowed and inflationary pressures have proved resistant to control. In turn, such economic difficulties have added to the restlessness of disadvantaged groups and the caution of economic elites whose capital investments might help stimulate a resurgence in growth rates.

Again citizen education is a beneficiary. Surely nothing heightens awareness of self in aggregative processes than economic dislocation, with all that this means for pocketbooks, living standards, and daily routines. And the issues derived from mounting interdependence add further to this awareness. Being socio-economic in origin, they reach much more deeply into the fabric of everyday life than do those of high politics. They call attention to our intangible possessions, such as the air around us and the safety of our travel, in the same penetrating way that economic dislocation highlights our material possessions.

In sum, like the individuals who comprise them, political and social systems are everywhere under duress, besieged by internal challenges to their integrative capacities and by external demands on their adaptive capacities. The ways in which different systems respond to the challenges of interdependence will doubtless vary considerably, but the challenges are global in scope and relentless in intensity, allowing no system the luxury of relying on long-standing traditions to sustain its values and move toward its goals.

Teaching and Learning in a Transnational World

And this imperative, of course, returns us to the central problem: to meet the challenges of interdependence they must be perceived for what they are, and to be so perceived traditional perspectives must give way to transnational ones. More specifically, the attitudes, loyalties, and participatory behavior of citizens must undergo profound transformations. Interdependence is laden with potential for citizen education, but it is a potential that has yet to be realized. There have been, to be sure, some changes in recent years. As exemplified by the growth of consumer groups

and the intensified activities of conservation organizations, the perspectives of citizens have not been immune to the dynamics of mounting interdependence.[3] But such changes in the orientations of citizens is minimal in comparison to what is needed. If for no other reason, large educational tasks still remain because of the ways in which the choices citizens must make and their grasp of important economic, social, and political problems are shaped and confounded by the mass media. The event-centered approach of the media often creates jumbled and confused perspectives that are woefully lacking in the coherence and flexibility that the challenges of interdependence require.

To make matters more difficult, many of the challenges of interdependence are not immediately apparent. Even if the mass media were to alter their ways, the capacity to recognize the transformations that are unfolding cannot be easily developed. The deep-seated changes that are at work are obscure. Their sources are multiple, their scope unlimited, their direction variable, their impact extensive, their influence pervasive, and their consequences profound. It is simply not clear what personal, community, national, and international life is going to be like in the years ahead. We know only that it will be different and that as educators we need to shoulder the task of preparing our students to conduct themselves responsibly under these conditions of uncertainty, complexity, and transformation. How do we restructure our courses and reorient our teaching so as to equip our students for life in a transnational world? How do we sensitize them to the dynamics of change? How do we alert them to recognize the many ways in which world affairs impinge ever more closely upon their daily lives? How do we enable them to fill more responsibly the new and varied transnational roles they seem bound to occupy, to discern the aggregative processes to which they contribute, to think more clearly about the choices that they and their communities will have to make, to appreciate more fully that opportunities as well as threats are inherent in change? How do we contest apathy and foster confidence in the potentials of human intelligence and political action? How do we do a better job in preparing young people for citizenship in a world where nation-states are no longer the only central actors and governments no longer omnicompetent, where the dynamics and responsibilities of citizenship are in transition and no longer as evident as they once were, where traditional values and loyalties are no longer as relevant as they once were, and new values and loyalties have yet to emerge with compelling clarity? How, in short, do we help young people realize the full measure of their talents and sensitivities in a fast-changing world that fosters uncertainty, invites unease, and seems ever more ominous?

There are, obviously, no easy answers to these questions. The fit between the responsibilities of modern citizenship and the dynamics of

---

[3] For a discussion of the changing orientations and activities of citizens, see James N. Rosenau, Citizenship Between Elections: An Inquiry into the Mobilizable American (New York: Free Press, 1974), Chapter 2

mounting interdependence is clearly an ungainly one and not easily achieved. However, if my analysis of the transformations at work in world affairs is correct, and if the foregoing notion of citizenship as self-conscious and purposive involvement in the aggregative processes of remote communities is meaningful, some guidelines as to how we need to reorient our educational efforts emerge with clarity. First, it seems plain that the citizenship training we undertake can no longer be confined to the person-in-the-street. As more and more nongovernmental organizations form more and more vertical communities, the number of occupational and social roles to which transnational dimensions and responsibilities attach proliferates accordingly. Our students, in other words, are destined to find themselves in many more situations that relate them to public affairs than was the case for their predecessors. Hence we have to assume that not only will they be voting in future elections, but also that many will be occupying positions in business, legal, communications, labor, and other types of organization that are linked to a wide variety of the aggregative processes through which the transnationalization of world affairs is taking place. The ways they conduct themselves in these roles--their judgments about the causes and consequences of the various decision choices open to them--thus fall within the purview of our concerns as educators of future citizens.

