

# *Business Ethics Reader*

Stephen Hicks, Ph.D.

Rockford University

2	Stephen Hicks, “What Business Ethics Can Learn from Entrepreneurship”
8	Ethical Principles charts
9	Human Nature—Good, Bad, or <i>Tabula Rasa</i> ?
11	Garrett Hardin, “Living on a Lifeboat”
14	Ronald Bailey, “Nine Billion Mouths to Feed”
16	Tom Beauchamp, “The Manufacture and Regulation of Laetrile”
21	Tom Beauchamp, “The F.C.C.’s Fairness Doctrine”
26	Quotations on politicized business
27	Study questions for Chapters 1 and 2 of <i>Atlas Shrugged</i>
28	Mixed Economy flow chart
29	Quotations on money
30	Amy Chua, “Why Chinese Mothers Are the Best”
34	Johann Sulzer & Immanuel Kant, “Obedience in Education in 1700s Germany”
35	John Locke, “Some Thoughts concerning Education”
39	Marsha Enright, “Maria Montessori”
42	Maria Montessori, “Some Quotations on Education”

# What Business Ethics Can Learn from Entrepreneurship

Stephen R. C. Hicks

*The Journal of Private Enterprise* 24(2), 2009, 49-57

Rockford University, Illinois

## Abstract

Entrepreneurship is increasingly studied as a fundamental and foundational economic phenomenon. It has, however, received less attention as an ethical phenomenon. Much contemporary business ethics assumes its core application purposes to be (1) to stop *predatory* business practices and (2) to encourage *philanthropy* and *charity* by business. Certainly predation is immoral and charity has a place in ethics, neither should be the *first* concerns of ethics. Instead, business ethics should make fundamental the values and virtues of entrepreneurs—i.e., those self-responsible and productive individuals who *create* value and *trade* with others to win-win advantage.

*JEL Codes:* A12, A13, L26

*Keywords:* Entrepreneurship, Ethics, Virtue Ethics

## I. Three Character Types: Carly, Tonya, and Jane

Entrepreneurship is increasingly studied as a fundamental and foundational economic phenomenon. Schumpeter (1950) and Kirzner (1978) were pioneers, and their successors have generated a sizeable literature. Yet entrepreneurship has received less attention as a moral phenomenon and, correspondingly, less attention in the business ethics literature.

Consider the moral status of the entrepreneur by contrast to two other types.

1. *Carly*: As a student, Carly worked hard and received good grades. Upon graduation she took a job, but at the same time saved money and worked on her business plan. When she was ready, she took the entrepreneurial plunge and started her own business, which she developed successfully, and then, a few years later, sold for \$10 million. She is now living the good life of travel, building her dream home, raising her family, and managing her portfolio of investments.

2. *Tonya*: Tonya also worked hard in college and, upon graduation, took a job in a financial institution. She discovered a flaw in its funds-routing procedures, which enabled her anonymously to divert \$10 million to an offshore bank, from which it was quickly re-routed through several Caribbean and Swiss banks, ending up in an account known only to Tonya. One year later, Tonya resigned her position at the financial institution and is now living in discreet luxury somewhere in Europe.

3. *Jane*. While in college, Jane studied liberal arts and graduated with a good degree. Unfortunately, the summer after her graduation Jane's parents died suddenly. Fortunately, they left her \$10 million in their wills, of which Jane immediately donated \$9.9 million to charities devoted to the homeless, victims of floods, and to the planting of trees in the Brazilian rainforest. Jane invested the remaining \$100,000 in a certificate of deposit earning 8% annually, the proceeds enabling her to live frugally and without too much discomfort.

Let us now ask the ethics question: Which of the three is the most moral? Whom should we uphold as the ideal? Should we teach our children and students to admire and strive to be like Carly, Tonya, or Jane? All three require strength: It is not easy to build a successful business. It is not easy to figure out a con and get away with it. And it is not easy to give away all of one's money.

Tonya is representative of a predatory ethic: she harms others and uses the proceeds to benefit herself. She is representative of the zero-sum, gain-at-the-expense-of-others practices widely condemned in the business ethics literature.

Jane is representative of an altruistic ethic: she is selfless, and she places what she has at the disposal of others in society, keeping only the minimum for herself. She is representative of the "social justice" practices widely praised in the business ethics literature.

Carly is the prototypical entrepreneur and is representative of a self-realization, egoistic ethic. She creates value, trades with others, and lives her dream life. Yet she is not discussed in the business ethics literature. She is the invisible woman.

Yet the character traits and value-producing activities of entrepreneurs at least implicitly inform an ethic. To make this ethic explicit, let us begin with a standard description of the entrepreneur.

## II. The Entrepreneurial Process

The entrepreneurial process begins with an *informed and creative idea* for a new product or service. The entrepreneur is *ambitious* and *gutsy* and takes the *initiative* in developing the idea into a new enterprise.

Through much *perseverance* and *trial and error*, the entrepreneur *produces* something of value. He or she takes on a *leadership* role in showing consumers the value of the new product and in showing new employees how to make it. The entrepreneur *trades* with those customers and employees to *win-win* results. He or she thus achieves *success* and then *enjoys* the fruits of his or her accomplishment.

To expand upon each of the italicized elements in this description:

Entrepreneurs generate business ideas and decide which ones are worth pursuing. In the process of coming up with *informed, creative ideas*, entrepreneurs speak of vision, "thinking outside the box," imagination, active-ness of mind, and "light-bulb moments." Having generated ideas, they speak of exercising judgment: Which ideas are actually good ones? Can the product or service be developed technically? Will it sell? What does the market research show? Entrepreneurs exhibit a commitment to cognitive achievement—intellectual playfulness, research, experimentation, and analysis.

*Ambition* is the drive to achieve one's goals, to be successful, to improve oneself, to be better off, to be the best that one can be. Entrepreneurs feel more than the often-abstracted and idle wishing—"Wouldn't it be nice if I were rich and independent?"—that many people experience. Ambitious individuals feel strongly the *need* to achieve their goals.

Entrepreneurship requires *initiative*. It's one thing to have a good business plan; it's another to turn the plan into reality. Entrepreneurs are self-starters who make the commitment to bring their good ideas into existence.

A new enterprise involves venturing into the unknown, a willingness to take on obstacles—including the possibility of disapproval and mockery—and the possibility of failure. Consequently, entrepreneurial activity takes *guts*—a willingness to take calculated risks, to be aware of possible downsides while not letting the fear of failure or disapproval dominate one's decision-making.

Entrepreneurial success is almost never easy and overnight; success is a result of sticking with it through the difficulties and over the longer term. That is to say, *perseverance* is essential.

Entrepreneurs must persevere through the technical obstacles in product development, in the face of the naysayers who declare that it can't be done or who are otherwise obstructionist, and in the face of their own self-doubts. Entrepreneurs must be good at short-term discipline and at keeping their long-term motivations present in their thinking.

The development process is almost always a *trial and error* process, requiring that the entrepreneur make adjustments based on experience. Successful entrepreneurs adjust to real-world feedback, which means being able to admit mistakes and incorporating newly-discovered facts, rather than pig-headedly ignoring anything that is a threat to their pet ideas.

*Productivity:* The development process hopefully culminates in a working product. If so, the entrepreneur has added value to the world by creating a new good or service, making it work consistently, producing it in quantity, and continuing to improve the quality.

Those who transact with the entrepreneur, whether as customers, employees, or venture capitalists, engage in *win-win trade*, exchanging value for value. Socially, trade is a process of dealing with others on a peaceful basis according to productive merit. It requires protecting one's own interests and respecting the other party's doing the same, exercising one's skills of negotiation, diplomacy, and, when necessary, toughness in order to achieve a mutually beneficial result. Entrepreneurs also add value by bringing *leadership* to the trade. Entrepreneurs are creating something new, so they are the first to go down a new path. Those who go first set an example for others to follow and, especially in the case of a new product and service, they must show new customers the value of the new product and service and must teach new employees how to produce the new product or service. Accordingly, entrepreneurs must exhibit leadership in showing others the new way, encouraging them through the learning process, and in marketing the new. Part of the trade, then, is that the customer or employee is shown a new opportunity and is enabled to take advantage of it, and the entrepreneur receives compensation for doing so.

Finally, the entrepreneur experiences *success* and the *enjoyment* of success. Entrepreneurial success yields both material and psychic rewards—both the goods that financial success can bring and the experience of financial independence and security that go with it. And of course there is the psychological reward of achievement: experiencing enhanced self-respect and the sense of accomplishment in what one has created.

### III. Entrepreneurship and Virtue Ethics

So far I have sketched the entrepreneurial process in terms of the traits and actions that lead to entrepreneurial success. What does this have to do with morality?

One major approach to ethics is through virtue. Virtues are action-guiding character traits that aim at good results. The ethics literature is populated with many competing accounts of what the good results should be and, consequently, with competing accounts of what virtues we should uphold. Some virtue ethicists make the claim that a character has priority in ethical evaluation over rules or principles, actions, and consequences. Setting aside the issue of whether virtue has priority, my concern here is to connect entrepreneurial success traits to virtues.

If we cash out the above entrepreneurial character traits in terms of *virtues*—i.e., in terms of character traits and commitments that enable and constitute good action—then we make the following connections:

The entrepreneur's generating and evaluating informed and creative ideas connects to the virtue of *rationality*. Rationality is the commitment to the full exercise of one's reason. The entrepreneur's initial active and creative thinking are functions of reason, as is the exercise of evaluative judgment in determining which business ideas are actually good ones.

The entrepreneur’s ambition and drive for success connect to the virtue of *pride*. Pride has forward-looking and backward-looking aspects (e.g., taking pride in what one *has* accomplished); it is the forward-looking aspect that is relevant here. Taking pride in oneself means wanting the best for one’s life, which implies a felt commitment to achieving the best in one’s life. For example, taking pride in one’s appearance means wanting to look one’s best, which implies a commitment to health, hygiene, and style. The entrepreneur’s drive for success is a consequence of taking pride in the business part of his or her life.

The entrepreneur’s showing initiative by being a self-starter and committing to bring the business plan into existence connects to the virtue of *integrity*. Integrity is the policy of acting on the basis of what one believes to be true and good. It is translating thought into practice. That is, one’s thoughts are integrated with one’s actions; or one’s beliefs about what would be good are integrated with one’s actions to bring that good into existence from planning.

The entrepreneur’s commitment to action, despite the fear that comes from being aware of the risks, connects to the virtue of *courage*. Courage is the virtue of committing to an action that one judges to be right while being aware, both intellectually and emotionally, of the possibilities of failure.

The entrepreneur’s perseverance through difficulties, disapproval, and other temporary doubts connects with the virtue of *independence*. Independence is the virtue of trusting one’s own judgment and acting on the basis of one’s best judgment despite short-term frustrations or the contrary opinions of others.

The entrepreneur’s working through the trial-and-error process of product development connects to the virtue of *objectivity*. Objectivity is the policy of guiding one’s thoughts by one’s best awareness of the facts, of being open to new facts; or, to put it negatively, not wearing intellectual blinders and avoiding uncomfortable feedback from reality. A constituent element of objectivity is the virtue of *honesty*, the policy of not pretending to oneself or others that facts aren’t facts.

The entrepreneur’s productivity connects to the virtue of *productiveness*. Productiveness is a commitment to the creation of value, to being self-responsible for bringing into existence that which one needs and wants.

The entrepreneur’s trading value for value with customers and employees connects to the virtue of *justice*. Justice is a commitment to evaluating and interacting with individuals according to their merit, and a correlative commitment to being *oneself* evaluated and interacted with on the basis of one’s own merit. Justice applied to business trades means that trades are entered into voluntarily, that is, on the basis of each party’s independent judgment, and that the terms of the trade are established by each party’s independent judgment of the merits of the trade.

And, finally, the entrepreneur’s achieving success, including the financial and psychological rewards of creating a flourishing business, connect to the general moral values of *flourishing*, *happiness*, and *fulfillment*. Flourishing, or happiness, is the state successful living. As one’s business life is a component of one’s overall life, the entrepreneur’s engaging in the actions that lead to flourishing in business is a component of an overall flourishing life. The entrepreneur’s actions both constitute and lead to a life that is fully realized.

Summarizing all of the above in a table, we get the following:

**Table 1:**  
***Entrepreneurial Character Traits and Related Moral Virtues***

Entrepreneurial Trait:	Moral Virtue:
Knowledge and Creativity	Rationality
Ambition	Pride

Guts	Courage
Initiative	Integrity
Perseverance	Independence
Trial and error	Objectivity (including Honesty)
Productivity	Productiveness
Trade value for value	Justice
<b>Entrepreneurial Consequence:</b>	<b>Moral Value:</b>
Experiencing and enjoying success	Self-esteem, Pride, Flourishing

**IV. An Entrepreneurial Code of Ethics**

The virtues and values listed in the right column of the table together constitute *an entrepreneurial code for business ethics*. That set of virtues is an abstraction on a description of entrepreneurial activity. The thoughts and actions of entrepreneurs are particulars of a general set of success traits. Those success traits of entrepreneurs are particulars of a general set of virtues.

