The Journal of
Law, Social Justice
& Global Development

Civic Education for Democracy: an Indicator for Civic Skills Teaching and Democracy vs. Authoritarianism

David Lempert

Article Information

Issue 28: 2025: *Special Issue*, 'Communicating Culture, Sustainability and Civil Society', editors: Jonathan Vickery, Stuart MacDonald, and Nicholas J. Cull.
Keywords: civic education, democracy, participatory democracy, public oversight, accountability, social contract
Journal ISSN: 1467-0437

Abstract

Surprisingly absent today in the arsenal of democracy and legal development interventions globally, and of little interest in the 'Western democracies', is civic education in public schools. Preparing citizens with the wide range of skills for equal participation and impact in the full spectrum of public decision-making in all institutions that have political influence — regardless of citizens' individual positions, families, access, wealth or other differential ability to exert power — is largely ignored. This article begins with the theory of civics education for democracy and examines the approaches that currently exist domestically in the U.S. and globally, including in international development (governance and 'democracy building') programs, for defining the essential skills for civic education for social contract democracy and preparing citizens for full and equal exercise of public responsibilities to assure the overall protection of group and individual rights and for meeting specific needs. Based on this theory, the article generates a list of key civic skill categories and skills for social contract democracy in complex societies. It then uses this list to create an indicator for measuring the actual commitment of countries and the ability of specific curricula to prepare citizens fully and equally and effectively for social contract democracy and for guiding efforts to improve civic education. Global application of this indicator reveals little real difference today in the preparation of citizens in 'Western democracies' and in one-Party or (generally recognised) authoritarian states, with regard civic responsibilities.

Author

David Lempert, Ph.D., J.D., M.B.A., E.D. (Hon.): superlemp@alumni.stanford.org

Introduction

While there has been a focus in recent years on global human rights education, following the promotion and passage of a U.N. Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training in 2011 (U.N., 2011), surprisingly absent today in the arsenal of democracy and legal development interventions globally and of little interest in "Western democracies" is a focus on civic education in public schools. In most countries today, no matter how they define themselves, preparing citizens not just for enforcing human rights but for helping citizens to develop the full range of skills for equal participation in and impact on the full spectrum of public decision-making in all institutions that have political influence and regardless of citizens' individual positions, families, access, wealth or other differential ability to exert power, is largely ignored.

Critiques coming both from establishment elites who point to a "global crisis in democracy" (Diamond, 2019) and from populists, identifying as problematic the concentration of political power globally in institutions such as global corporations (Korten, 1995), military and police/national security state (Chomsky, 1991), communications media (Hermann and Chomsky, 1988), or in elite networks beyond the reach of citizen or even control of formal government leaders (Wolin, 2003), agree on a common concern. They both point to failures in or threats to democracies and warm of severe consequences for human security and well-being. Nevertheless, despite these critiques, there has been little public or policy discussion over civic education and the specific set of skills that citizens need and currently lack that would ensure effective democracy. If there is a failure in educating citizens for responsibilities of democracy, it obviously follows that there is and will continue to be a failure to achieve and maintain democratic forms of government. Nevertheless, the lack of concern for civic education itself symbolizes the failure of the international community as a whole and by almost every government to protect democracy, for reasons either of neglect or design.

While there is a long list of short-term solutions proffered by experts to address identified problems of and threats to democracy, there is little focus on the specific skills that citizens need in order to establish, protect and maintain a democratic political and legal culture in which every citizen has effective civic training. The experts largely ignore the goal of effective and equal participation by citizens in the identification of the locus of power on specific political decisions and the exercise of citizen oversight, instruction and implementation of all of those activities that are carried out in the name of and with the funds of the citizenry by those individuals and institutions, in a way that fully protects human sustainability and internationally agreed community and individual rights.

Here, in this introduction, I briefly describe this gaping hole and then offer an overview of how this article seeks to fill it.

The Scope of the Current Problems in Civic Education: Though my statements claiming that there is a lack of attention to civic education and civic skills in international and domestic policy, and that "democracies" are also failing to educate their citizens effectively for democracy, may sound sweeping, I am simply reporting what the evidence, presented in more detail in the following two short sub-sections, shows for each of these two levels. International "development" programs today largely fail to even consider civic education among the range of initiatives that fall under the rubric of "democracy, governance and human rights" for rooting a democratic political culture, while even at the domestic level in so-called "Western democracies", there appears to be a lack of focus on the actual skills that citizens need in a democracy.

Support by Wealthy Countries, Largely Considered "Democracies", for Effective Civic Education and Skills Internationally, through International Organizations, is Weak or Non-Existent: At the international level, the United Nations "Sustainable Development Goals" (SDGs) for 2015 to 2030, do not even use the word "civic education" or "citizen education" or "democracy" or participatory governance (U.N., 2015). Instead,

they offer only a fuzzy and mostly meaningless term, "Civic Engagement" (U.N., 2020). Only the seventh target of SDG 4 on "Quality Education", following the goals of education for economic growth, cobbles together a haphazard set of slogans and buzz words in this area, and does little more than to call upon countries to:

> **4.7** By 2030, ensure that all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including, among others, through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture's contribution to sustainable development

While that grab-bag of terms may sound promising, the reality is that the only measures for this, among some 231 SDG indicators are the:

> **4.7.1** Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies; (b) curricula; (c) teacher education; and (d) student assessment.

Beyond the list of platitudes, the key words representing governance skills are all glaringly absent. The mentions of government accountability and justice in SDG 16 avoid essential and meaningful terms like federalism, cultural autonomy, indigenous peoples, and community rights. The only important rights appear to be only business rights and some rights for assimilation of laborers from different individual categories.

UNESCO, the U.N. agency that is tasked with education and also with a number of cultural protections, also fails to focus on the components of civic education and skills even in an agenda of "citizenship education" (UNESCO, 2013). Its approach is, instead, on "global citizenship" which it defines mostly as "values" ("humanistic values such as tolerance towards others and respect for human dignity") and "interpersonal skills" as well as "critical thinking" and "empathy", along with "learning about … institutions, good governance, the rule of law, democratic processes, civil society and civic participation" but without the necessary skills of actual citizen empowerment and efficacy.

