



FACTS & OPINIONS

On Public Interest Issues

Quotes

The ideal tyranny is that which is ignorantly self-administered by its victims.

– James Dresden

A Constitution of government is addressed to the common sense of the people; and never was designed for trials of logical skill, or visionary speculation.

– Joseph Story, former U.S. Chief Justice

We are so constituted that we believe the most incredible things, and, once engraved upon the memory, woe to him who would endeavor to erase them.

– Goethe

Milton Friedman

Mark Alexander

In the near-half century of the Cold War, the fields of battle took many forms. There were the diplomatic battlefields, such as Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev's shoe-pounding "we will bury you" tirade before the United Nations and U.S. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson's brilliant demonstration of the existence of Soviet missiles in Cuba before that same body. There were the cultural battlefields, where the likes of Jane Fonda and John Kerry demonstrated their contempt for the cause of freedom, even going so far as to meet with Communist North Vietnamese officials in wartime, in Hanoi and Paris, respectively. There were also the "hot" battlefields of the Cold War — from Korea to Central Africa and Vietnam to Central America, to name a few.

Then there was the battlefield of ideas. Here, Milton Friedman stood as a giant among men, defending the cause of liberty against the totalitarian ideologies of Marxism,

Communism, and Socialism.

Milton Friedman, American patriot, "Chicago School" economist, Nobel Laureate, and advisor to presidents, died on 16 November, 2006, at the age of 94. He is survived by his wife, fellow economist and frequent co-author Rose, and their son David, also a Chicago School economist. With Dr. Friedman's passing, the free world loses one of its greatest-ever intellectual warriors.

Friedman is, of course, best known for his articulation of and apologia for free-market economics — a system he considered a fundamental necessity of man's existence as a free, self-determinative individual. No lightweight in his field, these ideas won Friedman the Nobel Prize for Economics in 1976. Working in the shadow of Roosevelt's New Deal and Johnson's Great Society, at a time when the country was wrestling with its soul, Friedman's reinvigoration of free-market

continued on page 4

FACTS & OPINIONS

February 2007
Volume 13, Number 1

President
Dr. Don Racheter

FACTS & OPINIONS is one of our quarterly membership newsletters, arriving in February, May, August, and November. It consists of short articles of public interest with an emphasis on current issues.

FACTS & OPINIONS is published by Public Interest Institute at Iowa Wesleyan College, a nonpartisan, nonprofit, research and educational institute, whose activities are supported by contributions from private individuals, corporations, companies, and foundations. The Institute does **not** accept government grants.

Contributions are tax-deductible under sections 501(c)(3) and 170 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Permission to reprint or copy in whole or part is granted, provided a version of this credit line is used: "Reprinted by permission from FACTS & OPINIONS, a quarterly newsletter of Public Interest Institute." The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of Public Interest Institute.

If you have an article you believe is worth sharing, please send it to us. All or a portion of your article may be used. The articles in this publication are brought to you in the interest of a better-informed citizenry, because IDEAS DO MATTER.

We invite you to:
CALL us at 319-385-3462
FAX to 319-385-3799
E-MAIL to public.interest.institute@limitedgovernment.org
VISIT our Website at www.limitedgovernment.org
WRITE us at our address on page 8

Copyright 2007 PII

Focus on Iowa Wesleyan College

Iowa Wesleyan College continues to prosper. Since 2003 enrollment has increased nearly 30 percent. Over the last 18 months the college has dedicated \$10 million to campus rejuvenation and development, faculty and staff remuneration, and technology enhancement.

IWC is also proud to announce the addition of several accomplished new members to its faculty. These include Teresa Finken, Shawna Hudson, and Preston VanLoon (Education); M. Arif Ghayur and William Bland (Criminal Justice and Sociology); Rev. Jason Gutzmer (Campus Minister) and Tong Yi (Computer Science and Mathematics).