In historical context, the list of virtues is very Aristotelian (Aristotle, 1984; see especially Aristotle’s discussions of courage in Book III, pride as the “crown” of the virtues, truthfulness, and liberality with respect to money in Book IV, justice in Book V, and *phronesis* or practical wisdom in Book VI of *Nicomachean Ethics*) and very Objectivist (Rand, 1964).

One important implication of the above is that an entrepreneurial ethic contrasts strongly to the ethics codes prevalent in the traditional and current business ethics literature. An assumption of much of the literature is that that success according to business criteria and success according to ethical criteria are different things. A consequence of that view is that business is amoral and ethics is something that has to be imported into or grafted onto it—or, in more extreme views, that business is inherently immoral and the purpose of ethics is to rein in or restrain business.

By contrast, the above entrepreneurial code of virtues connects business to ethics positively. It sets a foundation for a business-friendly ethic based on the assumption that successful business practice has *within* it the resources to develop an ethic. Entrepreneurs are individuals who are oriented toward practical success. The commitments and traits that enable them to achieve the good, i.e., success in life, are virtues. And virtues are the subject matter of morality and ethics. Entrepreneurship is a particular vehicle for moral activity.

Or to put the point another way: When we teach the skills for practical business success, the list on the left side of the table is what we teach. When we teach moral virtue, the list on the right is what we teach. And they come to the same thing—the moral is the practical.

Another implication of the above involves making the full case for the free society. The ethicist must be an ally of the economist and the political scientist in making that argument. Economists work out the commercial mechanisms of a free society, and political scientists work out its constitutional and limited government requirements. Yet while the economists and political scientists of the free society have done excellent work, less has been accomplished in articulating, advocating, and defending a free society’s ethic, including its business ethic.

James Buchanan made the following observation:

“We true liberals are failing to save the soul of classical liberalism. Books and ideas are necessary, but they are not sufficient to insure the viability of our philosophy. No, the problem lies in presenting the ideal. My larger thesis is that classical liberalism cannot secure sufficient public acceptability when its vocal advocates are limited to ‘does it work?’ pragmatists. ... A vision, an ideal, is necessary. People need something to yearn and struggle for. If the liberal ideal is not there, there will be a vacuum and other ideas will supplant it. Classical liberals have failed in their understanding of this dynamic” (Buchanan, 2002).

Entrepreneurial success is not the whole of ethics, but it is a good start for business ethics. Ethical codes matter *socially*: We develop political and economic systems to produce and protect what we think is the good, and what we think is good depends on our moral code. And moral codes are crucial *personally*: one’s moral code is one’s spiritual drive—it is that which one thinks best, highest, and most noble that says who one is and which brings out one’s best. We need a moral code that idealizes the Carlys—not one that urges us to be Janes or that is limited to attacking the Tonys.

The key thesis of an entrepreneurial code of ethics is that business ethics should focus first on creativity, productivity, and trade. Creative, productive traders are highly-realized moral individuals. That is to say that business ethics should take entrepreneurship seriously and foundationally as a moral phenomenon.

## References

- Aristotle. 1984. *Nicomachean Ethics*. In *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, edited by Jonathan Barnes. 2 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Buchanan, James. 2002. “Saving the Soul of Classical Liberalism.” *The Wall Street Journal*, January 1.
- Kirzner, Israel. 1973. *Competition and Entrepreneurship*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rand, Ayn. 1964. “The Objectivist Ethics.” In *The Virtue of Selfishness*. New York: New American Library.
- Schumpeter, Joseph. 1950. *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. New York: Harper & Brothers. See especially Chapter VII.

\* \* \*

## *Ethical Principles*

	<i>Egoism</i>	<i>Altruism</i>	<i>Predation</i>
<i>Intent</i>	Self interest	Selfless	Self interest
<i>Action</i>	Produce	Give	Take
<i>Consequence to self</i>	Benefit	Sacrifice	Benefit
<i>Consequence to other(s)</i>	Benefit or neutral	Benefit	Sacrifice
	“Carly”	“Jane”	“Tonya”

<i>Heroes</i>			
<i>Sports</i>			
<i>Money</i>			
<i>Sex</i>			
<i>Gifts</i>			



## *Human Nature—Good, Bad, or Tabula Rasa?*

### **Genesis: Adam and Eve**

<sup>15</sup>The Lord God took the man and put him in the Garden of Eden to work it and take care of it. <sup>16</sup>And the Lord God commanded the man, “You are free to eat from any tree in the garden; <sup>17</sup>but you must not eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, for when you eat from it you will certainly die.”

<sup>18</sup>The Lord God said, “It is not good for the man to be alone. I will make a helper suitable for him.” ...

<sup>21</sup>So the Lord God caused the man to fall into a deep sleep; and while he was sleeping, he took one of the man’s ribs<sup>[a]</sup> and then closed up the place with flesh. <sup>22</sup>Then the Lord God made a woman from the rib<sup>[a]</sup> he had taken out of the man, and he brought her to the man. ...

<sup>3</sup>Now the serpent was more crafty than any of the wild animals the Lord God had made. He said to the woman, “Did God really say, ‘You must not eat from any tree in the garden?’”

<sup>2</sup>The woman said to the serpent, “We may eat fruit from the trees in the garden, <sup>3</sup>but God did say, ‘You must not eat fruit from the tree that is in the middle of the garden, and you must not touch it, or you will die.’”

<sup>4</sup>”You will not certainly die,” the serpent said to the woman. <sup>5</sup>”For God knows that when you eat from it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil.”

<sup>6</sup>When the woman saw that the fruit of the tree was good for food and pleasing to the eye, and also desirable for gaining wisdom, she took some and ate it. She also gave some to her husband, who was with her, and he ate it.

### **Genesis: Cain and Abel**

<sup>4</sup>Adam<sup>[a]</sup> made love to his wife Eve, and she became pregnant and gave birth to Cain.<sup>[b]</sup> She said, “With the help of the Lord I have brought forth<sup>[c]</sup> a man.” <sup>2</sup>Later she gave birth to his brother Abel.

Now Abel kept flocks, and Cain worked the soil. <sup>3</sup>In the course of time Cain brought some of the fruits of the soil as an offering to the Lord. <sup>4</sup>And Abel also brought an offering—fat portions from some of the firstborn of his flock. The Lord looked with favor on Abel and his offering, <sup>5</sup>but on Cain and his offering he did not look with favor. So Cain was very angry, and his face was downcast.

<sup>6</sup>Then the Lord said to Cain, “Why are you angry? Why is your face downcast? <sup>7</sup>If you do what is right, will you not be accepted? But if you do not do what is right, sin is crouching at your door; it desires to have you, but you must rule over it.”

<sup>8</sup>Now Cain said to his brother Abel, “Let’s go out to the field.” <sup>[d]</sup> While they were in the field, Cain attacked his brother Abel and killed him.

<sup>9</sup>Then the Lord said to Cain, “Where is your brother Abel?”

“I don’t know,” he replied. “Am I my brother’s keeper?”

**St. Paul:** “I am physical, sold into slavery to sin. I do not understand what I am doing, for I do not do what I want to do; I do the things that I hate ... What a wretched man I am! Who can save me from this doomed body?”

**Pope Innocent III** (1160-1216) and disgust at human body: “impure begetting, disgusting means of nutrition in his mother’s womb, baseness of matter out of which man evolves, hideous stink, secretion of saliva, urine, and filth.”

**Martin Luther** in 1520: “Man has a twofold nature, a spiritual one and a bodily one. According to the spiritual nature, which men refer to as the soul, he is called a spiritual, inner, or new man. According to the bodily nature, which men refer to as flesh, he is called a carnal, outward, or old man, of whom the Apostle writes in 2 Cor. 4 [:16], ‘Though our outer nature is wasting away, our inner nature is being renewed every day.’ Because of this diversity of nature the Scriptures assert contradictory things concerning the same man, since these two men in the same man contradict each other, ‘for the desires of the flesh are against the spirit, and the desires of the Spirit are against the flesh,’ according to Gal. 5 [:17].”

**Plato, *The Myth of Gyges*:** “According to the tradition, Gyges was a shepherd in the service of the king of Lydia; there was a great storm, and an earthquake made an opening in the earth at the place where he was feeding his flock. Amazed at the sight, he descended into the opening, where, among other marvels, he beheld a hollow brazen horse, having doors, at which he stooping and looking in saw a dead body of stature, as appeared to him, more than human, and having nothing on but a gold ring; this he took from the finger of the dead and re-ascended. Now the shepherds met together, according to custom, that they might send their monthly report about the flocks to the king; into their assembly he came having the ring on his finger, and as he was sitting among them he chanced to turn the collet of the ring inside his hand, when instantly he became invisible to the rest of the company and they began to speak of him as if he were no longer present. He was astonished at this, and again touching the ring he turned the collet outwards and reappeared; he made several trials of the ring, and always with the same result-when he turned the collet inwards he became invisible, when outwards he reappeared. Whereupon he contrived to be chosen one of the messengers who were sent to the court; where as soon as he arrived he seduced the queen, and with her help conspired against the king and slew him, and took the kingdom. Suppose now that there were two such magic rings, and the just put on one of them and the unjust the other; no man can be imagined to be of such an iron nature that he would stand fast in justice. No man would keep his hands off what was not his own when he could safely take what he liked out of the market, or go into houses and lie with any one at his pleasure, or kill or release from prison whom he would, and in all respects be like a God among men.”

\* \* \*

*Lifeboat Ethics:*  
*The Case against Helping the Poor*  
by Garrett Hardin

Environmentalists use the metaphor of the earth as a “spaceship” in trying to persuade countries, industries and people to stop wasting and polluting our natural resources. Since we all share life on this planet, they argue, no single person or institution has the right to destroy, waste, or use more than a fair share of its resources.

But does everyone on earth have an equal right to an equal share of its resources? The spaceship metaphor can be dangerous when used by misguided idealists to justify suicidal policies for sharing our resources through uncontrolled immigration and foreign aid. In their enthusiastic but unrealistic generosity, they confuse the ethics of a spaceship with those of a lifeboat.

A true spaceship would have to be under the control of a captain, since no ship could possibly survive if its course were determined by committee. Spaceship Earth certainly has no captain; the United Nations is merely a toothless tiger, with little power to enforce any policy upon its bickering members.

If we divide the world crudely into rich nations and poor nations, two thirds of them are desperately poor, and only one third comparatively rich, with the United States the wealthiest of all. Metaphorically each rich nation can be seen as a lifeboat full of comparatively rich people. In the ocean outside each lifeboat swim the poor of the world, who would like to get in, or at least to share some of the wealth. What should the lifeboat passengers do?

First, we must recognize the limited capacity of any lifeboat. For example, a nation’s land has a limited capacity to support a population and as the current energy crisis has shown us, in some ways we have already exceeded the carrying capacity of our land.

#### **Adrift in a Moral Sea**

So here we sit, say 50 people in our lifeboat. To be generous, let us assume it has room for 10 more, making a total capacity of 60. Suppose the 50 of us in the lifeboat see 100 others swimming in the water outside, begging for admission to our boat or for handouts. We have several options: we may be tempted to try to live by the Christian ideal of being “our brother’s keeper,” or by the Marxist ideal of “to each according to his needs.” Since the needs of all in the water are the same, and since they can all be seen as “our brothers,” we could take them all into our boat, making a total of 150 in a boat designed for 60. The boat swamps, everyone drowns. Complete justice, complete catastrophe.

Since the boat has an unused excess capacity of 10 more passengers, we could admit just 10 more to it. But which 10 do we let in? How do we choose? Do we pick the best 10, “first come, first served”? And what do we say to the 90 we exclude? If we do let an extra 10 into our lifeboat, we will have lost our “safety factor,” an engineering principle of critical importance. For example, if we don't leave room for excess capacity as a safety factor in our country’s agriculture, a new plant disease or a bad change in the weather could have disastrous consequences.

Suppose we decide to preserve our small safety factor and admit no more to the lifeboat. Our survival is then possible although we shall have to be constantly on guard against boarding parties.

While this last solution clearly offers the only means of our survival, it is morally abhorrent to many people. Some say they feel guilty about their good luck. My reply is simple: “Get out and yield your place to others.” This may solve the problem of the guilt-ridden person’s conscience, but it does not change the ethics of the lifeboat. The needy person to whom the guilt-ridden person yields his place will not himself

feel guilty about his good luck. If he did, he would not climb aboard. The net result of conscience-stricken people giving up their unjustly held seats is the elimination of that sort of conscience from the lifeboat.

This is the basic metaphor within which we must work out our solutions. Let us now enrich the image, step by step, with substantive additions from the real world, a world that must solve real and pressing problems of overpopulation and hunger.

