

Listen America (1980), Jerry Falwell

The Reverend Jerry Falwell founded the Moral Majority in 1979 to counter what he considered to be both the creeping socialism of the welfare state and the moral decline evidenced in the excesses of the youth revolt. Americans, he insisted, "are s and tired of the way amoral liberals are trying to corrupt our nation." Coupling fundamentalist Christianity with conservative Republicanism, the Moral Majority emerged as a major political and social force in the 1980s—and a major ally of Ronald Reagan.

We must reverse the trend America finds herself in today. Young people between the ages of twenty-five and forty have been born and reared in a different world than Americans of years past. The television set has been their primary baby-sitter. From the television set they have learned situation ethics and immorality—they have learned a loss of respect for human life. They have learned to disrespect the family as God has established it. They have been educated in a public-school system that is permeated with secular humanism. They have been taught that the Bible is just another book of literature. They have been taught that there are no absolutes in our world today. They have been introduced to the drug culture. They have been reared by the family and the public school in a society that is greatly void of discipline and character-building. These same young people have been reared under the influence of a government that has taught them socialism and welfarism. They have been taught to believe that the world owes them a living whether they work or not.

I believe that America was built on integrity, on faith in God, and on hard work. I do not believe that anyone has ever been successful in life without being willing to add that last ingredient—diligence or hard work. We now have second- and third-generation welfare recipients. Welfare is not always wrong. There are those who do need welfare, but we have reared a generation that understands neither the dignity nor the importance of work.

Every American who looks at the facts must share a deep concern and burden for our country. We are not unduly concerned when we say that there are some very dark clouds on America's horizon. I am not a pessimist, but it is indeed a time for truth. If Americans will face the truth, our nation can be turned around and can be saved from the evils and the destruction that have fallen upon every other nation that has turned its back on God.

There is no excuse for what is happening in our country. We must, from the highest office in the land right down to the shoe shine boy in the airport, have a return to biblical basics. If the Congress of our United States will take its stand on that which is right and wrong, and if our President, our judiciary system, and our state and local leaders will take their stand on holy living, we can turn this country around.

I personally feel that the home and the family are still held in reverence by the vast majority of the American public. I believe there is still a vast number of Americans who love their country, are patriotic, and are willing to sacrifice for her. I remember the time when it was positive to be patriotic, and as far as I am concerned, it still is. I remember as a boy, when the flag was raised, everyone stood proudly and put his hand upon his heart and pledged allegiance with gratitude. I remember when the band struck up "The Stars and Stripes Forever," we stood and goose pimples would run all over me. I remember when I was in elementary school during World War II, when every report from the other shores meant something to us. We were not out demonstrating against our boys who were dying in Europe and Asia. We were praying for them and thanking God for them and buying war bonds to help pay for the materials and artillery they needed to fight and win and come back.

I believe that Americans want to see this country come back to basics, back to values, back to biblical morality, back to sensibility, and back to patriotism. Americans are looking for leadership and guidance. It is fair to ask the question, "If 84 per cent of the American people still believe in morality, why is America having such internal problems?" We must look for the answer to the highest places in every level of government. We have a lack of leadership in America. But Americans have been lax in voting in and out of office the right and the wrong people. My responsibility as a preacher of the Gospel is one of influence, not of control, and that is the responsibility of each individual citizen. Through the ballot box Americans must provide for strong moral leadership at every level. If our country will get back on the track in sensibility and moral sanity, the crises that I have herein mentioned will work out in the course of time and with God's blessings.

It is now time to take a stand on certain moral issues, and we can only stand if we have leaders. We must stand against the Equal Rights Amendment, the feminist revolution, and the homosexual revolution. We must have a revival in this country. . . .

As a preacher of the Gospel, I not only believe in prayer and preaching, I also believe in good citizenship. If a labor union in America has the right to organize and improve its working conditions, then I believe that the churches and the pastors, the priests, and the rabbis of America have a responsibility, not just the right, to see to it that the moral climate and conscience of Americans is such that this nation can be healed inwardly. If it is healed inwardly, then it will heal itself outwardly. . . .

Americans have been silent much too long. We have stood by and watched as American power and influence have been systematically weakened in every sphere of the world.

We are not a perfect nation, but we are still a free nation because we have the blessing of God upon us. We must continue to follow in a path that will ensure that blessing. . . .

Let us never forget that as our Constitution declares, we are endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights. It is only as we abide by those laws established by our Creator that He will continue to bless us with these rights. We are endowed our rights to freedom and liberty and the pursuit of happiness by the God who created man to be free and equal.