In October, IWC hosted "Many Cultures One People," a Cultural Arts Festival, headlined by the prominent Rwandan singer and dancer, Jean Paul Samputu. That same month, in an event sponsored by the Friends of Harlan-Lincoln, the campus was greeted by author C.J. King, who discussed her book *Four Marys and a Jessie*, which probes the lives of Mary Todd-Lincoln and her progeny.

Finally, the Tigers will have a new Athletic Trainer roaming the sidelines of sporting events; Nancy Stevens — the 17 year veteran trainer — has stepped down. Stevens will be replaced by Stacey Rife, a graduate of Truman State University, Kirksville, MO. Stevens will continue to teach in the Physical Education Department.

What's New at Public Interest Institute?

On November 30, Research Analysts John Hendrickson and Jon Miltimore and Senior Research Analyst Amy Frantz attended the 2006 Southeast Iowa Legislative Affairs Luncheon sponsored by the Mount Pleasant Area Chamber of Commerce. Several local Legislators, public officials, and area business leaders attended the session and topics of discussion included tax and regulatory climates, healthcare, and workforce development.

From November 28-December 2, Institute President Don Racheter (Phd.) was in Washington D.C. for conferences hosted by the State Policy Network and the Institute for Policy Innovation. Numerous state-based think tanks and national public policy organizations sent representatives to exchange ideas and discuss various public policy issues. Events included visits to the Heritage Foundation, Americans for Tax Reform, and the White House. Featured events included an address from former U.S. Attorney General Ed Meese and a roundtable discussion with members of the media.

**If you would like information on Iowa Wesleyan College, write or call: Iowa Wesleyan College
601 North Main
Mt. Pleasant, IA 52641
(319) 385-8021
www.iwc.edu**

A Crisis in Civic Education

John Hendrickson

The Public Interest Institute has the objective of creating a better informed citizenry through civic education. One might think that our nation's colleges and universities would have the same objective, but a recent study commissioned by the Intercollegiate Studies Institute (ISI) found the opposite to be true. The results of the survey show that college graduates do not have an adequate understanding of American history or civics. The crisis in historical and civic ignorance is a dangerous factor that needs to be addressed not only in the classroom but also at the dinner table.

The University of Connecticut's Department of Public Policy, who conducted the study, "asked more than 14,000 randomly selected college freshman and seniors at 50 colleges and universities across the country 60 multiple choice questions" in the areas of American history and government, foreign affairs, and economics.¹ The findings show that college "seniors scored just 1.5 percent higher on average than freshmen, and at many schools, seniors know less than freshmen about America's history, government, foreign affairs, and economy."²

"Overall, college seniors failed the civic literacy exam, with

an average score of 53.2 percent, or F, on a traditional grading scale." The average scores of seniors in the four areas tested by the literacy exam are quite disturbing:

- American History-58.5%
- Government-51.4 %
- America and the World-51.5,
- Market Economy-50.5 %³

College freshman did not do much better when asked questions which every American should know. For example, only 47.9 % recognized that the line "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal" is a direct quotation from the Declaration of Independence, 49.4 % did not know that the *Federalist Papers* were written in support of the ratification of the Constitution, and 75% did not understand the Monroe Doctrine.⁴

The study also showed that Ivy League schools such as Yale did worse than the private schools such as Grove City College, which ranked fourth in the results. Yale ranked forty-fourth and John Hopkins University came in dead last at fiftieth. Rhodes College and Colorado State University came in as the top two in the survey.

The study also found that schools that required courses "related to America's history and institutions outperformed those schools where fewer courses were completed."⁵ Many schools do not require students to take a course on American history or government and these students, unfortunately, often graduate with no basic understanding of these subjects.

