DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 271 351 SO 017 261

AUTHOR Bennett, William J.; Kirkpatrick, Jeane
TITLE History, Geography, and Citizenship: The Teacher's Role. Ethics and Public Policy Essay 64.
INSTITUTION Ethics and Public Policy Center, Washington, DC.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-89633-102-4
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 24p.
AVAILABLE FROM Ethics and Public Policy Center, 1030 Fifteenth Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20005 ($2.00).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Citizenship; *Citizenship Education; Civics; *Critical Thinking; *Democracy; Democratic Values; Education; Elementary Education; *Foreign Policy; Geography; Historiography; History; *History Instruction; Political Attitudes; Secondary Education; Social Studies
IDENTIFIERS *Citizenship Education Program; Democratic Communication

ABSTRACT

One of a series of booklets designed to make available to a wide audience thoughtful perspectives on issues of domestic and foreign policy, this booklet contains two essays which provide a solid base for elementary and secondary teachers to communicate the nature of America's place in the world, its responsibilities, ideals, and traditions to prepare young people for responsible citizenship in the democracy that leads the free world. William Bennett's "History-Key to Political Responsibility" discusses the past illuminating the present, restoring the faith in democracy, and the decline in the status of history as a subject. Jeane Kirkpatrick's "Learning to Think about Foreign Policy" discusses characteristics of foreign policy, democratic assumptions, and educating for democracy. (TRS)

Ethics and Public Policy Essay • 64
April 1986

History, Geography, and Citizenship

The Teacher's Role

William Bennett
Jeane Kirkpatrick

Foreword by Samuel Sava

Ethics and Public Policy Center • Washington, D.C.

This is one of a series of essays published by the Ethics and Public Policy Center to make available to a wide audience thoughtful perspectives on issues of domestic and foreign policy. Like Center studies, Center essays are written by authors who recognize the validity of fundamental Western values and attempt to combine moral reasoning with empirical analysis. The authors alone are responsible for the views expressed.

●

Copies of this publication are available at $2 each from the address below. Other titles in the Center's essay series are listed on the inside back cover.

Ernest W. Lefever, President
ETHICS AND PUBLIC POLICY CENTER
1030 Fifteenth Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 682-1200

ISBN 0-89633-102-4

WILLIAM BENNETT, Secretary of Education, was previously chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities. He taught law and philosophy at several universities, including the University of Texas, Harvard, and Boston, and was a consultant to some fifty secondary schools on quality in curriculum development.

JEANE KIRKPATRICK, former Ambassador to the United Nations, is Leavey University Professor of Government at Georgetown University and a senior fellow at the American Enterprise Institute. She is the author of several books, including (1974) *Political Woman*.

Contents

Foreword

In 1828, Henry Brougham, addressing the House of Commons, said: "Education makes a people easy to lead, but difficult to drive; easy to govern, but impossible to enslave." Brougham's words sum up the conviction that inspires many teachers in democratic countries: that education—the right kind of education—plays a vital role in preserving freedom. But what is the right kind of education?

According to George Orwell, "there are times when the first duty of intelligent people is the restatement of the obvious." The two essays that follow celebrate, in highly original style, certain obvious truths about the contributions of history, political philosophy, and geography to the development of responsible young citizens. Together, these essays by Secretary of Education William Bennett and Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick offer an inspiring guide for elementary and secondary school teachers. They provide a solid base for teachers to communicate the nature of America's place in the world, its responsibilities, its ideals, and its traditions.

The essays are derived from addresses given at a conference on "Civic Virtue and Educational Excellence" sponsored by the Ethics and Public Policy Center in April 1985. Having chaired the conference, I now have the honor again of presenting these two stars of our intellectual, educational, and governmental firmament, each a teacher and scholar, and each a participant in the formulation of public policy.

The schools are charged with the duty of preparing young people for responsible citizenship in the democracy that leads the free world. Since the greatest danger to our humane tradition may be the tendency of free people to take their freedom

for granted and, consequently, to lose the vigilance that alone enables freedom to survive in a world where tyrants await their opportunity, a specially heavy responsibility rests on our schools. What other institutions can ensure that the traditions and the vigilance of free men and women are transmitted from generation to generation?