The hope of reversing the trends of decay in our republic now lies with the Christian public in America. We cannot expect help from the liberals. They certainly are not going to call our nation back to righteousness and neither are the pornographers, the smut peddlers, and those who are corrupting our youth. Moral Americans must be willing to put their reputations, their fortunes, and their very lives on the line for this great nation of ours. Would that we had the courage of our forefathers who knew the great responsibility that freedom carries with it. . . .

Our Founding Fathers separated church and state in function, but never intended to establish a government void of God. As is evidenced by our Constitution, good people in America must exert an influence and provide a conscience and climate of morality in which it is difficult to go wrong, not difficult for people to go right in America.

I am positive in my belief regarding the Constitution that God led in the development of that document, and as a result, we here in America have enjoyed 204 years of unparalleled freedom. The most positive people in the world are people who believe the Bible to be the Word of God. The Bible contains a positive message. It is a message written by 40 men over a period of approximately 1,500 years under divine inspiration. It is God's message of love, redemption, and deliverance for a fallen race. What could be more positive than the message of redemption in the Bible? But God will force Himself upon no man. Each individual American must make His choice. . . .

Americans must no longer linger in ignorance and apathy. We cannot be silent about the sins that are destroying this nation. The choice is ours. We must turn America around or prepare for inevitable destruction. I am listening to the sounds that threaten to take away our liberties in America. And I have listened to God's admonitions and His direction—the only hopes of saving America. Are you listening too?

[From *Listen America* by Jerry Falwell, pp. 17–23. Copyright © 1980 by Jerry Falwell. Used by permission of Doubleday, a division of Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group, Inc.]

Name: _____

Block: _____

Listen America (1980) – Jerry Falwell

AP US History Mr. Rhinehart

1. What was the Moral Majority? What was the movement a reaction against? _____

2. List some of the problems Falwell discusses throughout the speech and place them into the context of the United States during the 1960's and 70's (i.e. what is a historical example of the complaint he is referencing)

#1: _____

#1: _____

#1: _____

3. What does Falwell believe is the solution to America's problem politically and socially? _____

4. Does Falwell's message and focus represent a change or continuity in terms of social and political focus? Please explain . . .

E Pluribus Unum -- The Cult of Ethnicity, Good and Bad

Schlesinger, Educator and historian, was well known for his service during the Kennedy and administrations. His books, which have earned him awards such as the Pulitzer Prize and the National Book Award, include *The Age of Jackson* (1945), *The Age of Roosevelt* (1960), and more recently *The Disuniting of America* (1992). This article originally appeared in *Time Magazine*.

Monday, Jul. 08, 1991

"The Cult of Ethnicity, Good and Bad"

By ARTHUR SCHLESINGER JR. Professor Schlesinger is the author of 14 books.

The history of the world has been in great part the history of the mixing of peoples. Modern communication and transport accelerate mass migrations from one continent to another. Ethnic and racial diversity is more than ever a salient fact of the age.

But what happens when people of different origins, speaking different languages and professing different religions, inhabit the same locality and live under the same political sovereignty? Ethnic and racial conflict -- far more than ideological conflict -- is the explosive problem of our times.

On every side today ethnicity is breaking up nations. The Soviet Union, India, Yugoslavia, Ethiopia, are all in crisis. Ethnic tensions disturb and divide Sri Lanka, Burma, Indonesia, Iraq, Cyprus, Nigeria, Angola, Lebanon, Guyana, Trinidad -- you name it. Even nations as stable and civilized as Britain and France, Belgium and Spain, face growing ethnic troubles. Is there any large multiethnic state that can be made to work?

The answer to that question has been, until recently, the United States. "No other nation," Margaret Thatcher has said, "has so successfully combined people of different races and nations within a single culture." How have Americans succeeded in pulling off this almost unprecedented trick?

We have always been a multiethnic country. Hector St. John de Crevecoeur, who came from France in the 18th century, marveled at the astonishing diversity of the settlers -- "a mixture of English, Scotch, Irish, French, Dutch, Germans and Swedes . . . this promiscuous breed." He propounded a famous question: "What then is the American, this new man?" And he gave a famous answer: "Here individuals of all nations are melted into a new race of men." *E pluribus unum*.

The U.S. escaped the divisiveness of a multiethnic society by a brilliant solution: the creation of a brand-new national identity. The point of America was not to preserve old cultures but to forge a new, American culture. "By an intermixture with our people," President George Washington told Vice President John Adams, immigrants will "get assimilated to our customs, measures and laws: in a word, soon become one people." This was the ideal that a century later Israel Zangwill

crystallized in the title of his popular 1908 play *The Melting Pot*. And no institution was more potent in molding / Crevecoeur's "promiscuous breed" into Washington's "one people" than the American public school.

