William James once wrote, “A great many people think they are thinking when they are merely rearranging their prejudices.” There is no better reason why our democracy needs a truly strong, independent and free press, one that challenges the status quo.

Our need for good journalism—synthesizing and analyzing information, separating the chaff from the wheat, challenging “spin” and providing context for news in an engaging and timely narrative—has never been greater. The Information Revolution is swamping us with megabytes of undigested information. Globalization has increased the interdependence and interlocking relationships of the world’s economies, cultures, conflicts and religions. And September 11th made it clear that our democracy’s security and health depend to a large degree on a free press that provides thought-provoking, worldwide coverage—and, thus, deters us from merely rearranging our parochial prejudices. The media, for example, has done much in the last year to shatter the stereotype of Islam as a monolithic, anti-Western religion. In-depth reporting has shed light on the complexities and divisions among Muslim nations as well as explaining to Americans that we need not look far to learn more about Islam, for Islam is this country’s fastest growing religion.

To discuss the state of America’s free press, last June, Carnegie Corporation of New York held a forum (see pg. 40) and invited a number of prominent journalists, publishers, news executives and deans of journalism and communications schools to share ideas on how to strengthen the journalism profession. Judy Woodruff, CNN’s anchor and Corporation trustee, said, “I know I speak for my fellow board members at the Corporation when I say that there is wholehearted, enthusiastic support for a look at American journalism at a time when we depend on journalism more than ever, and when we can be lifted up by it—as we were on 9/11 and in the aftermath—and, just as easily, be let down by it.” She opened the discussion by raising a number of important questions, including the following:

- Is news coverage, and especially international news coverage, which increased in quality and quantity after September 11th, gradually reverting to prior norms?
- Is a thoughtful, deliberative discussion of important issues—like President Bush’s doctrine on pre-emptive strikes—possible in today’s environment of “24-hour news/political spin”?
- Why is diversity in the newsroom so difficult to achieve?
- Never before have journalists been as well-educated, but does the news business allow them to live up to their potential?

Journalists have served the nation well, as have many courageous publishers who put the national interest above their own parochial ones. Today, it is apparent that journalism is straining under increasing pressures—corporate, educational, societal and socioeconomic—and it is equally apparent that it is in our democracy’s interest to confront these challenges and help solve as many as possible. Journalists, after all, are America’s eyes and ears and often the voice of its conscience. As Arthur Miller once wrote, “A good newspaper, I suppose, is a nation talking to itself.”

Contributing to the national dialogue about issues of importance to our country and our society is one aspect of the Corporation’s mission that we consider vital, even when, as is the case with journalism, we do not have a program focusing on a particular area of concern. The programs that are currently central to the Corporation’s work—the need to educate our citizens, to strengthen our democracy, to aid international development and to better understand ethnic conflict and face the dangers of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction—are those we have dedicated our resources to for the five years that I have served as president. Last year, after September 11th, we did ask ourselves, as did many Americans, whether the directions we were pursuing were clear enough, our work relevant enough, our efforts strong enough to help make sense of a world that had suddenly become infinitely more complex and confusing. What we decided, after much soul-searching, was that the challenges we try to address as a foundation are deeply intertwined with the life of our nation and our country’s role in the world, and it was necessary to keep on course, to rededicate ourselves to the goals we had set for ourselves and for the Corporation.

This belief in long-term aspirations is reflected even in the management of our endowment. When Andrew Carnegie established Carnegie Corporation of New York in 1911, he wrote to his trustees that his chief happiness was the thought that “even after I pass away the wealth that came to me to administer as a sacred trust for the good of my fellowmen is to continue to benefit humanity for generations untold.” Though our economy has gone through troubling fluctuations over the past months, as we move through the fall and into another year, we are confident that our investment strategy for both our programs and our endowment is sound. We are pleased that our strategies will enable us to continue to support our grantees at the same level as we did in our last fiscal year.

Overall, we are following the course that Carnegie set for us: to be steady, to be thoughtful, and to go the distance. After nearly a century of philanthropic work, that seems to be a philosophy we can steer by, no matter what changes lie ahead.

Vartan Gregorian
President
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Moving Beyond Storybooks

Teaching Our Children to Read to Learn
Why Do You Like to Read?

Carnegie Corporation of New York interviews Sangay Diki, 11, who is in the 6th grade in Queens, New York.

CC: Do you like to read?
Sangay: Yes.
CC: What do you like about reading?
Sangay: I like finding out about details and facts in the story. Like, all about the characters and how they look and the things they do—stuff like that.
CC: When did you learn to read?
Sangay: In second grade. I was born in Nepal and I learned English there because I went to an American school and that’s where I learned to read. I came here in the third grade.
CC: How was the transition?
Sangay: Well, when people come from Nepal and they don’t speak English, it’s hard, but for me it was easy because I learned English in Nepal.
CC: Do you read fiction and nonfiction in school now?
Sangay: In Nepal we read more histories and that kind of thing. Here, we read more funny books, like the Wayside School series.
CC: Did you have a reading program last year at school?
Sangay: Yes. In the middle of the day we split into two groups and one-half of the class went with one teacher and the other half went with another teacher and we read out loud and wrote stuff. We were reading newspapers and had to answer what, when and why, and had to write our own articles about it and then read it out loud to the class.
CC: Do you like that kind of reading as much as you like reading a story?
Sangay: I think it’s the same thing as stories.
CC: And do you like reading your reports or articles out loud in class?
Sangay: Yes, because everybody gives comments about what you wrote and sometimes when I write something, I understand a lot, but when I read it aloud, people help me more with it.
CC: Are you reading anything right now?
Sangay: Harry Potter and the Philosopher’s Stone. My teacher says the book is better than the movie because it makes you feel stuff.
CC: Have you felt anything yet?
Sangay: No.
CC: One of the books you have with you is some of Shel Silverstein’s poetry. What do you like about poetry?
Sangay: I like it because it can be funny.
CC: Do you like serious stories?

new desks are a variety of new academic subject texts as well as samples of what is now called “literature.” Their storybooks a fond memory, the children will be expected to read these new texts, laden with content and new vocabularies, not merely to demonstrate that they can sound out the words, but to demonstrate that they understand what they read. In short, they are now reading to learn.

But are they?
and psychological development.

As dismal as this picture is, there are, according to Kamil, “many [teachers] who do an excellent job.” Indeed, many of these teachers “have developed methods that are more advanced than the research is.” There is, he emphasizes, an urgent need to “harvest” these best practices and methods of teaching children to read to learn.

With the help of a grant from Carnegie Corporation of New York, Kamil will direct “Best Practices for ‘Reading to Learn’ Across Disciplines in Grades Four and Up,” a research project based at Stanford University that will attempt to do exactly that. Reaching out to professional organizations such as the National Council of Teachers of English and the International Association of Reading, Kamil and a panel of six researchers and practitioners—experts in the fields of literacy, technology and second language—will investigate educational programs within their respective fields, identifying best practices.

The aim, according to Kamil, is to “offer models of best practices that can be implemented in a wide range of school settings and adapted to other content fields.”

No Fourth Grade Slump Here

One place where the transition from decoding words to reading to learn seems to be going smoothly is the New City Elementary School in Clarkstown Central School District in Rockland County, a suburb 30 miles north of New York City. One of ten Clarkstown K-5 schools, New City Elementary School, along with the district’s 2,300-student middle school and two high schools, has earned a reputation for educational excellence. The New York State Report Card, the annual overview of academic performance of New York schools statewide issued by the State Education Department, corroborates what Rockland County real estate agents regularly tell prospective home buyers: Clarkstown schools are among the highest-performing schools in the state.

As measured by the state’s English Language Arts Assessment, a test that measures listening, reading and writing skills, 58 percent of New City Elementary School fourth graders were able to demonstrate that they met standards while an additional 34 percent demonstrated that they exceeded the standards. Classes comprise students with a range of skill levels, including students with learning disabilities.

On a recent hot and humid June afternoon, a reporter traveled to New City to try to understand why these fourth graders, far from being in a slump, were doing so well. First stop: Mrs. Deming’s fourth-grade English Language Arts class where a review discussion of narrative poetry was in progress.

"O.K., what’s a narrative poem?" Deming asked. In response, about 20 eager hands shot up. “It tells a story!” exclaimed one student. What else? “It’s got a beginning, middle, and end!” The students, seemingly impervious to the wilting heat, were enjoying themselves as they confidently demonstrated their
knowledge of the characteristics of narrative poetry, wavering briefly in a moment of uncertainty over the difference between a simile and a metaphor.

Displayed on an easel at the front of a room was a three-stanza narrative poem entitled “Fourth Grade Frolic,” composed that morning by the fourth graders. Students have English Language Arts class twice daily, from 8:10 a.m.—9:20 a.m. and from 12:40 p.m.—1:40 p.m. If the afternoon is spent working on reading, the following morning is spent on a writing assignment related to what they learned in the previous session. The reverse is also frequently the case. The poem on display told the story of their journey through the fourth grade—and, by the way, offered *prima facie* evidence that they did indeed know what a narrative poem was.

Reading for Meaning

In an exercise designed to ensure that students were reading for meaning, Deming paired them off, handing each pair of “buddies” a book of poetry. The pairing was not random. Stronger readers were paired with weaker readers, though the range in proficiency was not so wide that either child would be frustrated. Instructed to determine whether the poem assigned was indeed a narrative poem and to explain in their own words what the meaning of the poem was, the students went to work. Some craftily positioned themselves in the path of the lone fan whirring away high on a shelf. Others headed for the open doors in hope of snaring an errant breeze.

Each pair of buddies read their poem silently, read it aloud to each other and then quietly discussed the poem. What was this poem all about? Did it tell a story? Did it use any of the techniques of narrative poetry? Finally, they settled down to write a paraphrase of the poem’s meaning, lining up their arguments to make the case as to whether it was a narrative poem.

While the students worked on their poems, Deming quietly explained to a visitor that she tried to cover all of the literary genres, with an emphasis on nonfiction, including how-to books and biographies and autobiographies. Also poetry, she said with a smile, since fourth graders are not likely to come to poetry on their own. With each new form of poetry that they learn, students are given the task of writing in that form. Each student has compiled an illustrated anthology of poems they have written and poems they have read and particularly enjoyed. Entitled “My Poetry Scrapbook,” the slim volume is subtitled “Poems I Made” and “Poems I Love.”

Teaching Reading Across the Curriculum

Deming teaches social studies as well as English Language Arts; the two other members of the fourth grade teaching “team,” Nancy Marcus and Jessica Gallagher, teach English Language Arts and science and mathematics respectively. All three teach reading and writing in both of their academic disciplines. Students are required to keep a journal in every subject area.

“We need to teach reading skills across the curriculum,” says Deming, adding, “The inferential part of reading is key.” From kindergarten through the second grade, she explains, students are taught to decode text. During this time, they mostly read stories. In the third grade, teachers begin to “teach for understanding.” By the fourth grade, when students are reading texts in the...
different subject areas, learning activities that focus on reading with understanding have intensified. In general, she says, students are reading and writing “so much in the content areas” that by the time the children are in the fifth grade, where they begin to use trade books and more critical reading is expected of them, they are ready.

By now, in Deming’s class, the learning activity in progress had just concluded. The buddy pairs were ready to get on with their reports on narrative poetry.

Flushed and slightly sweaty, Danny and Josh quickly cut to the chase: Their poem—entitled “I Should Have Stayed in Bed Today”—was definitely a narrative poem. Their classmates rewarded the boys’ analysis and presentation with a boisterous round of applause. As they sat down, the pair appeared extremely happy that they hadn’t remained in bed that day, dispelling suspicion that any irony was intended in assigning the pair this particular poem.

And so it went. On a hot afternoon in June, a group of fourth graders gave every sign that they thought analyzing poetry was a really cool thing to do. As the children noisily dispersed and headed for their next class, a student approached a visitor with a shy smile. With little urging, Lauren explained why she enjoyed reading so much. “It’s fun!” she said. And also, she quickly added, “When you read you can go to a different place, even when Mom is yelling at you.”

If It Works, Adopt It

Pressed to explain the apparent success of teaching their students to read and write so well, teacher Nancy Marcus puts it this way: “We start off loving reading ourselves,” she explains, “[our students] know we love it.”

Alan Lipman, principal of New City Elementary School for fifteen years, notes that he had hired all three fourth grade teachers. The three have established close working relationships with each other over time, relationships that enable them to work together as a team. Stressing the importance of teachers “not working in isolation,” Lipman also emphasizes how critical it is for teachers to be given “planning time” every day. The teachers agree that this time is vital because it allows them to share their ideas, struggles, successes and failures. “If they find something that works well,” says Lipman “we adopt it.”

In such an atmosphere of support and trust, where, according to Marcus, teachers are “allowed to make mistakes,” indeed, are encouraged by their principal to push the boundaries of what they know and have done before, both teachers and students have benefited.

The strategies for creating successful reading-to-learn instruction that are employed by Lipman and his teachers are mirrored in the Report of the National Education Association Task Force on Reading 2000. The report offers guidelines for creating effective reading programs that include focusing on reading achievement for all students; time, resources and professional development for planning instruction; connections between reading and other content areas; collaboration among teachers; and giving teachers the freedom to exercise their professional judgment in deciding how to meet the instructional needs of students.

Lipman sums up these concepts in a few succinct words. What is needed, he says, is “motivated kids, parental involvement, dedicated teachers, continuity and time to develop a team.”