The harsh ethics of the lifeboat become even harsher when we consider the reproductive differences between the rich nations and the poor nations. The people inside the lifeboats are doubling in numbers every 87 years; those swimming around outside are doubling, on the average, every 35 years, more than twice as fast as the rich. And since the world's resources are dwindling, the difference in prosperity between the rich and the poor can only increase. ...

### **Learning the Hard Way**

What happens if some organizations or countries budget for accidents and others do not? If each country is solely responsible for its own well-being, poorly managed ones will suffer. But they can learn from experience. They may mend their ways, and learn to budget for infrequent but certain emergencies. For example, the weather varies from year to year, and periodic crop failures are certain. A wise and competent government saves out of the production of the good years in anticipation of bad years to come. Joseph taught this policy to Pharaoh in Egypt more than 2,000 years ago. Yet the great majority of the governments in the world today do not follow such a policy. They lack either the wisdom or the competence, or both. Should those nations that do manage to put something aside be forced to come to the rescue each time an emergency occurs among the poor nations?

“But it isn't their fault!” Some kind-hearted liberals argue. “How can we blame the poor people who are caught in an emergency? Why must they suffer for the sins of their governments?” The concept of blame is simply not relevant here. The real question is, what are the operational consequences of establishing a world food bank? If it is open to every country every time a need develops, slovenly rulers will not be motivated to take Joseph's advice. Someone will always come to their aid. Some countries will deposit food in the world food bank, and others will withdraw it. There will be almost no overlap. As a result of such solutions to food shortage emergencies, the poor countries will not learn to mend their ways, and will suffer progressively greater emergencies as their populations grow. ...

### **Chinese Fish and Miracle Rice**

The modern approach to foreign aid stresses the export of technology and advice, rather than money and food. As an ancient Chinese proverb goes: “Give a man a fish and he will eat for a day; teach him how to fish and he will eat for the rest of his days.” Acting on this advice, the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations have financed a number of programs for improving agriculture in the hungry nations. Known as the “Green Revolution,” these programs have led to the development of “miracle rice” and “miracle wheat,” new strains that offer bigger harvests and greater resistance to crop damage. Norman Borlaug, the Nobel Prize winning agronomist who, supported by the Rockefeller Foundation, developed “miracle wheat,” is one of the most prominent advocates of a world food bank.

Whether or not the Green Revolution can increase food production as much as its champions claim is a debatable but possibly irrelevant point. Those who support this well-intended humanitarian effort should first consider some of the fundamentals of human ecology. Ironically, one man who did was the late Alan Gregg, a vice president of the Rockefeller Foundation. Two decades ago he expressed strong doubts about the wisdom of such attempts to increase food production. He likened the growth and spread of humanity over the surface of the earth to the spread of cancer in the human body, remarking that “cancerous growths demand food; but, as far as I know, they have never been cured by getting it.”

### **Overloading the Environment**

Every human born constitutes a draft on all aspects of the environment: food, air, water, forests, beaches, wildlife, scenery and solitude. Food can, perhaps, be significantly increased to meet a growing demand.

But what about clean beaches, unspoiled forests, and solitude? If we satisfy a growing population's need for food, we necessarily decrease its per capita supply of the other resources needed by men.

India, for example, now has a population of 600 million, which increases by 15 million each year. This population already puts a huge load on a relatively impoverished environment. The country's forests are now only a small fraction of what they were three centuries ago and floods and erosion continually destroy the insufficient farmland that remains. Every one of the 15 million new lives added to India's population puts an additional burden on the environment, and increases the economic and social costs of crowding. However humanitarian our intent, every Indian life saved through medical or nutritional assistance from abroad diminishes the quality of life for those who remain, and for subsequent generations. If rich countries make it possible, through foreign aid, for 600 million Indians to swell to 1.2 billion in a mere 28 years, as their current growth rate threatens, will future generations of Indians thank us for hastening the destruction of their environment? Will our good intentions be sufficient excuse for the consequences of our actions? ...

To be generous with one's own possessions is quite different from being generous with those of posterity. We should call this point to the attention of those who from a commendable love of justice and equality, would institute a system of the commons, either in the form of a world food bank, or of unrestricted immigration. We must convince them if we wish to save at least some parts of the world from environmental ruin.

Without a true world government to control reproduction and the use of available resources, the sharing ethic of the spaceship is impossible. For the foreseeable future, our survival demands that we govern our actions by the ethics of a lifeboat, harsh though they may be. Posterity will be satisfied with nothing less.

\* \* \*

*Psychology Today*, September 1974

[http://www.garretthardinsociety.org/articles/art\\_lifeboat\\_ethics\\_case\\_against\\_helping\\_poor.html](http://www.garretthardinsociety.org/articles/art_lifeboat_ethics_case_against_helping_poor.html)

## *Nine Billion Mouths to Feed*

By Ronald Bailey

The author is sympathetic to anti-globalization activists. But history amply shows that limiting people to local crops is a recipe for famine.

*The Wall Street Journal*, Oct. 18, 2015

In the late 18th century, Robert Thomas Malthus argued that human population growth would always outstrip food production, thus perpetually condemning some portion of humanity to famine. His disciples today are now pointing to recent steep increases in food prices as harbingers of a new age of scarcity. Global food prices have indeed been soaring, along with other commodity prices, since 2005. In real terms, the Food and Agriculture Organization's price index crested in 2011 at 60% above its 2005 price levels. Farmers around the world predictably reacted to the higher prices by growing more food. World cereal production rose from 2,348 million tons in 2011 to 2,540 million tons today. Since the 2011 peak, food prices have been drifting downward, although they remain 18% higher than they were a decade or so ago.

Cue the prophets of doom. Richard Heinberg of the Post Carbon Institute has said that the world is now at "peak everything." He has further warned that humanity is "waking up to a century of declines." In 2013, Earth Policy Institute founder Lester Brown asserted: "The world is in transition from an era of food abundance to one of scarcity." Journalist Joel K. Bourne Jr. declared earlier this year, in his book "The End of Plenty," that "the world is running out of food."

Now comes the neo-Malthusian journalist David Rieff. He argues in "The Reproach of Hunger: Food, Justice, and Money in the Twenty-First Century" that "if significant changes to the global food system are not made, a crisis of absolute global food supply could occur sometime between 2030 and 2050." Mr. Rieff's argument is halfhearted in comparison to Stanford University biologist Paul Ehrlich's bold 1968 pronouncement, in "The Population Bomb," that "the battle to feed all of humanity is over. In the 1970s hundreds of millions of people will starve to death in spite of any crash programs embarked upon now."

The chief question for Mr. Rieff is: Will it be possible to feed the nine billion people who will most likely be living on the planet by the middle of this century? He writes that, "in the main," his "own views are pessimistic." But he immediately acknowledges the possibility of predictive failure and declares: "I insist that it is entirely possible that twenty years from now, it is the optimists who will be proven right."

Mr. Rieff spends most of the book excoriating in turgid prose those he designates as "optimists," who argue that hunger and poverty are technically solvable problems. He accuses them of "an overreliance verging on mystical faith in the application of scientific breakthroughs that will give farmers in the poor world the technological inputs and market savvy needed to grow enough food to comfortably feed the nine or ten billion human beings who will be alive on this earth by 2050." He has particular disdain for philanthro-capitalists as personified by Bill Gates. When Mr. Gates's foundation advocates harnessing technology to feed the hungry and reduce poverty, Mr. Rieff sees only ideology. "Perhaps twenty-first century liberal capitalism's greatest trick has been convincing so much of the world that it is not an ideology, and as it did so, convincing itself as well," he writes.

The author's sympathy rests with anti-globalization activists and their demands for "food sovereignty," which amounts essentially to autarkic agriculture by peasant farmers. As history amply shows, limiting people to local crops is a recipe for periodic famine.

Mr. Rieff denounces what he sees as the global development "consensus" that "only transformative power of liberal capitalism in combination with science and technological innovation can end hunger and extreme poverty." He finds that the "only feasible" answer to the problems of hunger and poverty "is to

be found in the strengthening of the state and in the promise and burden of democratic politics.” Ultimately, politics is the key to fixing the “broken” global food system.

Broken? It is true that far too many people are still hungry, but poverty is receding around the globe. Earlier this month the World Bank released projections that the number of people living in absolute poverty (defined as \$1.90 per day) will have fallen from 902 million people (or 12.8% of the global population) in 2012 to 702 million people (or 9.6% of the global population) this year. According to the World Bank, these figures provide “fresh evidence that a quarter-century-long sustained reduction in poverty is moving the world closer to the historic goal of ending poverty by 2030.”

In any case, what Mr. Rieff means by politics is not at all clear. He hand-waves in the direction of peasant and smallholder farmer movements and is all in favor of some kind of democratic accountability. Surely protecting the property rights of small farmers and establishing honest democratic political institutions in poor countries would go a long way toward addressing hunger and poverty.

But Mr. Rieff hasn’t a clue about how to achieve those goals. In fact, neither does anyone else. “You can’t engineer prosperity,” asserted MIT economist Daron Acemoglu and Harvard economist James Robinson in their 2012 book, “Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity, and Poverty.” Politics does indeed affect food security. A quick glance at the Economist magazine’s Intelligence Unit’s Global Democracy and Food Security Indices finds that of the 15 countries that rank lowest on food security, all but two score below five points on the Unit’s 10-point democracy index. Conversely, the 24 countries ranked as full democracies (scoring above eight points) all tally high on the Food Security Index.

The recipe for prosperity is known: strong property rights, a free press, the rule of law, free trade, honest bureaucracies, limited government and democratic politics. In other words: liberal capitalism. If more of humanity adopts this recipe, the optimists will indeed be proved right and Mr. Rieff wrong.

\* \* \*

*Mr. Bailey is the science correspondent for Reason magazine  
and the author of “The End of Doom: Environmental Renewal in the Twenty-First Century.”*

# *Manufacture and Regulation of Laetrile*

By Tom Beauchamp

It has been estimated that consumers waste \$500 million a year on medical quackery and another \$500 million annually on some “health foods” which have no beneficial effect. Unnecessary deaths, injuries and financial loss can be expected to continue until the law requires adequate testing for safety and efficacy of products and devices before they are made available to consumers. (President John F. Kennedy in a message to Congress)

Let me choose the way I want to die. It is not your prerogative to tell me how. (Glenn Rutherford, cancer patient and Laetrile supporter at FDA hearing)

These quotations express the essence of an acrimonious conflict that raged over the better part of the 1970s in the scientific and popular press, in courtrooms and hearing rooms, in prestigious research institutions, and among drug manufacturers. This debate emerged over the regulation, manufacturing, and marketing of Laetrile, a drug said to be a cure for cancer by its supporters but denounced as worthless by much of the scientific community.

The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has a responsibility to determine both the *safety* and the *efficacy* of a drug before allowing it to be marketed in the United States. The FDA’s responsibility for drug licensing dates from the passage of the 1906 Pure Food and Drug Act, which primarily addressed safety abuses among patent medicine purveyors. In 1962 new laws were passed (partly in response to the Thalidomide tragedy involving malformed fetuses) that required the FDA to assess a drug’s efficacy as well as its safety before the drug could be approved for marketing.

The FDA examined Laetrile for safety and found no significant problems. However, the FDA could not find evidence of the drug’s effectiveness and became convinced that Laetrile was worthless for the treatment of cancer. Consequently the drug was banned from the U.S. market.

Laetrile supporters reacted with fury to the drug ban. Cancer victims demanded the right to use it. Over 20 state legislatures that opposed the FDA’s decision legalized it for intrastate marketing and consumption. Others felt the FDA was denying the American people their Constitutional right to freedom of choice. Many argued that since the drug had not been proven unsafe, people should be allowed to use it pending further tests. But many in the medical and scientific communities opposed this laissez-faire attitude. They argued that patients were drawn toward an inexpensive, painless cure for their disease but failed to realize its ineffectiveness. Critics claimed that numerous deaths had resulted from Laetrile use and that some of these people could have been helped by legitimate alternative forms of treatment.

The debate’s ferocity was new, but Laetrile was not. According to Dr. Charles Moertel of the Mayo Clinic, “Amygdalin had many centuries of use for medical purposes. Usually administered in the form of bitter almonds, it was a common ingredient of herbal prescriptions for a variety of illnesses, and by liberal interpretation of ancient pharmacopeias one might conclude that it was used for the treatment of cancer.” German physicians briefly used amygdalin in cancer treatment in 1892, but they discarded the extract as ineffective and toxic.

Modern proponents of Laetrile therapy attribute the beginning of the Laetrile movement to Ernst Krebs, who began experimenting with the extract of apricot pits in the 1920s, and to his



son, Ernst Krebs, Jr., who refined the extract to produce Laetrile in 1949 for use in the treatment of disorders of intestinal fermentation cancer. Since then pro-Laetrile researchers have experimented with a variety of methods and techniques for using Laetrile in cancer treatment, and they claim that Laetrile is in fact effective. According to Krebs, Laetrile is effective because cyanide, which is an active ingredient, attacks the cancerous cells while an enzyme called rhodanese protects the normal cells.