The new American nationality was inescapably English in language, ideas and institutions. The pot did not melt everybody, not even all the white immigrants; deeply bred racism put black Americans, yellow Americans, red Americans and brown Americans well outside the pale. Still, the infusion of other stocks, even of nonwhite stocks, and the experience of the New World reconfigured the British legacy and made the U.S., as we all know, a very different country from Britain.

In the 20th century, new immigration laws altered the composition of the American people, and a cult of ethnicity erupted both among non-Anglo whites and among nonwhite minorities. This had many healthy consequences. The American culture at last began to give shamefully overdue recognition to the achievements of groups subordinated and spurned during the high noon of Anglo dominance, and it began to acknowledge the great swirling world beyond Europe. Americans acquired a more complex and invigorating sense of their world -- and of themselves.

But, pressed too far, the cult of ethnicity has unhealthy consequences. It gives rise, for example, to the conception of the U.S. as a nation composed not of individuals making their own choices but of inviolable ethnic and racial groups. It rejects the historic American goals of assimilation and integration. And, in an excess of zeal, well-intentioned people seek to transform our system of education from a means of creating "one people" into a means of promoting, celebrating and perpetuating separate ethnic origins and identities. The balance is shifting from *unum* to *pluribus*.

That is the issue that lies behind the hullabaloo over "multiculturalism" and "political correctness," the attack on the "Eurocentric" curriculum and the rise of the notion that history and literature should be taught not as disciplines but as therapies whose function is to raise minority self-esteem. Group separatism crystallizes the differences, magnifies tensions, intensifies hostilities. Europe -- the unique source of the liberating ideas of democracy, civil liberties and human rights -- is portrayed as the root of all evil, and non-European cultures, their own many crimes deleted, are presented as the means of redemption.

I don't want to sound apocalyptic about these developments. Education is always in ferment, and a good thing too. The situation in our universities, I am confident, will soon right itself. But the impact of separatist pressures on our public schools is more troubling. If a Kluge of the Ku Klux Klan wanted to use the schools to disable and handicap black Americans, he could hardly come up with anything more effective than the "Afrocentric" curriculum. And if separatist tendencies go unchecked, the result can only be the fragmentation, resegregation and tribalization of American life.

I remain optimistic. My impression is that the historic forces driving toward "one people" have not lost their power. The eruption of ethnicity is, I believe, a rather superficial enthusiasm stirred by romantic ideologues on the one hand and by unscrupulous con men on the other: self-appointed spokesmen whose claim to represent their minority groups is carelessly accepted by the media. Most American-born members of minority groups, white or nonwhite, see themselves primarily as Americans rather than primarily as members of one or another ethnic group. A notable indicator today is the rate of intermarriage across ethnic lines, across religious lines, even (increasingly) across racial lines. "We Americans," said Theodore Roosevelt, "are children of the crucible."

The growing diversity of the American population makes the quest for unifying ideals and a common culture all the more urgent. In a world savagely rent by ethnic and racial antagonisms, the U.S. must continue as an example of how a highly differentiated society holds itself together.

* Find this article at: <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,973355,00.html>

Name: _____

Block: _____

E Pluribus Unum, Arthur Schlesinger Jr

AP US History Mr. Rhinehart

1. What has been the historic fate of large multiethnic empires in World History? Provide ONE example.

2. According to Schlesinger, why has the traditional historic fate of multiethnic empires NOT been the fate of the United States? _____

3. What is the "Cult of Ethnicity" according to Schlesinger? What is the danger of this line of thinking according to Schlesinger? _____

4. Evaluate the argument of Schlesinger -- do you agree with his POV or disagree with his conclusions? Why? (please provide specific historical examples to support your points)

Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital

by Robert D. Putnam

When Alexis de Tocqueville visited the United States in the 1830s, it was the Americans' propensity for civic association that most impressed him as the key to their unprecedented ability to make democracy work. "Americans of all ages, all stations in life, and all types of disposition," he observed, "are forever forming associations."

Recently, American social scientists of a neo-Tocquevillean bent have unearthed a wide range of empirical evidence that the quality of public life and the performance of social institutions are indeed powerfully influenced by norms and networks of civic engagement. Researchers in such fields as education, urban poverty, unemployment, the control of crime and drug abuse, and even health have discovered that successful outcomes are more likely in civically engaged communities.

Social scientists in several fields have recently suggested a common framework for understanding these phenomena, a framework that rests on the concept of social capital. By analogy with notions of physical capital and human capital--tools and training that enhance individual productivity--"social capital" refers to features of social organization such as networks, norms, and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit.

Whatever Happened to Civic Engagement?