"How does one sever a

"Overall, college seniors failed the civic literacy exam, with an average score of 53.2 percent, or F, on a traditional grading scale."

people's roots? Answer: Destroy its memory. Deny a people the knowledge of who they are and where they come from," wrote Patrick Buchanan.⁶ Dr. Matthew Spalding, Director of the B. Kenneth Simon Center for American Studies at the Heritage Foundation, observed, "President Bush wants regime change in Iraq, but — considering how ignorant many Americans are of their history — the harder job may be regime maintenance here at home."⁷

The now famous saying "ideas have consequences" is quite true, and we can add that ignorance has consequences. As a nation we should be an example to the rest of the world, a shining city on a hill, a beacon of liberty. The only way we can effectively do this is to have a citizenry that understands the fundamentals of liberty and the basic historical and civic knowledge that corresponds. As the study concludes, we are facing "nothing less than a coming crisis in American citizenship."⁸ Not only are we battling ignorance and an apathetic society, but ideologies that seek to tear down the principles created by the American Founding.

Education still suffers from the
continued on page 6

To continue our publications, Public Interest Institute relies on the support of individuals and organizations who care about the future of our country and its ability to meet the challenges of the 21st century. Please use the enclosed postage-paid card to help us continue our work.

Milton Friedman

Mark Alexander

continued from page 1

ideas was a godsend.

At a time when that half of the world which subsisted behind the Iron Curtain longed to be free, America itself seemed content to follow what fellow economist Friedrich von Hayek called “The Road to Serfdom.”

America’s apparent willingness to become a modern welfare state on the model of her European counterparts, complete with endless entitlements and soft socialism, was just that — slavery to the state.

Rather, as the title of one of Friedman’s classic works states, Americans must be “Free to Choose,” for “Capitalism and Freedom” are inextricably bound. “Many people want the government to protect the consumer,” Friedman said. “A much more urgent problem is to protect the consumer from the government.”

Speaking of the need for free markets for freedom, Friedman argued that “the tide of ideas isn’t local. It’s international; it’s worldwide.” Indeed, his influence has been felt worldwide. Friedman’s “Chicago Boys” provided economic leadership in countries around the globe: Thatcher’s Great Britain, Chile, the Czech Republic, Portugal,

South Korea, and Spain, to name a few. By enacting Friedman’s free-market ideas — hammering inflation, reducing trade barriers, inducing foreign investment, and cutting public spending — these economies went from dormancy to dynamism within a matter of years.

Let’s not forget, of course, Friedman’s prescient advocacy for then-unheard-of ideas like the flat tax, market deregulation, and school choice. Then there’s the “Friedman Test,” a statistical masterpiece that still reverberates in the world of economic theory. According to Martin Anderson, chief domestic-policy advisor to Ronald Reagan, Friedman’s footprint on the history of ideas is sizeable. “If you step back and look at all the sweeping political and economic changes in the United States and even in other countries, a lot of people have had an important effect,” says Anderson, “but if you had to name one person who had the most impact, it’s Milton Friedman.” Before the influence of free-market ideas had reached so far, Friedman joined von Hayek, his University of Chicago colleague, in the founding of the Mont Pelerin Society in 1947. Comprising a handful of woefully outnumbered but likeminded individuals, the Society became known as a “kind of Comintern for the free-market.”

“America itself seemed content to follow... ‘The Road to Serfdom’...to become a modern welfare state on the model of her European counterparts, complete with endless entitlements and soft socialism.”

In 1967, the spring season of the American welfare state, Friedman’s election as president of the American Economic Association stood in stark contrast.

In 1980, Friedman found a broader venue for his ideas, with the monumental debut of his “Free to Choose” series on PBS, where, as the Heritage Foundation’s Ed Feulner puts it, he made “a compelling case to millions of viewers on the essential connection between capitalism and human freedom.” In 1988 Ronald Reagan awarded Dr. Friedman the Presidential Medal of Freedom. It is hard to imagine a more deserving recipient.

Renowned by friends and enemies alike as an indefatigable debater, Friedman was not without his lighter side. When

continued on page 8

All of our publications, including *Facts & Opinions*, are available for sponsorship. Sponsoring a publication is an excellent way for you to show your support of our efforts to defend liberty and define the proper role of government. For more information, please contact PII at 319-385-3462 or public.interest.institute@limitedgovernment.org

Individuals like you who believe in individual liberty and free-market solutions
envelope to make your tax-deductible contribution to this effort today.