Initially Krebs's supporters claimed that Laetrile not only cured or controlled existing cancers but could also prevent cancers from forming. They based their claims of Laetrile's efficacy primarily on patients' case histories (some published in a volume called *Laetrile Case Histories*) and on personal testimonials of "cured" cancer patients. However, many in the medical and scientific communities were not impressed with this form of proof. They considered the reported case histories too sketchy and the follow-up times too short to support the claims. Moreover, few patients took Laetrile without first undergoing more traditional forms of cancer therapy. Under these conditions it is virtually impossible to determine which treatment or treatments should receive credit for improvements. Also, the natural history of cancer is not totally understood, and spontaneous remissions can and do occur.

In 1962 the FDA charged Krebs with violating the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, on grounds that he could not prove his drug's effectiveness. In 1963 Laetrile was banned because it was not found to be an effective treatment of cancer or any other health problem. Since then, Laetrile proponents have revised their claims. They no longer proclaim Laetrile an independent cure for cancer instead emphasizing its role in the prevention and control of the disease. Laetrile supporters also maintain that the standards of proof for Laetrile research have been higher than for other cancer drugs and that pro-Laetrile results have been obtained but suppressed.

The controversy surrounding Laetrile turned largely on the drug's efficacy and on one's right to *manufacture, market, and purchase* the product. During the 1970s the FDA suffered criticisms that it was a paternalistic agency after it attempted to ban the manufacturing and marketing of the popular artificial sweetener saccharin. The Laetrile problem immediately followed this unpopular FDA policy. By mid-1977 FDA head Donald Kennedy said his agency found increasing evidence of Laetrile's inefficacy. However, criticism of the FDA was also increasing and efforts were mounted either to allow free choice of the drug or to test for efficacy in a public trial using human subjects. Some state legislatures and judges called the FDA's findings into question. Some states had legalized its manufacture and sale, and some courts had criticized the FDA record and policies. Even prestigious physicians and newspapers such as *The New York Times* endorsed the right of individuals to choose to use a possibly inefficacious drug.

Responding to the demands for a Laetrile efficacy trial with human subjects the National Cancer Institute sponsored a 1981 clinical trial with 178 terminal cancer patients. The trial results dispelled any lingering doubts in the medical and scientific communities over Laetrile's alleged ability to destroy cancer cells. Of the 178 trial subjects, only one demonstrated a partial positive response to Laetrile treatment. His gastric carcinoma showed a 10-week retardation period. However the cancer progressed, and the patient died 37 weeks after Laetrile therapy. In their conclusion, the trial doctors commented, "No substantive benefit was observed in the terms of cure, improvement or stabilization of cancer." According to the study, several patients displayed symptoms of cyanide toxicity and blood cyanide levels approaching the lethal range. The report concluded Amygdalin (Laetrile) is a toxic drug that is not effective as a cancer treatment." In response, Laetrile manufacturers sued the NCI in three lawsuits, claiming the study had drastically reduced demand for Laetrile, thereby inflicting financial damage on the manufacturers. All three suits were dismissed in the courts.

According to proregulation partisans, it is desirable and necessary to protect uneducated risk takers who are vulnerable to unsubstantiated medicinal claims: “The absolute freedom to choose an effective drug is properly surrendered in exchange for the freedom from danger to each person’s health and well-being from the sale and use of worthless drugs.” From this perspective, regulation is not irreconcilable with freedom of choice. If a regulation promotes situations under which more informed and deliberative choices are made, it does not constrict freedom; and a choice cannot be free if the product is a fraud.

By contrast, freedom-of-choice advocates claim that the simple restriction of Laetrile violates the individual’s right to autonomous choice and the manufacturers’ rights to market a product. Supporters of this view resent the characterization of cancer patients as people who are incapable of making rational or free decisions because of the stress of illness. They believe that most of these individuals are able to make well-founded personal decisions and should be allowed to do so.

The economic implications of banning Laetrile have also introduced a significant controversy. Each side has accused the other of economic exploitation of cancer victims. Laetrile proponents say that traditional cancer treatments represent an enormous and profitable industry and claim that a cost savings for patients would be achieved if Laetrile were legally marketed in the United States. They note that the American Cancer Society estimated that as early as 1972 the direct costs of cancer treatment totaled over \$3 billion (for hospital care nursing home care, physicians’ and nurses’ fees, drugs and other treatments, and research). By comparison, Laetrile supporters claim that legalized Laetrile would cost a fraction of conventional cancer therapies.

Laetrile has been primarily manufactured and marketed in Mexico. In one study it was estimated that in 1977 alone, approximately 7,000 patients were treated in two Mexican clinics at an average cost of \$350 per day. The United States represents a large potential market for a legalized, over-the-counter Laetrile. However, due to FDA restrictions, one may neither import amygdalin from foreign countries nor ship it across state lines. Although the FDA does not control *intrastate* commerce, it would not be profitable for any one state to manufacture Laetrile in all its stages—that is, from the farming of apricot trees to the laboratory synthesis of the finished drug. Furthermore, the FDA has issued an import alert ban on amygdalin and all corresponding brand names, including Laetrile and vitamin B-17. The FDA refuses to permit importation of Laetrile on the grounds that “it appears to be a new drug without an effective new drug application (NDA).” The FDA also classifies the Laetrile issue as a health fraud case. As a senior scientist at the AMA commented, “People took Laetrile, ignored other, more, conventional cancer treatment, and died.” Although NDAs for Laetrile have been submitted to the FDA, none has been approved. Consequently, the FDA currently proscribes all importation and interstate transportation and marketing of amygdalin under any brand name.

However, one may still obtain amygdalin quickly and easily within the United States. VitaChem International/Genesis West in Redwood City, California, offers 50 tablets of “Laevalin, a naturally occurring amygdalin” for \$47.50. Mexican-based Vita Inc. will ship 100 Laetrile tablets to a United States address for \$65.00. To circumvent FDA regulations, U.S. Laetrile marketers have changed the brand name but continue to market amygdalin openly, in violation of the FDA import and interstate commerce ban.

The courts as well as the press have provided the arena for the conflict over the rights of a patient to choose a treatment and the rights of manufacturers to market a product. Although it was not the intent of Congress to impose such restrictions on choice, the patient’s choice is in fact restricted by the 1962 drug amendments. Because these amendments restrict the market to

industry-tested and FDA-approved products, treatment by and manufacturing of alternatives are inevitably constricted.

A series of lawsuits have challenged the FDA restrictions, and a number of states have passed laws legalizing its use. In early 1977 U.S. District Court Judge Luther Bohanon (U.S. District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma) issued a ruling permitting Laetrile's importation under a physician's affidavit for terminally ill cancer patients. Although overturned by an appeals court in December 1986, Bohanon's ruling allowed Laetrile treatment for terminal patients. Despite the opportunity to convince the FDA of the drug's efficacy, Laetrile proponents did not obtain an NDA approval for amygdalin. The judicial and legislative challenges are not, however, without opponents. Lawyer William Curran, for instance, has deplored the action of certain courts in allowing the use of Laetrile for the terminally ill:

It is understandable that judges have had trouble dealing objectively with the legal pleas of plaintiffs who are dying a painful death and whose only wish is to indulge in a harmless, although ineffective, gesture of hope. The courts have tried to dispense mercy. Their error has been in abandoning the protection of law for these patients.

As the arguments have developed, the issues of choice and fraudulent representation by business have moved to the forefront. Franz Ingelfinger, the distinguished former editor of the *New England Journal of Medicine* and himself a cancer victim, was convinced that Laetrile was useless. In 1977 he wrote, "I would not take Laetrile myself under any circumstances. If any member of my family had cancer, I would counsel them against it. If I were still in practice, I would not recommend it to my patients." On the other hand, he said, "Perhaps there are some situations in which rational medical science should yield and make some concessions. If any patient had what I thought was hopelessly advanced cancer, and if he asked for Laetrile, I should like to be able to give the substance to him to assuage his mental anguish, just as I would give him morphine to relieve his physical suffering." Ingelfinger did not view truthful marketing of the drug as involving a fraudulent misrepresentation.

In May 1987 a Laetrile bill was introduced into the U.S. House of Representatives. H.R. 651 provided that the controversial efficacy requirements of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act would not be applied to Laetrile if a patient were under a physician's care (see Exhibit 1). The bill's sponsor, Rep. Bill Goodling (R-PA) asserted that "the legislation does not state that Laetrile is a cure for pain or a pain reducer." The bill died in the Health and Environment Subcommittee of the House Energy and Commerce Committee.

The National Institutes of Health and most other health care institutions still discourage the use of Laetrile, preferring conventional methods of cancer treatment. The National Cancer Institute's official policy is to encourage conventional methods with the explanation that testing has always shown "evidence of Laetrile's failure as a cancer treatment." The American Cancer Society holds the position that "Laetrile is not effective in the prevention or treatment of cancer in human beings." Despite the medical evidence and the FDA's past efforts to restrict the drug's marketing, one may still today purchase amygdalin by dialing a toll-free number.

### **Exhibit 1**

H.R. 651: To provide that the effectiveness requirements of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act shall not apply to Laetrile in certain cases, be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in the administration of section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the effectiveness requirement of such section shall not be applicable to Laetrile when used under the direction of a physician for the treatment of pain.

# *The FCC's Fairness Doctrine*

By Tom L. Beauchamp

(Revised by John Cuddihy, Joanne L. Jurmu, and Anna Pinedo)

Government intervention in the publication and dissemination of news is inconsistent with the notion of a free press. However, the government has a responsibility to ensure fairness in the dissemination of information on matters of community interest. These two obligations often conflict. Until recently, a U.S. government mechanism of media accountability known as the Fairness Doctrine existed. The doctrine attempted to mediate between broadcasters' First Amendment rights and those of the public by requiring broadcasters to provide balanced coverage of important public issues.

The Fairness Doctrine originated in congressional and Federal Communications Commission (FCC) legislation. The FCC's 1949 "Report on Editorializing by Broadcasters" outlined the doctrine and stressed the importance of the development, through broadcasting, of an informed public opinion in a democracy. It affirmed the "right of the public in a free society to be informed and to have presented to it for acceptance or rejection the different attitudes and viewpoints concerning these vital and often controversial issues." In 1959 Congress amended the Communications Act of 1934 to impose, in section 315(a), a statutory "obligation upon [broadcasters] to operate in the public interest and to afford reasonable opportunity for the discussion of conflicting views on issues of public importance."

The Fairness Doctrine did not require broadcasters to give equal time to contrasting views. However, if "during the presentation of views on a controversial issue, an attack [was] made upon the honesty, character, integrity, or like personal qualities of an identified person or group," that person or group had to be given an opportunity to respond on the air. The broadcasting company had to bear all presentation costs.

The policy was traditionally confined to broadcast rather than print media, based on a principle of scarce resource allocation. There is a relative scarcity of broadcasting possibilities, because the number of people who want to broadcast exceeds the number of available broadcast licenses. The government allocates this limited resource through a licensing system, designed to protect the public interest through the enforcement of various regulations.

In 1969 the U.S. Supreme Court held the Fairness Doctrine to be constitutional and consistent with the First Amendment's intent in *Red Lion Broadcasting Co. v. Federal Communications Commission*. The Court ruled that the scarcity of available frequencies justifies the imposition of a government regulatory system intended to ensure that broadcasters, as fiduciaries, act in the public interest. The Court declared the public's First Amendment rights to hear differing viewpoints "paramount" to broadcasters' rights. Justice Byron White expressed the Court's opinion as follows:

Where there are substantially more individuals who want to broadcast than there are frequencies to allocate, it is idle to posit an unabridgeable First Amendment right to broadcast comparable to the right of every individual to speak, write or publish. ... A license permits broadcasting, but the licensee has no constitutional right to be the one who holds

the license or to monopolize a radio frequency to the exclusion of his fellow citizens. There is nothing in the First Amendment which prevents the Government from requiring a licensee to share his frequency with others and to conduct himself as a proxy or fiduciary with obligations to present those views and voices which are representative of his community and which would otherwise, by necessity, be barred from the airwaves.

The Court reaffirmed the scarcity of the radio airwaves and the responsibility of broadcasters as public trustees in subsequent cases. Similar reasoning served to justify the Fairness Doctrine's application to cable programming.

The Fairness Doctrine was neither strictly enforced nor widely applied. From May 1980 through August 1987, the FCC received over 50,000 complaints of alleged Fairness Doctrine violations. The FCC dismissed the vast majority of the charges. The Fairness Doctrine was primarily invoked to restrict virulent racism and other use of the airwaves to intimidate and attack persons and institutions. The FCC also used the doctrine in 1967 to require broadcasters to give significant time to antismoking messages. It was almost never used to enforce accountability for claims made in documentaries, no matter how hard-hitting or speculative. Although the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB) has reported several cases in which documentaries were accused of violating the Fairness Doctrine, the FCC upheld only one complaint, later overturned in federal court.