Second, and perhaps most important, the foregoing discussion of interdependence suggests that our task is not simply a matter of providing new and up-dated information about the human condition. Ideally, to be sure, it would be desirable to expand student knowledge about the activities of multinational corporations, the demands of Third World countries, the imbalanced trading patterns of the United States, and the growth of dissident movements in Iran, Canada, and the Soviet Union. Yet, higher levels of factual information do not necessarily conduce to good citizenship, at least not in a time of mounting interdependence. For recognition and comprehension of the proliferating, complex aggregative processes in which all of us have become participants is not a matter of knowing the facts. It is rather a matter of possessing the analytic skills with which to trace the innumerable links in the innumerable causal chains that entwine our lives. To know, for example, that the United States consumes daily more oil than it produces and that it does so through increasing imports from the Middle East is not necessarily to be able to appreciate how daily choices in getting to work, discarding old newspapers, buying new appliances, or keeping money in savings accounts might thereby be relevant. To understand that Italy's politics are divisive or that few governments of the industrial world are run by clear-cut majorities is not necessarily to be able to grasp how one's actions upholding or contesting the policies of one's union, ethnic association, or veterans organization might further enhance or diminsh the stability of one's government. To be acquainted with the fact that the underpriviledged in Third World countries are restless and demanding a redistribution of the wealth is not necessarily to be able to discern the implications for Ghana in drinking cocoa for breakfast or for Brazil in drinking coffee at dinner. To have insight into the growing importance of multinational corporations in world affairs is not necessarily to be able to sort out one's loyalties if one is a businessman whose company's policies in a foreign land conflict directly with those of one's country. To be informed

that everywhere subgroups are pressing for more autonomy is not necessarily to be able to cope with requests that one support professional colleagues abroad if one is an international airline pilot urged to protest insensitivity to hijackings in Algeria or a scientist pressed to condemn oversensitivity to intellectuals in the Soviet Union. To understand that governance is more complex than it used to be is not necessarily to appreciate why a chief executive can treat energy policies as "the moral equivalent of war" or to know what to think about a newspaper editorial that suggests Navaho leaders may be less than patriotic by entering into talks with OPEC officials.[4]

In short, information and knowledge are in themselves no longer adequate guides to action. They may have been sufficient when the variety and kinds of actions necessary to the performance of responsible citizenship were limited in number and narrow in scope. Now, however, a broad range of activities have consequences for public affairs. Aggregative processes are pervasive, encompassing many of our family decisions and undergirding many of our work or job-related choices. Thus good citizenship training more than ever involves development of the ability to analyze as well as the capacity to absorb information. Students need the tools with which to process information, give it coherence and meaning, both as to its empirical implications and its ethical imperatives.

Before turning to a discussion of what the analytic talents appropriate to good citizenship may involve, let me suggest a third guideline for the reorientation of our educational responsibilities that can be readily derived from the mushrooming of relevant aggregative processes. It is a guideline that involves the exercise of restraint in our efforts to motivate students to act more responsibly as citizens. I refer to the temptation to arouse them by treating the long-term trends underlying mounting interdependence as threatening and bound to overwhelm and subvert the values they cherish. Such outcomes are, of course, possible, but they are far from certainties. Yet, it does not require much imagination to perceive the long-term trends as ominous and the world as inescapably headed toward disaster. The data on population growth relative to increases in food supply can readily be depicted as eventually leading to famine, just as the decline in the capacities of government and the rise of subgroup loyalties can easily be portrayed as ultimately culminating in upheaval and chaos. Whatever the accuracy of such projections, they offer fertile opportunities for those of us who are inclined to use scare tactics as a means of engaging apathetic students. "Unless you become interested and active," we may be tempted to reiterate in our classes, "you and your generation will be engulfed by catastrophe."