By almost every measure, Americans' direct engagement in politics and government has fallen steadily and sharply over the last generation, despite the fact that average levels of education--the best individual-level predictor of political participation--have risen sharply throughout this period. Consider the well-known decline in turnout in national elections over the last three decades. From a relative high point in the early 1960s, voter turnout had by 2000 declined by nearly a quarter; tens of millions of Americans had forsaken their parents' habitual readiness to engage in the simplest act of citizenship.

It is not just the voting booth that has been increasingly deserted by Americans. A series of identical questions posed by the Roper Organization to national samples 10 times each year over the last two decades reveals that since 1973 the number of Americans who report that "in the past year" they have "attended a public meeting on town or school affairs" has fallen by more than a third (from 22 percent in 1973 to 13 percent in 1998).

Not coincidentally, Americans have also disengaged *psychologically* from politics and government over this era. The proportion of Americans who reply that they "trust the government in Washington" only some of the time" or "almost never" has risen steadily from 30 percent in 1966 to 75 percent in 1998. These trends are well known, of course, and taken by themselves would seem amenable to a strictly political explanation. Perhaps the long litany of political tragedies and scandals since the 1960s (assassinations, Vietnam, Watergate, Irangate, and so on) has triggered an understandable disgust for politics and government among Americans, and that in turn has motivated their withdrawal. I do not doubt that this common interpretation has some merit, but its limitations become plain when we examine trends in civic engagement of a wider sort.

RELIGION. Religious affiliation is by far the most common associational membership among Americans. Indeed, by many measures America continues to be (even more than in Tocqueville's time) an astonishingly "churched" society. Yet religious sentiment in America seems to be becoming somewhat

less tied to institutions and more self-defined. The 1960s witnessed a significant drop in weekly churchgoing--from roughly 48 percent in the late 1950s to roughly 41 percent in the early 1970s. Since then, it has stagnated or (according to some surveys) declined still further.

UNION MEMBERSHIP. For many years, labor unions provided one of the most common organizational affiliations among American workers. Yet union membership has been falling for nearly four decades, with the steepest decline occurring between 1975 and 1985. By now, virtually all of the explosive growth in union membership that was associated with the New Deal has been erased.

PTAs. The parent-teacher association (PTA) has been an especially important form of civic engagement in twentieth-century America because parental involvement in the educational process represents a particularly productive form of social capital. It is, therefore, dismaying to discover that participation in parent-teacher associations has dropped drastically over the last generation, from more than 12 million in 1964 to barely 5 million in 1982 before recovering to approximately 7 million now.

VOLUNTEERING. Next, we turn to evidence on membership in (and volunteering for) civic and fraternal organizations. These data show some striking patterns. First, membership in traditional women's groups has declined more or less steadily since the 1960s. For example, membership in the national Federation of Women's Clubs is down by more than half (59 percent) since 1964, while membership in the League of Women Voters (LWV) is off 42 percent since 1969. Similar reductions are apparent in the numbers of volunteers for mainline civic organizations, such as the Boy Scouts (off by 26 percent since 1970) and the Red Cross (off by 61 percent since 1970). At all educational (and hence social) levels of American society, and counting all sorts of group memberships, the average number of associational memberships has fallen by about a fourth over the last quarter century.

The most whimsical yet discomfiting bit of evidence of social disengagement in contemporary America that I have discovered is this: more Americans are bowling today than ever before, but bowling in organized leagues has plummeted in the last decade or so. Between 1980 and 1998, the total number of bowlers in America increased by 10 percent, while league bowling decreased by 40 percent. (Lest this be thought a wholly trivial example, I should note that nearly 80 million Americans went bowling at least once during 2001, *nearly a third more than voted in the 2002 congressional elections.*)

The rise of solo bowling threatens the livelihood of bowling-lane proprietors because those who bowl as members of leagues consume three times as much beer and pizza as solo bowlers, and the money in bowling is in the beer and pizza, not the balls and shoes. The broader social significance, however, lies in the social interaction and even the occasionally civic conversations over beer and pizza that solo bowlers forgo.

New Associations, New Patterns of Involvement

At this point, however, we must confront a serious counterargument. Perhaps the traditional forms of civic organizations whose decay we have been tracing have been replaced by vibrant, new organizations. For example, national environmental organizations (like the Sierra Club) and feminist groups (like the National Organization for Women) grew rapidly during the 1970s and 1980s and now count hundreds of thousands of dues-paying members. An even more dramatic example is the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP), which grew exponentially from 400,000 card-carrying members in 1960 to 38 million in 1998, becoming (after the Catholic Church) the largest private organization in the world.