The doctrine was usually applied to ensure that the licensed station owners' political preferences would not control the presentation of candidates for public office. However, these regulations were also loosened over the years. For example, the FCC held that any station endorsing or criticizing a candidate on the air had to give the opposing or criticized candidate air time to respond. In 1983 FCC Chairman Mark Fowler revised the commission's policy on televised political debates. He announced that broadcasters could schedule political debates with the candidates of their choice without being required to provide air time to excluded candidates. Broadcasters could cover debates as bona fide news events without having to make time available to those who did not participate.

#### THE CURRENT LEGAL SITUATION

The Fairness Doctrine has come under fire from both sides of the political spectrum. Conservatives oppose it as an expendable form of government intervention, while some liberals support it as a means of intimidating or even silencing journalists. In May 1981 the FCC recommended that the Fairness Doctrine be repealed. The commission issued a detailed study of the doctrine in 1985. It concluded that the doctrine was "an unnecessary and detrimental regulatory mechanism [that] disserves the public interest." The FCC did not at that point repeal the doctrine because it believed that Congress had already codified it. However a May 1986 ruling by the U.S. Court of Appeals held that the Fairness Doctrine was not a statutory requirement. According to the ruling, written by Judge Robert Bork and supported by then Appeals Court Judge Antonin Scalia, Congress had merely ratified the doctrine in amending section 315(a) of the 1934 Communications Act. The decision permitted the FCC to modify or to abolish the doctrine. The commission then did abolish the doctrine's chief measures in August 1987 claiming that they violated First Amendment rights and stifled controversial programming.

The court of appeals ruling spurred controversy in Congress, where some members have consistently voiced support for the doctrine. There have been several legislative proposals to codify the doctrine and make it an explicit requirement of the Communications Act. Rep. John Dingell (D-MI), chairman of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce introduced an amendment to the Communications Act that would "require expressly that licensees of broadcast

stations present discussion of conflicting views on issues of public importance.” President Reagan vetoed the measure, and Congress lacked the two-thirds majority needed to override the veto. In February 1987 Sen. Ernest Hollings (D-SC) chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, deftly steered a bill through the committee that would have restored the Fairness Doctrine. Although Hollings argued vigorously for the bill, congressional deficit-reduction negotiations eliminated it. Still more recent bills introduced by Senator Hollings and Representative Dingell have either failed to clear their respective committees or died on chamber floors.

## THE CURRENT DEBATE

On August 4, 1987, the FCC voted unanimously to eliminate the Fairness Doctrine. In a letter to Representative Dingell, then FCC Chairman Dennis Patrick emphasized that although the FCC had abolished the doctrine’s major clauses, several of the doctrine’s regulations remained in force: the political editorial rule, the personal attack rule, the Zapple Doctrine, and the “application of the Fairness Doctrine to ballot issues.”

As stated by the FCC, “The rules on political editorials and personal attacks do not forbid the broadcast of either. Instead, they require broadcasters who carry such editorials or attacks to offer the persons adversely affected by them a chance to state their side of the case in person or through a spokesman.” The political editorial clause currently mandates that TV and radio stations offer political candidates whose opponents have been endorsed by the involved station “a reasonable opportunity to respond” on air to the endorsement. The FCC requires that the opposing candidate be furnished with an editorial transcript within 24 hours of a broadcast. If a station broadcasts a political editorial within three days of the election, the station must provide the transcript and a response-time offer prior to the editorial’s airing.

Personal attacks also require response time. However, attacks “occurring during uses by legally qualified candidates” are not covered by the Fairness Doctrine. Attacks made on “foreign groups or foreign public figures” are also immune from the doctrine’s “personal attack” claims.

Like the political editorial clause, the Zapple Doctrine also involves political campaigning. Should a TV or radio station run an advertisement during a formal campaign period in which political supporters endorse a candidate, an opponent’s supporters have the right to a reasonable opportunity to respond. The Zapple Doctrine may only apply to legally qualified candidates during formal campaign periods. The restrictions “reflect the intent of Congress to confine special treatment of political discussion to distinct, identifiable periods.”

The ballot-issue exception requires broadcasters to permit opposing sides equal air time to discuss and advertise for or against ballot propositions. However, “The [Federal Communications] Commission will not intervene in cases alleging false and misleading statements regarding controversial issues of public importance.”

Although these clauses remain in force, an FCC employee declared that these exceptions “are not vigorously enforced” and have not seen frequent use in recent years. Overall, the FCC has moved away from even the spirit of the Fairness Doctrine, firm in the belief that the doctrine stifled rather than promoted discussion and debate on public issues.

Doctrine opponents have challenged the Supreme Court’s *Red Lion* decision, claiming that it is based on the mistaken premise of airwaves scarcity and need for improved communication of information, which are no longer valid. From this perspective, the Fairness Doctrine is now an unfair restraint on free market trade; technological advances since the *Red Lion* case have eliminated the former scarcity. The 1985 FCC report noted a dramatic increase to more than

10,000 radio and television broadcasting stations, a 400 percent growth since 1949. Commercial broadcasters opposed to the doctrine point out that in many cities listeners and viewers can pick up dozens of radio and television stations and have access to only one significant newspaper. The FCC also observed that the growth of cable television, satellite television, and new telecommunications services offer an almost unlimited number of broadcast options.

The 1985 FCC report noted that the “Fairness Doctrine in operation thwarts the laudatory purpose it is designed to promote. Instead of furthering the discussion of public issues, the fairness doctrine inhibits broadcasters from presenting controversial issues of public importance.” Broadcasters sometimes hesitate to air controversial materials for fear that they will be forced to use expensive air time to present another side of the issue. For some broadcasters, the loss of advertising time alone prevents them from making room in their broadcast schedule for these materials. For example, there may be as many as 15 candidates running in a presidential primary, which makes the provision of equal time burdensome for many stations.

Doctrine supporters claim that the relative scarcity of usable airwaves persists. The “scarcity of frequencies should not be measured by the number of stations allowed to broadcast, but by the number of individuals or groups who wish to use the facilities, or would use them if they were more readily available.” They point to the economic value of government licenses as a measure of the relative demand. Independent VHF licenses have sold for as much as \$700 million in New York. Also, the number of stations has not increased in isolation, but in proportion to the nation’s population growth. The broadcast medium continues to be more inaccessible to the private citizen than the print medium because the government must allocate the use of airwaves. Finally, the increase in stations does not necessarily correspond to any local increase in availability of diverse views on issues.

The Fairness Doctrine has been the only significant mechanism of control. The House Committee on Energy and Commerce Report on the Fairness Doctrine points out that “numerous case histories demonstrate that the Fairness Doctrine promotes carriage of views that would otherwise not be available to the American public.” Former FCC Chairman Charles Ferris testified before the Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance that “in 1979, during [his] watch, the Commission explicitly found that the Fairness Doctrine enhanced, not reduced, speech.” The congressional committee questioned the authority of the 1985 FCC report because it relied solely on broadcasters’ accounts of the doctrine’s effects.

Opponents argue that the Fairness Doctrine violates constitutional principles by allowing the government to intervene and to define how freedom of expression is to be used and practiced. The doctrine, they say, provides a dangerous potential for government abuse. They point to the FCC’s statement that federal law permits government agencies to file Fairness Doctrine complaints against the media. This ruling (in July 1985) resulted in a complaint filed by the CIA charging that ABC’s “World News Tonight” had three times distorted the news in broadcasting allegations that the CIA had tried to arrange the assassination of Ronald Rewald, a Honolulu businessman who was under indictment for several crimes. These CIA complaints would reverse past precedents and require greater accountability of the media to the government.

Fairness Doctrine supporters face an uphill battle in the judiciary and Congress. A Media Action Project (a DC public interest law firm) employee said that when the Supreme Court declined in 1989 to review the 1986 DC Court of Appeals ruling, a legal review of the case became “extremely difficult.” If the firm decides to re-file a Fairness Doctrine case, it will certainly “seek a more sympathetic court.”

Legislative attempts to codify the Fairness Doctrine appear equally unlikely. Although Congressman Dingell and Senator Hollings have repeatedly introduced bills in Congress to resurrect the doctrine, they have all failed. A House legislative aide maintains that “hearings on [Representative Dingell’s bill] aren’t even likely to be held in this congressional session.” Although chairs of powerful House and Senate committees, neither Dingell nor Hollings has yet managed to convince their colleagues to codify the Fairness Doctrine. Furthermore, the executive branch publicly supports the doctrine’s abolition. If Congress did attempt to override a presidential veto of any doctrine measure, it probably could not muster the two-thirds support needed for legislative approval.

U.S. citizens continue to be wary of government intervention in the private sector. But the Fairness Doctrine has, until recently, been considered a justified exception. Although it is a measure that often intrudes upon broadcasters’ freedoms, the doctrine was traditionally designed to protect the individual’s moral and political right to the presentation of differing views on important issues.

\* \* \*



## *Quotations on Politicized Business*

1. “In general, the art of government consists in taking as much money as possible from one party of the citizens to give to the other.” (Voltaire, 1764)
2. “I expect all the bad consequences from the chambers of Commerce and manufacturers establishing in different parts of this country, which your Grace seems to foresee. . . .The regulations of Commerce are commonly dictated by those who are most interested to deceive and impose upon the Public.” (Adam Smith, 1785 letter)
3. Farm subsidies are “a temporary solution to deal with an emergency.” (Henry Wallace, president Roosevelt’s secretary of agriculture in 1933 when the US introduced farm subsidies.)
4. “There is nothing so permanent in Washington as a temporary government program.” (Milton Friedman, Nobel Prize in Economics, 1976)
5. “Many key businessmen articulated a conscious policy favoring the intervention of the national government into the economy. Important businessmen did not, on the whole, regard politics as a necessary evil, but as an important part of their larger position in society.” (Gabriel Kolko, *The Triumph of Conservatism*. The Free Press, 1963, p. 5)
6. “Government’s view of the economy could be summed up in a few short phrases: If it moves, tax it. If it keeps moving, regulate it. And if it stops moving, subsidize it.” (Ronald Reagan, 1986)
7. James Bovard, *The Farm Fiasco* (1990):
  - “This year the USDA is rewarding farmers for not planting on 78 million acres of farmland—equivalent to the entire states of Indiana, Ohio, and most of Illinois.”
  - “With the \$160 billion that the government and consumers have spent on farm subsidies since 1980, Uncle Sam could have bought every farm, barn, and tractor in thirty states.”
  - “Farm subsidies—roughly \$25 billion a year in handouts, plus \$10 billion in higher food prices—are the equivalent of giving every full-time subsidized farmer two new Mercedes each year.”
8. “Capitalism’s biggest political enemies are not the firebrand trade unionists spewing vitriol against the system but the executives in pin-striped suits extolling the virtues of competitive markets with every breath while attempting to extinguish them with every action.” (Raghuram Rajan and Luigi Zingales, *Saving Capitalism from the Capitalists*. Crown, 2003, 276)
9. “When buying and selling are controlled by the legislature, the first thing to be bought and sold is legislators.” (P. J. O’Rourke, political humorist)

\* \* \*

## Study questions for Ayn Rand's *Atlas Shrugged*

### Chapter I, "The Theme"

1. Eddie Willers confronts Jim Taggart with the problem of the late order from Boyle's steel company. How does Jim deal with it?
2. Dagny Taggart is confronted with the problem of the stopped train. How does she deal with it?
3. Overall, how do Jim's and Dagny's leadership styles compare?
4. What point is Rand making by having Jim and Dagny be brother and sister?
5. Why is Eddie so troubled by the oak tree's destruction?
6. Why do Jim and Eddie have such opposing evaluations of Ellis Wyatt?
7. Why does Jim seem so intensely opposed to Dagny's ordering from Rearden Steel?
8. Dagny's order is for the new Rearden Metal. Why does she evaluate it positively, and why does Jim evaluate it negatively?

### Chapter 2, "The Chain"

1. What does the bracelet mean to Rearden?
2. What is the significance of Lillian Rearden's first words, given her husband's profession?
3. Why is Rearden's mother upset that he missed supper that evening?
4. How does Lillian accept the gift of the bracelet from her husband?
5. Why does Rearden's mother criticize his gift of the bracelet to Lillian?
6. Why does Rearden give his brother the gift of money for the Friends of Global Progress?
7. How does Phillip accept the gift of money from his?
8. What is the disagreement between Paul Larkin and Hank about the importance (or not) of public opinion and Rearden's "Washington man" ?
9. Why is this chapter titled "The Chain" ?