SAMUEL SAVA, *Executive Director*
National Association of Elementary
School Principals

Alexandria, Virginia
April 11, 1986

History—Key to Political Responsibility

WILLIAM BENNETT

In his 1984 Jefferson Lecture, Sidney Hook pointed to a paradox. During the past fifty years, he observed, our society has been able to make gigantic strides in the direction of greater freedom and social justice, while totalitarian states—first Nazi Germany and then the Soviet Union—have produced wars, holocaust, economic misery, concentration camps, and gulags. "Yet in spite of that record," Mr. Hook said, "the paradox is that faith and belief in the principles of liberal democracy have declined in the United States. Unless that faith and that belief can be restored and revivified, liberal democracy will perish."

Admittedly, Mr. Hook did not draw on batteries of research teams to document the eroding allegiance to the norms of a free, self-governing society. By the canons of modern social science, then, his observations might be impugned as being impressionistic. But many of the finest minds of our time share his impressions. In 1980, for example, Raymond Aron spoke of "loss of confidence in the country's institutions" throughout the United States. And in Great Britain, the distinguished philosopher Karl Popper stated flatly, "Americans are no longer certain that their country and form of government are the best."

Such views are especially worrisome to those of us professionally involved in education. After all, the primordial task of any school system is the transmission of social and political values. As Bernard Brown observes, "all schools must transmit a cultural heritage and help legitimize the political system—otherwise the regime in the long run loses effectiveness and is replaced, perhaps after a short

This essay, first given as an address at an Ethics and Public Policy conference in April 1985, was published in the Summer 1985 issue of *Policy Review*.

anarchic interlude, by another regime that knows better how to secure obedience."

Are American schools helping to transmit our democratic heritage? Do the norms and values that the schools inculcate make the case for our political system? Although the evidence on this question is fragmentary and often anecdotal, what we know is not encouraging. A recent survey found that many thirteen- and seventeen-year-olds do not know what happens to a law after it passes Congress, and the majority fail to realize that a President cannot declare a law unconstitutional. In short, far too many students cannot explain the essentials of American democracy.

Why should we be surprised, when many of our schools no longer make sure their charges know the long procession of events that gave rise to modern democracy? We offer our students the flag but sometimes act toward it as if it were only cloth. We neglect to teach them the ancient texts sewn into its fabric, the ideas and endeavors of cultures whose own emblems in time lent us the designs for our own. Too often our high school graduates know little or nothing of the Magna Carta, the Bible, the Greek polis, the Federalist Papers, or the Lincoln-Douglas debates.

We cannot hope that our students will know why the world got into its present situation—or even what that situation is—if they know so little of the events that came before them. In the spring of 1985, about fifteen American teenagers and fifteen Soviet teenagers met near Washington to discuss the threat of nuclear war. The Americans were members of a school's talented and gifted program. The Russians attend an embassy school and are the children of Soviet diplomats. Here are some excerpts from a newspaper account:

> What do you think of America? asked one [American] pupil. "America is a good country," replied Dmitry Domakhin, 12, whose father is a diplomat. "It's such a pity that it's a capitalist country." Dmitry grinned as the audience of parents and pupils laughed.
>
> Later, he posed his own question to the American children. "In the Soviet Union, when we have lunch at school, the lunch is free," he said. "I just want to know, how much do you have to pay?" Ninety to 95 cents per meal was the answer. Dmitry smiled again.
>
> Alexei Palladin 14, whose father is a correspondent for [a] Soviet newspaper, pointed out that the Soviet Union and the United States have been friends before. "What do you know about the Second World

War?" Alexei asked the Americans. No answer. He nodded as if that was what he expected. "Nobody even knows," he said, "that we were allies. We were fighting Nazism together."

When I came across this story, the thought crossed my mind that in exchange for the ability to induce one or two of our talented and gifted youngsters to make some reference, however fleeting, to free elections, free speech, Afghanistan, the Nazi-Soviet Pact, or to the plight of Andrei Sakharov, I'd willingly trade away a couple of Olympic gold medals.

Yet when these students fail to respond with an awareness of historical truths, whose fault is it? Is it theirs? No. Whose children are these? They're ours. Aren't they as bright as their Soviet counterparts? Of course they are. Are they good? Yes. Are they well-intentioned and open-minded? Yes. Are they eager to learn? Yes. They are all these things. But they are also, so it seems, intellectually innocent, and as Kant said, "innocence is a splendid thing, but it is easily seduced." It is not our students' fault that we have forgotten that intellectual innocence too can be seduced. so that they can only nod their heads in agreement and applaud when confronted with standard Soviet propaganda themes.