New Approaches in an Urban Setting

A mere 1.2 percent of the children enrolled in Clarkstown Central School District fall into the category of “English language learners.” Twenty-three certified teachers provide instruction to the 437 students enrolled in New City Elementary School. Classroom libraries are well stocked with books and equipped with computers. The facilities are bright and clean,
security measures are nominal and morale is high. By almost any measure, then, teaching and learning conditions at New City Elementary School are optimal, but that doesn’t mean that literacy can only thrive in an affluent environment. Even school districts in traditionally less advantaged areas can develop exemplary reading programs when the teachers, the administrators and the community decide that’s exactly what they want to do.

A case in point is Union City, New Jersey, right across the Hudson River from Manhattan. The most densely populated city in the U.S.

Even school areas can develop teachers, the
Standardized tests is either equal to or exceeds the state average. The turnaround was based, in large part, on creating a systemic school reform program rooted in the idea that improved literacy is the key to all other student learning.

Union City began by forming an Elementary Literacy Committee comprising primarily teachers and directed by Fred Carrigg, who was named Executive Director for Academic Programs for the city after serving as its Supervisor of Bilingual/ESL (English as a Second Language) Education. Working alongside a number of other committees set up to examine every aspect of education in the city’s elementary schools, the Elementary Literacy Committee focused on constructing a literacy curriculum that would help develop students’ thinking, reasoning and collaborative skills but was also, as Carrigg explains, firmly rooted in state standards. An integral part of the revised curriculum was an emphasis on encouraging teachers and students to explore new ways to learn, and to help the children learn by doing—demonstrating proficiencies by writing research papers and carrying out reading and writing-related projects. One of the first steps the committee took was to scour the shelves of the district’s schools to examine its textbooks; they eventually determined that most of the books were not relevant to Union City’s students and did not promote the language and readings skills the children needed to acquire.

After a year of research, discussion and planning, the Union City reformers began to institute fundamental changes aimed at immersing students in a language-rich environment and providing instruction across the curriculum that was literature-based. The district built up an inventory of books reflecting themes identified as important by the teachers who would actually use the texts. Often, the books reflected topics close to students’ lives, which allowed teachers to introduce exercises such as starting conversations with the students about what they had read. Other ideas were also brought into the learning mix, including methods for helping children to develop enriched vocabulary skills. All the ideas that produced results were outlined in great detail by the Elementary Literacy Committee, which produced guidebooks that correlated texts, page numbers, suitable activities, proficiencies and state standards. They presented as much information as possible in one place, helping teachers plan their activities and strive for specified outcomes.

Fred Carrigg also credits the use of technology as a real catalyst for bringing about fundamental change in the Union City schools. With funds provided by New Jersey’s Quality Education Act (which enabled the transfer of funds from wealthier school districts to poorer ones) and support from the National Science Foundation and corporate partners such as Verizon (Bell Atlantic), Union City not only bought computers and software, but also developed a high-speed, district-wide network of voice, video and data that interconnected classrooms throughout the city, along with local libraries and even a daycare center. Students, teachers, administrators and even parents can now interact across the network via e-mail and other programs. Today, children are learning research skills by accessing the Internet and using CD-ROMs, but the focus remains on literacy; in fact, teachers have noted that computers offer support for the process of writing and rewriting, and so help to stimulate the development and acquisition of language skills.

Still, Carrigg says, the process “isn’t about technology, it’s about education. I can’t imagine adding technology in a meaningful way without reforming curriculum.” And he adds what is per-
haps his most important point about why Union City’s schools have made such remarkable strides: “We are a district,” he says, “that believes every child can succeed.”

Literacy as a National Issue

Schools like those in Union City and the Clarkstown Central School District are the success stories, but they are too few and far between. Fortunately, there are signs that Congress and the federal government have begun to recognize the importance of gaps in literacy achievement as a national problem that requires national attention. Accountability is the national free fall in high school. By the time U.S. students reach the tenth grade, only a third are reading proficiently. Nearly half of 17-year-olds are unable to read at the ninth grade level, and in 35 of the nation’s largest cities, almost half of the high schools graduate only 50 percent of their students.

Andrés Henríquez, program officer in the Corporation's Education Division, focuses on early childhood education, including upper elementary and middle schools. The phenomenon of the middle school slump, he acknowledges, is immensely complex, and there is no single education model that can address the nation cannot afford to lose half of our high school graduates.”

Gregorian’s observations are confirmed in a recent report, Reading for Understanding: Toward an R&D Program in Reading Comprehension, issued by the RAND Reading Study Group, a panel of 14 reading experts charged with recommending to the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Educational Research and Improvement ways of honoring the quality and relevance of research and development related to improving reading comprehension.

According to the report, we are living at a time when the availability of blue-

Literacy, said educator Paolo Freire, “is the practice of freedom.”

overriding theme of a $26 billion education bill signed by President George W. Bush. The bill mandates the annual, standardized testing of children in reading and mathematics in grades three through eight. If schools with poor performances fail to show improvement after two years, management changes will be mandated and parents will be provided with federal funds for tutoring.

Schools will now be required to separate out the performances of minority groups. The intent of this practice of “disaggregation” is to prevent schools from hiding lagging test scores in larger averages.

These policy changes come not a moment too soon, for we have ample evidence that the overwhelming majority of students in our urban schools who do not develop the comprehension skills necessary to read to learn—poor, minority children and children whose first language is not English—never recover. We know that as adolescents they continue to descend into an eductangle of socioeconomic, race, gender, language and cultural issues in which the urban literacy challenge is embedded.

Moreover, in this unruly “nonsystem” of American education, in which school districts are continually grappling with local issues, and internecine political struggles are frequently the rule, “There is no magic bullet,” Henríquez explains, “and there is no one-size-fits all approach.” However, what we do know with absolute certainty, he adds, is that, “It’s not a language arts problem. It’s everyone’s problem.”

A Lot at Stake

“During the past century,” notes Carnegie Corporation President Vartan Gregorian, “the nation could absorb a 50 percent dropout rate from our high schools.” But no longer is such an extravagant waste of human resources feasible. Declares Gregorian, “In the 21st century, a century of global competition—a knowledge-dominated, rather than a sweat-dominated era—our collar jobs has grown scarcer, and many service-related jobs require a high school diploma. In such a time, a more advanced literacy has become an economic necessity for U.S. citizens. Despite this, NAEP data indicate that the level of reading skills of most Americans has stagnated over the last 30 years. Moreover, internationally, U.S. eleventh graders perform close to the bottom, behind students from developing nations such as the Philippines, Indonesia and Brazil. The poor performance of U.S. middle and high school students in international mathematics and science comparisons is attributable to their poor performance as readers.

“Students who are good comprehenders,” the RAND Reading Study Group points out, “use strategies in reading to learn new concepts, get deeply involved in what they are reading, critically evaluate what they read and apply their new knowledge to solve practical as well as intellectual problems.” At the same time, “Adult reading
involves reading for pleasure, learning and analysis, and it represents a prerequisite to many forms of employment, to informed participation in the democratic process, to optimal participation in the education of one’s children, and to gaining access to cultural capital.”

In short, in the twenty-first century more than ever before, a great deal is riding on America’s success in teaching its children to read to learn. Advanced literacy is essential to providing all the rights and joys of full U.S. citizenship. Paolo Freire, the late Brazilian educator and writer, put it this way: Literacy, he said, is nothing less than “the practice of freedom.”

For fourth-grader Lauren, however, avid and engaged reader that she is, at this point in her life reading is something else, something at once simpler and more substantial than what the experts say. Unaware that she is well on her way to developing advanced literacy, and to enjoying the benefits of full citizenship, Lauren only knows that reading is a really fun thing to do.

Why Do You Like to Read?

Carnegie Corporation of New York interviews Christopher Wisell, 13, and his brother Sam, 10. Christopher attends Brattleboro Area Middle School in Brattleboro, Vermont, and is in the 8th grade; Sam is in the 5th grade at Vernon Elementary School in Vernon, Vermont.

CC: Do you remember when you learned to read?
Sam In the first grade.
CC: Do you remember what it was like?
Sam It was cool.
CC: Why?
Sam Because it used to be like just looking at symbols for me and then I could understand and read. So that was cool.
Christopher: When he was starting to read, I remember that he would slowly read out loud from little books and then Mom and me would correct him when he needed help. After a while he got really good at it and didn’t need help anymore and he started reading bigger books.
CC: Sam, did you read in school in the fourth grade?
Sam For 15 minutes every Friday we had DEAR—Drop Everything and Read. And we read in literacy class.
CC: What happened in literacy class?
Sam We read books and then the teacher asked us questions like, if your book has a superhero, what are the characteristics about him or her that you like? And we had to write about the book.
CC: How do you choose books that you want to read on your own time?
Sam My teacher read us a book called The Great Brain* and then I liked it and asked if there were anymore. And she sent me to the library and I got five more Great Brain books.
CC: How about you, Christopher? What are you reading?
Christopher: Salamandastron,* * It’s part of the Redwall series.
CC: Do you like to read?
Christopher: I like how it gives me something to do and how it can let me think about stuff—and learn, too. I read some books on World War I and II and that taught me what it was like during those times for people who were involved in the wars.
CC: What else do you like about reading?
Christopher: It helps me in school. The more I read by myself, the better I do in school. Like when you’re required to read something for school, if you’ve got practice reading already, then you can read faster and appreciate more. And if I do well in school, I think it will help me do better in my life.
CC: So reading helps you learn. What is it you like about learning?
Christopher: It makes me feel good.
CC: Did you have a reading class in school last year?
Christopher: We had it for half the year, every day for forty-five minutes. In the classroom, there’s a few big chairs and lots of pillows and you just kind of lay down on a bench or a chair and read. You still have to try to read different genres—but other than that, it’s pretty free. Sometimes the teacher will give out work sheets, but usually she just gives you a deadline and says, read this book by such-and-such a date.
The support of research and scholarship has been a fundamental theme of Carnegie Corporation of New York’s work over the years. Its Scholars Program helps men and women of vision examine some of the most significant and critical questions facing today’s global society.

Laura K. Donohue

Encounters with Northern Ireland’s barbed wire, soldiers with machine guns and militant teenagers stunned Laura Donohue. She was 20, an Irish-American student on a holiday planned with green hills and thatched cottages in mind. The 1989 trip rearranged her priorities, calling her to the work of helping states respond to terrorism. “I talked with people my own age who were engaged in violence because violence had been done to their own families and people they loved—and I realized they were acting out of a strong moral conviction,” recalls Donohue, now 32 and teaching a course called “Security, Civil Liberties and Terrorism” at Stanford University. “It could have been me there, faced with the same circumstances and having to make the same moral decisions. What’s the difference between them and me? What is it that drives some people to violence? How do states make things worse? Those are the questions I had then and they still animate my research.”

Donohue began her career at Dartmouth College, where she earned a BA with honors in philosophy as well as a citation for her work in war and peace studies, which she began after visiting Northern Ireland. After Dartmouth, Donohue returned to the province. At the University of Ulster, she earned a postgraduate diploma in a war and peace studies program—and her classmates included Loyalists, who favored ties to England, and Republicans, including former members of the Provisional Irish Republican Army who had just completed prison sentences for terrorism. “The irony was that we discussed general theories of peace studies, but never discussed politics in class—it was too controversial!” Donohue said. As a result, much of her education took place outside of the classroom. “I learned Irish history
by going to the pub—actually, I was on a pub team that won the All Northern Ireland Pub Quiz about Irish history, politics and music. The four of us won 96 cans of Bass Ale.”

Donohue stayed at Ulster another year and earned an MA with distinction in 1993. “It was a reality-based education, and very sobering. I came to appre-
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ciate the complexities of the conflict and
to become more concerned about state
measures that exacerbated tension on
both sides of the religious divide.”

Reflecting this concern about state
reactions to terrorism, her subsequent
research concentrated on counter-terrorism. Between 1994 and 1998, she was at
the University of Cambridge earning a
Ph.D. in history. Her doctoral disserta-
tion examined the impact of “tempo-
rary” counter-terrorism laws that had
been enacted over many decades in
Great Britain and Northern Ireland. In
1999, while a visiting scholar at Stanford
University’s Center for International
Security and Cooperation, Donohue
used her dissertation as the basis for a
book, published by the Irish Academic
Press and entitled Emergency Powers and
Counter-terrorist Law in the United
Kingdom 1922–2000. Donohue intro-
duced the book with a December 2000
speech at the House of Commons, an
honor that recognized its importance as
the first comprehensive analysis of
counter-terrorist legislation in the U.K.

In Donohue’s analysis, a small per-
centage of terrorist acts should be con-
sidered attacks against the state, while
most others could be treated as crimes.
The two approaches have enormous ramifi-
cations for democracies. If a ter-
rorist act is deemed a crime, it is
addressed with existing criminal laws
designed to deter crime while protecting
the rights of citizens and non-citizens.
But if an act of terrorism is consid-
ered an attack on the state and its ability
to protect the lives and property of its citi-
zens, deterrence is no longer seen as an
option—states must try to prevent fur-
ther acts of terrorism. And prevention
invariably affects civil liberties.

Donohue believes that states often
over react because terrorism creates
enormous public pressure on every
branch of government to do something.
“When an open society has been taken
advantage of in this manner the immedi-
ate response is to close it,” she says. “To
feel safe, people are willing to live with
more restrictions and more government
mistakes.” Northern Ireland’s counter-
terrorism laws, which began accumulat-
ing as temporary measures in the 18th
century, increased police powers for
entry, search and seizure; expanded
detention without charges or hearings;
instituted censorship of newspapers,
books, films and records; restricted
meetings, assemblies and the singing of
nationalist songs; closed Republican
organizations, and banned the wearing
of Easter lilies, an inflammatory symbol
of an Irish uprising against the British
during Easter Week, 1916.