\* \* \*

## *Quotations on Money*

“No one can earn a million dollars honestly.” (William Jennings Bryan)

“The rich are the scum of the earth in every country.” (G. K. Chesterton)

“Behind every great fortune there is a crime.” (Balzac)

“The love of money is the root of all evil.” (I Timothy 6:8-10)

“The lack of money is the root of all evil.” (Mark Twain)

“The universal regard for money is the one hopeful fact in our civilization, the one sound spot in our social conscience. Money is the most important thing in the world. It represents health, strength, honour, generosity, and beauty as conspicuously and undeniably as the want of it represents illness, weakness, disgrace, meanness and ugliness. Not the least of its virtues is that it destroys base people as certainly as it fortifies and dignifies noble people.” (George Bernard Shaw, *Major Barbara*)

“If a man runs after money, he’s money-mad, if he keeps it, he’s a capitalist; if he spends it, he’s a playboy; if he doesn't get it, he’s a ne'er-do-well; if he doesn't try to get it, he lacks ambition. If he gets it without working for it, he’s a parasite; and if he accumulates it after a lifetime of hard work, people call him a fool who never got anything out of life.” (Vic Oliver)

“A neighbor not long ago told me that her husband was one of eighteen nephews and nieces of a man who at his death had left a trust that gave each of them, when they turned twenty-one, an annual income of \$60,000 each. Apart from her husband, who went on to medical school, not one of these legatees finished college. The result of their uncle’s generous benefaction was to breed a set of drug addicts, full-time beach bums, ne'er-do-wells, and other human disasters.” (Joseph Epstein, “Money is Funny,” p. 311)

“It is a socialist idea that making profits is a vice; I consider the real vice is making losses.” (Winston Churchill)

“Economic efficiency consists in making things that are worth more than they cost.” (J. M. Clark)

Martin Luther: “There is on earth no greater enemy of man, after the Devil, than a gripe-money and usurer, for he wants to be God over all men ... . Usury is a great, huge monster, like a werewolf ... And since we break on the wheel and behead highwaymen, murderers, and housebreakers, how much more ought we to break on the wheel and kill ... hunt down, curse, and behead all usurers!”

“There is no money in poetry, but then there is no poetry in money, either.” (Robert Graves)

“Why doesn’t someone write a poem on money? Nobody does any-thing but abuse it. There’s hardly a good word for money to be found in literature. The poets and writers have been needy devils and thought to brave out their beggary by pretending to despise it.” (John Jay Chapman)

**B**ut please do not think that I am not fond of banks,  
Because I think they deserve our appreciation and thanks,  
Because they perform a valuable public service ie in eliminating  
the jackasses who go around saying that health and happiness are  
everything and money isn't essential,  
Because as soon as they have to borrow some unimportant money  
to maintain their health and happiness they starve to death so they  
can't go around any more sneering at good old money, which is  
nothing short of providential.

(Ogden Nash, "Bankers are just like anybody else, except richer")

\* \* \*

## *Why Chinese Mothers Are Superior*

By Amy Chua

Can a regimen of no playdates, no TV, no computer games and hours of music practice create happy kids?  
And what happens when they fight back?

*The Wall Street Journal*, January 8, 2011

A lot of people wonder how Chinese parents raise such stereotypically successful kids. They wonder what these parents do to produce so many math whizzes and music prodigies, what it's like inside the family, and whether they could do it too. Well, I can tell them, because I've done it. Here are some things my daughters, Sophia and Louisa, were never allowed to do:

- attend a sleepover
- have a playdate
- be in a school play
- complain about not being in a school play
- watch TV or play computer games
- choose their own extracurricular activities
- get any grade less than an A
- not be the No. 1 student in every subject except gym and drama
- play any instrument other than the piano or violin
- not play the piano or violin.

I'm using the term "Chinese mother" loosely. I know some Korean, Indian, Jamaican, Irish and Ghanaian parents who qualify too. Conversely, I know some mothers of Chinese heritage, almost always born in the West, who are not Chinese mothers, by choice or otherwise. I'm also using the term "Western parents" loosely. Western parents come in all varieties.

All the same, even when Western parents think they're being strict, they usually don't come close to being Chinese mothers. For example, my Western friends who consider themselves strict make their children practice their instruments 30 minutes every day. An hour at most. For a Chinese mother, the first hour is the easy part. It's hours two and three that get tough.

Despite our squeamishness about cultural stereotypes, there are tons of studies out there showing marked and quantifiable differences between Chinese and Westerners when it comes to parenting. In one study of 50 Western American mothers and 48 Chinese immigrant mothers, almost 70% of the Western mothers said either that "stressing academic success is not good for children" or that "parents need to foster the idea that learning is fun." By contrast, roughly 0% of the Chinese mothers felt the same way. Instead, the vast majority of the Chinese mothers said that they believe their children can be "the best" students, that "academic achievement reflects successful parenting," and that if children did not excel at school then there was "a problem" and parents "were not doing their job." Other studies indicate that compared to Western parents, Chinese parents spend approximately 10 times as long every day drilling academic activities with their children. By contrast, Western kids are more likely to participate in sports teams.

What Chinese parents understand is that nothing is fun until you're good at it. To get good at anything you have to work, and children on their own never want to work, which is why it is crucial to override their preferences. This often requires fortitude on the part of the parents because the child will resist; things are always hardest at the beginning, which is where Western parents tend to give up. But if done properly, the Chinese strategy produces a virtuous circle. Tenacious practice, practice, practice is crucial for excellence; rote repetition is underrated in America. Once a child starts to excel at something—whether it's math, piano, pitching or ballet—he or she gets praise, admiration and satisfaction. This builds

confidence and makes the once not-fun activity fun. This in turn makes it easier for the parent to get the child to work even more.

Chinese parents can get away with things that Western parents can't. Once when I was young—maybe more than once—when I was extremely disrespectful to my mother, my father angrily called me “garbage” in our native Hokkien dialect. It worked really well. I felt terrible and deeply ashamed of what I had done. But it didn't damage my self-esteem or anything like that. I knew exactly how highly he thought of me. I didn't actually think I was worthless or feel like a piece of garbage.

As an adult, I once did the same thing to Sophia, calling her garbage in English when she acted extremely disrespectfully toward me. When I mentioned that I had done this at a dinner party, I was immediately ostracized. One guest named Marcy got so upset she broke down in tears and had to leave early. My friend Susan, the host, tried to rehabilitate me with the remaining guests.

The fact is that Chinese parents can do things that would seem unimaginable—even legally actionable—to Westerners. Chinese mothers can say to their daughters, “Hey fatty—lose some weight.” By contrast, Western parents have to tiptoe around the issue, talking in terms of “health” and never ever mentioning the f-word, and their kids still end up in therapy for eating disorders and negative self-image. (I also once heard a Western father toast his adult daughter by calling her “beautiful and incredibly competent.” She later told me that made her feel like garbage.)

Chinese parents can order their kids to get straight As. Western parents can only ask their kids to try their best. Chinese parents can say, “You're lazy. All your classmates are getting ahead of you.” By contrast, Western parents have to struggle with their own conflicted feelings about achievement, and try to persuade themselves that they're not disappointed about how their kids turned out.

I've thought long and hard about how Chinese parents can get away with what they do. I think there are three big differences between the Chinese and Western parental mind-sets.

First, I've noticed that Western parents are extremely anxious about their children's self-esteem. They worry about how their children will feel if they fail at something, and they constantly try to reassure their children about how good they are notwithstanding a mediocre performance on a test or at a recital. In other words, Western parents are concerned about their children's psyches. Chinese parents aren't. They assume strength, not fragility, and as a result they behave very differently.

For example, if a child comes home with an A-minus on a test, a Western parent will most likely praise the child. The Chinese mother will gasp in horror and ask what went wrong. If the child comes home with a B on the test, some Western parents will still praise the child. Other Western parents will sit their child down and express disapproval, but they will be careful not to make their child feel inadequate or insecure, and they will not call their child “stupid,” “worthless” or “a disgrace.” Privately, the Western parents may worry that their child does not test well or have aptitude in the subject or that there is something wrong with the curriculum and possibly the whole school. If the child's grades do not improve, they may eventually schedule a meeting with the school principal to challenge the way the subject is being taught or to call into question the teacher's credentials.

If a Chinese child gets a B—which would never happen—there would first be a screaming, hair-tearing explosion. The devastated Chinese mother would then get dozens, maybe hundreds of practice tests and work through them with her child for as long as it takes to get the grade up to an A.

Chinese parents demand perfect grades because they believe that their child can get them. If their child doesn't get them, the Chinese parent assumes it's because the child didn't work hard enough. That's why the solution to substandard performance is always to excoriate, punish and shame the child. The Chinese parent believes that their child will be strong enough to take the shaming and to improve from it. (And when Chinese kids do excel, there is plenty of ego-inflating parental praise lavished in the privacy of the home.)

Second, Chinese parents believe that their kids owe them everything. The reason for this is a little unclear, but it's probably a combination of Confucian filial piety and the fact that the parents have sacrificed and done so much for their children. (And it's true that Chinese mothers get in the trenches, putting in long grueling hours personally tutoring, training, interrogating and spying on their kids.) Anyway, the understanding is that Chinese children must spend their lives repaying their parents by obeying them and making them proud.

By contrast, I don't think most Westerners have the same view of children being permanently indebted to their parents. My husband, Jed, actually has the opposite view. "Children don't choose their parents," he once said to me. "They don't even choose to be born. It's parents who foist life on their kids, so it's the parents' responsibility to provide for them. Kids don't owe their parents anything. Their duty will be to their own kids." This strikes me as a terrible deal for the Western parent.

Third, Chinese parents believe that they know what is best for their children and therefore override all of their children's own desires and preferences. That's why Chinese daughters can't have boyfriends in high school and why Chinese kids can't go to sleepaway camp. It's also why no Chinese kid would ever dare say to their mother, "I got a part in the school play! I'm Villager Number Six. I'll have to stay after school for rehearsal every day from 3:00 to 7:00, and I'll also need a ride on weekends." God help any Chinese kid who tried that one.

Don't get me wrong: It's not that Chinese parents don't care about their children. Just the opposite. They would give up anything for their children. It's just an entirely different parenting model.

Here's a story in favor of coercion, Chinese-style. Lulu was about 7, still playing two instruments, and working on a piano piece called "The Little White Donkey" by the French composer Jacques Ibert. The piece is really cute—you can just imagine a little donkey ambling along a country road with its master—but it's also incredibly difficult for young players because the two hands have to keep schizophrenically different rhythms.

Lulu couldn't do it. We worked on it nonstop for a week, drilling each of her hands separately, over and over. But whenever we tried putting the hands together, one always morphed into the other, and everything fell apart. Finally, the day before her lesson, Lulu announced in exasperation that she was giving up and stomped off.

"Get back to the piano now," I ordered.

"You can't make me."

"Oh yes, I can."

Back at the piano, Lulu made me pay. She punched, thrashed and kicked. She grabbed the music score and tore it to shreds. I taped the score back together and encased it in a plastic shield so that it could never be destroyed again. Then I hauled Lulu's dollhouse to the car and told her I'd donate it to the Salvation Army piece by piece if she didn't have "The Little White Donkey" perfect by the next day. When Lulu said, "I thought you were going to the Salvation Army, why are you still here?" I threatened her with no lunch, no dinner, no Christmas or Hanukkah presents, no birthday parties for two, three, four years. When she still kept playing it wrong, I told her she was purposely working herself into a frenzy because she was secretly afraid she couldn't do it. I told her to stop being lazy, cowardly, self-indulgent and pathetic.

Jed took me aside. He told me to stop insulting Lulu—which I wasn't even doing, I was just motivating her—and that he didn't think threatening Lulu was helpful. Also, he said, maybe Lulu really just couldn't do the technique—perhaps she didn't have the coordination yet—had I considered that possibility?

"You just don't believe in her," I accused.

"That's ridiculous," Jed said scornfully. "Of course I do."

"Sophia could play the piece when she was this age."

“But Lulu and Sophia are different people,” Jed pointed out.

“Oh no, not this,” I said, rolling my eyes. “Everyone is special in their special own way,” I mimicked sarcastically. “Even losers are special in their own special way. Well don’t worry, you don’t have to lift a finger. I’m willing to put in as long as it takes, and I’m happy to be the one hated. And you can be the one they adore because you make them pancakes and take them to Yankees games.”

I rolled up my sleeves and went back to Lulu. I used every weapon and tactic I could think of. We worked right through dinner into the night, and I wouldn’t let Lulu get up, not for water, not even to go to the bathroom. The house became a war zone, and I lost my voice yelling, but still there seemed to be only negative progress, and even I began to have doubts.

Then, out of the blue, Lulu did it. Her hands suddenly came together—her right and left hands each doing their own imperturbable thing—just like that.

Lulu realized it the same time I did. I held my breath. She tried it tentatively again. Then she played it more confidently and faster, and still the rhythm held. A moment later, she was beaming.

“Mommy, look—it’s easy!” After that, she wanted to play the piece over and over and wouldn’t leave the piano. That night, she came to sleep in my bed, and we snuggled and hugged, cracking each other up. When she performed “The Little White Donkey” at a recital a few weeks later, parents came up to me and said, “What a perfect piece for Lulu—it’s so spunky and so her.”

Even Jed gave me credit for that one. Western parents worry a lot about their children’s self-esteem. But as a parent, one of the worst things you can do for your child’s self-esteem is to let them give up. On the flip side, there’s nothing better for building confidence than learning you can do something you thought you couldn’t.