The Past Illuminates the Present

It is important for our children to realize the ways in which the past illuminates the present. Our students will not recognize the urgency in Nicaragua if they cannot recognize the history that is threatening to repeat itself. If they have never heard of the Cuban missile crisis, they cannot comprehend the Sandinista head of secret police when he states that "Cuba's friends are Nicaragua's friends, and Cuba's enemies are Nicaragua's enemies." If they know nothing of the Russian Revolution, they cannot comprehend the Sandinista Minister of Defense when he says, "Marxism/Leninism is the scientific doctrine that guides our revolution" and "we would like to help all revolutions." If students know nothing of the Monroe Doctrine, what difference will the intrusion of the Brezhnev Doctrine in Central America mean to them?

How have we come to such a pass? Surely one explanation for the fact that democratic values no longer seem to command the

assent they once did is that for many years now the teaching of social studies in our schools has been dominated by cultural relativism, the notion that the attempt to draw meaningful distinctions between opposing traditions is a judgment that all virtuous and right-minded people must sternly condemn.

One social studies series for elementary schools, for example, advises the teacher that the material aims to "decrease inclination toward egocentrism, ethnocentrism, and stereotyping." But what this means, it turns out, is more than teaching children that all cultures and traditions are not the same. It means teaching that all cultures and traditions are equally valid, that there are not real criteria for good and bad, right and wrong, noble and base. But if all traditions are equally valid, then there is clearly not much point in transmitting a particular cultural heritage, a distinctive set of social and political values. On the contrary, to the extent that educational philosophy is dominated by the idea of cultural relativism, any attempt to impart a particular cultural tradition is ipso facto illegitimate.

So each generation brings its *tabula rasa* into the world, and many educators, including the cultural relativists, proceed to teach as if it would be a shame to dirty the slate with any affection or respect for our own tradition But the world itself is not a *tabula rasa*. Some important things have happened to make us what we are, and we cannot be intelligible to ourselves without remembering these things. We remain alien to ourselves, strangers at home, when we do not know our past.

I am reminded of a passage in C.S. Lewis's *The Screwtape Letters*. The devil Screwtape is tutoring his young nephew and disciple, Wormwood, in the arts of corruption. The trick, he explains, is to keep men from acquiring wisdom, a trick accomplished by cultivating disdain for the past and a devotion to present-mindedness. "Since we cannot deceive the whole human race all the time," Screwtape says, "it is important to cut every generation off from all others; for where learning makes a free commerce between the ages there is always a danger that the characteristic errors of one may be corrected by the characteristic truths of another." I believe that if our children do not even know the inherited principles of a liberal democracy, it is foolish to expect that they should put their faith in those principles.

Restoring the Faith in Democracy

How then are we to restore the American faith in the principles of liberal democracy? A good way to begin, it seems to me, would be by recognizing the importance and the value of the study of history, and by taking the necessary steps to strengthen history as a subject taught in the schools. As Meg Greenfield of the *Washington Post* writes, "in the reconstruction of American schooling that is going forward I would put properly taught history second on the list of goals to be achieved—right after literacy."

Apart from its intrinsic interest as a record of the past, history is a vitally important study for several reasons. First, history is organized memory, and memory, in turn, is the glue that holds our political community together. Strictly speaking, the United States did not simply develop; rather, the United States was created in order to realize a specific political vision. Today, as in the past, it is the memory of that political vision that defines us as Americans.

Throughout our history, there have indeed been occasions when our actions have fallen tragically short of our vision, and it is important for our students to know about those occasions. Certainly, we Americans are not strangers to sin. But there have also been occasions when we have not fallen short of our ideals, and students ought to know about those as well. Professor Lino Graglia writes, "In the context of inhumanity and misery I read as history, I hold the American achievement high." By studying American history, and yes, celebrating its heroes explicitly for each generation, and noting its achievements as well as its failures, our students are invited to grasp the values of our political tradition.