Once on the books, such laws can be
difficult to live with or to repeal,
Donohue reports. Even when there is lit-
tle evidence of terrorism—she found only
four occasions of violence in Northern
Ireland between 1922 and 1972—the
mere possibility of violence feeds a popu-
lar preference for safety over civil rights.
This is especially true if the loss of civil
rights falls heaviest on minority groups,
such as Catholics in Northern Ireland.
The civil rights campaign that exploded
in the province in the late 1960s grew out
of the uneven application of extraordi-
nary state powers. The campaign led to
the suspension of Northern Ireland’s par-
liament in 1972 and reimposition of
British authority—and yet most of the
counter-terrorism laws were reintro-
duced. Donohue says that political expe-
dience often keeps counter-terrorism laws
alive; for to repeal them requires the claim
that some level of violence is acceptable or
that terrorism is no longer a threat. The
former is politically untenable, and the
latter impossible to prove.

In general, Donohue theorizes that
inappropriate state responses to terror-
ism run the risk of triggering a
“counter-terrorist spiral,” which invol-
ves “inroads into civil liberties, the
alienation of minority groups, the radi-
calization of extreme elements, the
estrangement of foreign governments,
the generation of an increase in terror-
ist threats and the increased effective-
ness of terrorist acts.” But she has more
questions than answers. When is a ter-
rorist crime properly considered an act
of war? At what point in a conflict do

“When an open society has
been taken advantage of by terro

How did states respond to terrorism in Northern Ireland?
democracies might balance security and freedom. To support her research, Carnegie Corporation named her a Carnegie Scholar in June 2001. Donohue’s project, scheduled for completion as a book manuscript in late 2003, will provide what she calls a taxonomy of counter-terrorism. It will provide a detailed history of terrorism in a half-dozen countries as well as their political, social, economic and military responses. She will assess which actions diminished terrorism, short-term and long-term, and which actions had no effect or made the situation worse.

While conducting the research, Donohue is based at Stanford’s Center for International Security and Cooperation. As an acting assistant professor in the university’s political science department, she is incorporating the research into her course, “Security, Civil Liberties and Terrorism.” She says teaching helps her process and organize the research into lectures, which will become book chapters, and that the collegial atmosphere in the center and the department provide an “ideal” intellectual environment, one that is both supportive and challenging.

After the terrorist attacks on September 11th, Donohue began tracking the government’s response and believes the U.S. is overreacting domestically and abroad. “My concern is that we don’t need to go through all the learning pains that afflicted Europe in the 60s, 70s, and 80s. We know the predictable patterns that liberal, democratic states fall into when confronting terrorist challenges. Simply borrowing counter-terrorism measures from these states isn’t a good idea unless we understand what effect they had. If we’re going to take a page out of their history, we need to read the whole book.”

Michael J. Sandel

On a winter break from graduate school, Michael Sandel set off for the south of Spain with a book bag of philosophy and, in a way, never returned. “I became immersed in Immanuel Kant’s Critique of Pure Reason, John Rawls’ A Theory of Justice and Robert Nozick’s Anarchy, State, and Utopia. I returned to Oxford and took seminars in political philosophy and haven’t really emerged since then,” recalls Sandel, now 49, a professor of government at Harvard University and a political theorist in his own right.

Sandel says he has been interested in politics since growing up in Minneapolis, Minnesota, but became immersed in philosophy when a scholarship took him to Oxford. His planned two-year program at Oxford stretched into four years, with Sandel teaching politics during his last year and obtaining a doctorate in 1981.

Then that rarest of rarities occurred: his dissertation was published and became a classic in the field. In Liberalism and the Limits of Justice, published by Cambridge University Press in 1982, Sandel explored the philosophic roots of liberalism and criticized its development into a doctrine that not only detached individual rights from considerations of the common good, but also separated political discussions from those on moral and religious issues that animate democratic life. In this form of liberalism, government is expected to provide a neutral framework of laws so that citizens can pursue the good life in any way that individuals define it. But Sandel argued that democratic politics cannot be neutral on moral questions; instead, it should nurture the civic virtues that inspire citizens to seek the common good.

The book helped shape the communitarian movement, which has, since the 1980s, sought to temper the American obsession with individual rights with a stronger sense of civic responsibility for the common good. (Sandel, for his part, resists the communitarian label, finding fault with some of its positions.) Reprinted many times, with a new edition in 1998, Liberalism and the Limits of Justice has now been translated into seven languages. The tension between individual and community is of worldwide interest, and every country comes from a different perspective; in Japan, for example, many readers are interested in introducing more individuality into a culture some consider to be too community-minded.

After Oxford, Sandel joined the Harvard faculty as an assistant professor, became an associate professor in 1983 and, in 1999, was named a Harvard College Professor in a special recognition of his teaching skills—best exemplified by his undergraduate course, “Justice,” which has to meet in the university’s Sanders Theater because it attracts 700 to 800 students each term. The course relates the classic works of Aristotle, Kant and John Stuart Mill to contemporary issues such as affirmative action, hate speech, gay marriage and income inequality. Modestly, Sandel attributes the course’s popularity to the students, who are provoked and inspired by class debates to sort out their own moral and political positions. Among his other professional activities, Sandel was recently appointed by President George W. Bush to the President’s Council on

### Terrorism, the immediate response is to close it.” —Laura K. Donohue
Bioethics, which is now focusing on the issue of cloning.

Sandel’s second book, *Democracy’s Discontent: America in Search of a Public Philosophy* (Belknap Press), appeared in 1996, and was featured as a cover story in *The Atlantic Monthly*. Another measure of its impact was the publication, a few years later, of *Debating Democracy’s Discontent* (Oxford University Press, 1999), a volume with more than a dozen scholarly responses. Sandel’s book struck a chord because it linked his first book’s philosophic inquiry to a new interpretation of the American political tradition. In digging into American political history, Sandel happily discovered that our “public philosophy,” or mainstream political tradition, did not always embrace a liberalism that is narrowly focused on the rights of the individual. Among speeches and writings of prominent thinkers from the time of the American Revolution to World War II, Sandel found evidence of a rival public philosophy—one that he called civic republicanism because of its greater emphasis on promoting civic virtues for the common good.

But after the World War II, Sandel says, the civic republican public philosophy was crowded out by rights-based liberalism and its two offshoots: an egalitarian liberalism—with mostly Democratic adherents who call themselves liberals—that advocates a nonjudgmental government but, inconsistently, makes exceptions by also championing selected values like tolerance and fairness; and libertarian liberalism—with mostly Republican adherents who call themselves conservatives—that advocates for a small government that lets individuals use the free market to define the good life for one and all. Sandel warned that both egalitarian and libertarian liberalism give inadequate weight to the obligations of citizenship and the claims of community. He called for an American revival of civic republicanism.

But how exactly does a country do that? Until recently, Sandel says, the call for civic virtue and morality in politics has been monopolized by cultural conservatives who blame big government and cultural institutions for being non-

---

Michael J. Sandel lecturing in Sanders Theater at Harvard University.
needs certain public spaces and shared
give citizens of all socioeconomic 
a common ground.” —Michael J. Sandel

Beverly B. Mack

Beverly Mack found the driving force for her scholarly mission while reading The Washington Post in 1984, just after returning from several years in Nigeria. The newspaper had published what she calls “the standard article about Muslim women—indicating that they are oppressed and can’t do anything—implying they have no brains, no ambition, no use.” A Post editor welcomed Mack’s offer of another perspective for its “Outlook” section, and she wrote a moving story about a deeply religious Muslim writer and teacher who sacrificed her work to follow her faith as an illiterate man’s third wife. To Mack’s horror, the piece appeared under the headline, “Being Third Wife Beats Having a Career in Moslem Nigeria.”

“I was dumbfounded!” recalls Mack, who is 50 and an associate professor of African and African-American Studies at the University of Kansas in Lawrence. She is not an apologist for any patriarchal society that discriminates against women and she is especially critical of Muslim regimes that devalue women. But as a scholar of African literature, language, religion and culture, she bristles at simplistic Western stereotypes that she says unintentionally demean Muslim women by writing them all off as subservient underachievers. “No one who has lived among these women could have anything but the greatest respect for them. It made me think the only way to change the Western stereotype was to share evidence of Muslim women’s scholarship through the centuries.”

She also believes that the celebration of Muslim women’s scholarship might be the best way to foster change from within Muslim societies—those that deny women equal access to education and, thus, independence. “Providing historical proof of Muslim women’s continuous involvement in scholarly networks and social development activities is, I think, a culturally appropriate way to support and promote women’s education, not to mention their political and social activism. The scholarly women in Muslim history serve as role models who embraced Islamic values. Reviving their writings and accomplishments should have more influence in Muslim cultures than would Western advocacy of women’s rights, alone.”

Mack grew up in Tolland, Connecticut, and after graduating from the University of Connecticut in 1973, joined the Peace Corps, which sent her to
teach in a small village in Sierra Leone. This experience led to her decision in graduate school to study Hausa, the lingua franca of West Africa, and do fieldwork in Kano, Nigeria, the center of Hausa culture. At the University of Wisconsin, she earned an M.A. in African literature and, in 1981, a Ph.D. in the department of African Languages and Literature, with doctoral minors in African history and comparative literature. She is fluent in two African languages, Hausa and Krio, and is conversant in Arabic and French.

To do research for her doctoral dissertation—*Wa’ko’kin Mata: Hausa Women’s Oral Poetry*—Mack traveled on a Fulbright grant in 1979 to Kano to find, record and analyze Hausa women’s poetry. In pursuit of her goal, she spent a great deal of time at the emir’s palace, drawn by the emir’s female “praise singer,” who entertained the court and preceded him in public places with lavish praise. Mack learned that praise singing also includes oral poetry and was told about other women who also wrote and recited poetry. “What I found,” she said, “was poetry written in a religious tradition that served to inform people about their history, religion and current events. Some sang contemporary songs of wisdom and warning about childcare, hygiene, politics or drugs. They also sang extemporaneously—often weaving social criticism into their songs while playing a stringed instrument or a calabash drum.”

In 1982, Mack returned to Kano for post-doctorate research and teaching at Bayero University, where she lectured about African and African-American literature. One result of her work there was her edited and annotated volume of Hausa poetry, *Al’kalamai a Hannun Mata* (A Pen in the Hands of Women). Published in 1983 by the Northern Nigerian Publishing Company, the poems of Hauwa Gwaram and Hajiya ‘Yar Shehu appear in the original Hausa.

“When I first visited the publishing company, the editors told me that Nigerian women didn’t write poetry,” Mack recalls. “But when I took out a stack of poems by Hauwa Gwaram and Hajiya ‘Yar Shehu, they had to admit that perhaps there was something to publish after all.” The book is still widely used in northern Nigeria as a text for adult literacy classes.

Now at the University of Kansas, Mack has been an associate professor of African and African-American studies since 1996 and an associate professor of religious studies since 1997. Her most popular, introductory course, “Women and Islam,” usually draws a large and diverse assortment of students, including some Muslim women in veils, as well as Middle-Eastern and African-American students.

Another course covers Nana Asma’u bint Shehu Usman dan Fodiyo, a prolific 19th century poet and teacher. Although she was still a legendary figure in 20th century Nigeria, her writing was not published and there were no books about her. When Mack first inquired about Asma’u during her 1979 trip to Nigeria, she was directed to Jean Boyd, an expatriate Englishwoman who taught school in Sokoto, Nigeria. Concerned that Nigerian schoolchildren in the 1960s were being taught European history for lack of African history books, Boyd began researching regional history. In the course of that work, she met Nana Asma’u’s great-great-great grandson, who loaned her a goatskin satchel filled with Asma’u’s manuscripts. Asma’u had written about history, battles she witnessed, political conflicts and Muslim values and principles. Boyd and Mack subsequently received a grant from the

Mack and Boyd completed their study of Asma’u with a literary biography, One Woman’s Jihad, published by Indiana University Press in 2000. Mack and Boyd’s books are widely used by scholars and students in a variety of college courses including history, women’s studies, literature, anthropology and religion. In One Woman’s Jihad, one of Asma’u’s poems, written in 1856, describes some basic principles of Islam. In one section, she encourages women to pursue their education as they would food: attention they deserved. Indeed, in the Islamic community, Asma’u’s manuscripts were kept in the family’s home and not in a state or university library. As a result, women’s writings and scholarship have largely escaped the attention of publishers and historians. This is changing with the growth of interest in social history and as more women become historians and enjoy the kind of access to the world of Muslim women that is denied to men.

In 2000, Mack was named a Carnegie Scholar and given support to undertake exploratory research. She hopes to discover pre-19th century works of Muslim women scholars, mostly in sub-Saharan and North Africa. The only evidence she has that such scholarship once existed is some 19th century correspondence and other materials that refer to a wealth of women’s scholarship going back several centuries. What survives is uncertain.

After taking a preliminary trip to Morocco this summer, Mack plans to make a half-dozen field trips over the next year to North Africa, where Islamic communities have existed since the 10th century or earlier. As in the past, she will generally avoid well-known archives and, instead, develop a network of sources that should lead her to privately held collections where women’s writing is much more likely to be found. She is optimistic about uncovering, and ultimately publishing, a wealth of theological writing, eulogies, literature, correspondence and historical, social and political commentaries. “But I don’t know what I’ll find or where I’ll find it until I get there,” Mack says. “It’s a mystery, but whatever happens, I’ve learned that ‘Allah will provide.’”