There are all these new books out there portraying Asian mothers as scheming, callous, overdriven people indifferent to their kids’ true interests. For their part, many Chinese secretly believe that they care more about their children and are willing to sacrifice much more for them than Westerners, who seem perfectly content to let their children turn out badly. I think it’s a misunderstanding on both sides. All decent parents want to do what’s best for their children. The Chinese just have a totally different idea of how to do that.

Western parents try to respect their children’s individuality, encouraging them to pursue their true passions, supporting their choices, and providing positive reinforcement and a nurturing environment. By contrast, the Chinese believe that the best way to protect their children is by preparing them for the future, letting them see what they’re capable of, and arming them with skills, work habits and inner confidence that no one can ever take away.

\* \* \*

Amy Chua is a professor at Yale Law School and author of “Day of Empire” and “World on Fire: How Exporting Free Market Democracy Breeds Ethnic Hatred and Global Instability.” This essay is excerpted from “Battle Hymn of the Tiger Mother” by Amy Chua, Penguin Press, 2011.

\* \* \*



## *Sulzer & Kant on Obedience in Education in 1700s Germany*

In Britain and America in the 1700s, the most influential philosopher of education was John Locke, with his [\*Some Thoughts Concerning Education\*](#). In France, it was Jean-Jacques Rousseau with his *Emile*.

But in the German states, it was [Johann Georg Sulzer](#), with his 1748 *An Essay on the Education and Instruction of Children*. Sulzer's fundamental thesis:

“Obedience is so important that all education is actually nothing other than learning how to obey.”

“It is not very easy, however, to implant obedience in children. It is quite natural for the child's soul to want to have a will of its own, and things that are not done correctly in the first two years will be difficult to rectify thereafter. One of the advantages of these early years is that then force and compulsion can be used. Over the years, children forget everything that happened to them in early childhood. If their wills can be broken at this time, they will never remember afterwards that they had a will, and for this very reason the severity that is required will not have any serious consequences.” [1]

From Immanuel Kant's lectures on education, first delivered in 1776/77:

“Above all things, obedience is an essential feature in the character of a child, especially of a school boy or girl.” [2]

\* \* \*

### Sources:

[1] Johann Georg Sulzer, *Versuch von der Erziehung und Unterweisung der Kinder (An Essay on the Education and Instruction of Children)*, 1748. Quoted in Alice Miller, [\*For Your Own Good\*](#).

[2] Immanuel Kant, *On Education*. Translated by Annette Churton. University of Michigan Press, 1960. In Ozmon and Craver's *Philosophical Foundations of Education*, 7th ed.

\* \* \*

## *SOME THOUGHTS CONCERNING EDUCATION*

John Locke

§ 1. A sound mind in a sound body, is a short, but full description of a happy state in this world; he that has these two, has little more to wish for; and he that wants either of them, will be but little the better for any thing else. Men's happiness, or misery, is most part of their own making. He whose mind directs not wisely, will never take the right way; and he whose body is crazy and feeble, will never be able to advance in it. I confess, there are some men's constitutions of body and mind so vigorous, and well framed by nature, that they need not much assistance from others; but, by the strength of their natural genius, they are, from their cradles, carried towards what is excellent; and, by the privilege of their happy constitutions, are able to do wonders. But examples of this kind are but few; and I think I may say, that, of all the men we meet with, nine parts of ten are what they are, good or evil, useful or not, by their education. It is that which makes the great difference in mankind. The little, or almost insensible, impressions on our tender infancies, have very important and lasting consequences; and there it is, as in the fountains of some rivers, where a gentle application of the hand turns the flexible waters into channels, that make them take quite contrary courses; and by this little direction, given them at first, in the source, they receive different tendencies, and arrive at last at very remote and distant places.

§ 2. I imagine the minds of children, as easily turned, this or that way, as water itself; and though this be the principal part, and our main care should be about the inside, yet the clay cottage is not to be neglected. I shall therefore begin with the case, and consider first the health. of the body, as that which perhaps you may rather expect, from that study I have been thought more peculiarly to have applied myself to; and that also which will be soonest despatched, as lying, if I guess not amiss, in a very little compass.

§ 3. How necessary health is to our business and happiness; and how requisite a strong constitution, able to endure hardships and fatigue, is, to one that will make any figure in the world; is too obvious to need any proof.

§ 43. This being laid down in general, as the course ought to be taken, it is fit we come now to consider the parts of the discipline to be used a little more particularly. I have spoken so much of carrying a strict hand over children, that perhaps I shall be suspected of not considering enough what is due to their tender age and constitutions. But that opinion will vanish, when you have heard me a little farther. For I am very apt to think, that great severity of punishment does but very little good; nay, great harm in education: and I believe it will be found, that, *cæteris paribus*, those children who have been most chastised, seldom make the best men. All that I have hitherto contended for, is, that whatsoever rigour is necessary, it is more to be used, the younger children are; and, having by a due application wrought its effect, it is to be relaxed, and changed into a milder sort of government.

§ 67. Manners, as they call it, about which children are so often perplexed, and have so many goodly exhortations made them, by their wise maids and governesses, I think, are rather to be learned by example than rules; and then children, if kept out of ill company, will take a pride to behave themselves prettily, after the fashion of others, perceiving themselves esteemed and commended for it. But, if by a little negligence in this part, the boy should not put off his hat, nor make legs very gracefully, a dancing-master will cure that defect, and wipe off all that plainness of

nature, which the à-la-mode people call clownishness. And since nothing appears to me to give children so much becoming confidence and behaviour, and so to raise them to the conversation of those above their age, as dancing; I think they should be taught to dance, as soon as they are capable of learning it. For, though this consist only in outward gracefulness of motion, yet, I know not how, it gives children manly thoughts and carriage, more than any thing. But otherwise I would not have little children much tormented about punctilios, or niceties of breeding.

Never trouble yourself about those faults in them, which you know age will cure.

§ 135. I place virtue as the first and most necessary of those endowments that belong to a man or a gentleman, as absolutely requisite to make him valued and beloved by others, acceptable or tolerable to himself. Without that, I think, he will be happy neither in this, nor the other world.

§ 148. When he can talk, it is time he should begin to learn to read. But as to this, give me leave here to inculcate again what is very apt to be forgotten, viz. that great care is to be taken, that it be never made as a business to him, nor he look on it as a task. We naturally, as I said, even from our cradles, love liberty, and have therefore an aversion to many things, for no other reason, but because they are enjoined us. I have always had a fancy, that learning might be made a play and recreation to children; and that they might be brought to desire to be taught, if it were proposed to them as a thing of honour, credit, delight, and recreation, or as a reward for doing something else, and if they were never chid or corrected for the neglect of it.

§ 149. Thus children may be cozened into a knowledge of the letters; be taught to read, without perceiving it to be any thing but a sport, and play themselves into that which others are whipped for. Children should not have any thing like work, or serious, laid on them; neither their minds nor bodies will bear it. It injures their healths; and their being forced and tied down to their books, in an age at enmity with all such restraint, has, I doubt not, been the reason why a great many have hated books and learning all their lives after: it is like a surfeit, that leaves an aversion behind, not to be removed.

§ 157. The Lord's prayer, the creed, and ten commandments, it is necessary he should learn perfectly by heart; but, I think, not by reading them himself in his primer, but by somebody's repeating them to him, even before he can read. But learning by heart, and learning to read, should not, I think, be mixed, and so one made to clog the other. But his learning to read should be made as little trouble or business to him as might be.

§ 160. When he can read English well, it will be seasonable to enter him in writing. And here the first thing should be taught him, is to hold his pen right; and this he should be perfect in, before he should be suffered to put it to paper: for not only children, but any body else, that would do any thing well, should never be put upon too much of it at once, or be set to perfect themselves in two parts of an action at the same time, if they can possibly be separated.

§ 162. As soon as he can speak English, it is time for him to learn some other language: this nobody doubts of, when French is proposed. And the reason is, because people are accustomed to the right way of teaching that language, which is by talking it into children in constant conversation, and not by grammatical rules. The Latin tongue would easily be taught the same way, if his tutor, being constantly with him, would talk nothing else to him, and make him answer still in the same language. But because French is a living language, and to be used more in speaking, that should be first learned, that the yet pliant organs of speech might be accustomed to a due formation of those sounds, and he get the habit of pronouncing French well, which is the harder to be done, the longer it is delayed.

§ 178. At the same time that he is learning French and Latin, a child, as has been said, may also be entered in arithmetic, geography, chronology, history, and geometry too. For if these be taught him in French or Latin, when he begins once to understand either of these tongues, he will get a knowledge in these sciences, and the language to-boot.

Geography, I think, should be begun with; for the learning of the figure of the globe, the situation and boundaries of the four parts of the world, and that of particular kingdoms and countries, being only an exercise of the eyes and memory, a child with pleasure will learn and retain them: and this is so certain, that I now live in the house with a child, whom his mother has so well instructed this way in geography, that he knew the limits of the four parts of the world, could readily point, being asked, to any country upon the globe, or any county in the map of England; knew all the great rivers, promontories, straits, and bays in the world, and could find the longitude and latitude of any place before he was six years old. These things, that he will thus learn by sight, and have by rote in his memory, are not all, I confess, that he is to learn upon the globes. But yet it is a good step and preparation to it, and will make the remainder much easier, when his judgment is grown ripe enough for it: besides that, it gets so much time now, and by the pleasure of knowing things, leads him on insensibly to the gaining of languages.

§ 179. When he has the natural parts of the globe well fixed in his memory, it may then be time to begin arithmetic. By the natural parts of the globe, I mean several positions of the parts of the earth and sea, under different names and distinctions of countries; not coming yet to those artificial and imaginary lines, which have been invented, and are only supposed, for the better improvement of that science.

§ 180. Arithmetic is the easiest, and consequently the first sort of abstract reasoning, which the mind commonly bears, or accustoms itself to: and is of so general use in all parts of life and business, that scarce any thing is to be done without it. This is certain, a man cannot have too much of it, nor too perfectly;

§ 184. As nothing teaches, so nothing delights, more than history. ...

§ 194. Though the systems of physics, that I have met with, afford little encouragement to look for certainty, or science, in any treatise, which shall pretend to give us a body of natural philosophy from the first principles of bodies in general; yet the incomparable Mr. Newton has shown, how far mathematics, applied to some parts of nature, may, upon principles that matter of fact justify, carry us in the knowledge of some, as I may so call them, particular provinces of the incomprehensible universe. And if others could give us so good and clear an account of other parts of nature, as he has of this our planetary world, and the most considerable phænomena observable in it, in his admirable book "*Philosophiæ naturalis principia mathematica*," we might in time hope to be furnished with more true and certain knowledge in several parts of this stupendous machine, than hitherto we could have expected. And though there are very few that have mathematics enough to understand his demonstrations; yet the most accurate mathematicians, who have examined them, allowing them to be such, his book will deserve to be read, and give no small light and pleasure to those, who, willing to understand the motions, properties, and operations of the great masses of matter in this our solar system, will but carefully mind his conclusions, which may be depended on as propositions well proved.

§ 216. Though I am now come to a conclusion of what obvious remarks have suggested to me concerning education, I would not have it thought, that I look on it as a just treatise on this subject. There are a thousand other things that may need consideration; especially if one should take in the various tempers, different inclinations, and particular defaults, that are to be found in

children; and prescribe proper remedies. The variety is so great, that it would require a volume; nor would that reach it. Each man's mind has some peculiarity, as well as his face, that distinguishes him from all others; and there are possibly scarce two children, who can be conducted by exactly the same method. Besides that, I think a prince, a nobleman, and an ordinary gentleman's son, should have different ways of breeding. But having had here only some general views in reference to the main end and aims in education, and those designed for a gentleman's son, who being then very little, I considered only as white paper, or wax, to be moulded and fashioned as one pleases; I have touched little more than those heads, which I judged necessary for the breeding of a young gentleman of his condition in general; and have now published these my occasional thoughts, with this hope, that, though this be far from being a complete treatise on this subject, or such as that every one may find what will just fit his child in it; yet it may give some small light to those, whose concern for their dear little ones makes them so irregularly bold, that they dare venture to consult their own reason, in the education of their children, rather than wholly to rely upon old custom.

\* \* \*

**Source:** *Some Thoughts Concerning Education* [1690]. <http://oll.libertyfund.org/>

\* \* \*

## *Montessori Education*

By Marsha Enright

*Formerly a psychotherapist, Marsha Familaro Enright co-founded in 1990 the Council Oak Montessori School, of which she is the president and administrator. She is currently the president of the Reason, Individualism, Freedom Institute, and leads development of the College of the United States.*

The education of the human child is of profound importance to anyone dedicated to achieving “the best within us,” but especially to those who have, or wish to have, children of their own, and to those who are or wish to become teachers. What are the child’s nature and needs? How are they different from those of an adult? How can we best foster the child’s development so as to help him maximize his potential for productivity and happiness in life? Current research validates Montessori’s ideas. We believe that, on the whole, the philosophy of the child developed by Italian physician and teacher Maria Montessori (pictured at left), is most consistent with the Objectivist view of human nature, needs, and values.