**Face It:
U.S. Immigration
Policy is Broken**

Jon Miltimore

Winston Churchill once observed, "Any man who is under 30, and is not a liberal, has no heart; and any man who is over 30, and is not a conservative, has no brains." Though it is perhaps unfair to stereotype conservatives as hard-hearted curmudgeons and liberals as sentimental ninnies, the quote, like most great quotes, reflects a grain of truth. The conservative aversion to government can at times result in a myopia toward the human element of a legislative end. Liberals' faith in government makes them susceptible to utopianism and hyperopia; because of their surplus compassion, they can sometimes no longer see a forest, only trees.

The immigration debate is a prime illustration of Churchill's paradigm. Liberals argue the only problem with our immigration system is that some have arrived in the U.S. (illegally) and do not possess official status. They should be granted (or put on a path to) citizenship regardless of the fact that they entered illegally and cut in front of tens of thousands people around the world waiting to enter the U.S. through proper legal channels. The Left's exuberant fondness

Facts & Opinions
Question of the Quarter:

Will Democrats clean up Washington by eliminating earmarks and passing lobbying reform?

Send your thoughts on this issue to us at
public.interest.institute@limitedgovernment.org.
We may publish some of your ideas in the next issue
of *Facts & Opinions* in May 2007 and on our Website at
www.limitedgovernment.org.

for diversity and multiculturalism allows it to ignore the immense challenge of absorbing an enormous pool of immigrants who tend to be poor, meagerly educated, Spanish speaking, and an ethnic minority. Because immigration policy is not broken it does not need to be fixed. Any physical barrier is simply xenophobic (and racist), we are told, and analogous to the Berlin Wall. (Whatever the merits or effectiveness of a barrier may be, many on the Left possess a startling inability to distinguish a wall meant to keep people out from one meant to keep people in.)

The Right has taken an "enforcement first" approach: Fix the border, then deal with the 12 million illegal immigrants in the country. Liberals respond that they were not born yesterday and the truth is many on the Right continue to maintain that solving the illegal immigration problem is simply a matter of "cracking down" on illegals.

Since it would be a political (and likely logistical) impossibility to deport 12 million people,

"cracking down" means high profile INS raids and harsher penalties on those employing illegals. The former is a loser because it is ugly and a public relations nightmare. The latter may be effective in slowing the number of immigrants entering the country illegally, but immigration hawks are fooling themselves if they believe illegal immigrants, many of whom are now established and have families, will optionally leave the wealthiest country in history in a mass exodus because of increased difficulty in finding employment.

The U.S. ignores immigration at its peril. It is folly to assume the U.S. can continue to integrate floods of impoverished, poorly educated, and ethnically diverse immigrants. It is equally foolish to deny the 12 million immigrants an opportunity to earn some form of conditional legal status.

Essentially, immigration reform will require both hearts and brains. Let us hope our Representatives are up to it.

*Jonathan Miltimore is a
Research Analyst at Public
Interest Institute.*

A Crisis in Civic Education

John Hendrickson

continued from page 3

“progressive” ideology that thrives in the majority of liberal arts colleges. We need to return to programs with traditional core liberal arts curriculums. Colleges such as Hillsdale College⁹, Grove City College¹⁰, and Thomas Aquinas College¹¹ are just a few examples of institutions that are successfully returning to traditional aspects of education.

Many students in history, political science, and economics programs are bombarded with dogmas of political correctness and taught to be ashamed of America. The Founding Fathers are often portrayed as “opportunists” for various reasons. Military history is disappearing in favor of “peace studies.” John J. Miller, in *National Review*, recently reported that Stephen Ambrose “donated \$250,000 to the University of Wisconsin to endow a professorship in American military history. . . Today, more than \$1 million sits in a special university account for the Ambrose-Heseltine Chair in American History.” To no surprise, “the chair remains vacant.”¹² Perhaps if the donors contributed money for the Betty Friedan Chair of American social history the position would have been filled immediately.