But if history is a kind of collective memory, it is also a mode of inquiry that aims at determining the truth. As a method of inquiry, history teaches respect for facts and for the proper methods of weighing evidence. It helps us to distinguish superficiality from depth, bias from objectivity, tendentiousness from honesty, stupidity from discernment, and confusion from lucidity. History provides us with a sense of perspective and with the ability to make critical judgments. As the distinguished historian Felix Gilbert has observed, "the past is one way—and not the worst way—of acquiring the right and the criteria to judge the present." And acquiring the criteria to judge the present, it seems to me, is no less vital to

the success and well-being of democratic self-government than acquiring a sense of community.

But again, in being exposed to the truth about our history, our students, of course, should be exposed to the whole truth. So let it be told. As Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan puts it:

> Am I embarrassed to speak for a less than perfect democracy? Not one bit. Find me a better one. Do I suppose there are societies which are free of sin? No I don't. Do I think ours is on balance incomparably the most hopeful set of human relations the world has? Yes I do. Have we done obscene things? Yes we have. How did our people learn about them? They learned about them on television. In the newspapers.

Decline in the Status of History

Unfortunately, even the subject of history is in danger of losing its distinct identity, of becoming absorbed in the smorgasbord of this and that known as "social studies." The Council for Basic Education noted in its 1982 report, *Making History Come Alive*:

> In most schools today, the subject of history is subsumed by the curricular genus of "social studies." Teachers of history belong to social studies departments, they commonly identify themselves as social studies teachers, and they teach other subjects in addition to history. Parents are likely to presume that if their children are taking any social studies courses, they are learning history. They may or they may not be.

The Council for Basic Education report largely confirmed the findings of a 1975 study conducted by the Organization of American Historians. The OAH study noted a significant decline in the teaching of secondary school history throughout the country. It found that in some states "virtually no training in history is demanded" of secondary school history teachers. In one state, history teachers were being encouraged to emphasize concepts that transcend "any given historical situation." In another state, the trend was toward ethnocultural courses; in another, the focus was on problem solving, decision making, and social action. And in another, the OAH representative predicted that history would soon be supplanted by more "relevant" courses such as consumer affairs, ecology, and multicultural studies.

The present decline in the status of history in our schools is very serious. To be ignorant of history is to be, in a very fundamental way, intellectually defenseless, unable to understand the workings

either of our own society or of other societies. It is to be condemned to what Walter Lippmann called a state of "chronic childishness." Lippmann continued:

> Men must collaborate with their ancestors. Otherwise they must begin, not where their ancestors arrived but where their ancestors began. If they exclude the tradition of the past from the curricula of the schools they make it necessary for each generation to repeat the errors rather than benefit by the successes of its predecessors.

Such a situation is intolerable. In order to change it, I propose an intellectual initiative designed to transmit our social and political values, to generate individual intelligence, and to provide our young people with the perspective they need to function effectively in today's world. At the core of this intellectual initiative—yes, it too is a kind of defense initiative—lies an enhanced appreciation of the role and value of the study of history. Specifically, then, I advocate consideration of the following program:

- First, our schools should treat history as an autonomous discipline, related to, but distinct from, the social studies. This history must be sure to teach the events and the principles that have formed modern states.
- Second, local communities should agree (and they can agree) on what constitutes a minimum of historical knowledge that every high school graduate, regardless of whether he or she goes on to college, must master.
- Third, just as math and physics must be taught by persons who know their subject, so history must be taught by people who know history. As the Council for Basic Education has pointed out, "the preparation of history teachers should include concentration in history, taught by historians and augmented by significant study in such related fields as literature, the arts, anthropology, and the social sciences."

If taught honestly and truthfully the study of history will give our students a grasp of their nation, a nation that the study of history and current events will reveal is still, indeed, "the last best hope on earth." Our students should know that. They *must* know that, because nations can be destroyed from without, but they can also be destroyed from within.

Americans are the heirs of a precious historical legacy. Let it

never be said of us that we failed as a nation because we neglected to pass on this legacy to our children. Remember that whatever our ancestry of blood, in one sense we all have the same fathers—our Founding Fathers. Let it be said that we told our children the whole story, our long record of glories, failures, aspirations, sins, achievements, and victories. Then let us leave them to determine their own views of it all: America in the totality of its acts.

If we can dedicate ourselves to that endeavor, I am confident that our students will discern in the story of their past the truth. They will cherish that truth. And it will help to keep them free.

Learning to Think About Foreign Policy

JEANE KIRKPATRICK

As a classroom teacher and sometimes examiner, I always said to my students: "Please do your best to address the question posed to you. There may be many other subjects of greater interest that you would prefer to write about, but please address the problem posed to you." The problem posed to me is how education can contribute to the making of sound foreign policy in a democracy.