These new mass-membership organizations are plainly of great political importance. From the point of view of social connectedness, however, they are sufficiently different from classic "secondary

associations" that we need to invent a new label--perhaps "tertiary associations." For the vast majority of their members, the only act of membership consists in writing a check for dues or perhaps occasionally reading a newsletter. Few ever attend any meetings of such organizations, and most are unlikely ever (knowingly) to encounter any other member. Their ties, in short, are to common symbols, common leaders, and perhaps common ideals, but not to one another.

The concept of "civil society" has played a central role in the recent global debate about the preconditions for democracy and democratization. In the newer democracies, this phrase has properly focused attention on the need to foster a vibrant civic life in soils traditionally inhospitable to self-government. In the established democracies, ironically, growing numbers of citizens are questioning the effectiveness of their public institutions at the very moment when liberal democracy has swept the battlefield, both ideologically and geopolitically.

In America, at least, there is reason to suspect that this democratic disarray may be linked to a broad and continuing erosion of civic engagement that began a quarter-century ago. High on the nation's agenda should be the question of how to reverse these adverse trends in social connectedness, thus restoring civic engagement and civic trust.

ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION OF *MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK* (from *The Journal of Democracy*)

In 1995 Robert Putnam followed up his work on civic involvement in Italy with an exploration of the U.S. experience. He began with the same thesis: the quality of public life and the performance of social institutions are... powerfully influenced by norms and networks of civic engagement. He then went on to demonstrate that civic engagement, as measured by voting, political participation, newspaper readership, and participation in local associations, was in decline.

The concept of "civil society" has played a central role in the recent global debate about the preconditions for democracy. In newer democracies, this term has pointed to the need to foster a vibrant civic life in societies traditionally inhospitable to self-government. At the same time, in the established democracies, growing numbers of citizens are questioning the effectiveness of their public institutions. Putnam writes that in America, there is reason to suspect that this democratic disarray may be linked to a broad and continuing erosion of civic engagement that began a quarter-century ago. He shows that over the last three decades there has been a fundamental shift in:

Political and civic engagement. Voting, political knowledge, political trust, and grassroots political activism are all down. Americans sign 30 per cent fewer petitions and are 40 per cent less likely to join a consumer boycott, as compared to just a decade or two ago. The declines are equally visible in non-political community life: membership and activity in all sorts of local clubs and civic and religious organizations have been falling at an accelerating pace. In the mid-1970s the average American attended some club meeting every month, by 2000 that rate of attendance had been cut by nearly 60 per cent.

Informal social ties. In 1975 the average American entertained friends at home 15 times per year; the equivalent figure (2000) is now barely half that. Virtually all leisure activities that involve doing something with someone else, from playing volleyball to playing chamber music, are declining.

Tolerance and trust. Although Americans are more tolerant of one another than were previous generations, they trust one another less. Survey data provide one measure of the growth of dishonesty and distrust, but there are other indicators. For example, employment opportunities for police, lawyers, and

security personnel were stagnant for most of this century - indeed, America had fewer lawyers per capita in 1970 than in 1900. In the last quarter century these occupations boomed, as people have increasingly turned to the courts and the police.

He went on to examine the possible reasons for this decline. Some familiar themes:

- Changes in family structure (i.e. with more and more people living alone), are a possible element as conventional avenues to civic involvement are not well-designed for single and childless people.
- Suburban sprawl has fractured the spatial integrity of people's. They travel much further to work, shop and enjoy leisure opportunities. As a result there is less time available (and less inclination) to become involved in groups. Suburban sprawl is a very significant contributor.
- Electronic entertainment, especially television, has profoundly privatized leisure time. The time we spend watching television is a direct drain upon involvement in groups and social capital building activities. It may contribute up to 40 per cent of the decline in involvement in groups.

However, generational change also came out as a very significant factor. A very civic-minded generation, born in the first third of the twentieth century, is now passing from the American scene. Their children and grandchildren (baby boomers and Generation X-ers) are much less engaged in most forms of community life. For example, the growth in volunteering over the last ten years is due almost entirely to increased volunteering by retirees from the "civic generation".

Social capital and social change

The follow-up (2007) US study to *Bowling Alone* has also stimulated debate. The first findings from the study found that, in the short run, immigration and ethnic diversity tended to reduce social solidarity and social capital. In ethnically diverse neighborhoods residents of all races tend to 'hunker down'.

Diversity does *not* produce 'bad race relations' or ethnically-defined group hostility, rather, inhabitants of diverse communities tend to withdraw from collective life, to distrust their neighbors, to volunteer less, give less to charity and work on community projects less often, to register to vote less, to agitate for social reform *more*, but have less faith that they can actually make a difference, and to watch more television. Diversity, at least in the short run, seems to bring out the turtle in all of us.