If there are any programs for citizenship education that have been promoted by the U.N. system since the adoption of the SDGs, I have been unable to find any, even on empowering citizens to enforce sustainable development governance and related rights protections. This category of approaches isn't unknown internationally, since groups have advocated for it like the Foundation for Democracy and Sustainable Development (Ward, 2013). It is simply unrecognized and ignored. Indeed, the only such project for specific civic skills training, that I have been able to find in an Internet search of civic education projects is an advertisement for a project officer on a short project in Fiji that dates back to 2007.[1]

Most of the focus of the U.N. system and other major international donor agencies today in democratic and legal development projects where it is on education at all, is on training elites who are already monopolizing authority in specific institutions (e.g., training of judges or lawyers, strengthening Parliamentary staffs, or "capacity building" of military, police and other government bureaucrats). Often the goal has nothing to do with promoting democracy but has hidden agendas of promoting contacts and influence, in place of empowerment and education of the citizenry for holding government accountable and responsive in ways that would change the balance of power to reduce the influence of elites (Lempert, 2011).

Where the category of "civic education" seems to exist at all in international programming, it is

[1] This was the U.N.'s Fiji Citizenship Education project (ICE). I was, coincidentally, in Fiji in 2017, evaluating a long human rights education project for the United Nations Development Programme, Fiji Regional Centre, AusAid, New Zealand Aid, and the United Nations Democracy Fund, I was not aware of it.

generally in the form of top-down efforts to promote doctrines rather than empowerment. It is often simply for public relations that allow for:
— the continuation and covering up of injustices such as in "awareness" projects on human rights treaties, that sometimes even shift the blame for lack of rights onto parents and other disempowered actors, and away from those who are perpetrators of rights abuses or fail to enforce the law (Lempert, 2011);
— simple proselytizing of "religious" doctrines on conservation or sustainable development rather than teaching actual sustainable development planning and enforcement (Lempert and Nguyen, 2017); or
— so-called "access to law" projects that increase government controls over citizens rather than promote government accountability (e.g., registration of minority births, use of courts merely for small individual civil disputes, or registering land or legitimatizing elites in their positions in bureaucracies ("government scorecards" or "meetings with legislators)) rather than for citizen empowerment for political action and oversight (Lempert, 2010a)).

Similarly, projects in "human rights education" typically just teach either the black letter law of human rights treaties, verbatim, or religious invocations rather than promote actual skills learning (Lempert, 2011) or teach citizens the strategic measures of human rights impacts and how to objectively measure real progress in achieving such impacts (Lempert, 2017a).

This shift in the agendas of civic-education to forms of disempowerment of citizens, and promotion of corporate agendas, is not only visible in the standard projects implemented by the U.N. system, but also in those of the European Commission, implemented both within and without Europe, transforming "civic education" in approaches that allow European development bureaucrats to transfer funds to institutional counterparts in government and "civil society" for promotion of "poverty alleviation" and "IT (information technology) education" (European Commission, 2003) and to build elite networks (Lempert, 2010a) to benefit European interests rather than to build democracies.

The World Bank was no better in its approaches to governance, though it makes claims about the importance of "democracy" to sustainability (and "growth"). The Bank's indicators fail to show any concern for education beyond technical skills that have direct, short-term, economic benefit in production, meaning that education to build democratic infrastructure (what the Bank calls "social capital") is largely ignored. The Bank does focus on educational results in fuzzy categories like "voice and accountability", "government effectiveness", "regulatory quality" (defined as "sound policies that … permit and promote private sector development"), "rule of law" (the extent to which agents have confidence in and abide by the rules of society"), and "control of corruption", but ties them to immediate benefits to business and ignores actual civic skills, citizen empowerment, and equitable distribution of power subject to citizen oversight (Kaufmann, Kraay and Mastruzzi, World Bank, 2007.[2]

There does seem to have been some commitment in the past in the U.S., both internationally and domestically in the U.S., and internationally to the idea of civics education and building democratic culture. One can find it during the U.S. civil rights

[2] My experience, working on a World Bank loan in what was a relatively new area, that of legal education and anti-corruption, in Kazakhstan, in 1997, with Kazakhstan's Ministries of Justice and the Ministries of Education is probably emblematic of what happens on such projects when consultants focus on results. I focused on developing loan proposals that directly met the Bank's legal specifications (to replace projects that violated the Bank's guidelines as being "self-dealing") and the Bank simply refused the replacement projects wanting me to rubber stamp and disguise the violations. The Bank refused loan projects to promote civic skills for citizens, despite the economic benefit of such loans and their direct compliance with the Bank's own guidelines. It took me 19 years to receive payment for this work and it required my taking the case to U.S. federal courts, to find that the U.S. courts would not stand behind U.S. citizens to enforce contracts in an international context, despite legal precedents for doing so. See *Lempert v. Kazakhstan*, in U.S. Federal District Court of the District of Columbia, 1999-2000. The case helped lead to passage of: U.S. Public Law 109-102, the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2005, Amending Section 599 B, Title XV of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262 o. et. seq.) and The Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2012, Section 7082 (a) Reforms, to ensure enforcement, in a law that now protects whistleblowers, that now exists on its face but that I fear has had little or no real impact beyond upholding my rights in my specific case.

era in the U.S. in the 1960s and later in furthering empowerment and social justice as part of the legacies of the U.S. government supported efforts to train citizens globally on things like "Legislative Drafting for Democratic Social Change" (Seidman, 1991) as well as partly after World War II, in efforts that dated back to the Marshall Plan and democracy building in post-World War II Germany and in Japan. Nevertheless, this category of projects and funding for them was small and has largely disappeared. The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) was spending some $30 million per year in the 1990s on civic education (roughly about $60 million today in budgets of some $30 billion in current dollars), which amounts to only about 0.1% of development aid (Congressional Research Service, 2019, page 20). Much of that past effort has seemed to disappear, with more recent focus not on ordinary citizen skills but with a focus on university professions and training of elites, and on public relations programs restricted to limited categories like criminal defense training, in programs like "know your rights" (USAID, 2002).