Not only is it dubious that the reiteration of this theme is unlikely to motivate lethargic students, but, even worse, it may well give them an erroneous picture of the aggregative processes in which they are participants. While scare tactics do highlight the existence of the

---

[4]The reaction of newspapers to the activities of Indian leaders was reported in the Los Angeles Times, October 16, 1977, p. 3

aggregative processes by stressing that undesirable outcomes are likely to ensue in the absence of action, such tactics are hardly conducive to a deep understanding of the dynamics of aggregation. By portraying doomsday to students, it seems to me, the aggregative processes emerge not as concrete and multiplicative sequences subject to social and political control, but rather as unseen hands at work, as hidden forces that are undermining long-established and comfortable routines and that are inevitably forging the chain of events along paths from which there is no escape.

How, then, to motivate students to want to probe and shoulder their widening citizen responsibilities? The answer, I think, also lies in the need to conceive of citizenship training as involving refined analytic skills as well as high levels of information and motivation. If students can learn to recognize, trace, and interpret the many aggregative processes in which they necessarily participate, then they are likely to have a greater sense of control over their own destinies and, accordingly, to be readier to relate themselves self-consciously and purposively to public affairs.

The Tools of Citizenship

But what are the analytic skills and tools that can foster good citizenship in an interdependent world? What should we be emphasizing in our teaching in addition to providing relevant information and stimuli to learning? How do we sensitize our students to recognize an aggregative process when they are caught up in one?

I have compiled a list of eighteen tools that may be appropriate to training for citizenship in an ever more interdependent world. Long as the list is, I do not offer it as an exhaustive compilation There are surely many more tools that could be added to the list and much more that could be said about the ones identified below. Hopefully, however, what follows will serve as a useful contribution to a much-needed dialogue on the problem of modern citizenship training.

Although I regard all the tools on my list as important and thus offer them in a rather random order, certainly high on any list would be the capacity to trace the flow of influence. We should organize our curricula and courses in such a way as to sensitize our students to the complex processes whereby one actor gets others to engage in behavior they would not otherwise undertake, to differentiate between those behaviors that are the result of prior influences and those that would have been undertaken in any event, to discern how each stage in an aggregative process shapes and limits the aggregation that can occur at the next stage. Tracing the flow of influence has always been pervaded with difficulties and pitfalls, but the task has been rendered even more arduous by mounting interdependence and the multiplicity of new transnational actors who can exercise influence in one or another situation.

A second tool we need to provide our students is the ability to

discern and assess unintended consequences. With so many new actors engaged in so many new and varied activities, considerable skill is required in distinguishing those events and trends that are the result of planning and effort from those that are unanticipated and unwanted and that can therefore lead actors and the aggregative processes of which they are a part in directions quite contrary to the desired goals. To be sure, our students as citizens might opt to serve their personal wants even as they know these will contribute to undesirable aggregative processes for the community (say, by choosing to buy a gas-guzzling car instead of a compact even though their family can manage easily with a small car), but surely they are better citizens by virtue of having consciously made such choices rather than being unable to recognize the unintended consequences of yielding to their personal preferences.

A third tool on which we need to focus our teaching talents is the concept of role. We need to equip students with the ability to see behavior as springing from the requirements and expectations of roles as well as the idiosyncracies and impulses of individuals. If they are to be professionals, association members, producers, consumers, tourists, and a variety of other transnational role occupants, they will need to be alert to the limits and potentials inherent in their roles just as they may already be learning the limits and potentials they possess as individuals. If they are to recognize the processes whereby discrete actions are aggregated and culminate in community policies, they will need to grasp that often what is aggregated is not random and coincidental behavior on the part of widely scattered individuals, but is rather common and expected behavior attached to occupational, socio-economic, and political roles that all concerned perceive as systematically and narrowly linked to each other. If they are to make sound judgments as to which of their multiple loyalties should prevail in response to the demands of complex transnational situations, they will need to grasp that the choices confronting them involve sorting out role conflicts as well as matters of conscience. Discerning the dynamics of role behavior is hardly easier than tracing the flow of influence or the advent of unintentional consequences, but the ability to do so would appear to be more and more central to the skills of modern citizenship as the world becomes more and more interdependent.