The most basic task is simply the nurturing of those values, attitudes, and practices that are essential in a democracy. A democratic system requires a certain state of mind and certain kinds of behavior—a certain "political culture," to use the social scientist's term. John Stuart Mill, Alexis de Tocqueville, Walter Bagehot, and all the great students of democracy in this century have emphasized the importance of a democratic political culture to a functioning democratic government.

Democratic government has unusually high requirements for popular participation and popular support, qualities that a democratic political culture nourishes and sustains. The culture not only teaches participation as an obligation of citizenship but also teaches restraint in the exercise of that obligation. Democracy requires both greater participation and greater self-restraint than any other political system. Its citizens must involve themselves in the political process, commit themselves to political activity, and confine their activity to legal and civil means that will leave intact the commonality on which the democracy itself rests.

Education for that rather subtle and quite complex syndrome of participation, restraint, expression of difference, and respect for

commonality is surely the first requisite of education for participation in a democracy. How do we go about it?

We are extraordinarily fortunate as a people in having inherited and so far preserved the basic elements of a democratic political culture. There is probably no more remarkable fact in the history of democratic government than that the endless stream of migrants who settled in the United States, beginning with the Mayflower, and who moved west, clearing frontiers and establishing states—these migrants found it natural to organize themselves in democratic ways. Persons thrown together for the first time thought it appropriate to come together to discuss how they should organize themselves, and who should lead them, and to decide those questions by democratic participatory means.

Given the *ad hoc* character of those new communities, this is really an extraordinary phenomenon, a fantastic legacy that we owe to our Anglo-Saxon roots and, I suspect, to the grace of God as well. It was preserved in all the diverse environments that the settlement of the continent involved, and it was preserved so casually, in so unplanned and accidental a fashion.

Contrast this to the ways that most people throughout history have organized themselves. During our colonial period there were also immigrants arriving in South America and on various islands in the New World. These immigrants found it natural to organize themselves in quite different systems, often with one man establishing dominance by one means or another, installing himself as a caudillo, taking most of what was valuable, in land and power, and ruling his fellows.

A primary task we have as educators is to preserve our democratic habits of association, the associational skills that Tocqueville found so remarkable on his visit here in the early nineteenth century. This we do, as educators and as citizens, mainly by example, by creating in classrooms and in our adult lives those habits of association that rest on respect for one another, respect for diversity, and tolerance of difference. A "decent respect to the opinions of mankind" begins in the neighborhood and in the classroom and on the playground, and it includes talking to one another and listening to one another, and accepting defeat where our points of view are rejected by the consensus.

Characteristics of Foreign Policy

Foreign policy differs in some important ways from other policy areas. The most important difference is that wrong foreign policy decisions can produce uniquely catastrophic results. The stakes in economic policy may be high. A wrong decision may cause people to lose their jobs. But serious mistakes in foreign policy may cost people their freedom, their civilization, and even their lives. In foreign policy, the stakes for all of us, especially in a democracy where we share burdens, are uniquely high. Prudent and correct decisions are therefore more important there than in any other area of policy making.

Foreign policy decisions have some other special characteristics. Their objects are more remote and exotic than those of domestic policy, more ambiguous and abstract. Foreign policy questions are therefore peculiarly susceptible to misunderstanding. We know less, and are therefore prepared to believe more, about remote persons and situations. The personal experience of ordinary citizens is seldom relevant in foreign affairs. Common sense, therefore, which is thought to be the great strength of citizens in a democracy, plays a less constraining and conditioning role in foreign than in domestic affairs. And foreign affairs are far more susceptible to manipulation, to being incorporated into grand ongoing ideological debates whether they really fit into those debates or not.

De Tocqueville noted this in his discussion of foreign policy in America: "I do not hesitate to say that it is especially in the conduct of foreign relations that democracy appears to be decidedly inferior to other governments. Experience, instruction, and habit succeed in creating, in a democracy, a homely species of practical wisdom, and the science of petty occurrences that is called 'good sense' directs the ordinary course of society in their domestic affairs, but is not adequate for foreign affairs" (*Democracy in America*, vol. I, part II, chap. 5).