Caroline Hoxby

When Caroline Hoxby was 13 years old, she signed up for the toughest course her public school had to offer, an elective in what Thomas Carlyle dubbed the dismal science, economics. “I just loved it,” recalls Hoxby, now 35 and a professor of economics at Harvard University. “Growing up in the 1970s, I was deeply aware of economic problems and I was really excited to find out that there was a whole science seeking answers to these questions. I can remember reading Adam Smith and thinking, ‘Oh my gosh! Someone has figured this out!’ I was just thrilled. It’s been a lifelong love affair with the subject.”

Hoxby, who is also the director of the Economics of Education Program at the National Bureau of Economic Research as well as being a fellow of the Hoover Institution, the Sloan Foundation and the MacArthur Foundation, was named a Carnegie Scholar in 2000 and given support to conduct research in promoting excellence in public education through an innovative system of student vouchers.

The project flows naturally from Hoxby’s longstanding interest in the economics of education, which was the subject of her doctoral dissertation as well as her theses for Oxford (where she earned an M. Phil. in economics), and Harvard, all of which won awards. As a pioneer in the economic issues of education, her research and testimony at state and federal hearings over the last decade have influenced policy and public debates on many school reform ideas, including the benefits of decreasing class size (it yields surprisingly small increases in student achievement, she found) and increasing students’ choice of schools (her research suggests that

**historical proof of Muslim women’s scholarship is a culturally appropriate women’s education.”**—Beverly B. Mack

Women, a warning. Leave not your homes without good reason. You may go out to get food or to seek education.

In Islam, it is a religious duty to seek knowledge.

Women may leave their homes freely for this.

Why had Asma’u and other respected women scholars been overlooked and gone unpublished? Mack’s explanation is that Muslim women traditionally lived a very private life and were revered for their central role in the family. Given their more secluded life, their accomplishments rarely broke the surface of public life to receive the
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competition generates significant increases in student achievement). While she delves into these highly controversial school reform issues, she says she does so as a scientist with complete indifference to her findings or their political ramifications. “Frankly, I’m not very interested in politics.”

It was ten years ago, while doing research for her dissertation, that Hoxby began investigating the traditional form of school choice that Americans take for granted—parents’ freedom to choose schools for their children by choosing where they live or by choosing private schools. One implication of this freedom to keep in mind, says Hoxby, is that “middle-class parents won’t stay around to experience” unpopular school reforms. So while competition is inherent in our school system, it is an imperfect form of competition—urban school districts, having lost out to suburban districts, no longer face competition from any school because the remaining families are often too poor to move away or pay tuition at private school.

In 1980, the economists Milton and Rose Friedman first addressed this loss of urban competition by proposing a system that would give each student a voucher representing the annual public investment in his or her education. In their system, parents would then “spend” the voucher at any participating public or private school and, in the process, spur the development of a competitive and diverse educational marketplace that the Friedmans believed would engage parents and significantly improve education.

While the Friedmans’ voucher idea generated enormous interest and controversy,* the nation’s economists were too preoccupied with other issues to develop the Friedmans’ model, says Hoxby. In economists’ absence, a sociologist and two legal scholars developed the first voucher proposals; politicians launched experimental programs in a few urban districts; and, subsequently, political scientists, legal scholars and policy experts—not economists—evaluated the early voucher experiments. “It’s paradoxical that economists were out of the loop,” says Hoxby. “As a result, many commentators abandoned the idea of trying to find analytic answers to questions about choice—and many people decided that vouchers were essentially a matter of principle. Unfortunately, when people view something as a matter of principle, their positions tend to harden, undermining any likelihood of consensus or compromise.”

Among the most common criticisms about voucher programs and proposals are that the value of vouchers is typically set too low to cover education costs at most private schools; that voucher systems will sap money from public schools and create private schools that aren’t demonstrably better or accountable to public standards; that voucher programs will attract the most able students and leave behind public schools filled with physically disabled, learning disabled and low-IQ students; that vouchers will destroy the idea of the common school by increasing segregation along racial, ethnic, religious and linguistic lines; and that city voucher programs do not provide any real choice among public schools because suburban school districts do not participate. Voucher opponents stress these risks while proponents minimize them—often adding that some tradeoffs must be accepted to gain the benefits that competition can bring.

Unfortunately, says Hoxby, this debate swirls around flawed voucher experiments and proposals, and not the well-designed voucher systems that she believes are possible. “The reality,” she says, “is that these plans started as a grassroots thing, not with school finance experts and economists and institutional experts trying to design and test an exemplary voucher system.”

And that is exactly what Hoxby is working on now as a Carnegie Scholar. Her work builds on the Friedmans’ model and would create competition not only among urban, but also suburban schools, charter schools, as well as private and religious schools. Competition is, in her view, the best path to school reform. Her prior research indicates that competition spurs educational improvements, including improved student achievement and greater appreciation for good teaching.

Under Hoxby’s ideal voucher system, families could send their children to the schools of their choice—and would have a meaningful choice of public and private schools in a multi-district region, metropolitan area or state. To promote such widespread participation of schools, this system would provide schools with adequate resources—vouchers would cover the specific costs of each student’s

*After years of debate and legal challenges, a landmark decision by the U.S. Supreme Court in June 2002 declared that school vouchers were constitutional.

“When people view something as principle, their positions harden, any likelihood of compromise.”
Hypothetically, then, Bob's voucher would have extra money for a special education program; Jane's voucher would cover costs associated with a hearing disability; Jim, a typical student with no special needs, would have a voucher covering average per-pupil costs for a regular education student; and Susan, who comes from a poor family, would have a voucher that reflected the extra cost of enriching her education. Vouchers could reflect virtually any education-related expense, ranging from transportation to the cost of teaching students who haven't yet learned English.

The system Hoxby proposes is vastly different from the controversial programs and proposals that offer a limited number of students a limited number of school choices with a one-size-fits-all voucher—priced as though every child had identical educational needs that could be met with a few thousand dollars. And unlike some voucher systems in place now, Hoxby's would leave it up to parents to decide, by their choice of programs and teachers, which schools grew and which ones closed. "It's important to allow unpopular schools to close, rather than continue our current practice of rewarding failing schools with more money."

A key feature of Hoxby's voucher system is that it is designed to be impossible for any group of students (disabled, poor, minority) to be segregated involuntarily. That is, such a group would have to want to self-segregate in order for segregation to occur. If, after introducing this system, policymakers still perceived that some socially desirable goal was not being met, the vouchers could be adjusted. For example, students could be given incentives to segregate themselves less than they are inclined to if left to their own devices: students would get larger vouchers if they attended schools with greater racial diversity. But Hoxby isn't sure such social engineering would be needed if groups cannot be segregated against their will.

Hoxby's system would also revolutionize school finance. Under the current system, school districts divvy up federal, state and local funds among schools according to rough estimates of the student body and its educational needs. Under Hoxby's plan, the same public funds would be apportioned to students, based on their individual educational needs. School districts that have similar per-pupil spending could easily participate in such a regional voucher system, including many cities that have high educational expenditures. For the voucher plan to work in areas with large discrepancies in per-pupil spending, tax reforms of some kind would be needed.

Hoxby has almost completed a computer model for the voucher plan. The hard part, she says, is going to be obtaining the data she needs from a metropolitan area to create a real-world simulator of the voucher program. When that is in place in early 2003, educators and policymakers could see exactly how the system would create individual vouchers and promote school competition across their school districts.

And contrary to George Bernard Shaw's pronouncement that "if all economists were laid end to end they would not reach a conclusion," Hoxby believes that a consensus among economists is developing about this approach to school choice. "For economists, the controversy is essentially disappearing, in that there is growing agreement that a voucher plan can be designed to do whatever you want it to do."
Attorney Ellen Alderman, along with her co-author and fellow attorney Caroline Kennedy, has written two definitive books* and numerous articles examining how the structure of our democratic government and our laws affects the lives of American citizens. In light of Andrew Carnegie’s mandate to Carnegie Corporation of New York, exhorting the foundation to pursue “the advancement and diffusion of knowledge,” coupled with our concern for strengthening our country’s democratic processes, we asked Ellen Alderman to write this essay on the tension between homeland security concerns and privacy issues post-September 11th. Sidebars to the article present overviews of other efforts to address the troubling question of how to protect privacy in a world interconnected by the Internet and confronted by the challenges of terrorism.

September 11th, we are told, “changed everything,” but at least one thing that should have changed, has not—the conventional wisdom that we cannot protect both our country and our civil liberties, especially our right to privacy. While new efforts to increase security undoubtedly pose threats to our privacy, the trauma and rigorous self-examination of the past year present a remarkable occasion to improve privacy protection in this country—providing we are willing to do so. Just as we have now come to the conclusion that our entire homeland security apparatus needs an overhaul, so, too, we must rethink our approach to protecting our right to privacy. Indeed, many issues we must address regarding privacy and homeland security dovetail, so that committing ourselves to both will enable us to better protect our country and our liberties.

We probably made a mistake from the start when we allowed the issue to be cast as a choice between privacy and security. Certainly, if we really did have to choose one or the other, there would be no contest; we would choose security and then perhaps loathe the oppressive world we would live in. As Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia recently said in another context, “We can all...”
stipulate that the safest societies in the world are totalitarian dictatorships.” Instead, it is the promise of the Bill of Rights that we do not have to choose between privacy (or any other civil liberty) and security. We can have both, yet neither will be absolute. It is not a choice, then, but a balance.

In striking this balance, as a society we have always been willing to weight the scale toward security. After September 11th, we are understandably and appropriately even more willing to lean in that direction. Yet a thumb on the security side of the scale is one thing; surrendering our privacy for security without question is quite another, and arguably dangerous because, in the process, we may give up a precious right without ensuring increased safety, and so become less free but not more secure. Thus, the key question is not which one to choose, but whether the gain in safety outweighs the loss of privacy.

Answering this question requires a kind of open-minded, rigorous, even imaginative national debate that has not traditionally characterized our engagement with these kinds of issues. Without such thoughtful evaluation, however, our failure is likely to be on both sides of the balance—not only in protecting our homeland, but also in safeguarding our right to privacy. It is imperative that we bring the process of balancing privacy and security into the 21st century, both to preserve our rights and to ensure our safety.

The American Approach to Privacy

One of the reasons there is so much room for improvement in the ways we protect our right to privacy is that we have never been particularly good at it in the first place. In general, our approach to privacy in this country has been a rather piecemeal affair. Instead of developing a comprehensive policy to protect this precious right, we have often waited until our privacy has been violated and then reacted. For example, state motor vehicle departments routinely sold our driving records until a man in California used them to stalk and murder Rebecca Schaeffer, a young actress. Spurred by the circumstances of Schaeffer’s death, in 1994 Congress enacted the Driver’s Privacy Protection Act, which generally prohibits states from disclosing personal information that their citizens submit in order to obtain driver’s licenses. Similarly, records of which videotapes we’d rented were widely available until opponents of theft and video voyeurism.

In the context of safety issues, though, our approach to privacy remains much like our pre-September 11th approach to security: based on outdated or erroneous assumptions and executed without any real assessment of effectiveness. Out of fear, we have been willing to compromise not only our civil rights but also our safety. When new security measures have been implemented, we have rarely built in effective protections against abuse, a step that would protect privacy without affecting safety. And we have not provided meaningful, long-term oversight to serve the twin purposes of deterring any future abuses while also evaluating whether a security measure continues to be effective. Finally, and arguably most important of all, we fail to adequately consider what social frontiers new and stringent security measures may lead us toward and whether we really want to go there.

Alternatives

For those who fear a loss of privacy, there is reason for optimism. Many of
the most promising and urgently needed security measures have little or nothing to do with privacy. Some of these measures are known as surveillance of means (which raises few privacy issues) rather than surveillance of people (which, by definition, compromises privacy). For example, security experts agree that the best protection against the terrifying prospect of weapons of mass destruction—nuclear, biological and chemical—in the hands of terrorists is to do a much better job of securing these lethal materials at their source, whether in nuclear stockpiles, laboratories or warehouses in the U.S. or around the globe. (Eight countries are known to have nuclear weapons but we are not sure exactly how many of these weapons exist or even where they are all kept. And nearly a year after the anthrax attacks, we still cannot definitively trace the source of the deadly agent.)

Similarly, we do not effectively safeguard the means—such as crop dusters, private aircraft and shipping containers—of deploying or transporting these materials. (Of the 2,000 shack-sized containers that enter the United States by land, sea and air each hour, less than two percent are opened for inspection). In addition, we must do much more to protect facilities such as nuclear reactors and water treatment plants, which are still frighteningly vulnerable targets.

More research and resources must be devoted to each of these critical components of homeland security. New technologies can help us to develop more effective devices to detect radiological (“dirty”) bombs before they detonate or to warn of a release of deadly chemicals. New scientific technologies can identify pathogens such as anthrax and smallpox before they spread. Vaccines against diseases dispersed by terrorists, as well as medicines to treat the fallout from radioactive or chemical attacks, would rob such assaults of their power to kill and terrorize. More efficient communications networks, especially between law enforcement agencies, emergency responders and medical personnel would also add to security. In June, the National Research Council (NRC), a committee of the nation’s leading scientists, engineers and physicians, issued a report lamenting our failure to harness and coordinate our country’s incredible scientific and technical resources to take these and other steps to protect ourselves. The NRC proposed a new think-tank agency, a Homeland Security Institute, to do so. The authors of the report deemed these measures “critical contributions to protect the nation from catastrophic terrorism.” None infringe on privacy.

Similarly, experts in international relations have urged that foreign policy and diplomacy (as well as education and training in these fields) be revamped to focus on gaining global cooperation to secure nuclear and other potentially devastating weapons, make countries less hospitable to terrorists, address reasons people turn to terrorism in the first place, rehabilitate America’s image in certain parts of the world and develop other strategies to help safeguard the United States. Again, these crucial steps have little to do with our privacy rights.