A fourth tool both builds upon and reinforces the sensitivities to influence, consequence, and role phenomena that we help our students develop. It consists of the ability to recognize patterned behavior and the social systems to which the patterns give rise. Such an ability is truly an analytic talent, since neither the patterns nor the systems in nature and come into being only through the operation of our minds. Large organizations such as multinational corporations and large collectivities such as nation-states may be the focus of emotional energy and they may have legal status, but empirically they acquire form and structure only as observers discern patterns in individual actions. Once they acquire a sensitivity to patterned behavior and systemic attributes, many of our students may well be stunned and exhilerated by how their analytic capacities permit them to infuse some order into the change and chaos that mounting interdependence seems to portend. And as they gain

confidence in their ability to identify social systems and asses their strengths and weaknesses, so may many students begin to develop judgments about where they fit in the patterned processes of transnational aggregation that encompass their lives.

A fifth tool to which we need to address our teaching talents concerns the role of history. We need to enable students to differentiate between the historical trends that are repeated in the present and the current dynamics that cut off the flow of the past and give rise to the break-points of history. As previously implied, we may be living through one of the great break-points of history. If we are, those who conduct themselves as if historical continuities are unfolding may fail miserably as responsible citizens seeking to cope with the challenges that lie ahead.

A sixth tool is the opposite of the ability to discern the limits of historical patterns. It involves the capacity to recognize the limits of change. We need to alert our students to the large degree to which habit pervades human affairs, inclining individuals, groups, and nations to perceive, evaluate, and otherwise respond to events as they always have. Patterned behaviors and aggregative processes are probably more pronounced and discernible than many students realize. People become so habituated to certain practices that they neither think about nor are aware of their behavior, with the result that many historical patterns are maintained even as they become increasingly inappropriate. Thus does inertia mark history; and thus do periods of transformation tend to be marked as much by incremental as by drastic change. Our students need to appreciate these limits of change imposed by the deep-seatedness of habit if they are also to comprehend the limits of history.

A seventh tool necessary to modern citizenship involves an appreciation of the power of industrialization and the dynamics of large-scale organizations. We need to build into our courses a capacity for grasping the range of profound impacts that follow from the processes of industrialization and the large economic, social, and political organizations to which an industrial civilization inexorably gives rise. While such an emphasis has long been necessary to good teaching, it takes on added importance as the processes of industrialization have begun to create large-scale organizations that transcend national boundaries. The emergence of multinational corporations is, I would argue, only the first wave of complex transnational organizations that the march of industrialization will leave in its wake. Comparable entities in science, education, health, communication, religion, and other walks of life seem likely to proliferate, if they have not already, and understanding the ways in which they do proliferate, creating new transnational roles and reshaping old relationships as they multiply and grow, is surely a prerequisite to effective citizenship training.

An eighth tool we need to provide students concerns the ability to know when to be outraged and when to suspend judgment. The complexity of world affairs heightens the importance of being able to avoid premature closure until all the elements in a situation fall into place, of knowing when and how to apply one's values to new and unfamiliar issues. It is

all too tempting to fall back on simpliatic standards and be outraged when rapid change gives rise to unexpected and perplexing developments. This is clearly what the editorial writers did when they defined the Navajo overtures to OPEC as an issue of patriotism. Instead of suspending judgment until the scope and consequences of the overtures became manifest, the authors of the editorials appear to have found it easier to resort to moral condemnation when this transnational occurrence did not fit readily into ther comprehension of public affairs. Our students seem likely to be faced with an endless series of such seemingly surprising developments. Hence, we need to alert them to the possibility that they may have to revise and reorganize their conceptions of proper and improper behavior if their analytic talents are to lead them into deeper levels of understanding. Obviously the ability to probe aggregative processes is not likely to grow if, with each accretion to an aggregation, one is inclined to reach value conclusions. This is not to suggest that one ought never apply high ethical standards or render moral judgments because the world has become complex. On the contrary, the proliferation of transnational actors who add to the claims on our loyalties (and whose performances thus need to be evaluated) would seem to expand the degree to which our value systems are relevant to good citizenship. But the need to apply values to unfamiliar situations should not be seen by our students as justifying the substitution of value judgments for analytic tools whenever they appraise the aggregative processes in which they participate.