Suppose you live in an urban area, and you want to think about the desirability of busing children to distant schools to achieve the goal of integrated schools. You may have children or grandchildren or neighbors who have been involved in a mandatory busing program; you have also read in the newspaper or seen on TV ac-

counts of families and communities involved in busing or alternatives. You therefore have some concrete basis for judgment about this question of domestic policy. You are surely going to think a great deal less concretely about the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan, or the vulnerabilities created in Europe by the Soviet installation of SS-20s, or the disagreements within the North Atlantic Alliance, or the controversy over aid for the *contras* in Nicaragua.

Discussion of foreign policy in a democracy, then—and there must of course be such discussion—compared to discussion of domestic policy, tends to be more abstract, more ideological, more remote from experience, less disciplined by experience, and therefore less realistic, because of the lesser contact with reality on the part of both participants and audience. It is likely to generate more heat than light.

The Democratic Assumption

Another aspect of thinking about foreign policy in a democracy is directly relevant to education. When we think about political and social affairs we tend to judge others by ourselves. On domestic questions it is reasonable to do this, because our fellow citizens are products of the same culture and inhabitants of the same society. They are likely to have hopes and dreams and wishes and values very similar to our own.

But in foreign policy, we deal with people from other cultures, and we may be quite wrong to assume that they share our hopes and fears and goals. The tendency to universalize, perhaps common to all people, is particularly strong in Americans. A comment by Harry Truman sheds some light on that tendency: "Our populace, unlike that of any other great nation, is made up of strains of every population around the world. When we became the most powerful nation in the world, we tried to put into effect the ideals of all races and nationalities, all of which we have written into the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence."

If President Truman was correct, if all kinds of people are present in our country and our culture and in our basic documents, then we are right in projecting onto all peoples in the world our ideals, our hopes, our fears, our plans. When we do that, we make what

I call the democratic assumption. It may very well be that most people in most places share our ideals and dreams, but the democratic assumption slides very quickly into the democratic fallacy. We move from assuming that other people desire what we desire and fear what we fear into imagining that they will behave as we behave and try to achieve the same goals by roughly the same means. In short, we assume that all people in the world will behave like the rather familiar human type that philosophers have called "economic man," or "Benthamite man," or "eighteenth-century bourgeois man"—or woman.

We know that human being well. He (or she) is predictable, moderate, reasonable, interested in his own comfort and security, in raising his standard of living, in helping his neighbors. He is sturdy, practical, reliable, and ready to compromise. Such people are not at all prone to guile, to violent revolution, or wars. They are not at all given to investing their futures or their children's, or their current resources, in foreign adventures; they will do so only under extreme provocation. Such men and women are, in short, easy to deal with.

De Tocqueville wrote about these people. "I know of nothing more opposite to revolutionary character than commercial character," he said. "Commerce is naturally adverse to violent action. It temporizes; it takes delight in compromise; it studiously avoids irritation. It is patient, insinuating, flexible, never has recourse to extreme measures until obliged by absolute necessity. Commerce renders men independent of one another, gives them a lofty notion of their own importance, leaves them to conduct their own affairs, and teaches them to conduct their own affairs well" (*Democracy in America*, vol. II, part III, chap. 21). That is the kind of people we are and have always been. People like us are less interested in power than in comfort and well-being. We are less interested in collective goods than in personal goods. People like us want, above all, to be left alone to pursue our private goals in our own manner.

Of course, those tendencies projected into the contemporary world do not constitute what might be called a perfect fit. In this century we have been involved in one war after another. This is probably the most violent century in human history; certainly it is the most violent century in *our* history. Through World Wars I and

II, Korea, and Vietnam, our foreign policy has become progressively global, expansive, and dangerous. More and more nations have been sucked into the conflicts with which our foreign policy is continually confronted.

Educating for Democracy

How can we prepare ourselves, not to mention our students, for responsible participation as democratic citizens in such a society and world as ours? I believe that, as teachers, we must do our very best to communicate to students the basic conditioning factors of the world in our time. Among these are the basic facts of geography. I truly believe that many of our most bitter foreign policy disputes are a direct consequence of the fact that Americans decided sometime not to study geography anymore. My sons attended French schools for two years, and I know that the French, at least as of five or six years ago, had not abandoned geography. It was an important, intensive course. I myself live in rooms with world maps on the walls. It is impossible to think sensibly about foreign affairs without knowing what is where.