Of course the most far-reaching security proposal of all, restructuring the United States government to address glaring lapses in the infrastructure of homeland security, does not infringe on privacy. In fact, the task of merging all or part of 22 agencies into one Department of Homeland Security, as has been called for by President Bush, with the intent of fixing the rampant defects in each—as well as coordinate with the FBI and CIA—is so extensive and complex a project that it is possible we cannot truly know the extent to which additional intrusive security measures are necessary, or how beneficial they might be, until we get these sweeping changes in place.

Given that there are many directions to follow in pursuit of security, we need to be sure that our government has done everything possible to protect us and our nation without weakening our rights. And we have ample cause for concern. The list of shortcomings in existing security safeguards have already come to light. Recently, for instance, Attorney General John Ashcroft announced plans to have the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) fingerprint 100,000 Middle Eastern visa holders; the next day, the Justice Department’s own inspector general testified before Congress that the INS and FBI were “years away” from processing the fingerprint files already on hand. Tens of thousands of foreigners are illegally obtaining Social Security...
Ten years ago, public documents—everything from birth certificates to bankruptcy filings—were so inaccessible in public archives that they were as good as private. Now, public records are becoming widely accessible on the Internet. Is this an advance in public accountability or a retreat from privacy rights? Similarly, health insurance claims and hospital records are increasingly collected in networked databanks in efforts to reduce healthcare costs and improve medical care. But who controls this personal information? As it is now, what you tell your physician may wind up on your boss’s desk. A 1995 University of Illinois study found that 35 percent of Fortune 500 companies acknowledged using individual health records “in making employment-related decisions,” nearly always without informing the employees.

As we adjust to living in this fishbowl called the information age we clearly have to develop new public policies and reconsider old ones. Privacy, after all, is essential for a functioning democracy. “Without the power to decide when to remain private and when to ‘go public,’ we cannot exercise many other basic freedoms,” writes Alan F. Westin in an essay, “Privacy Rights and Responsibilities in the Next Era of the Information Age,” published by the Aspen Institute. “If we are ‘switched on’ without our knowledge or consent, we have lost our fundamental constitutional rights to decide when and with whom we speak, publish, worship and associate.”

Help is on the way from the Computer Science and Telecommunications Board (CSTB), an operating unit of the National Academy of Science in Washington, D.C. CSTB was established in 1986 to provide independent advice to the federal government on technical and public policy issues relating to computers and communication. Composed of an interdisciplinary group of experts—including a revolving mix of policy specialists, sociologists, lawyers, business executives, economists, scientists and engineers—CSTB demystifies information technology and relates it to national and everyday concerns. The board’s findings and recommendations help inform public discussions and policy debates on Capitol Hill. Particularly influential have been its series of reports on the Internet, which provided justification for government investments, beginning in the early 1990s, and guided planning in both public and private sectors for the Internet’s commercialization.

Now, to examine web-related privacy issues, CSTB has established a Committee on Privacy and the Information Age, which is co-chaired by Lloyd Cutler, the former White House Counsel to Presidents Clinton and Carter and Judge William Webster, the former FBI and CIA director. It’s work will include holding several public meetings to hear from scores of experts and interested parties. The committee welcomes comments; visit www.cstb-privacy.org for information on how to contribute.

Committee members have already begun to develop guidelines for their work, which include assessing risks to personal information associated with information technology and examining the tradeoffs (e.g., between more personalized marketing and more monitoring of personal buying patterns) involved in the collection and use of personal information.

The committee’s first meeting was in June 2002, with other meetings scheduled for the fall and winter 2002-2003. This $1-million project is jointly supported by AT&T Foundation, Carnegie Corporation of New York, W.K. Kellogg Foundation and the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation.
numbers each year (and the identification papers that go with them) by using fake documents such as visas and green cards simply because the Social Security Administration does not have a system to verify records with the INS. When this report appeared in The New York Times, readers wrote in with 800 numbers to call and web sites to check to find the information the Social Security Administration was unable to obtain.

And this past July, John Magaw was forced to resign as head of the newly created Transportation Security Administration less than six months after taking the job because of the agency's failures in a number of areas, including delays of many months in conducting tests on procedures to close loopholes in checked-baggage security and putting ordinary travelers under intense scrutiny while not putting measures in place to investigate passengers who should raise concerns. Is this really the best our nation can do?

Effectiveness of Intrusive Measures

Even when we do consider intrusive new security devices or surveillance programs, we have a flawed process for doing so. Historically we often have begun with an inaccurate assumption, namely that more surveillance (and less privacy) must equal more security. How could it not, we think? If the security (and thus the privacy) must equal more security.

Historically we often have been systematic or exacting when it comes to evaluating security measures. For instance, if crime rates fall in neighborhoods with surveillance cameras, the cameras tend to get the credit without considering whether the drop is due to social or economic changes in the area, or whether the criminal activity simply moved down the street. Now, when the proposed measures are as intrusive as the BodySearch or a national identification system, and the harm we are faced with is as devastating as September 11th, we have to be much more exacting in determining just how effective a proposed security device is. Sometimes more intrusive measures are not the best way to improve public safety, they are just the easiest.
Protecting Against Abuse and Misuse

Although we cannot always be sure whether or not security measures will keep us safe, we can be certain that there’s a good chance they will be abused and used in ways we never intended. When tavern owners began using bar-coded drivers licenses to keep out underage drinkers, they were surprised—and delighted—to realize that they ended up with a database of names, addresses, ages, even social security numbers that could be exploited for marketing.

Video surveillance has created even more notorious opportunity for abuse ranging from male operators using the system to zoom in on women’s body parts (sometimes preserving an image as a wall poster) to a kind of virtual profiling system with cameras focused on individuals from a particular ethnic group. (Jeffrey Rosen found these misdeeds flourishing under the British surveillance system). Yet, as of this writing, police officers in our nation’s capital have 14 cameras in use that have the ability to link up with and access hundreds of additional cameras in the city’s schools and subways, and at a recent meeting in Washington, D.C., city officials admitted there were no standards in place regarding where the cameras could be installed, who could monitor them or how long the information would be kept on file.

In the private sector, video Peeping Toms have thrived, hiding cameras in dressing rooms, restrooms and bedrooms. The law, as usual, has had to play catch-up. Some egregious violations of privacy, such as secretly videotaping lovemaking, have gone unpunished simply because there was not yet a law that said it was wrong.

We agree to give up our privacy to be more secure, not to assist marketers, entertain bored security guards, or worse. Some of the abuses and misuses of security measures are relatively harmless, some are devastating and many are preventable. There is no reason to set up security systems that practically invite abuse. Safeguards can be built in from the start, through both law and technology.

When privacy issues began to gain attention in areas other than homeland security, they were not only a major consideration in the development of new products, but also became a selling point. For instance, when a supermarket chain’s frequent buyer card was exposed as a means to collect data about shoppers, a rival chain touted its own “privacy friendly” card. When the Internet marketing giant DoubleClick admitted it used “cookies” to amass information on unsuspecting web surfers, it was a disaster for the company and gave bragging rights to competitors who did not “put their hand in the cookie jar.” And recently, Microsoft introduced Palladium, a new system kicking off a mind-boggling long-range plan to change the architecture of personal computers as we know them, in large part to address privacy concerns. When privacy becomes a priority, resources and ingenuity go into creating new possibilities for protection.

There is no reason the same effort and energy cannot be applied to homeland security measures. The NRC’s proposed Homeland Security Institute, or something like it, could harness our best brains and resources to devise measures to keep us safe and protect privacy at the same time. We can also do a better job of protecting privacy in legislation that authorizes intrusive measures. When Congress gives law enforcement new or broader powers to listen in on phone conversations or read e-mail for example, the increased access can be restricted to cases of suspected of terrorism. It can even be stipulated that such access is extraordinary and not to be extended to traditional law enforcement concerns.

Any new security measures should also include protection against abuse, backed up by strict sanctions for those who misuse them. If a statute is enacted in an emergency, it should contain a “sunset” clause providing for its expiration at a set time. After rigorous review of how well a law has worked and evaluation of the alternatives, a law may be reinstated.

Congress took some of these steps in October 2001 when it passed the mammoth USA Patriot Act. The Patriot Act gives law enforcement sweeping new powers of surveillance, among them: greater ability to share information among different law enforcement groups; greater authority to use “sneak and peek” warrants to conduct a search without notifying the target (e.g., searching your home when you’re not there); and the new power to obtain information about
an individual’s Internet activity simply by “certifying” that the information is “relevant” to an investigation (critics liken this search to demanding that a librarian reveal all the material you perused at your local library).

Congress was able, in just a few weeks, to pass this 342-page law, which amends some 15 statutes because, in essence, the blueprint for it had already been drawn. Law enforcement agencies had been trying to get this kind of authority for years. In the immediate aftermath of September 11th we were willing—eager really—to give the authorities the benefit of the doubt. But now, law enforcement and Congress should do their part to assure us that these were indeed the right steps to take. The new surveillance powers were justified as essential to fight terrorism, but the claim began to lose credibility when, in some instances, such as the “sneak and peek” warrants, the new authority was extended to all criminal investigations. Many of the provisions have a sunset clause of 2005, but the most controversial one, lowering the standard for surveillance of Internet use, does not. All of the provisions should have sunset clauses and Congress, in its oversight role, should make them meaningful.

Oversight

Legislation such as the Patriot Act—and a new approach to privacy in general that emphasizes effectiveness of proposed intrusive security measures, addressed by rigorous oversight. The FBI has eased restrictions on agents’ ability to surf the web and attend certain political and religious gatherings in the course of an investigation. Both seem like reasonable measures, but restrictions were put on these activities because of past egregious abuse, such as the FBI’s notorious COINTELPRO program, which went on for years. (In the early 1970s, COINTELPRO was exposed as a domestic counterintelligence program run by the FBI and aimed at a broad range of activist groups; the methods COINTELPRO agents employed went far beyond surveillance, including the use of force and fraud, and abused numerous constitutionally protected rights.) So, if after September 11th, we want law enforcement again to have more surveillance power, let’s also understand how important it is to keep a better eye on them this time.

In regard to the Patriot Act, by 2005, law enforcement officials should demonstrate that the new surveillance powers are working, are not being abused, are still necessary, and are still the least intrusive means of getting the job done. Lawmakers should be willing to revise, rescind or overhaul the law as necessary. If handled properly, the Patriot Act and FBI policy changes may show us that, in some instances, the best way to strike the balance between privacy and security is not in refusing to allow more surveillance, but in insisting on more oversight. There may be times when our best protection is not to decrease the government’s ability to see us, but to increase our ability to see them. And to demand accountability.

Congressional oversight is part of the proposed new homeland security plan, of course, but it cannot be the hodgepodge of committees and subcommittees (88 by one count) that now oversee pieces of homeland security. It is not just the homeland security infrastructure, but also the oversight apparatus that needs an overhaul, including procedures to safeguard sensitive information while affording proper review. Some have also suggested strengthening the inspectors general who currently investigate federal agencies and removing them from the departments they are charged with overseeing. Still others propose an independent committee made up of experts in the field who would gain proper security clearances and oversee certain aspects of the homeland security program. The ultimate answer will likely be a combination of all these possibilities.

Long-Term Consequences

Finally, we have to better understand the long-term consequences of relinquishing some of our privacy in any given situation. In this we have failed as often as our elected officials. The loss of privacy appears simple enough—it man-
Before September 11th, Amitai Etzioni’s book, *The Limits of Privacy* (Basic Books, 1999), seemed a bit farfetched. Etzioni, a sociologist at George Washington University, argued in his book that the nation was leaving itself open to terrorism by putting a higher priority on protecting individual privacy rights than on protecting national security. Today, Etzioni’s call for a better balance between security and privacy frames the national debate. “I’m all in favor of rights, but there is another thing, the public interest,” he says. “We have to figure out how to square these two things, without saying one trumps the other.”

To help work on that problem, Etzioni joined the Markle Foundation’s recently organized Task Force on National Security in the Information Age. The task force’s objective is to offer the government a comprehensive approach to improving national security through the collection and management of information without trampling on peoples’ privacy. As Zoë Baird, Markle’s president, puts it, “We are very focused on how to use information technology to enhance security—and how to pursue that goal while also protecting the liberties that characterize America.”

The work of the task force, Baird says, will be driven by several fundamental questions. What information needs to be gathered and analyzed to foil terrorism in the United States? How can the government employ the best practices used by the private sector for data collection and information technology? How can government agencies work more effectively together in gathering and analyzing the security information it needs to combat terrorism? And how can civil liberties be protected while expanding counter-terrorism measures?

The scope of the task force’s challenge is suggested by the fact that the United States has no strategy to guide the collection and use of domestic information for national security, says Philip D. Zelikow, the task force’s executive director. He is head of the University of Virginia’s Center of Public Affairs and a former staff member of the National Security Council. By comparison, he notes, the U.S. collects vast amounts of information and intelligence abroad and uses advanced methods of analysis and data sharing to identify threats and prevent attacks. “Inside the U.S., our data is stovepiped and data sharing is weak, sometimes purely in terms of gathering intelligence information by law enforcement or by the intelligence community,” says Carter.

As an example, he points out that criminal investigators often look at airline passenger lists, but that it may be possible for the government to routinely sift through this colossal amount of data using search engines like those used on the Internet. “The airlines’ database could be routinely searched for names, combinations of itineraries or profiles,” Carter says. “By looking at all kinds of information about citizens and visitors, we would know who’s renting Ryder trucks or buying fertilizer for bombs or fermenters to make biological warfare agents or who is visiting Internet web sites to find instructions for designing a nuclear weapon. One could imagine a large variety of information that could be germane to homeland security. This project is looking at all the crucial safeguards and protections that should be attached to any such use of information.”