There are at least ten other tools of modern citizenship that strike me as worthy of emphasis in our teaching, but space limitations prevent even a brief elaboration. So let me just enumerate them here as an agenda for future consideration. These ten additional tools include enabling our students to distinguish between individual motives and group requirements, to differentiate between stable and unstable patterns, to separate the political from the legal, to discern how past actions feed back over time into present behavior, to know when leaders lead and when they follow, to distinguish between ideology as rhetoric and ideals as motivation, to recognize the difference between easy scapegoats and complex explanations, to delineate between political and organizational responsibility, to differentiate between expressive and instrumental action, and to recognize the ways in which conflict derives from cooperative endeavor.

To elaborate on the educational tasks that lie ahead is not, of course, to ensure their performance. Indeed, there is so much to be done that doubtless adequate performance will be wanting in a variety of ways. But let me stress that we have some things going for us. Most notably, unbeknownst to our students, they have had considerable subconscious experience in participating in aggregative processes, experience that we can build upon in our teaching. From the chain letters they are asked to perpetuate as children to the traffic jams in which they are caught as young adults, from the boycotts they may be asked to join to the water shortages they are asked to alleviate, our students have had ample first-hand exposure to the links between individual and collective behavior. Whatever they may do, they have learned that a failure to send the letter on to five new names will break the chain. Whatever they do, they have learned that the traffic jam is worsened rather than improved

when in their franticness not to be late they move forward at every opportunity and their car is forced to atop in a north-south cross street, blocking traffic going east and west. So they basically know that individual actions can cumulate in aggregate outcomes, and our task is to extend this analytic capacity into new realms, heightening their sensitivity to the flow of cause and effect and refining their ability to distinguish between the manifest and the latent, the intentional and the unintentional, the impulsive and the reflective, the continuity and the discontinuity.

And if all else fails, if our efforts to build upon the curiosities and past experiences of our students fall on deaf ears and we have to justify our stress on analytic skills, we can always fall back on an instrumental approach and exploit their career orientations. We need only point out that employers are as concerned about the analytic skills as the expertise of those they recruit and promote, that the most lucrative and distinguished careers acrrue to those whose capacity for analysis is refined and incisive, that neither luck, nor family connections, nor a winning personality, nor technical training is as effective a means of getting ahead in any field as the ability to trace influence, discern unintended consequences, assess systemic performance, or creatively apply any of the other skills I have mentioned. And if our students are skeptical about this evaluation of the dynamics of the job market, we need only read them this excerpt from a recent advertisement of no less a prestigious employer than the Mobil Oil Company:

> We have learned by experience that when we are looking for a man or woman with executive ability to promote... an individual's ability to deal with abstract problems involving judgment and the ability to reason is often more significant at that jucture than any technical knowledge...What is critically important in the long term is the broader dimensions of knowledge and insight that enable people to deal successively with a variety of social and economic problems.[5]

A Prescription for Citizens or for Life?

In conclusion let me acknowledge that my elaboration of our educational tasks and the skills needed for citizenship in an ever-more interdependent world would seem to amount to a prescription for the training of more than citizens, that it amounts to nothing less than the cultivation of broad-guaged human beings. To the extent that we in the teaching profession consider ourselves as possessing refined analytical talents and sensitivity to the dynamics of social systems, it might be argued that we are trying to remake our students in our own self-image, by encouraging their growth as thoughtful individuals, constantly probing

---

[5]Quoted by Richard F. Ericson in his 1979 Presidential Address to the Society for General Systems Research, in General Systems Bulletin, Vol.IX, No. 2 (Winter 1979), p. 42

who they are, where they are going, and where they fit in the worlds evolving around them. There is some truth to the argument. We do aspire to enabling our students to move more sophisticatedly and self-consciously in their future roles. We do hope they will become more aware of nuances, of underlying complexities, of subtle relationships. And we do seek to facilitate their sense of their own values and how these may be articulated in the larger scheme of things. But we do so not to promote our self-images. We strive to achieve these educational goals not because we want to commend the virtues of sensitivity and the life of the mind to our students. We do so because responsible citizenship in a transnational world requires a delicate and humane use of the senses and an imaginative and disciplined use of intelligence.