In foreign policy, geography is destiny. What gives the United States a vastly different stake in, say, Nicaragua than in, say, Burundi? Burundi is my example of a very remote place; I have been there, and I can testify that it is a very remote place. I do not think we should be indifferent to the hardships of its people, but I do believe that Burundi is less important to us than Nicaragua. The difference is rooted in geography.

Furthermore, I believe it is very important to give students some realistic sense of the parameters of human experience, which are closely related to the parameters of human possibility. These are learned through history. If one wants to think about revolution, or the use of violence to achieve a qualitative change in human nature, it is downright indispensable to know something about what has happened at other times and places when people have tried to do this. Utopianism has a history. We can study repeated examples of the effort to actualize, through political power, dreams of perfection in human beings.

Americans today need to know something about the outcomes of those experiments, so that they can recognize the short road from

utopianism to terror. Only through history—but readily through history—can that road be understood and remembered. Then the student may acquire a prudent regard for the experience of other pursuers of utopian goals.

I believe that we can teach our students about the importance of foreign policy. We can communicate to them that while foreign policy is, in fundamental senses, different from domestic policy—its questions are more difficult, more remote, more abstract—it is not therefore exempt from the controls of popular government and the normal discipline of public debate. In foreign affairs, the relation of experts to the public is not essentially different from what it is in domestic affairs. We must therefore insist that elected officials accept the responsibility for directing our foreign affairs. Those elected officials are, of course, the President and the Congress. No President, no Congress, can control all the outcomes in foreign affairs, but as far as possible they must be held responsible, through the ballot box, for the consequences of their decisions.

Discussion of foreign affairs has a very important role in a democracy. We should not fear it, but should insist that discussion be responsible, observing the constraints of reality. In a democracy, an effective policy requires broad popular support. That support can grow only out of discussion and consensus.

We citizens should try to ensure that the discussion of foreign affairs both in election campaigns and between campaigns is honest, well informed, and realistic. In judging the conduct of our elected foreign policy makers, we need to take into account two things: the special importance of foreign policy to us—the fact that it deals with challenges to the very survival of Western civilization—and the fact that foreign policy is especially subject to demagoguery because it is elusive and therefore can readily be manipulated by ideologues. As citizens in a democracy we must try to inform ourselves and our students about the nature of responsibility in policy making, about the institutions through which we can hold our rulers responsible, and about the history and geography that define the possibilities of relations among nations in our time.

CENTER ESSAYS

54. Central America in U.S. Domestic Politics, *Mark Falcoff* $2
The debate over U.S. policies in Central America is more often a reflection of domestic political differences than a realistic appraisal of the region. A Latin American scholar identifies the sources of common errors and points out the real problems we face there.

55. The Grenada Mission: Crisis Editorializing in the *New York Times*, *Wall Street Journal*, *Washington Post*, and *Washington Times*
Foreword by Edwin M. Yoder, Jr.; edited by Raymond English $2
The fourteen editorials reprinted here, from the two weeks following the landing of U.S. forces on Grenada in October 1983, show a diversity of response, from cheers to unremitting hostility. Veteran journalist Edwin Yoder gives an overview, and an appendix chronicles events on Grenada that led to the U.S. action.

56. Nuclear Arms and Soviet Aims
Ronald Reagan, Pierre Gallois and John Train, Eugene V. Rostow, and Paul H. Nitze $2
President Reagan discusses U.S.-Soviet relations; French general Gallois and American writer Train analyze the new trend toward low-yield, high-precision weapons; Yale professor Rostow examines Moscow's nuclear objectives; and chief U.S. medium-range arms negotiator Nitze describes what Moscow means by "peace."

57. Challenge and Response: Critiques of the Catholic Bishops' Draft Letter on the U.S. Economy, *Robert Royal, ed.* $4
Responses to the U.S. Catholic bishops' draft pastoral, "Catholic Social Teaching and the U.S. Economy," by the Catholic Lay Commission, Peter L. Berger, Michael Novak, Robert J. Samuelson, Andrew M. Greeley, George F. Will, Charles Krauthammer, and Philip F. Lawler. Historical essay by Archbishop John J. O'Connor.