How Major "Democracies" Appear to be Failing in Civic Education: While the rhetoric of the value of civic education and democracy is preached today globally several critics note that, it seems to be only in the form of empty statements in countries like the U.S. in laws like the "Child Left Behind Act of 2001" calling for civic education to "foster civic competence and responsibility" (U.S. Code, 2002), but offering no actual mechanisms for doing so. Laws and statements like this recognize what may indicate an earlier shell of democratic culture and aspirations for democracy that today that seem transformed into platitudes. According to recent studies of Western "democracies", the wealthier countries (as measured by Gross Domestic Product per capita) are those seen lagging in some measures of citizenship compared to countries in which citizens have mobilized for changes of governments (Hoskins, Vilalba and Saisana, 2011, p. 3). In these "democracies" today, there does not even appear to be a single journal devoted to "civic education" (based on Internet searches in summer, 2020).

Various authors in the "West" today refer to the idea of civic education as a "lost mission" (Lagemann, Lewis, 2012) and find schools "flunking democracy" rather than teaching it (Rebell, 2018). Collections of various studies in the U.S. (Campbell, 2019) show that the failure is long-term and that even the earlier civics courses in American high schools "had little or no effect on a variety of civic outcomes" including "political efficacy" and participation (citing Langton and Jennings, 1968). More recent studies suggest that "The Republic is (Still) at Risk" (Levine and Kawashima-Ginsberg, 2017, p. 17) with "almost all state standards documents … packed with miscellaneous topics … without coherence [and] without an explicit account of their overall purposes". In the U.S. less than 20% of the states even require a full year of civics education despite the complex concepts and skills today and another 20% have no requirement at all (Shapiro and Brown, 2018). Most of the programs that exist do are do little more than promote regurgitation of facts without any teaching of skills, with simple parroting of topics like "rights and responsibilities of citizens" (11 states) or the "role of government" (15 states) (Godsay, Henderson, Levine, Littenberg-Tobias, and CIRCLE, 2012). Other experts largely view this as part of an overall decline or dumbing down of the civics curricula, with a decline in civics courses in grade 9 (of 12) from 52% to 12% between 1928 and 1972 and with the "Problems of Democracy course" declining from 20% to 8% between 1948 and 1972 (Niemi and Smith, 2001, cited in The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE), 2003).

<u>The Purpose of this Article and its Fit with Previous Work</u>: This study and the measurement indicator and skills list that I generate as part of this study, fit into a body of work that I have developed and published to assure that international (and domestic/community) interventions fit into the requirements of international law and professional standards for "development", human rights (at the levels of both community and individual rights), and interventions in sustainable development, democracy, governance, and accountability. For several years, I have been codifying international

development law to promote accountability and standards (Lempert, 2018 a and b) and have been designing easy-to-use indicators for citizens, practitioners, educators and social scientists to use in assuring that interventions fulfill stated purposes and are not derailed by hidden agendas or used merely for public relations. I continue that work here.

Among the indicators that I have previously developed are those specifically for measuring interventions in "democracy" (Lempert, 2011) and human rights education (Lempert, 2010a) as well as for human rights, in general (Lempert, 2017a). I have also been a pioneer in civics and rights education at the university level, designing and introducing courses with laboratory field components based on a theory of "democratic experiential education". I have worked to introduce students directly to the "unseen" institutions of political power and decision-making, to a range of institutions and the public policy issues that they raise for citizen oversight and control and have taught many of the civic skills for qualitative analysis of policies.

This article goes beyond those previous works in two ways. While my previous indicators of development, democracy and human rights have focused generally on overall impacts and strategic goals (like balances of power and equity, cultural protections and sustainability) and on returning civics and social science to goals of empiricism, strategic and long-term thinking, and empowerment of students as citizens, they did not generate a specific list of critical skills that citizens need today in a global, urbanizing, and complex society to participate effectively in a "strong" participatory, social contract democracy (Rousseau, 1762a; Barber, 1994). The goal of this article is to generate such a list that educators can then use in the form of an indicator to guide and troubleshoot effective civic education in the modern context. At the same time, the measures and indicators that I present here can also be used to test the health and quality of a country's democracy and its political culture because the failures of civic education to effectively teach a full set of needed civic skills to citizens in secondary education (the level of schooling reached nearly universally today in industrial societies) is, by definition, directly reflected in failures in the political system. A country that does not fully educate all of its citizens to confront, oversee and control all areas of political authority in ways that also protect international law and goals of rights protections and sustainability, is a country that cannot by definition be "democratic", even if it calls itself one and even if citizens participate in a set of limited mobilized activities that transfer their civic roles to "representatives" or sets of unsupervised actors in multiple institutions and networks beyond direct citizen management and control. Citizens cannot merely talk the talk of democracy, or they are merely part of a system that is "by and for" the people but not one that is "of them", to cite U.S. President Abraham Lincoln in his Gettysburg Address. They must also have the skills to walk the walk and engage effectively with visible civic results.

This article is divided into the following six sections:

I. **The Theory of Civics Education for Democracy and How Contemporary Efforts Fail to Apply the Theory**: The first part of this article starts with the theory of civics education for social contract democracy that dates back more than two centuries and offers it as the guiding principle for this work. I then compare the approaches that currently exist in international development programs as well as domestically in the U.S. and globally for defining and preparing citizens for full and equal exercise of public responsibilities so as to assure the protection, in general, of both group and individual rights and exercise of governance meeting specific needs, to see how it is adhered to given that these claim to come out of the same social contract democratic tradition, as well as to see if anything has expanded or improved upon it. On its face, with quick inspection, it appears that there is only minimal difference today in the way citizens are educated in Western "democracies" and in authoritarian one-party states, demonstrating that the theories are failing to be applied. In looking at the theory, in terms of how it is used in contemporary work of scholars and practitioners, not only is it clear that governments fail to match the basic respects of preparing

citizens with civic skills for democratic governance, but that recent academic work has so muddled the original principles in contemporary debate over frameworks that there is only lack of clarity and confusion in the sector place of building effective skills training. The analysis in this chapter helps to begin to generate a list of missing conceptual categories for effective civic education for democracy.