Robert Putnam has also sought to track emerging, significant generators of social capital - and to examine some of the qualities that make them significant. Religion has been a particular focus - not surprising as (in his view) religious affiliations account for half of all US social capital. He cites U.S. mega-churches as 'the most interesting social invention of late 20th century'.

These churches have very low barriers to entry - the doors are open, there are folding chairs out on the patio - they make it very easy to come and go. But they also develop strong commitment from many members. On average, nearly half of all members are tithing [giving a tenth of their income]. What do they do that allows them to go from low to high commitment? According to Putnam, it is by creating a "honeycomb structure" of thousands of small groups: they have the mountain bikers for God group, the volleyball players for God, the breast cancer survivors for God, the spouses of the breast cancer survivors for God, and so on.

The intense tie thus involves an emotional commitment to others in their small group. Most of these people are seeking meaning in their lives but they are also seeking friends. The small groups spend two hours a week together - doing the volleyball or the mountain biking and praying; they become your

Name: _____

Block: _____

Bowling Alone

Mr. Rhinehart AP US History

1. When De Tocqueville visited the US in the 1830's what did he believe was the essential feature of American democracy (i.e. the feature that made it work so seamlessly)? _____

2. What has happened to social and public engagement in the last generation (i.e. 20-30 years)? What are some direct examples of this? _____

Ex #1: _____

Ex #2: _____

3. What explanations does Putnam give to explain this trend? What explanations would you add to Putnam's? (Suggest at least ONE additional reason to explain the decline in public associations)

4. What impact do you believe the decline in public participation will and has had on American democracy?

Edward Snowden: "Hero or Traitor"?

By Geoffrey R. Stone

(Law Professor University of Chicago)

Posted: 06/10/2013 11:31 pm

I was amused this evening to catch a glimpse of a CNN show asking this question, as if either characterization is correct. In my judgment, based on what I know from the media thus far, Snowden is neither a hero nor a traitor, but he is most certainly a criminal who deserves serious punishment.

I say this as someone who believes strongly in government transparency, but even more strongly in the orderly rule of law. Snowden knowingly accepted a position of trust in his relation to the government. He did not have to accept his job, but he did. A clear condition of that job was his voluntary agreement not to disclose any *classified* information - that is, information the disclosure of which could reasonably endanger the security of the nation. The government cannot always attach conditions to employment. For example, it cannot constitutionally require its employees to agree never to criticize the president or never to get an abortion or never to invoke their rights under the Fourth Amendment. But it is well-settled that the government can require its employees to agree to some conditions, and one of them is not to disclose *classified* information.

As the Supreme Court held in *Snepp v. United States* in 1980, not only can government employees constitutionally be required to agree not to disclose classified information, but they can even be required to agree, as a condition of employment, not to publish "any information or material relating to . . . intelligence activities" even *after* they leave the government service without "specific prior approval." As the Court emphasized, an employee's disclosure of "material relating to intelligence activities can be detrimental to vital national interests."

But what if the employee decides, in his own wisdom, that some classified information doesn't need to be classified or that it would be good for the public to know the classified information? Should the employee be allowed to make that judgment? Merely to state the question is to answer it. There is no reason on earth why an individual government employee should have the authority, on his own say so, to override the judgment of the elected representatives of the American people and to decide for the nation that classified information should be disclosed to friends and enemies alike. Such an act is a complete usurpation of the rule of law.

Now, this is not to say that there might not be situations in which it would be in the national interest for certain classified information to be disclosed to the public. It is easy to think of situations in which the decision to classify certain information is misguided, corrupt and dangerous to the nation. In some situations the information may be classified not to protect the national security, but to protect public officials from exposure. Perhaps they have acted foolishly, callously, unlawfully or unconstitutionally.

Perhaps it is important for the American people to know what their representatives are doing - even though the information is classified. Sometimes, the disclosure may be harmless to the national interest, sometimes the harm caused by disclosure may be outweighed by the benefits of disclosure.

The problem, and it is a problem that must be taken seriously, is *who* gets to decide when classified information should be made public? Who gets to put the national security at risk? The solution must be the creation of a clearly defined and credible procedure through which would-be leakers can bring their concerns to an independent panel of experts who can make a formal and professional determination whether the information at issue should be declassified. The absence of such a procedure leaves would-be leakers, who think they are acting heroically, with no recourse but to keep silent or plunge ahead in ignorance, with potentially grievous consequences for the nation.