58. Reinvigorating Our Schools: A Challenge to Parents, Teachers, and Policymakers, *Ernest W. Lefever, ed.* $4
Statements by Ronald Reagan, William J. Bennett, and Ernest W. Lefever, and excerpts from *A Nation at Risk* and two other national reports on encouraging excellence and developing civic virtue in America's public and private elementary and secondary schools.

59. Ethics and American Power, *Ernest W. Lefever, ed.* $4
Speeches in late 1984 by Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger and Secretary of State George Shultz took somewhat different approaches to the use of military power. They are published here along with responses by eleven distinguished Americans, including Richard John Neuhaus, Edward Teller, Carl F. H. Henry, and Seymour Siegel, and a related excerpt from Richard M. Nixon's book *No More Vietnams.*

60. Gaining Ground: New Approaches to Poverty and Dependency
Michael Cromartie, ed. $4
Increasing evidence of the negative effects of welfare programs has caused an urgent reassessment of the ways we try to help the needy. Charles Murray, Robert Royal, Glenn C. Loury, Michael Novak, and Peter L. Berger offer new perspectives on income supports, education, family life, and mediating institutions. Foreword by Leslie Lenkowsky.

61. What the Fundamentalists Want, *Richard John Neuhaus* $2
A Lutheran theologian and political philosopher asserts that most if not all of the "traditional values" espoused by the politically active religious Right are legitimate issues for debate in a democratic society. Foreword by William F. Buckley.

62. American Business and the Quest for Freedom, *Donald Rumsfeld and others* $1
A business leader and former secretary of defense looks at America's global role and the contribution of the private sector to security, peace, and freedom. President Reagan, William Simon, Irving Kristol, Richard Cheney, and Frank Shakespeare also comment on business and freedom at a dinner honoring Rumsfeld.

63. How Bishops Decide: An American Catholic Case Study, *Philip F. Lawler* $4
How do the Catholic bishops and the staff of the U.S. Catholic Conference produce pastoral letters on public policy issues? A Catholic journalist examines the internal processes. Foreword by Richard John Neuhaus.

Postpaid if payment accompanies order.
Orders of $25 or more, 10 per cent discount.

ETHICS AND PUBLIC POLICY STUDIES

Ethics and Nuclear Arms: European and American Perspectives
edited by Raymond English 1985 144 pages $7
Five European and five American political and religious leaders look at nuclear weapons and nuclear deterrence from moral and religious points of view. Among the authors are Wolfhart Pannenberg, Edward R. Norman, Stephen Haseler, Richard John Neuhaus, Michael Novak, and J. Bryan Hehir. Foreword by Paul H. Nitze.

The Varieties of Anti-Americanism: Reflex and Response
by Stephen Haseler 1985 72 pages $5
A British scholar distinguishes between harmless anti-Americanism stemming from envy or resentment and more serious forms reflecting a deep hostility to democracy and basic American values. Anti-Americanism should not be allowed to influence the definition and pursuit of U.S. interests and imperatives, he says. Foreword by Midge Decter.

The Politics of Sentiment:
Churches and Foreign Investment in South Africa
by Richard E. Sincere, Jr. 1984 176 pages $8
An examination of the proposal—supported in some U.S. church circles—that American corporations should withdraw their investments from South Africa in order to fight apartheid; finds that many South African religious, political, labor, and business leaders of all racial groups believe disinvestment would hurt rather than help constructive change.

Ethnic Groups in History Textbooks
by Nathan Glazer and Reed Ueda 1983 76 pages $5
From a study of six current high school texts in American history, the authors conclude that the textbook writers, in attempting to foster respect for ethnic groups, tend to overemphasize victimization of minorities—particularly blacks, American Indians, Hispanics, and Asians—and the guilt of the majority, thus distorting the image of American society as a whole.

Values in an American Government Textbook: Three Appraisals
edited by Ernest W. Lefever 1978 56 pages $5
An evaluation by Michael Novak, Jeane Kirkpatrick, and Anne Crutcher of a widely used twelfth-grade textbook in American government.

How the Cold War Is Taught:
Six American History Textbooks Examined
by Martin F. Herz 1978 81 pages $5
An examination of how six widely used high school textbooks present "cold war" issues—the Yalta agreements, the Berlin Blockade, the Korean War, and other events that have shaped the modern world.

Ten per cent discount on orders of $25 or more.
Complete catalog available upon request.

Ethics and Public Policy Center
1030 Fifteenth Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 682-1200

ISBN 0-89633-102-4