### **Maria Montessori**

Maria Montessori, the first woman to graduate from the University of Rome Medical School, became a doctor in 1896. Her first post was in the university’s Psychiatric Clinic.

In that age, retarded children were considered a medical problem, rather than an educational one, and were often kept in hospitals for the insane. Montessori’s visits with children in Roman insane asylums prompted her to study the works of Jean-Marc-Gaspard Itard (1775-1838) and Edouard Seguin (1812-1880), two French-born pioneers in education for the mentally deficient. She went on to read all the major works on educational theory of the previous two centuries.

In 1899, Montessori became director of the State Orthophrenic School, where her work with the retarded was so successful that the majority of her students were able to pass the state education exams. While other people exclaimed over this phenomenal success, Montessori pondered its implication for normal children. If the mentally deficient could do as well on the exams as normal children, in what poor state must those normal children be! This reflection led her to devote her life to education.

Montessori opened her first Casa dei Bambini (Children’s House) in 1907, applying to children of normal intelligence the methods and materials she had developed for deficient children. She also spent a great deal of time observing and meditating on what children did with her materials—what brought out their best learning and their greatest enthusiasm.

Montessori’s work with the retarded was so successful that the majority of her students were able to pass the state education exams.

As a result of Montessori’s achievements at the Casa dei Bambini, her method spread rapidly. By 1915, over 100 Montessori schools had opened in America, and many more had opened in the rest of the world. In Switzerland, one of the most important 20th-century theorists in child development—Jean Piaget (1896-1980)—was heavily influenced by Montessori and her method. Piaget was director of the modified Montessori school in Geneva, where he did some of the observations for his first book, *Language and Thought of the Child*, and served as head of the Swiss Montessori society.

Maria Montessori, *Her Life and Work*, by E.M. Standing, is an interesting historical account told from the viewpoint of a devoted follower. A more recent and objective biography is Rita Kramer’s *Maria Montessori*.

### **The Montessori Method**

Maria Montessori’s own works constitute the best source of information concerning her theories and methods. *The Montessori Method*, the first overview of her educational techniques, remains the best in many respects. *Dr. Montessori’s Own Handbook* goes into the details of her philosophy, materials, and methods. *The Discovery of the Child* is a later detailed summarization of Montessori’s philosophy and method of

teaching, with much discussion of the child's nature and the best means of approaching the child with work. *The Secret of Childhood* is a history of what—and how—Montessori learned about the unique nature of children, the problems that can arise when the child's nature is not properly nurtured, and the repercussions that proper and improper nurturing of the child have on society. This work is especially recommended for parents.

“A child's work is to create the person she will become.” Maria Montessori

According to Maria Montessori, “A child's work is to create the person she will become.” To carry out this self-construction, children have innate mental powers, but they must be free to use these powers. For this reason, a Montessori classroom provides freedom while maintaining an environment that encourages a sense of order and self-discipline. “Freedom in a structured environment” is the Montessori dictum that names this arrangement.

Like all thinkers in the Aristotelian tradition, Montessori recognized that the senses must be educated first in the development of the intellect. Consequently, she created a vast array of special learning materials from which concepts could be abstracted and through which they could be concretized. In recognition of the independent nature of the developing intellect, these materials are self-correcting—that is, from their use, the child discovers for himself whether he has the right answer. This feature of her materials encourages the child to be concerned with facts and truth, rather than with what adults say is right or wrong.

Also basic to Montessori's philosophy is her belief in the “sensitive periods” of a child's development: periods when the child seeks certain stimuli with immense intensity, and, consequently, can most easily master a particular learning skill. The teacher's role is to recognize the sensitive periods in individual children and put the children in touch with the appropriate materials.

Montessori also identified stages of growth—which she called “Planes of Development” —that occur in approximately six-year intervals and that are further subdivided into two three-year segments. These planes of development are the basis for the three-year age groupings found in Montessori schools: ages 3 to 6, 6 to 9, 9 to 12, and 12 to 18.

From birth to age six, children are sensorial explorers, studying every aspect of their environment, language, and culture. Montessori's *The Absorbent Mind* provides a detailed discussion of how the child's mind and needs develop during this period.

From age six to twelve, children become reasoning explorers. They develop new powers of abstraction and imagination, using and applying their knowledge to further discover and expand their world. During this time, it is still essential that the child carry out activities in order to integrate acting and thinking. It is his own effort that gives him independence, and his own experience that brings him answers as to how and why things function as they do. Montessori's *The Montessori Elementary Materials* discusses the materials and curriculum to be used for children during this period.

*From Childhood to Adolescence*, also by Montessori, outlines the changes children undergo in mentality and outlook as they grow from childhood to adolescence, and the nature and needs of the adolescent child. She also proposes a radical concept of schooling for the adolescent.

Valuable secondary works on the Montessori method include Elizabeth Hainstock's *Teaching Montessori in the Home: The Preschool Years*, and *Teaching Montessori in the Home: The School Years*. Both give an abbreviated view of the philosophy and the method, as well as detailed instructions on how to make and use the materials. Paula Lilliard's 1972 work, *Montessori: A Modern Approach*, reviews the history and nature of the Montessori philosophy, discussing how “current” it is in addressing modern educational concerns and what it has to offer the contemporary family.

“[W]e must respect religiously, reverently, these first indications of individuality.” -Montessori

Throughout her writing, Montessori combines keen observations and insights with a heroic view of the importance of the child's work in self-development—work by which each man creates the best within

him. Many writers and critics dislike Montessori's romantic rhetoric, and admittedly her phraseology tends to the mystical. Nevertheless, we find her language refreshing and inspiring. As the following sentence illustrates, she always keeps in mind the glory and grandeur of human development:

“Humanity shows itself in all its intellectual splendor during this tender age as the sun shows itself at the dawn, and the flower in the first unfolding of the petals; and we must respect religiously, reverently, these first indications of individuality.”

The Montessori method always places its principles and activities in the broad context of the importance of human life and development, intelligence and free will. Indeed, one of the cornerstones of the Montessori method is the presentation of knowledge as an integrated whole, emphasizing conceptual relationships between different branches of learning, and the placement of knowledge in its historical context.

### **Dewey versus Montessori**

In American academic circles, Montessori is little known, except as a name from the past, and textbooks on educational theory therefore tend to discuss her method only in an historical context. Much of this learned ignorance can be traced to *The Montessori System Examined*, a small but highly influential book published in 1914 by Professor William Heard Kilpatrick. In his time, Kilpatrick was one of the most popular professors at Columbia University's Teachers College, an institution with far-ranging influence among educational theorists and one of the main redoubts for John Dewey's Progressive method of education.

Dewey and Montessori approached education from philosophically and psychologically different perspectives. Dewey's concern was with fostering the imagination and the development of social relationships. He believed in developing the intellect late in childhood, for fear that it might stifle other aspects of development. By contrast, Montessori believed that development of the intellect was the only means by which the imagination and proper social relationships could arise. Her method focused on the early stimulation and sharpening of the senses, the development of independence in motor tasks and the care of the self, and the child's naturally high motivation to learn about the world as a means of gaining mastery over himself and his environment.

Thus, behind Kilpatrick's criticism of Montessori's educational method lay a great deal of antagonism towards Montessori's philosophy and psychology. Kilpatrick dismissed Montessori's sensorial materials because they were based on what he considered to be an outdated theory of the faculties of the mind (Dewey was greatly influenced by early Behaviorism) and a too-early development of the intellect. Kilpatrick also criticized Montessori's materials as too restrictive: because they have a definite outcome, he felt, they restrict the child's imagination. Following Dewey's collectivist view of man, and his central focus on the social development of the child, Kilpatrick also disliked Montessori's decidedly individualistic view of the child.

### **Montessori Today**

In the United States, the views of Dewey and Kilpatrick prevailed, and the name of Montessori was largely forgotten for several decades. Fortunately for recent generations of American children, a dissatisfied American mother, Nancy Rambusch, rediscovered Montessori in Europe during the 1950s. Rambusch began the “second-wave” Montessori schools in the United States, lectured widely on the Montessori method, and helped found the American Montessori Society. Over the past forty years, grass-roots interest has spurred a phenomenal growth of Montessori schools in America, but the movement is not generally recognized or promoted in university education departments.

\* \* \*

**Source:** <http://atlassociety.org/commentary/commentary-blog/3633-foundations-study-guide-montessori-education>



## *Some Quotations on Education*

Maria Montessori

### **Education should fit the child, not vice versa:**

“The adult has not understood the child or the adolescent, and is therefore in continual strife with him. The remedy is not that the adult should learn something intellectually, or complete a deficient culture. He must find a different starting point ... In their dealings with children adults ... look upon the child as something empty that is to be filled through their own efforts, as something inert and helpless for which they must do everything, as something lacking an inner guide and in constant need of direction. ... But if a child has within himself the key to his own personality ... these must be delicate powers indeed, and an adult by his untimely interventions can prevent their secret realization ... .” (1936)

### **Cognition and movement are integrated:**

“One of the greatest mistakes of our day is to think of movement by itself, as something apart from the higher functions. ... Mental development must be connected with movement and be dependent on it. It is vital that educational theory and practice should become informed by this idea. ... Watching a child makes it obvious that the development of the mind comes about through his movements. ... Mind and movements are parts of the same entity.” (1967, 141-2)

### **Choice:**

“These children have free choice all day long. Life is based on choice, so they learn to make their own decisions. They must decide and choose for themselves all the time. ... They cannot learn through obedience to the commands of another.” (1989, 26)

### **Intrinsic motivation, not extrinsic:**

“The prize and the punishment are incentives towards unnatural and forced effort, and therefore we certainly cannot speak of the natural development of the child in connection with them.” (1912/1964, 21)

“The secret of success is found to lie in the right use of imagination in awakening interest, and the stimulation of seeds already sown.” (1948/1967, 1-2)

### **Spontaneous self-development:**

“By leaving the children in our schools at liberty we have been with great clearness to follow them in their natural method of spontaneous self-development.” (1912/1964, 357)

“All we have to do is set the energy free. ... When we speak of freedom in education we mean freedom for the creative energy which is the urge of life towards the development of the individual. This is not the casual energy like the energy of a bomb that explodes. It has a guiding principle, a very fine, but unconscious directive, the aim of which is to develop a normal person. When we speak of free children we are thinking of this energy which must be free in order to construct these children well.” (1989, 12)

### **Meaningful-to-student context:**

“Education, as today conceived, is something separated both from biological and social life. All who enter the educational world tend to be cut off from society. ... People are prepared for life by exclusion from it.” (1967, 10-11)

### **Social voluntarism and win-win:**

“Our schools show that children of different ages help one another. The younger ones see what the older ones are doing and ask for explanations. These are readily given, and the instruction is really valuable. ... The older ones are happy to be able to teach what they know. People sometimes fear that if a child of five gives lessons, this will hold him back from his own progress. But, in the first place, he does not teach all the time and his freedom is respected. Second, teaching helps him to understand what he knows even better than before. He has to analyze and rearrange his little store of knowledge before he can pass it on. ... [So] everyone achieves a healthy normality through the mutual exchange.” (1967, 226-8)

Schools can make a “contribution to the cause of goodness by removing obstacles” (1965, 189).

### **The teacher as provider of structure, guide, and “policeman” :**

“Freedom in a structured environment.” (1965)

“The children in our schools are free, but that does not mean there is no organization. Organization, in fact, is necessary ... if the children are to be free to work.” (1967, 244)

“It is true that the child develops in his environment through activity itself, but he needs material means, guidance and an indispensable understanding. It is the adult who provides these necessities. ... If [the adult] does less than is necessary, the child cannot act meaningfully, and if he does more than is necessary, he imposes himself on the child, extinguishing creative impulses.” (1956, 154)

“Do not apply the rule of non-interference when the children are still the prey of all their different naughtinesses. Don’t let them climb on the windows, the furniture, etc. You must interfere at this stage. At this stage the teacher must be a policeman. The policeman has to defend the honest citizens against the disturbers.” (1989, 16)

### **Scientific method applied to education:**

“Scientific pedagogy” (1912)

### **Bibliography:**

- 1912. *The Montessori Method* (Schocken).
- 1948. *To Educate the Human Potential* (Kalakshetra).
- 1956. *The Child in the Family* (Avon).
- 1965. *Dr. Montessori’s Own Handbook* (Schocken).
- 1936. *The Secret of Childhood*.
- 1967. *The Absorbent Mind* (Henry Holt).
- 1989. *The Child, Society, and the World: Unpublished Speeches and Writings*, v. 7 (Ohio).

\* \* \*

**Source:** These quotations are from Stephen Hicks’s video lecture on *Objectivism and Montessori*, Part 12 of his Philosophy of Education course. Available at <http://www.stephenhicks.org/publications/philosophy-of-education/> and Youtube (<http://www.youtube.com/user/EducationPhilosophy>).

\* \* \*