II. **How Current Educational Approaches to Civic Education Skills Reflect Current Confusion and Fail to Offer Consistent and Comprehensive Guidance**: The second part of this piece presents contemporary lists of civic education skills, noting how they are also disconnected from the classic theories of education for social contract democracy. Many of these skills lists currently seem to focus only on very basic skills that are in fact not substantively different from those used in business or in pure functionary roles in organizations, with little that is really specific to citizen empowerment and impact in political decision-making. Some recent lists, however, in brainstorming what might be included, have started to haphazardly touch on some of the missing areas of civics education for social contract democracy. These skills categories can be re-organized in a way that generates a framework of key skills for educators and democracy specialists to apply to measure and promote civic education.

III. **A Framework and List of Indicative Skills for Civic Education for Social Contract Democracy in the Modern Context**: This section starts with the basic questions of what social contract democracy is designed to do and why it fails and uses them to generate a framework for civic education in contract democracy that overcomes existing and potential failures. There are several key basic questions to pose about what constitutes an effective and successful democracy and they are the very questions that most civic educators today are taught not to ask. They are questions at the levels of overall political decision-making, goals of government, and the full set of institutions and areas in which politics take place and can essentially be reduced to three main questions: "Who has power?"; "How do they keep it?", and "What do citizens need to do to hold it and keep it in ways that promote long-term interests?" In following these questions, this section generates a framework for civic education in social contract democracy with key subjects and a set off indicative skills, linked to specific disciplines that investigate and teach them and that can serve as a guide for primary and secondary school educators, globally.

IV. **An Indicator for Civic Skills Teaching for Social Contract Democracy to Measure Effective Civic Education**: Using the framework of key civic education skills that I develop in the third section, in this section I generate an indicator for educators, political scientists and political observers to use to measure whether civics education is meeting the needs for democratic citizenship. What is new and important about this indicator is that it starts by focusing on the inequalities one finds in authoritarian societies that would need to be overcome to achieve democracy, the specific mechanisms that elites in political and other institutions of political power use effectively to undermine democracy and that need to be challenged and overcome in order for citizens to assert and/or retain authority, and on the full set of places that public decisions are made and powers are exerted (beyond the formal and visible structures of "government" or "representative government") to assure full inclusion of the list of skills that citizens need to effectively attain, exercise and maintain their full democratic authority.

V. **Results of Applying the Indicator: The Global Failure of Civic Education for Democracy**: The indicator is not merely a guide to structuring civic education, but it is also an effective measure that exposes the lack of real difference today in preparation of citizens in "Western democracies" and in one-Party or generally recognized "authoritarian" states. These findings serve as an alarm bell for democracy advocates and for civic educators, globally.

VI. **Conclusion: Facing Realities**: In the conclusion, I discuss the contemporary political realities that seem to make it difficult, if not impossible for both democracy and civic

education for democracy today, though I offer the indicator in this article in the hope that it can make a difference.

-

I. Background: The Theory of Civics Education for Democracy and How Contemporary Efforts Fail to Apply the Theory

Recognition of the links between education for democracy likely dates back to the ancient Greeks, followed by a gap of nearly two millennia until the emergence of the modern concept of social contract democracy and the need for "education for democracy" in 18th Century Europe, as part of the "Enlightenment". The classic concepts of democracy and the link to education are in fact relatively clear and have not been replaced, which means that failures today to define and implement strategies o civic education to promote, maintain and protect democracy are not due to a lack of understanding of the concepts but to something else. The contemporary failure of Europe and the U.S. in their general school curricula and in international interventions to identify the range of skills a citizen needs and to offer them, suggests that the actual goal of what passes for civic education today, or its lack thereof, is not to promote democracy but to undermine its definition and to distort it. Indeed, some have described recent educational efforts in the U.S. and globally as a deliberate "dumbing down" of societies by elites, to create dependency, obedience and civic illiteracy, with a focus shifting to rudimentary "worker" skills of literacy and of mathematics along with regurgitation through constant testing (Gatto, 1992), as part of the "hidden curriculum" (Snyder, 1970).

This section starts with the classic theory of civics education for social contract democracy and the concepts of democratic political and legal culture as continue to be recognized within contemporary social science. It then examines the failures in the approaches that currently exist in the U.S. and Europe and globally in civic education to incorporate this well-established theory. Both national standards and contemporary discussions in academic literature fail to define and prepare citizens their essential roles in a functioning social contract democracy: that of full and equal exercise of public responsibilities that would assure the protection of their community (ethnic/cultural group) and individual rights and for meeting their needs. Indeed, the frameworks that currently exist for civic education that claim to be those for promoting "democracy" seem to focus only on very basic skills that are in fact not substantively different from those used in business or in pure functionary roles in organizations, with little that is really specific to citizen empowerment and impact in political decision-making that are at the basis of citizen roles in a democracy. While there are now some emerging skills frameworks for civic education that are providing the basis for comprehensive curricula to promote democracy, with ideas offered from different professional associations, the best recent framework (Torney-Purta, et. al., 2015) is actually geared to college level education, which also defeats the purpose of a civics curriculum that is available to all citizens in urban societies, through the secondary level and to the age of recognized political rights (18 years of age in the U.S.).

While this section focuses on three concerns in three sub-sections: first on democracy and civic education theory, second on contemporary failures of democracy and of civic education that make "democratic' and "non-democratic" states virtually indistinguishable, and third on how the scholarly and professional literature on civic education is responsible for the failure of civic education to link effectively to the goals of attaining and maintaining democracy, the next section will focus on the new frameworks for civic education and on how to appropriately identify the essential skills categories and on generating a skills list for effective democratic citizenship.

<u>The Theory of Building Democracy through Civic Education</u>: There are two key concepts that merge in the study of democratic civic education in Western political debate and social science; that of social contract democracy and that of political or civic "culture" and socialization, which is achieved through all levels of education. Civic education for democracy is simply the merging of

the two concepts to assure that citizens exercise their role in democracy ('social contractual" authority of citizens for participating equally and fully and effectively in all areas of political decision-making and control of what is considered part of the "common" (public goods/public property and public institutions)), with the idea of socializing every citizen to fulfill this role (largely through education in public institutions and public supported practices as part of their educational development), with the goal of replicating and protecting a sustainable and stable democratic society through time.