The study recommended

several solutions:

- increase the number of required history, political science, and economics courses
- hold higher education more accountable
- better inform students, parents, public officials, and taxpayers on the record of the institution's performance in teaching
- build academic centers on campuses to encourage and support the restoration of teaching American history, political science, and economics.¹³

Many non-profit groups are working to provide better civic education and participation among the citizenry. The Public Interest Institute, for example, sponsors the Iowa Civics Project free of charge to both private and public schools across Iowa. Dr. Don Racheter, President of PII, wrote a textbook on Iowa state government that is annually shipped to schools around the state, along with copies of Iowa's Constitution. Students at all grade levels have the opportunity to learn about state government.

The American civic literacy study should serve as a warning to everyone. In his 1989 *Farewell Address to the Nation*, President Reagan, who always reminded us of our great heritage, cautioned that we must not lose our American spirit: “An informed patriotism is what we want. And are we doing a good enough job teaching our children what America is and what she represents in the long history of the world?”¹⁴ As historian David McCullough said, “How

unpardonable it would be for us — with all that we have been given, all the advantages we have, all the continuing opportunities we have to enhance and increase our love of learning — to turn out blockheads or to raise blockheads.”¹⁵

Endnotes

¹ ISI, *The Coming Crisis in Citizenship: Higher Education's Failure to Teach America's History and Institutions*, ISI Publishing: Wilmington, Delaware, 2006, p. 6.

² *Ibid.*, p. 9.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁶ Patrick J. Buchanan, *The Death of the West: How Dying Populations and Immigrant Invasions Imperil Our Country and Civilization*, Thomas Dunne Books: New York, 2002, p. 147.

⁷ Matthew Spalding, “No Greater Lesson,” February 16, 2003, <<http://www.heritage.org/Press/Commentary/ed040303a.cfm>> (October 12, 2006).

⁸ ISI, p. 6.

⁹ <http://www.hillsdale.edu>

¹⁰ <http://www.gcc.edu>

¹¹ <http://www.thomasaquinas.edu>

¹² John J. Miller, “Sounding Taps: Why military history is being retired,” *National Review*, October 9, 2006, p. 44.

¹³ ISI, p. 7.

¹⁴ Ronald Reagan, *Speaking My Mind: Selected Speeches*, Simon & Schuster: New York, 1989, p. 416.

¹⁵ David McCullough, “Knowing History and Knowing Who We Are,” *Imprimis*, April 2005, vol. 34, no. 4, Hillsdale College, 2005.

John Hendrickson is a Research Analyst for the Public Interest Institute.

Employees of Public Interest Institute are available for speaking engagements. If interested, contact PII in any of the ways listed.

Have you renewed your membership with Public Interest Institute?

Channeling Choice

Ed Feulner

Trust the people.” It’s a simple concept, one that any self-respecting American politician will claim to honor. Unfortunately, our government often falls short of this simple credo. And that may explain the growing power of the FCC.

The Federal Communications Commission “is charged with regulating interstate and international communications by radio, television, wire, satellite and cable,” as its Web site puts it. There’s no doubt some regulation is necessary. But as The Heritage Foundation has long urged, the Commission should strive to maintain a communications framework in which economic decisions — and decisions on what to broadcast to the public — are made by consumers and citizens, not the government.

So it’s troubling to hear FCC Chairman Kevin Martin tell Congress he hopes to increase his agency’s supervision of television content. Martin has identified a real problem: too much objectionable material on TV. But he’s reached the wrong conclusion — that government must regulate what’s on TV.

It wouldn’t work anyway, frankly, because the FCC does a poor job of regulating. For instance, last year many local ABC network stations decided to skip airing the film “Saving Private

Ryan” because they were afraid the FCC might fine them. (The agency later ruled it wouldn’t.)