In the absence of such a procedure, what should Edward Snowden have done? Probably, he should have presented his concerns to senior, responsible members of Congress. But the one thing he most certainly should *not* have done is to decide on the basis of his *own* ill-informed, arrogant and amateurish judgment that *he* knows better than everyone else in government how best to serve the national interest. The rule of law matters, and no one gave Edward Snowden the authority to make *that* decision for the nation. His conduct was more than unacceptable; it was criminal.

Edward Snowden American Hero or Villainous Traitor?

Added by Mai Nowlin on February 18, 2014.



It looks as if Edward Snowden will not be leaving the headlines, or Russia for that matter, anytime soon. Since blowing the proverbial whistle on NSA spying, the question has been asked; Is Edward Snowden an American hero or a villainous traitor to his country? The answer to that really depends on who you ask. According to certain factions in the U.S government administration, he is indeed a villain. However in the opinion of most everyday Americans and a few important players on the political field, he is a hero.

Snowden, who was just elected as the incumbent rector for the University of Glasgow, U.K., has faced tremendous pressure from the U.S. government in their efforts to extradite him back to the United States to stand trial for treason. Luckily for him, he was supported by many who believed that his efforts to expose our governments spying tactics were justified and well overdue. Since his historic escape, Mr. Snowden has been given sanctuary in Russia where he is attempting to live a normal life without the close proximity and support of his family and friends. That in and of itself is very brave and self sacrificing. Some

would even go so far as to say that Snowden gave up his anonymity and basic freedom for the people of America. He did this so that all could be made aware of the lengths our government will go to, in order to maintain their iron fisted control and paranoid monitoring of regular everyday people.

In recent developments, it has come to light that the NSA was not only spying on regular Americans by listening in on phone calls and infiltrating personal information on its citizens, it was also spying on the activities of other countries, both allies and enemies alike. Tellingly, there has been no evidence whatsoever that Snowden's actions have weakened the U.S, government's ability to protect this great nation, or that the NSA's mass and widespread surveillance of Americans private communications has made the country any safer. Contrarily, the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, confirmed by the Senate and appointed by the President, mounted an exhaustive investigation in the wake of the Snowden revelations and concluded that the NSA surveillance program was categorically ineffectual and should be ended, as it was and still is a grave danger to our freedoms and civil liberties.



The programs defenders have tried to argue that had the surveillance been in place during the 911 attacks, they would probably not have happened. The board begged to differ in its majority report stating that the failure of the NSA to identify the threat, stemmed more from a lack of information sharing among agencies rather than a lack of surveillance capabilities. What seems to be more of a threat to the government is not the exposure of the secret tactics they employed to combat terrorism, but more the bumbling and cartoonish style of leadership they displayed for all the world to see. In light of this, can we bravely portray Edward Snowden as an American hero, or as the villainous traitor our government would have us believe he is? If one were to believe the drivel coming from James R. Clapper, the director of national intelligence, truth-telling should be treated as a crime. Yet he persisted in telling blatant lies to the Senate Intelligence Committee regarding the true scale of surveillance on the American people who occurred under his leadership!

Scattered throughout the massive trove of leaked information, it has been discovered that the U.S. government has not only been spying on its citizens in their so-called efforts to “protect” the nation, but they have even listened in on explicit phone calls between husbands and wives and viewed private and intimate photos and videos shared among average citizens. What could they possibly want with this type of information? At present, this and many other questions are yet to be answered and Americans are left to wonder just how far this surveillance program will ultimately go. Edward Snowden seemingly had the best of intentions when he set out on his courageous mission to alert Americans of the threat to our freedoms, so let us, in good conscience, hail him as the American hero he is as opposed to the villainous traitor some would wish us to believe him to be.

Op-Ed By Mai Nowlin

Name: _____

Block: _____

Author's Thesis Paper: In the author's thesis paper assignment, you will read two primary or secondary sources and be asked to answer a few questions on each source. Then in class we will discuss each author's ideas and you will decide who you believe is correct.

The Thesis?

- What is the main argument of each author?

The Evidence?

- Looking at the supporting evidence, analyze whether they are logically interpreted by the authors. Do they clearly support the thesis?

Critical Analysis?

- What do the sources add to your understanding of the topic? How does the author's ideas fit into other points of view or historical information as you understand it?
- What points are strongly made and well documented?

Final Analysis?

- Which of the sources makes the most convincing case and why?

**** For each source complete the Thesis, Evidence and Critical Analysis sections (you only need to complete the Final analysis section once) ****

Author's Thesis Paper: Edward Snowden, Hero or Traitor?