---

Studying Ways to Protect Privacy in an Era of Terrorism

Zoë Baird, President, The Markle Foundation
Future homemakers club, band and choir. This past June, the Supreme Court upheld that program too.

The proliferation of video cameras has been more subtle and extensive. Their use in public also began as a public safety measure, first appearing in likely robbery targets such as banks and convenience stores. We barely noticed when the devices—renamed security cameras—began creeping into other stores, lobbies, elevators, restaurants, malls and out into the streets. (Even before September 11th, there were more than 2,400 video cameras trained on the streets of New York City). Then, in many instances the cameras were networked, grouped together to form a comprehensive surveillance system in which multiple scenes could be funneled into one command center. The National Parks Service recently announced plans to install such a closed-circuit television system at the Washington Monument and the Lincoln, Jefferson, Roosevelt, Vietnam and Korean War Memorials in the nation’s capital.

It is crucial to understand that in accepting these security measures bit by bit, we are not only changing our behavior and our idea of what we can keep private, we are also changing the laws that legitimize these intrusions. Most of the security measures proposed in the past year (for example, airport searches, wiretaps, e-mail intercepts, video surveillance and the BodySearch system) will be governed by the Fourth Amendment, which prohibits “unreasonable searches and seizures.” The Supreme Court has declared that the Fourth Amendment protects Americans’ “reasonable expectation of privacy.” To decide what we can reasonably expect to keep private, courts do not look to an objective standard of what should be private in a free society; among other things, they look to us. (In a recent example of how changing social mores can influence law, this past summer the Supreme Court banned executions of the mentally retarded, citing a growing national consensus against such acts.) If the government intrudes on us in a certain way and we go along with it, that is a good indica-

Historically, new security measures never turn out to be temporary.
Professor M.L. Luhanga is vice chancellor of the University of Dar es Salaam in Tanzania. He is interviewed here by Susan Robinson King, Carnegie Corporation Vice President, Public Affairs.

SK: In the past few years, the University of Dar es Salaam has gone through a very complex and important strategic planning process. The international community has recognized it and the Partnership to Strengthen African Universities* has made investments in your future. How do you see this support working with the university?

MLL: We are still continuing with our strategic planning process. Right now we think we have the governance issues pretty much on track—essentially, we have completed phase one. And so we are now focusing more and more on our mission-oriented areas: training and research, and traditional service. Currently, I have a team looking at that in a more focused way. Our initial decision was to deal with the governance issues first, while putting the mission-oriented features on the back burner.

* In 2000, the presidents of four U.S. foundations—Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Ford Foundation, the MacArthur Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation—announced the creation of The Partnership to Strengthen African Universities, an initiative aimed at supporting the improvement of higher education institutions in a number of sub-Saharan African countries. The joint effort recognizes the importance of higher education in reducing poverty and stimulating economic and social development in Africa.
United Nations Secretary General Kofi A. Annan and Professor M.L. Luhanga, Vice Chancellor, University of Dar es Salaam, at Carnegie Corporation of New York for the announcement of the Partnership to Strengthen African Universities, a four-foundation initiative that supports the improvement of higher education institutions in a number of sub-Saharan African countries (Left). University of Dar es Salaam (Top).
SK: And of course, the mission is really critical to a university, isn’t it?
MLL: It is, it is. But of course, the governance issues were even more critical for us because our initial assessment was that on the mission side—the academic side—although there were things that were not that good, performance was not as poor as it was on the governance side. So, since one has to put priorities somewhere, we thought we’d start with the Saharan, under any metric, we are the last in terms of access to university education. It is even worse for girls, who have little access to higher education in the region, generally. So success for girls is a major, major strategic objective for us. I would say our top objectives are improving general access to higher education, improving research and making our research more relevant to the socioeconomic needs of Tanzania.

SK: Can you give me an example of one of the areas of research that you are re-focusing so that it will have greater impact on Tanzania and will respond to the country’s needs?
MLL: Well, for example, HIV/AIDS is a major problem in our country. It’s impacting the socioeconomic development of Tanzania tremendously, but the university has remained largely uninvolved. The research agenda of the university has not addressed that particular issue in a focused manner, except for work by several colleagues in the Muhimbili University College of Health Science. But since the other faculties had not really responded to this major, major calamity, starting about two years ago, each faculty and each institute began going through and rethinking their research agenda. The faculty is really repositioning themselves to address Tanzania’s critical needs in the 21st century.

SK: In a way, you’re saying that the work that goes on in the university today is now seen to be very tied to the life and the future of the country.

MLL: That’s what we want, to make our work very much more relevant to the future of Tanzania and what the country really needs from us.

SK: That’s not an easy job, is it? To turn around a university?
MLL: It is not an easy thing to do, but we have to to it; we have to try. You know academics—not only in Tanzania but in the United States as well—usually want to work as individuals, and often do. I believe that if you want to address societal problems, you need to form large, interdisciplinary teams, and that is a major undertaking, a difficult process. But we have started forming these teams. For instance, our colleagues in the natural sciences, like chemistry, are doing quite a lot of work on malaria. And we hope that these examples of success will at least show the others that it can be done.

What we want country

Mulembwa Munaku and Joel Mtebe, University of Dar es Salaam graduates in Computer Science, are now assisting in the development of the university’s smart cards.
SK: How do you encourage, inspire, convince faculty that they need to respond to these societal needs?

MLL: We do it in the following way: first of all, in terms of promotion. The publications that the members of the staff produce are very, very crucial in terms of their promotion. Since their promotions obviously impact their pocketbook issues—the salaries they get—as well as their status within the university and within the society, we've made one criteria for promotion the relevance of research to these societal needs. When we submit publications to our external reviewers, one of the issues we ask them to look at is the relevance of the research reported in the publication. How relevant is it to the societal needs of Tanzanians? This kind of criteria encourages faculty to focus on certain kinds of research, and then the publications that come out of the research are actually tied into the needs of Tanzania. This process also encourages the faculty to pass on a belief in relevant research, because they supervise graduate students and help them understand the importance of undertaking research that responds to society's needs. It also means that they can produce collaborative journal papers and other types of publications that are relevant.

SK: So there is a real incentive for faculty to change?

MLL: Yes, because if the work is not relevant to the country's development, we don't consider it as part of the promotion process.

SK: Who are the leaders in this university reform? Would you say it's faculty-driven or is it the students who are demanding something new from higher education?

MLL: I would say initially, it started with the faculty, particularly within the circles of the engineering faculty. Mainly, it was a response to the loss of faculty who were leaving the university for greener pastures elsewhere. And, as well, it was a response to the tremendous loss of resources from the government. And so the reform movement really was started by people in the faculty—but the faculty together with the administration, because at the university, the administration is actually made up of members of the faculty. Here, we run a very collegial administration. The deans and directors of research institutes are in office for three years; they can continue for another three years if they are re-elected, but after six years, they have to stand down and another person must come into the office. So, we have a very collegial, committee-oriented system and reform was mainly a faculty-driven process initiated in response to the external environment, which was hostile to the survival of the university.

SK: I hear that the University of Dar es Salaam is a very entrepreneurial institution. Would you say that's true?

MLL: We're trying to be entrepreneurial, but we are not there yet. We have a Swahili proverb, which says that here, in east Africa, and around the Indian Ocean, we have coconut trees, and people make a wine from these trees. They say that if you praise somebody who makes this coconut wine, he'll add water to increase the volume so that he gets more money by selling more wine. So we say, “Don't praise him too much.” In this way, at the university, we say that we are not there yet. We are trying to do something different and something entrepreneurial but we haven't reached our goals.

SK: But the “ivory tower,” which is sometimes the way Americans describe a university—where you closet yourself away from the real world—that is not how you would describe the university of Dar es Salaam, is it?

MLL: We are trying to move away from the ivory tower. The university was created thirty years ago. At that time it was more of an ivory tower than it is today. Now, the university is more closely linked to the society in which it exists.

SK: Are you feeling competition from the private colleges and universities that are now being established in Africa?

MLL: Most of them are fairly small, but I did encourage my colleagues to look at them. You see, in Tanzania, only three percent of the students who finish primary education go on to get a university education. In the United Nations human development reports, they note anything in the third decimal place as zero. So, because the number of students who actually graduate and have the opportunity to enter university is very
small, I don’t think of these new universities as competition. We are nurturing them, actually, because we are admitting into the University of Dar es Salaam only twenty-nine percent of the students who qualify to attend. We are not meeting the demand by far.

**SK:** And so, as an educator, you really want to see many more higher education opportunities?

**MLL:** Certainly, certainly. I want to see much more. I’m chairman of the accreditation committee of the Higher Education Accreditation Council, which allows these institutions and these pri-

date universities to be set up in Tanzania, and certainly, we see our role as promoting them. Allowing them, really, and nurturing them to be established in Tanzania, rather than seeing them as competitive. Most of my staff, for example, are serving in various capacities at these institutions. Two or three of them are serving as chief executive officers of some of these private universities. This kind of interaction with private universities is a role that we think, as the oldest university in Tanzania, we need to play, because we see the development of higher education as crucial to the development of Tanzania. Certainly the government on its own does not have the resources to make an immediate impact on higher education, so the more we can help, the better.

**SK:** And does the business community and other sectors of the economy agree that higher education is critical?

**MLL:** They want to get a degree and a job, really, which is understandable at this time. Tanzania is going through a tremendous transformation where the public sector, which used to be dominant, is dying. Actually, it’s being deliberately diminished by the government and the private sector is being encouraged to play a major role in the economy. So, we are changing as well, and encouraging our students, through the entrepreneurial activities of the university, to become what we are calling the job-creators and not just the job-seekers.

**SK:** Are the students hungry for infor-

mation and motivated or simply anxious about the hunt for work?

**MLL:** We do not yet have full information about our students. But we have included most of those questions in a survey, which we are carrying out with the support of a Carnegie Corporation grant. We will survey all our graduates, in all our degree programs as well as the employers who have hired our graduates. We want to develop a better understanding of our students and their needs and perceptions.

**SK:** Would you say that the students are politically active?

**MLL:** Some of them are politically involved and some of the crises we went through at the university, when the country was going from a single-party system to a multi-party system, were precisely because the students were becoming more politically aware, aware of their rights and responsibilities. I’ve been taken to court as vice
chancellor on many occasions because students now know their rights, and they go to the high court to demand them. Some of the student leaders are members of parliament. One of them is a chairman in an opposition political party. One of them is a chairman of the youth wing of a political party.

SK: And do they have a sense that they are building a new country, a new Tanzania?

MLL: Yes, and that has been the unique thing about Tanzania. Julius Nyerere, our first president, always instilled in the youth the idea that we are building a nation, a self-reliant nation. Somewhere, I think, the message got blurred a little bit, but that sense is beginning to come back.

SK: Under your Carnegie Corporation grant you are installing “smart cards” on campus: plastic cards—like credit cards—that will give students access to many services. Tell me about them.

MLL: Right now, the smart cards project is mainly linked with our library system, but we also want to link the cards with our health system so there will also be health information about the students on the cards. Then we want to link them with what we call the academic registrar’s information system, so information on the academic performance of the students will also be included. Most of our students receive some type of support or sponsorship from the government. There have been complaints that the allowance the government gives students towards the purchase of books does not end up being used for that purpose. With the smart card system, you can control access so that the student cannot draw money out of the account, but they can use the smart card in a cash register machine at the book store to purchase books. So, with the card, you can put different controls on different accounts. This can even be done by a parent who can decide what amount of money to put into which account.

SK: Have you been able to establish the smart card project or is it still on the drawing board?

MLL: The project is not quite ready yet. We will be rolling out the smart cards with our first-year students, starting this September. Some of our students who graduated last year in computer science have been hired to develop some of the software for the system.

The smart card was actually displayed at the international trade show in Dar es Salaam this past July. Every year the university displays our research activities so the public will know what we are doing. This year, the university emerged as the overall winner of the exhibition. Tanzania’s many industries displayed their wares, but we came out first. The prime minister, the president of Tanzania, the president of Zanzibar, the prime minister and chief minister of Zanzibar, the first lady of Tanzania—all these dignitaries came and visited the smart card exhibit.

SK: So it has done much to enhance the university’s reputation?

MLL: Oh yes. The prime minister was especially impressed. And we have actually linked up with a local bank here which is interested in the smart card, so they’ve given us an office in town where we will be running our computer classes. They will be opening a branch in our university at the University Computing Center (UCC).
In a limited way, they’ll be using the smart card, because this activity will be centered in the UCC. The bank is interested in trying out these cards for their customers.

SK: So here is an example of the partnership between business and the university that you believe is critical for the future of education in Tanzania.

MLL: Yes. And it came out of the smart card project. We want the university to depend on grants. Fundraising is a critical part of the work of a university president. Is this something that is part of your job as well?

MLL: We started very early—I think about nine or ten years ago—to try to convince the government that students must pay a portion of the costs of studying at the university. That system is still not in place, though I think most countries south of the Sahara now of it. That’s what’s fair. Those who come from very poor families, however, should be exempt—they should be provided with scholarships, and so on. We are still doing that.

SK: A question for the long term. The Partnership to Strengthen African Universities is expected to be a ten-year partnership. But twenty years from now, thirty years from now, will the university be able to stand alone financially so that it will not have to suffer any negative consequences of the economy?

MLL: In a country like Tanzania, it is sometimes hard to think long term. In the U.S., with its strong economy, you can look twenty years down the road, but when you are in one of the twenty-five poorest countries in the world, sometimes it’s very difficult to have that long of a time horizon.