In 18th Century France, at the dawn of the industrial revolution, when Jean Jacques Rousseau authored his revolutionary work on the "social contract", imagining a society where individual citizens would bargain with each other to draft a contract or constitution for their joint management and control of public resources, public institutions, public powers, and influences and actions of public authority (Rousseau, 1762a), he simultaneously published a work on education, to describe how citizens would be prepared for that society (Rousseau, 1762b). For these political philosophers, in a way that has become almost axiomatic, these two concepts were inextricably linked. The essential link between the two in a way in which they reflected and reinforced each other and could not exist without each other was obvious with the idea of a "contract" to control all areas of public decision-making as the key organizing principle for democratic civic life and skills then as today.

In adapting the ideas of social contract into a constitutional framework in the U.S., only a short time later, into an actual social contract for citizens that was developed and debated a priori (Madison, Hamilton and Jay, 1788; Brutus and Henry, 1787), the authors of the U.S. constitutional system made no explicit mention of education and skills of citizens. Nevertheless, the idea of an equality of citizens to exercise their contract rights, requiring that they have the education and socialization to do so was implicit. The social contract ideal and the need for a citizenry that would exercise it was implicitly recognized in the views of Thomas Jefferson, one of the drafters of that constitution and later U.S. President. Jefferson recognized that the constitution was meant to be renegotiated by every successive generation in a process that required citizens to possess a full set of democratic skills of governance for recognizing their full sets of interests and their abilities of oversight as citizens (Jefferson, 1787). The lack of any full negotiation of the constitution since then, beyond mere short amendments that do not reflect major social changes (such as industrialization and urbanization) suggests a failure to follow that logic, though Jefferson's invocation is not lost on this author. I have imagined what such a contract would look like today in the modern context and have drafted it as well as defended it in a series of 15 amendments to the U.S. constitution, presented in a three-volume work (Lempert, unpublished but partly available online).

In his early 20th century classic, *Democracy and Education*, John Dewey sought to update Rousseau's concepts in industrial America, offering a set of precepts for civic education for democracy, though not much in the way of skills for preparing an educated citizenry for participatory democracy (Dewey, 1916). Like James Madison in the *Federalist Papers* presenting the U.S. Constitution, Dewey's approach was an activist one for citizens. It was not simply one giving away authority in an indirect democracy to elected officials by proxy (i.e., voting). In his work, Dewey warned against one of the failures of civic education that seems to characterize it today; its co-optation by elites to promote top-down democracy rather than the skills of civic empowerment: "Rulers are simply interested in such training as will make their subjects better tools for their own intentions. Even the subsidy by rulers of privately conducted schools must be carefully safeguarded", he warned (Dewey, Chapter 7). Dewey feared that civic education would also lead to nationalism rather than protections of "humanity as a whole and with the idea of progress" (Dewey, Chapter 7). He helped define the goals of civic education in democracy as making "provision for participation in its good of all members on equal terms and which secures flexible readjustment of its institutions" in ways

that reflect social contract ideals of Jefferson, not merely to follow existing institutions but to change or replace them, giving "individuals a personal interest in social relationships and control, and the habits of mind which secure social changes" (Dewey, Chapter 7).

More recent works in social science have introduced the concept of a "civic culture" (Almond and Verba, 1963) and have presented those approaches that authors deem necessary for transition to democracy for re-educating citizens in authoritarian or oligarchic systems to that of participatory democracy (Moore, 1966; Verba and Nie, 1972; Herz, 1982: Lipset, 2004). These works have implied or noted a need for civic education to do this, though they have not offered clear blueprints for how to achieve it, which perhaps has contributed to some of the confusion that exists today as to what skills and concepts actually need to be taught in order to attain and maintain a "democratic" "civic culture".

Though these basic principles are sufficient to establish a framework for democracy and for civic skills, the very framework, let alone any clear guidelines and applications, seem to be abandoned today in the U.S. and globally. In New York State, for example, the Task Force on Civic Readiness for the oversight of civic curricula is trying to reinvent the wheel and is only now at the stage of basic definitions like those of "civic readiness", "civic learning", and "civic skills and actions" (New York State Board of Regents, 2020). Their definition of terms does at least make it clear that civic education does need to have a skills component which differs from "knowledge" and "mindsets" (consciousness and values) that are not directly empowering or active, leading to measurable results on institutions and decisions, in order to ensure enforcement of a "social contract", but they have yet to progress beyond the discussions started decades ago (if not two centuries ago, and earlier).

Failures of Current Measures and the Result of "Democratic" Civic Education that is Almost Indistinguishable in "Democratic" and "Non-Democratic" States: While the idea of civic *skills* for democracy is long recognized along with and distinguished from *knowledge* and *perspectives* on democracy, human rights and governance, the real failure in civics education has been in the lack of clear guidance on how to choose which skills citizens need to learn (and how) for which kinds of participation, oversight, and control, in which institutions, on which kinds of decisions, at which levels, with which kinds of protections and with which goals. This lack of direction has led to a haphazard selection and a degeneration to weak and ineffectual civic education that ultimately is little different from the preparation for work as employees in any institutions, or from simple endorsement of elite policies in actions that are mostly indistinguishable in so called "democratic" and "un-democratic" states.

Below, I start with an examination of what was the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)'s approach to civic skills in 1998, exposing the weaknesses and failures in guidance, followed by an examination of the frameworks that exist today, incorporating most of the failures, in the U.S. Department of Education in 2011 and the European Community's 2020 Education and Training Policy Agenda. I then apply a simple test to both of these to demonstrate how serious the failure in civic education for democracy is today. It is that there is little difference today between civic education in Western democracies (and the civics components taught in civic education in these countries) and the teaching in counterpart one-Party states like the former Soviet Union and contemporary Vietnam, where I have worked to analyze legal and civics education. The political systems and political cultures may still have differences but the similarities in civic education suggest that many of the differences that are believed to exist may disappear in the future or may have already disappeared.

The USAID Framework [the future of which, is currently an open question]: In its "Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators" USAID in 1998, devoted its category 2.3.5. to "Strengthened Democratic Political Culture" that included the requirement that "citizens have knowledge about their systems of government" (USAID, 1998) and a list of three indicative "results" for civic education, including:

- 2.3.5.1. Expanded Higher Quality Civic Education in Schools;
- 2.3.5.2. Expanded Higher Quality Informal Civic Education Initiatives; and
- 2.3.5.3. Community-based Civic Action Programs Expanded/Initiated.