Source #1 => Edward Snowden: Hero or Traitor? By Geoffrey Stone

Thesis: _____

Evidence: _____

Critical Analysis: _____

Source #2 => Edward Snowden: Hero or Traitor? By Mai Nowlin

Thesis: _____

Evidence: _____

Critical Analysis: _____

9/11 Causes and Effects

A day Americans will never forget. 9/11/01. On this day 19 terrorists boarded multiple commercial airplanes, hijacked them and crashed them into different targets on the eastern coast. Their targets were the World Trade Centers, and the Pentagon. The others lost control and crashed in fields. The terrorists had many justifications for their actions and here are the top three.

Cause #1: The first cause is America's foreign policies particularly in the support of Israel. Osama Bin Laden himself said that this was the main reason for al Qaeda attacks against America. Bin Laden's judgment never came from the American culture but from the US support for Israel. Especially the support it gave to Israel's invasion of southern Lebanon in 1982. This specific event triggered Bin Laden's anti-Americanism. In retaliation his first actions involved a boycott of US goods in the 1980s. But as problems escalated in the Middle East many groups began to feel the same as Bin Laden towards America. Throughout this time ties between the Middle East and America deteriorated even further. What made it worse, in the eyes of many Muslims in the Middle East was the decision to deploy 500,000 US troops to Saudi Arabia after Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait in 1990. This resulted in even more resentment towards the United States and their policies.

Cause #2: The second cause or reason why 9/11 happened was because of America's foreign occupation in the Middle East namely in Iraq and Saudi Arabia. In his book *Dying to Win*, political scientist Robert Pape examined modern suicide campaigns and concluded that while they are certainly driven by religious zeal, another key component is foreign occupation in other countries. This theory might explain why 15 of the 9/11 hijackers were Saudis, as there was a substantial US presence in the Saudi kingdom around that time, but it does not explain the other four hijackers, who were Lebanese, Egyptian and Emirati, none of those countries were occupied by the US. This shows how one can conclude that the 9/11 attacks were mainly fueled by nationalism not religion.

Cause #3: Another related cause of the 9/11 attacks was the influence of the CIA. In mid-1979, the same time as the Soviet Union deployed troops into Afghanistan, the United States began giving several hundred million dollars a year to the Afghan Mujahedeen insurgents fighting the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and the Soviet Army. With the Afghan Mujahedeen were Muslim volunteers from other countries, known as Afghan Arabs. The most famous of the Afghan Arabs was Osama bin Laden, known at the time as a wealthy and pious Saudi who provided his own money and helped raise millions from other wealthy Gulf Arabs. Later, Bin Laden organized the Al-Qaeda organization to carry on armed jihad in other countries; the primary target was the United States which is the same country that had helped fund the Mujahedeen against the Soviets. A number of analysts have described Al-Qaeda attacks as blowback or an unintended consequence of American aid to the Mujahedeen.

Questions:

1. Summarize the main ideas of the article above: What justification did the 9/11 attackers use for their actions?

Putnam's indictment of television is deeply and appropriately Tocquevillian. Tocqueville warned that individualism could pull Americans into private concerns and leave us vulnerable to the degradation of public life. If Putnam is right, then Tocqueville's prophecy is now urgent. Alternatively, though, the polity may have abandoned the people. Imagine if unions still organized torchlight parades on Labor Day during a presidential election year; if presidential candidates came to town in motorcades and waved at supporters, stopping to shake their hands and kiss their children; and if local party politicians, church leaders, and others contacted voters personally asking for support for one candidate or another. Amidst all this activity wouldn't you be more likely to run into someone who asked you to bowl with his league? Or invited you to come to a meeting of an investment club? Mightn't you be more trusting of the world at large? The television might be on at the bowling alley, and on election night you might watch the returns on TV at the American Legion hall or gathered with friends. But you wouldn't be a couch-potato citizen.

So maybe it's not that the people have lost interest in the polity, seduced by *Friends* one night and *Frasier* another. Maybe the polity, as it were, has lost interest in the people. It's not that Americans are tuning out. They're being left out.

Copyright 1996 by New Prospect, Inc. Readers may redistribute this article to other individuals for noncommercial use, provided that the text, all HTML codes, and this notice remain intact and unaltered in any way. This article may not be resold, reprinted, or redistributed for compensation of any kind without prior written permission from the author. If you have any questions about permissions, please contact [The Electronic Policy Network \(query@epn.org\)](mailto:query@epn.org), P.O. 383080, Cambridge, MA 02238, or by phone at (617) 547-2950 (voice) or (617) 547-3896 (fax).

[Electronic Policy Network](#) | [Economics & Politics](#) | [Welfare & Families](#) | [Civic Participation](#) | [Health Policy](#)
[The American Prospect Online](#)

The American Prospect / Send us a message at prospect@epn.org
Copyright 1996 New Prospect, Inc.

RETURN