I’ll give you an example. About five years ago, we had a tremendous drought and people were dying of hunger, so the government had to abandon its budget in order to import a lot of food to feed the population. Less than a year later, we had the El Niño rains. Towns, homes, businesses, whole communities were being washed away. It was a terrible tragedy for the whole country, for everyone. So in Tanzania, sometimes you move from one disaster to the next and often you abandon your budget. Planning becomes a major problem.

We are Tanzania, to knows be an important part of the life of the country.

SK: How would you describe the reputation of the university?

MLL: I would say our reputation, currently, is very good, especially after having moved away from the ivory tower image that we had. Our reputation is very good with the people of Tanzania. We are always trying to reach out and be sure that the community knows what we’re doing.

SK: To survive, American universities must depend on tuition and they must charge a certain percentage of the costs for training a student.

SK: Do you think that’s important that students pay part of the tuition?

MLL: I think it’s important because right now, the majority of the population, the people who are not enjoying the university’s educational services and benefits, are the ones who are bearing the costs. So the students at the university—a small part of the population—who are benefiting from higher education and who are getting the social and private benefits from it, must pay a percentage of the costs.
Since we’re a public university, the government has always favored us and we did not suffer as much. But the government ministries were actually surviving from month to month—they were getting a budget on a monthly basis. It was that bad. But we were being given a three-month budget and the allocation that they gave us was exactly the amount that had gone through parliament. Others did not fare that well because the calamities that had befallen the country had to be addressed.

SK: For the long term, then, the financial strength of the university will have to

MLL: I think it was mainly because of my performance in university and my love for academics. I just enjoy reading. I read quite widely in very many fields. I also consume a lot of novels, a lot of newspapers, and so on. I thrive on debate and in discussing issues. I would not change this career for anything else, either politics or something like that.

SK: Did you get this love from your parents?

MLL: Yes, my parents encouraged me very much to study as much as possible, and even with the low level of knowledge that they had, it was incredible that they encouraged all of us. My late father had twelve children, and he encouraged all of us to continue our education and to study up to our limits. Not all of us made it into academia, but we made it as far as we could.

SK: And what is your specialty? What is your field?

MLL: I’m a telecommunications engineer.

SK: And you became vice chancellor because you were the best debater?

MLL: No, I’m not sure about that. Here in Tanzania, the vice chancellor is appointed by the president of the country. I was chief academic officer, which is the next position to the vice chancellor, and the president appointed me to that post. Before then, I had not held any administrative position in the university. So the president appointed me to be chief academic officer, and then four months later he appointed

Treasury Secretary Paul O’Neill joining the rock star from Ireland, Bono, for a tour all over Africa, saying that the world must respond to the needs in Africa. What is the perspective from your point of view of such a tour?

MLL: I think these publicity things are mostly for the media. The media gives them two or three minutes on TV and then you forget them. It doesn’t help anybody. I think the problems faced by Africa need long-term solutions and serious attention, and unless they are looked at in that way, then nothing changes. I’m not one to play these publicity games. If we want to address serious problems, and to change the future of Africa for the better, we should really put in place serious programs which are long term, and can be sustained.
On June 19, 2002, Carnegie Corporation convened a forum of journalists, publishers, broadcasters and journalism school leaders for an open discussion about existing tensions over whether the news profession exists as a public trust, a bulwark of democracy responsible for keeping Americans informed of important issues, or as a business that sees its primary allegiance to shareholders and its chief responsibility to increase profit margins and ratings regardless of the quality of content.

Although most participants acknowledged that media serve both corporate and public interests, there is disagreement about how well the public is served.

Presenting the issue from the separate perspectives of print and broadcast media and journalism schools were Leonard Downie, executive editor for The Washington Post, Neal Shapiro, president of NBC News, and Orville Schell, dean of the Graduate School of Journalism at the University of California at Berkeley (UCB).

Downie, co-author of The News About News: American Journalism in Peril, maintains quality journalism and healthy profits decisions is an increasingly fragmented market due in part to the proliferation of cable stations and the rise of the Internet. Fierce competition for market share has many newspapers and broadcasters promoting sensational and “entertaining” news, some say to the detriment of the public good.

But Neal Shapiro, as head of top-ranked NBC News, argues that profits earned from news programs, in combination with more sophisticated technology, have made it possible to report stories that could not have been covered in the past.

Speaking about news content, Shapiro said, “I do think the challenge for us in the commercial world is that we are not going to put on an hour of [something] really boring. That doesn’t mean you don’t do it. Find an interesting way to do it. That, I would say, is a challenge to our producers in commercial television as opposed to PBS. That is the structure. We have to make a living at it.”

Countering Shapiro was Lawrence K. Grossman, past president of both NBC News and the Public Broadcasting System, “We need to look seriously at the content gaps that are critical for this democracy. We are getting a lot of headlines from all over the world, but no matter how many news channels we have, the perspective, context and in-depth coverage of critical, yet often boring, eye-glazing issues are simply not being done in this day and age.”

Deans of America’s top journalism schools see the academic sphere as a place to develop metrics for measuring how news companies serve the public, evaluating the quality and quantity of public service information, and tracking outreach to and inclusion of America’s increasingly diverse population.

Schell of UCB also sees journalism schools as catalysts for institutional and regulatory change, particularly in broadcasting: “Whereas the news business is a business...in the case of broadcast, the public owns the airwaves,” he says. Pointing out that commercial broadcasting licenses are issued for “the public interest, convenience and necessity,” Schell argues that the only way to guarantee the public is served is to ensure that an independent public broadcasting system is adequately funded. One proposal for establishing a funding stream is to use proceeds from the electromagnetic spectrum being auctioned by the Federal Communications Commission.

The forum grew out of a Corporation-funded series of meetings that brought together journalism school leaders to examine journalism education and its impact on the journalism profession.

“Journalism schools,” said Corporation president Vartan Gregorian, “have to be not only guardians of the First Amendment, but also the guardians of public institutions and public knowledge, charged with providing the critical distance, perspective and discernment of what is happening in our country in order to protect our democracy.”

A report about the journalism forum is available at www.carnegie.org.
Foundation Roundup

African Women’s Media Center Builds Database for Journalists

The African Women’s Media Center (AWMC), a project of the International Women’s Media Foundation, has received funding to develop the first comprehensive online database of African media, which will be available not only to African journalists but to reporters worldwide.

In addition to the database of African media contacts, AWMC, based in Senegal, will expand its web site to offer resources, skills training and networking opportunities for Africa’s growing pool of women journalists.

For more information, go to www.awmc.com or www.iwmf.org.

Carnegie To Go: World’s First Nuclear Database

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in Washington, DC, now offers Carnegie to Go, a free service that sends the latest arms proliferation news to handheld computers.

Using information from databases of global nuclear and global ballistic missile arsenals, subscribers can learn the number, names and range of missiles of the world’s largest stockpiles. The service also offers daily news and analysis of critical proliferation issues.

For more information, go to www.ceip.org/weapons.

Ford Foundation Launches GrantCraft: Practical Wisdom For Grantmakers

The Ford Foundation has a new program called GrantCraft that shares tools and techniques for effective grantmaking. Drawing from Ford’s long history of grantmaking as well as the experiences of other funders and grantees from around the world, GrantCraft is producing an innovative series of guides, videos and case studies. These new materials offer an insider’s look at grantmaking from the practitioner’s perspective on topics that include what to do when projects flounder, using requests for proposals, building community partnerships, scaling up successful work, and amplifying new voices.

Ford has created a GrantCraft web site from which materials may be downloaded or ordered. For more information, go to www.grantcraft.org.

Kaiser Foundation Examines Health Care For the Uninsured

A new report from The Henry J. Kaiser Foundation examines community health care centers that serve a disproportionately large number of uninsured patients and reveals the ramifications for the centers’ sustainability.

Not surprisingly, centers with the heaviest concentration of patients without health coverage operate in areas of the country where poverty is greatest. Revenues for these operations are declining, due in part to stagnating government funding levels and declining rates of Medicaid coverage resulting from welfare reform and other factors. In fact, sixty-six percent of all health centers are located in states where a woman with two children who works full time at the minimum wage is not eligible for Medicaid.

On top of these changes, nearly half the centers risk financial instability from trying to provide more services than their budgets can afford, increasing the demand for subsidies from communities with limited revenue bases.

The report, A Profile of Federally Funded Health Centers Serving a Higher Proportion of Uninsured Patients, is available online at www.kff.org.

Kellogg Supports School Readiness Program For Vulnerable Children

Each year, about one-third of the nearly four million U.S. children who start school are not ready to learn. To address this gap, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation has launched an educational program called “Supporting Partnerships to Assure Ready Kids” (SPARK) that targets preschool children who are underserved by existing preschool programs and who are least likely to have access to quality care and school readiness preparation.

Eight community organizations in seven states and the District of Columbia have received initial grants to develop effective learning programs and business models. Upon review and approval of the models, Kellogg will provide implementation funding for at least five years.

For more information about SPARK, go to www.wkkf.org.

Knight Foundation Report Examines U.S. Support For International Journalism

A new report commissioned by the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation reveals that a $600 million U.S. investment in building independent media in emerging democracies over
the last decade has produced mixed results.

While some countries show positive effects from capacity-building programs that encourage independent reporting, others face economic problems that have left them vulnerable to exploitation by powerful political leaders and oligarchs.

The Media Missionaries: American Support for International Journalism describes the efforts of U.S. government organizations and foundations to support democratic initiatives by promoting a strong, independent press. It offers “15 Commandments of Media Development” based on lessons learned from a range of programs around the world.

For more information, go to www.knightfdn.org.

---

The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation is supporting a growing area of philanthropy that uses the popularity of sports and athletes to promote community programs. The Sports Philanthropy Project provides technical assistance to professional sports associations to help them develop and improve their philanthropic activities, enhance their impact on community programs and advance best practices in sports philanthropy.

While most teams already support player appearances and charitable causes, the new mode of sports philanthropy is aimed at building strong partnerships between teams and their home communities with the goal of providing increased support to health and social programs.

“Sports have an enormous emotional hook and value to a community,” says Joe Marx of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. “These teams can do so much to bring about change if they are focused and concerned about their local community.”

For more information, go to www.sportsphilanthropyproject.com.

---

Rockefellers Offer Service For Managing Global Giving

The Rockefeller family has created the Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors (RPA), an independent, nonprofit service that develops and manages giving programs for individuals and families. RPA, located in New York City, is an outgrowth of the philanthropy office of Rockefeller Family Services, which advises Rockefeller family members and other clients on charitable giving in more than 40 countries.

Despite uneasiness about the economy, philanthropy in the United States is experiencing its biggest growth in 50 years, with total giving by independent foundations alone reaching $29 billion in 2001.

With over 100 years of experience and multigenerational giving, RPA is uniquely positioned to offer assistance to individuals and families who are contemplating or have recently begun philanthropic giving.

For more information, go to www.rockpa.org.

---

Russell Sage Studies
Cultural Diversity Within Democracy

As part of its Cultural Contact Program, the Russell Sage Foundation has issued a new report about how democracies accommodate cultural practices that run counter to mainstream beliefs and existing legal systems.

The report, Engaging Cultural Differences: The Multicultural Challenge in Liberal Democracies, details results of a study conducted by an interdisciplinary team funded by Russell Sage called the Law and Culture Working Group.

The group examined how democratic legal systems influence mainstream beliefs and values and how democracies deal with non-Western practices such as child marriage, corporal punishment and female circumcision.

For more information about these and other projects of the Cultural Contact Program, go to www.russellsage.org.

---

The Russell Sage Foundation
Study Finds Arts Industry Is Good For Business

A new report by one of the nation’s leading arts organizations suggests that communities faced with scaled-back budgets and the need to set funding priorities may want to think twice before eliminating support for the arts, often regarded as extraneous and costly.

Results from an economic impact study by Americans for the Arts show that America’s nonprofit arts industry generates $134 billion in economic activity every year in addition to $24.4 billion in federal, state and local tax revenues.

The total reflects a combination of direct spending by arts organizations ($53.2 billion) and indirect income from things such as hotels, restaurants, parking and souvenirs ($80.8 billion).

“When communities invest in the arts, there is a tendency to think that they are opting for cultural benefits at the expense of economic benefits,” says Robert Lynch, President of Americans for the Arts. “The arts are an industry that generates extraordinary economic activity. When we say that the arts mean business, that’s not just a slogan; it’s the truth.”

Data for the research were gathered from 3,000 nonprofit arts organizations and 40,000 attendees at arts events in 91 cities and 33 states and the District of Columbia. For more information, go to www.AmericansForTheArts.org.
**NewBooks**

Since “diffusion of knowledge” is part of Carnegie Corporation’s mission, we would like to pass on news of four recently published books. One, hot off the press, is a follow-up to a landmark Corporation report on early childhood care and education: *What Kids Need* reports on a decade’s worth of research and recommendations on how to improve the lives of the youngest among us. *No More Killing Fields*, by Corporation president emeritus David Hamburg, offers new ideas for the prevention and resolution of deadly conflicts. *Inside Full-Service Community Schools*, by Joy Dryfoos and Sue Maguire, offers information about how school-based human services programs are helping families and students across the nation and *The Ideas That Conquered the World*, by Michael Mandelbaum, outlines the new global realities in the post-Cold-War world.