The latter included a short list of potential skills training "from the bottom up, to engage the active participation of community members in initiatives aimed at meeting their needs and which they themselves help identify" such as: "petition drives, cases brought before appropriate judicial authorities, public hearings, lobbying local government officials, or regional regulatory agencies" (USAID, 1998). While the civic education in schools did not really mention skills but merely components like "the study of democratic principles" of education "about democratic practices", USAID did recognize at least a small range of bottom-up skills in courts, bureaucracies and legislative institutions. Unfortunately, USAID documents do not seem to offer any comprehensive list anywhere of the initiatives that "communities" identified for meeting their needs, the skills they felt they needed, or how "communities" were identified (what levels of interests and boundaries).

The U.S. Department of Education's Framework: The national framework for civic education in the U.S., offered by the U.S. Department of Education (DoE), is a "civics framework" that includes "three interrelated components: Knowledge, intellectual and participatory skills, and civic dispositions" but identifies only the skills of "interacting, monitoring, and influencing" without further clarification and guidance for application (National Center for Education Statistics, 2011). In its assessment of programs and its testing, DoE's National Assessment Governing Board (2010) in fact prioritizes, disempowering ideology and minimal participatory skills that hardly touch on real political decision-making. At all grade levels, DoE's assessment of civic skills is merely a measure of the ability to regurgitate textbook information and ideology that hides political inequalities and democratic failures. For example, among points of focus are "the meaning of citizenship" and "responsibilities of citizens" in "America's constitutional democracy", with study of "how laws are made", formal textbook explanations of "branches of government" and "levels of governments" as well as how the "government established by the Constitution embod[ies] the purposes, values, and principles of American democracy". Nowhere on the list are there political skills for translating rights and needs into public action and protections.

The European Framework: The focus of European civics education is similar to that in the U.S. with similar flaws, with "civic competence" and "key competencies" focusing on four dimensions shown in the Civic Competence Composite Indicator (CCCI): "Citizen Values" (that include "understanding the importance of volunteering, voting and protesting"), "Social Justice Values", "Participatory Attitudes" and a combined category of "Knowledge and Skills for Democracy" [called in some of the frameworks "Cognitions about Democratic Institutions" that appear to be limited to skills like "interpreting political campaign messages" (Hoskins, Villalba, and Saisana, 2012). While the directions are all appropriate, the list of skills is limited to only two sub-sets which are not specific at all to civics or democracy: the general category "Critical thinking" and "Skills for involvement in decision making including use of new social media" (page 21).

Failures of Existing Civic Education Frameworks to Reflect the Objectives and Skills Needs for Social Contract Democracy through a Comparison of Civic Education in Different Countries: Perhaps the best way to highlight the failings of existing governmental frameworks in the U.S. and Europe for civic education is to compare these frameworks directly to civic education approaches in one-Party states. Table 1 **(pp.52-56)** presents this data using the two frameworks described above, for the U.S. and Europe, with data from my research and experience into civic education in the Soviet Union (in 1989-90) (Lempert, 1996), Vietnam from 1998 to 2006 (Lempert, unpublished Vietnam research), and then in Laos from 2009 to 2017. The results of the comparison make the failures clear. Here are explanations of the data sources that I used for comparison

countries, how I constructed the Table, and the results.

- Source of the Data: Since I have not found specific data on "civics education" curriculum and skills as such in one Party states, I am relying on previous field work in countries like the former Soviet Union where I focused on legal education and socialization starting from basic education, Viet Nam and Laos where I worked for several years in legal development and governance projects and used local grade school curricula and books to learn the local languages, and other countries like Kazakhstan where I worked on education projects that touched on these areas. In 1989-90, I worked as a researcher in Leningrad, Russia, based at the Leningrad State University Law Faculty and the affiliated Sociology Research Institute, N.I.I.K.S.I., studying legal education and legal curriculum as well as civics education and curriculum in schools, followed in 2008 by research in Kazakhstan for a World Bank loan on legal education, with research into civics education. In 1998 to 2006, I lived in Vietnam as a government consultant on law and rights projects, including university teaching in human rights and various projects including one for UNICEF on implementation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) with visits to schools and reading of the Vietnamese curriculum, as well as trainings for professionals at local and national levels (including Ministries and the National

Assembly), businesses and non-governmental organizations as well as with teachers and those producing school curricula. This work has allowed for a broad insight into the curriculum and actual skills and understandings. I conducted similar work and research in Laos in 2009 to 2017, affiliated with the Lao Academy of Social Sciences. In addition to being raised in the United States, I have also lived long-term in Europe where I have had a chance to look at these issues. [From 2017 to 2022, I have lived in Germany and have also used basic curriculum materials to study the German language and to study legal and political culture].

See Table 1. **Comparing Current Approaches to Civics Education in the U.S. and Europe to that in One-Party Authoritarian Regimes: p.96.**

- **Construction of Table 1: In** Table 1, in Columns 1 and 2, I place the U.S. Department of Education and the European Framework of the Civic Competence Composite Indicator (CCCI), side by side, given that they generally overlap with each other, with five elements of the U.S. framework parallel to three of the CCCI, and with a fourth area of the CCCI, "Social Justice", not reflected directly in the U.S. framework.

In Column 3, I present my interpretive analysis of the civic curriculum framework and teachings in the Soviet Union and in the two Southeast Asian one-Party states, in comparison with those of the U.S. and Europe.

The purpose of Column 4 is to offer space for commentary on the skills and approaches that one would expect to find in the U.S. and European categories if they were meeting citizens' needs for social contract democracy, but that are missing in those frameworks and are also absent in the Soviet Union and two Southeast Asian one-Party states. Column 4 also helps to generate a framework of skills categories for social contract democracy that can be used to address current failings to prepare citizens for the kind of social contract democracy envisioned by the political philosophers and constitutional drafters of the Enlightenment era.