A free society is best guided from the bottom up, not from the top down — and certainly not by five unelected FCC commissioners. The fact is, some things — such as what we watch and listen to — are none of Washington’s business.

Still, Martin’s correct when he notes that “parents need better and more tools to help them navigate the entertainment waters, particularly on cable and satellite TV.” But these tools won’t come through government supervision. They’ll come from free-market capitalism.

A good first step: Ease regulations that limit competition. For decades, cable companies enjoyed virtual monopolies over coverage areas. Direct broadcast satellite systems now provide one source of competition, but there could and should be much more.

Phone companies such as Verizon and AT&T, for instance, want to offer video programming to consumers, using Internet technologies. These “Internet-protocol TV,” or IPTV systems, would give viewers even more user control over what comes into their homes.

Sadly, though, regulation is slowing this new competition. Local cable franchise rules, for instance, mean it could take years before these new competitors can operate nationwide. Here’s where the federal government can help — by getting regulators out of the way.

That’s the approach behind the Broadband Consumer Choice Act of 2005, sponsored by Sen. John

Ensign, R-Nev. It would stimulate competition by eliminating the requirement that local governments license cable providers. But the measure [was] bottled up in committee for months. *(Editor’s note: this bill is now dead in the new Congressional session.)

More choice would certainly help consumers. Right now, parents are able to block channels they don’t want. But if more providers delivered television through different systems, customers might eventually be able to purchase only the channels they want, instead of purchasing bundles of channels, as most must do now. So you wouldn’t need to block a channel — if you didn’t want it, it wouldn’t be there and you wouldn’t be paying for it.

Some suggest the FCC should mandate that cable companies allow customers to buy only the individual channels they want. But this top-down approach likely would fail, as so many government regulatory schemes do, and might even lead to fewer choices at higher prices. It would be better to let the market deliver what the consumers want.

Build a better mousetrap, they say, and the public will buy it — if the government stays out of the way. It’s time for policymakers to step back, cut the red tape and give television viewers choices. The last thing they need from Washington is more static.

Ed Feulner is President of the Heritage Foundation. Reprinted by Permission.

**Public Interest Institute
at Iowa Wesleyan College
600 North Jackson Street
Mt. Pleasant, IA 52641-1328**

NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION
U.S. POSTAGE PAID
MAILED FROM ZIP CODE 52761
PERMIT NO. 338

Milton Friedman

Mark Alexander

continued from page 4

Richard Nixon famously remarked, “We are all Keynesians now,” Friedman wrote to friend and Keynesian economist John Kenneth Galbraith: “You must be as chagrined as I am to have Nixon for your disciple.”

On another occasion, when hiring an administrative assistant concerned over her lack of training in economics, Friedman didn’t miss a beat: “You don’t have to worry about not knowing anything about economics. There are many people who studied economics for years and don’t know anything about economics. Stick with me

and you’ll learn the correct way.”

That good-spiritedness, however, never kept Friedman from making his point with powerful effect. When Nixon enacted wage-and-price controls in 1971, Friedman penned a scathing assessment in the opinion pages of the *New York Times*: “The controls are deeply and inherently immoral. By substituting the rule of men for the rule of law and for voluntary cooperation in the marketplace, the controls threaten the very foundations of a free society. By encouraging men to spy and report on one another, by making it in the private interest of large numbers of citizens to evade controls, and by making actions illegal that are in the public interest, the controls undermine individual morality.”

It is worth noting that

Friedman’s 1976 Nobel Prize — the pinnacle of his life’s work — fell on the 200th anniversary of both Thomas Jefferson’s Declaration of Independence and Adam Smith’s “The Wealth of Nations.” This is altogether fitting, since Milton Friedman embodied the inextricable link between personal liberty and economic liberty that these two seminal works have come to represent. As we say a fond farewell to one of the free world’s great champions, let us hope that America continues to be blessed with men of such moral and intellectual courage.

Mark Alexander is executive editor and publisher of The Patriot Post.

Reprinted by permission.

For more visit:
<http://patriotpost.us/>