---

**The Ideas That Conquered the World**

**MICHAEL MANDELBRAUM**

*Public Affairs, 2002*

Michael Mandelbaum, professor of American Foreign Policy at the School of Advanced International Studies of the Johns Hopkins University and senior fellow of the Council on Foreign Relations, outlines the new power realities in the world in his latest book, *The Ideas That Conquered the World*. According to Mandelbaum, the “Liberal Theory of History,” first proposed by Woodrow Wilson at the end of World War I, points to three ideas that still dominate the world today—First, the importance of free markets as the world’s indispensable vehicle for the creation of economic wealth; second, the recognition of democracy as the most advantageous political system; and third, an instinct for peaceful relations among and between nations.

For many Americans, the post-Cold-War world was dramatically ushered in by the terrorist attacks of September 11th, 2001. While these events were both horrific and traumatic, Mandelbaum says, they did not “change everything,” as numerous commentators have asserted. Instead, they highlight even more intensely the new global realities and shift in power and areas of influence that need to be incorporated into a new understanding of international relationships. *The Ideas That Conquered the World* is a fresh and incisive analysis of the policies, ideas and economic systems of the 21st century and offers recommendations for achieving global equity in the years ahead.

---

**No More Killing Fields: Preventing Deadly Conflict**

**DAVID HAMBURG**

*Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2002*

David Hamburg, president emeritus of Carnegie Corporation and currently a visiting scholar in the Department of Psychiatry at the Weill Medical College of Cornell University in New York City, along with former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, established the Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict (CCPDC) in 1994 to address the threat to world peace of intergroup violence and to advance new ideas for the prevention and resolution of deadly conflict. In *No More Killing Fields: Preventing Deadly Conflict*, Hamburg draws on the earlier CCPDC work (which concluded in 1997) as he examines the terrorist attacks of September 11th and the eruption of civil and regional wars in the Balkans, Africa and elsewhere, to explain how the policies that helped manage the Cold War are not effective anymore.

Today, Hamburg argues, the constant and rapid flow of information around the globe actually warns policymakers and the general public about potential crises before they turn deadly, but often, by the time the necessary measures are agreed upon by the international community, and a response organized, preventive opportunities are lost and war has already erupted. Instead of waiting for the deployment of peacekeepers, an early, nonmilitary option exists, Hamburg says, and presses for the international community to work toward creating positive economic conditions in unstable countries. A stable economy, he notes, often prevents deadly conflict more effectively than military or UN intervention.

---

**Inside Full-Service Community Schools**

**JOY DRYFOOS AND SUE MAGUIRE**

*Corwin Press, Inc., 2002*

To many, the rise of full-service schools means there is a safe place for students to go after school to expand on what they’ve learned during the day. But in fact they do much more than that: school-based human service programs across the country are helping poor and middle-class families deal with an array of social problems. The key to the success of these programs, says Joy Dryfoos in her new book, *Inside Full-Service Community Schools*, coauthored with Sue Maguire, is to involve the school community—especially parents—in determining how the school’s services can best serve those they aim to help. Integrating social services into overall reform efforts can further lead to better results.

---

**What Kids Need: Today’s Best Ideas for Nurturing, Teaching, and Protecting Young Children**

**RIMA SHORE**

*Beacon Press, 2002*

When Carnegie Corporation of New York released the landmark study *Starting Points* in 1994 it served as a clarion call to researchers, policymakers, educators and parents to refocus much needed attention on the development and nurturing of children during their early years. Now, Beacon Press has published *What Kids Need*, the results of a new Corporation initiative summarizing a decade of research in early childhood care and education. The book speaks to the need for making the welfare of young children a national priority as it explores the range of effective parenting techniques and social supports, programs and policies that can improve children’s lives. It also examines all aspects of healthy child development, including the importance of prenatal care, quality child care, public health insurance for low-income children and how to create universal pre-kindergarten programs.

*What Kids Need* offers practical advice for new parents, stressing that “Parents matter—a great deal.” Nurturing parents, the books suggests, can even change traits that appear to be inborn and the style of early parenting can affect a child’s confidence and ability to adjust in the early school grades. Included is a six-point agenda for change that represents the best ideas and most current thinking about what kids really do need in order to grow up healthy and develop the life skills to succeed.
Knowledge and its Returns

by STEPHEN R. GRAUBARD

War avoided between two heavily armed states, ideologically and politically hostile, the Soviet Union and the United States? Is credit for this undoubtedly remarkable achievement to be given simply to political leaders in both those societies, and perhaps in others as well who saw the need for restraint, preached it, and practiced it? Or, ought one to acknowledge that in the absence of knowledge, of many kinds, these heavily armed states might have resorted to war, as others had done in 1914, with even more catastrophic consequences? How much did the study of arms control, supported initially largely in the United States, create knowledge eventually shared with others that made all who possessed atomic weapons realize the hazards of their use? How much were the control systems, devised by the great powers, the intellectual inventions of scholars, men and women who understood that the new weapons were not simply more powerful than those that had existed previously, and would not be controlled by the legal procedures valued by so many in the inter-war years who constantly preached the necessity of disarmament? To argue this is not to denigrate the achievements of a Reagan or a Gorbachev, though both were almost certainly exaggerated; it is simply to say that a peace, maintained for forty-five years, despite constant provocations, owes a great deal to that generation of arms control scholars whose names are legion, today too little remembered. In any tribute to peacemakers, the name of Bernard Brodie must figure prominently, along with dozens of others. They developed the ideas that recommended restraint. The institutions that supported their research—that recognized the imperative need for new knowledge—must also be recalled; the two together produced the intellectual armament that so greatly helped to prevent war.

Peace, however, was not maintained simply through the invention of a new arms control philosophy. For two potentially belligerent states, each supremely confident of its own virtue, knowledge of the other was essential. Know Your Enemy (John Murray, 2002), the title of Percy Craddock’s recent book, might have been the inspired title of any number of books published during the long years of the Cold War. In fact, knowledge of the Soviet Union, as it existed in the United States before 1941, was minimal, communicated largely by a small number of cultivated and perceptive Russian émigré scholars in the country’s leading universities. Though the war did something to create a greater acquaintance with the Bolsheviks who had held power since 1917, much of what was learned was subjective, greatly influenced by the understandable appreciation of a regime and a people who had courageously resisted the Nazis, and had made an incomparable contribution to the final Allied victory in 1945. The disillusion that followed the war had effects, both good and bad, but no one can doubt that the impetus given to a more serious study of the Soviet Union in all its dimensions must figure as one of its more beneficial results. Again, the new knowledge of Soviet society, the new learning, supported by foundations like Carnegie Corporation*

---

*The Russian Research Center at Harvard University was founded in 1947 with support from Carnegie Corporation, which continued its funding for ten years. The Corporation’s support for the center was aimed at stimulating “…a larger volume of research in the Russian field [and giving] impetus to studies which will make use of the best of modern social science methods in an attempt to understand some of the crucial problems of Russian behavior…”
legitimately that it did much to preserve the peace and to prevent war.

The Knowledge Void

Where such knowledge has not existed, where scholarship has been weak and fragmentary, journalism has been the mainstay of public opinion, and the results have generally been less happy. While it would be an exaggeration to say that the errors made in Vietnam through four presidential administrations—those of Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon and Ford—can be attributed principally to the paucity of knowledge in the United States of the societies of southeast Asia, Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, or of the country’s inadequate understanding of the nature of guerrilla warfare, such a claim is not wholly unreasonable. In the Second World War, while the country started with substantial knowledge of its principal European enemies, Germany and Italy, and with considerably less knowledge of Japan, it recognized very early the necessity of making great efforts to increase its knowledge of all three. By providing instruction to both civilians and selected military personnel in the requisite languages, but also, more importantly, in the politics, economics, and cultures of societies fundamentally different from the American, a major contribution was made to winning the war but also in keeping the peace. The intellectual profit the country realized through this investment in education cannot be overstated. No comparable effort was made before the war, during the war, or since the war in southeast Asia. It remains terra incognita for all but a few experts able to claim learning in an area that today embraces hundreds of millions, if south Asia is seen to be integrally connected to it. That ignorance is replicated in other areas as well.

These are problems of the past that persist today. Another, however, has become paramount since September 11th. While research of even the most elementary kind cannot fail to reveal that terrorism figured as a subject of great interest to those concerned with rogue states and revolutionaries after the demise of the Soviet Union, it is no secret that terrorism never commanded the intellectual resources given over many decades to a study of arms control or international Communism. To say that the field has lacked definition, and cannot today claim intellectual pioneers of the distinction of Brodie or Adam Ulam—whose number might be multiplied a hundred times—is to state the obvious. More serious, perhaps, and worth reflecting on, is whether the subject is today being pursued in a way that gives promise of providing defenses this country and others so desperately require. The atom bomb obliged whole societies to think the unthinkable, but also to reflect on ways to prevent the unthinkable. Is this, in fact, happening today? Or are we hearing a muffled debate that never deals with essentials? Does the creation of an Office of Homeland Security, however important, or the institution of new surveillance procedures at airports and in other public places, begin to acknowledge the seriousness of a problem as threatening as any posed by the Soviet Union in the pre-Gorbachev era? What needs to be studied—what needs to be known—if the next attack is not to make that of the Twin Towers seem as primitive as the early bombing of Berlin when compared with what followed at Hiroshima? Who, then, is to study what? Are atomic devices, chemical and biological weapons the ones that require close scrutiny, or are others, more conventional in every respect, capable of inflicting fewer casualties while producing no diminished sense of insecurity? What can private and public institutions, as distinct from the federal government, do to encourage these studies and indeed give them intellectual authority? Is the United States today a country equally hospitable to the objective study of Arab and Israeli politics, of the religious fundamentalism common to both? Indeed, is that the region of the world that waits to be studied, more seriously than at any time in the past? Does this country’s continued reliance on Middle Eastern oil determine much of American policy in the region, and does this dependence not guarantee continued acceptance of governments that can never be mistaken for democracies? Do all such policies contribute to Muslim hostility? Are these the issues that we need to know more about, or is this a time to study how terrorists are made and why it is so difficult to control them? In a time when secrecy seems imperative, when politicians and journalists are reluctant to risk themselves, fearing the catastrophe that may occur at any moment that will show them to have been callow and unfeeling, there is a desperate need for more knowledge, for more informed discussion of conditions too frequently ignored. As with the circumstances that prevailed after 1945, yesterday’s defense solutions are not likely to be useful in resolving the twenty-first century’s crises. How can whole populations be instructed in the dangers that now impend?

Scholarship is the Key

There are no obvious answers to any of the questions posed in this essay. All, however, presume a willingness to study the present and to learn from the past, not only that of ancient Greece and Rome, of nineteenth-century Germany, France and England, but also of the United States. We need to know more about our political and social system, how it has changed since the time of Lincoln, Wilson, the two Roosevelts, Truman and Eisenhower. Kennedy and Nixon, Carter, Reagan, the Bushes and Clinton are not simply the political heirs of these earlier men. To learn more about them all, so fundamentally different in their intellectual and moral capacities and concerns, but also in their political understanding, is not simply to study individual administrations in times of war and peace. It is to inquire closely into the ideas and values common in their time that made certain policies palatable, and others unthinkable. What institutional innovations were attempted in the long twentieth century, by whom, and with what success? How was public opinion changed, and with what consequences, and for whom? In short, at the moment, there is an imperative need to know the democracies of today, including our own, no less important, perhaps, than learning about regimes, groups, and individuals who for whatever reason choose to threaten these democracies. Philip Bobbitt, in his recently published book, The Shield of Achilles (Knopf, 2002) argues that the “long war” that started in 1914 and ended in 1990 is indeed over, but that the threat of further conflict, of a very different kind, is no less great. His is not simply the cry of a Cassandra; rather, he is arguing for an understanding of the world we live in, and while there is no need to accept his definitions of that world, there is a desperate need for the kind of knowledge that no amount of investigative reporting can ever provide, that only the scholar can bring, marrying theory to a close study of empirical fact. We have never been more privileged with respect to information; the urgent need today is to know how to use that information to devise policies to create again the sense of personal security and safety that so many once imagined nation states were in a position to provide. That knowledge is desperately needed, and only institutions committed to social scientific inquiry of a difficult, sensitive and potentially contentious kind can stimulate individuals to produce it.
Andrew Carnegie founded Carnegie Corporation under an act of the New York State Legislature in November, 1911. He specified that the income from his initial capital gift of $25 million was to be used “to promote the advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding among the people of the United States.” For some years, Carnegie had also been making gifts for specific purposes in other countries, but now found that the terms of the Corporation’s charter would not allow him to make any gifts from this trust outside the United States.

Carnegie then made a second gift to the Corporation two months later, this time of $75 million, specifying that the income earned by $20 million of the amount should go to “the continuance of gifts for libraries and church organs, as to heretofore made by me in Canada and in the United Kingdom and British Colonies.” An accompanying letter authorized the Corporation’s trustees, at their discretion, to employ any income not required for these activities for the more general Corporation purposes in the United States.

Carnegie Corporation is currently in its 89th year of activities in what is now known as the former British Commonwealth, with a focus on specific African nations. The first Corporation grant was made in Kenya in 1925 to set up a school, known as the Jeanes School, for practical training of Africans as supervisors in rural education. This was the first institution established anywhere primarily for the training of such teachers.

Other early grants provided support for scientific research, public and academic library development, encouragement of adult education for Africans, opportunities for technical education for “coloured” and Asian students, and financing of visits to and from Africa by leaders in the education field.

In the decades that have passed since Andrew Carnegie’s gift for Canada and the British colonies, the Corporation has supported projects ranging from enhancing women’s health and development to strengthening African universities. Over the years, the program has changed names, themes and geographic foci but remains an integral part of the Corporation’s commitment to Andrew Carnegie’s vision of philanthropy, which he said should aim “to do real and permanent good in the world.”