In designing this table, I have taken the U.S. and European frameworks literally. While the frameworks claim to be setting standards for civic "competence", the subject areas do not specifically reference skills. They only reference subject areas of "knowledge" and "perspectives" that are measured through written testing rather than the development of specific skills. While many civic skills can be tested in written form (including many managerial, advocacy, legal and political skills) along with the reasoning processes of choices of approaches, the testing frameworks that the U.S. and Europe use for measuring civic competence of youth only vaguely mention actual skills. One can only make very limited assumptions

about what those skills might be by looking at what is described generally in the literature of civics curriculum to see the kinds of classroom activities and exercises that are mentioned as best practices that might indicate that youth are developing some kind of certain skills in class exercises.

While Table 1 does not offer clarity on any specific skills that are considered parts of national civic curriculum in the U.S. or Europe, this is not to say that these skills are not taught at many individual schools. As an aside, some of these practices can be used to help generate a list of what could be part of a full civics curriculum, and I have listed some of these in a text box. At best, what appears in the literature is that certain schools experiment with forms of active learning in civics as did my own high school in suburban New York in the 1970s (that seems to have been unique in offering a course on "media" and the analysis of propaganda, control), social studies courses with active debates on international issues, and extra-curricular opportunities with student government and student media. For the purposes of this analysis, I have generated this list of Formal and Informal "Best Practices" in Civics Education Skills Teaching in U.S. and Europe in the text box below. Most of the formal skills are those for representative government rather than direct democracy. Those informal (extracurricular) skills are more empowering but they are chosen only by a small percentage of students and likely exist only in a percentage of all schools.

Refer also to Figure 1, 'Formal "Best Practices" in Civics Education in U.S. and Europe: p.92.

- Results: The results of this analysis, in Columns 3 and 4 of Table 1 **[See pp.93-97]** provide an unpleasant wake-up call to those in the U.S. and Europe who may believe that their civics preparation, skills and concepts in "democratic" systems are substantively different from those of one-Party states. While the forms of government are certainly somewhat different, citizen skills (and actual citizen authority over the spectrum of public decisions) are only really different in a few of the categories of representation, such as selections of political candidates and some minimal influences on representatives. To the extent that Western democracies teach some specific skills of representational democracy in multi-party or two-party systems, with some civil society organizations that exert independent political roles and have some attributes of free press, there is a difference in skills training in a set of skills that can be listed. However, if representative mechanisms are short-circuited in the countries or if access to them is unequal, democracy can be easily short-circuited in ways that make the skills of representative democracy meaningless. Unless citizens also have the skills to recognize and stop this kind of degradation, the few democratic skills that they have can also be rendered meaningless. Indeed, there are several mechanisms for this kind of short-circuiting of formal democratic mechanisms (including thing like the influence of money, networks, governmental powers of surveillance, etc.) for which civics education is not preparing students anywhere, meaning that citizens in the U.S. and Europe are essentially as disempowered in political skills and awareness as their counterparts in one-Party regimes.

Note that while it is possible that I am oversimplifying or caricaturing what actually goes on in many schools in "Western democracies", the important point here is that the outlines and measures of essential civic skills for democracy are not clearly elaborated in any government education guidelines or in any government tests of effectiveness in the U.S. and Europe. That means that they are potentially flexible to allow for excellent programming but also, and probably more likely, vulnerable to failure and abuse. This is why authors, like those cited in the introduction, are reporting on the decline of democracy and the failures of citizenry to engage in or restore effective democratic governance.

Column 4 may be the most significant part of this table because it helps in the identification of what I present and number, later in this article, as some 13 categories of failures in the basic design of civic education frameworks that require a corresponding logical set of skill categories for preparing citizens to engage in social contract democracy.

What Table 1 reveals is that no countries prepare citizens for protecting the actual institutional structures of public control from corruption or degradation, which, in fact, are the fundamental features of "social contract" democracy; negotiating oversight and control of the system, itself, rather than simply participating in a system that may be corrupted or degraded and subject to outside controls. Apparently, every country now starts with the assumption that the existing system of political institutions is one that citizens must fit into without even helping citizens to identify what and where political power and decisions are and what a "social contract" for their control even is or how it is negotiated. This fundamental ideological approach that is counter to the tenets of social contract democracy is what ultimately leads to the conclusion that civics education in one-Party states and in so-called "democracies" are more similar than different.

As John Dewey and the pioneers of social contract democracy warned (cited above), the idea of starting with first principles of governance, identifying institutions and interests, and then fitting the necessary skills to their public management and oversight by the citizenry, is the essence of civics and not the parroting of dogmas or formal categories promoted by those who hold influence and whose interest is in using educational systems to manipulate the citizenry for their own benefit. Achieving this is the basis for restarting a system of civics education for social contract democracy, which provides the basis for detailed frameworks of civics education skills that are developed and presented later in this article.

<u>How Scholarly and Professional Literature Has Been Part of the Problem of Defining Civic Education for Democracy</u>: While the classic principles of social contract democracy and education are clear, much of the literature on civics education today appears to either knowingly or subconsciously hide or confuse the search for a clear framework that would identify the set of civic skills needed by citizenry in a social contract democracy. As the Director of Research at one of the leading civics education centers in the U.S. wrote me recently, "Rather than describing SKILLS, the field is still at the level of definitions of what 'civic education' even is and is supposed to do"[3] even though it is more than two centuries since the writings of Rousseau, Madison, Hamilton, Jay, and Jefferson addressed these issues. Indeed, as a recent article also pointed out, the discipline of Political Science globally, along with other social sciences, has increasingly turned into anti-science theology in the service of ideologies of power and control of citizenry, in place of any kind of discipline or real empowerment, perhaps by design and in efforts to undermine civic culture (Sly, 2018). This section examines the theories on civic education that are scattered today in the academic literature given the absence of any journal to promote it (despite dozens of journals on "social justice" and other contemporary slogans claiming to promote political rights and equality) and documents the failure of those works to offer any kind of coherent or comprehensive framework. This serves as a prelude to an examination of the jumble of different specific civic skills that are mentioned and promoted in the literature without any clear underlying theoretical framework, as well as of the most recent attempt at compiling what exists in a list of civic skills (that of Torney-Purta and colleagues, 2015), that is unfortunately only directed at the university curriculum and university students rather than universally to the full citizenry in elementary and secondary school education.

[3] Personal correspondence from Dr. Rey Junco, Director of Research at the Tisch College of Civic Life at Tufts University, at Circle, The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement, June 15, 2020.

What one finds in the civics education literature today in the absence of any frameworks for civic education skills that fit with concepts of social contract democracy and effective governance, can be described as a jumble of advocacy for specific programs, promotion of individual ideas, and a continuing search for basic definitions. Often these are just calls for "more active" learning and "fewer tests" but without any explanations ("Hey Policy Makers!", 2017) or simply for "supportive standards and curricular policies" (National Assessment Governing Board, 2010) or strategic litigation to force schools to use existing standards (Rebell, 2018).

Typical of theory in this field is the classification of "traditions" in ways that reorient thinking away from essential democratic and political rights theories like that of social contract democracy, viewing "Education for Public Democracy", for example, as a struggle, instead, between abstractions like traditions of "privately-oriented citizenship" and "public democratic citizenship" (Sehr, 1997), or in terms of sweet sounding religious appeals like "intellect, morality and action" in "restoring [a] lost mission" (Lagemann and Lewis, 2012). There is also a set of ideological buzz words that commonly appear, calling for "awareness", "critical consciousness", "altruism and social activism", "civic communication" and other "multidimensional" touchy-feely shallow terms of the current era of neo-liberal ideology in academic publication, as well as calls for action that instead of promoting any kind of action or empowerment lead merely to "narratives" and jargon (Hurtado, Ruiz, and Whang, 2012a) or to proselytization of "social responsibility" without content (Hurtado, Ruiz, and Whang, 2012b). Other exhortations promote "civic identities", "civic principles", "civic society and systems" and "civic participation" "embedded in … wider community, schools and classrooms, home environments and the individual" (Schulz, Fraillon, Ainley, Losito and Kerr, 2008). Like religious doctrinal education, much of contemporary civic education is also focused not on any real empowering skills but on the "inner" person, so that (the resulting disempowered and unskilled) citizens are "informed and thoughtful", "think critically", have "awareness of public and community issues", "contribute to organizations", "have moral and civic virtues", and have "skills knowledge and commitment needed to accomplish public purposes", with at best one or two weak actual skills like "voting", "petitioning and protesting" thrown in for good measure, but with no focus on effectiveness, goals or types of institutions they need to oversee and manage (CIRCLE, 2003). Others promote knowledge of "economics", "trust in government", "attitudes … toward immigrants and ethnic minorities and women's rights" to promote "engagement" without any real framework (Aradeo, Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Husfeldt, and Nikolovna, 2002).

Those frameworks that are self-promoting seek to encourage what used to be the ethic of volunteerism, that exists everywhere including in totalitarian regimes but has now been renamed "civic engagement" in the form of "service learning" (for-credit work that subsidizes approved organizations and relieves teachers of obligations to supervise empowering programs and actual field work), "character education programmes", and "simulations" (disempowering classroom experiences that distort reality and cut off students from real interactions and impact) (Lin, 2015). While the idea of simulations to "practice citizenship by playing roles" is certainly well intentioned and may work for many young children or for very specific skills taken out of a larger context (such as some negotiation skills), the idea that "fictional environments …. that would be impossible [for student engaged learning] in the real world" raises questions as to whether the approach to simulations is really just to convince citizens to be spectators and not to be empowered at all (Gould, 2011).

These simulations do not include any realistic political situations to prepare students for political activity as citizens in the world in which we have been living for generations in which there continue today to be reports in almost every country of infiltration of student groups by police informants, blackmail by security state agencies, political assassinations by government and criminal networks, or the cover up of these actions that are part of the reality of civics. Dealing with those requires a real set of skills that

not even these simulations will teach, despite their being "highly engaging and motivating" (Gould, 2011). Somewhat more active, by contrast, and offering some real skills in context of policy action, are approaches like Project Citizen and Youth Participatory Action Research, promoting monitoring and influence as well as communication in a local context but not fitting into a larger framework of the overall skills necessary in civic education (Citizens Education Initiative). One might ask how these projects touch on the oversight, regulation or confrontation of citizens with their military and police powers or with the major corporate interests in their communities that may be part of much larger domestic and global networks. Is experience in selecting the colors of the walls of the student cafeteria really an exercise preparing students for social contract democracy, or is it a diversion and a manipulative tool to undercut it?

Other approaches promote historical narratives in place of skills, such as "familiarity with several key historical struggles, campaigns and social movements" and "the ability to think critically about complex issues" "to work collectively" and to have "moral and political courage" but also without the skills to act (National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement, 2012). This seems to be emblematic of the disempowering approach to civics that is conducted today globally in the name of empowerment.

II. **How Current Educational Approaches to Civic Education Skills Reflect the Current Confusion and Fail to Offer Consistent and Comprehensive Guidance**

At the heart of the nearly universal failure in civics education today to empower citizens with the skills that they need for social contract democracy or even for effective participation in limited ways that their political systems allow, not just in authoritarian political systems where one would expect a lack of real civic education but also in "democracies", is that it starts with the faulty premise of defining "civic knowledge" as limited to repeating State and elite mythologies that obfuscate the actual locus and workings of political power that citizens need to recognize in order to protect their interests. The approach to civic education that one finds almost everywhere today is not to provide actual knowledge of how systems work and how interests and needs can be presented and asserted, but in fact to distract and misdirect citizens towards elite generated dogma (what the National Council for the Social Studies, (2013, page 33) calls "obtaining factual knowledge of written provisions found in important texts"). What civic experts today call "civic consciousness" is actually a civic "unconsciousness" in which understanding of political realities of power and its use are replaced by a kind of religious or ideological indoctrination focusing on "morality" or "political correctness" along with some basic knowledge of "current issues" framed from above (Carpini and Keeter, 1996), along with disempowering tasks like "following the news", learning "virtues", and learning the "principles … that are meant to guide official institutions" (National Council for the Social Studies, 2013, page 33). As a result of this indoctrination, what is left in terms of "civic skills" teaching, if skills are taught at all, is mostly the fitting of citizens into existing institutional structures or focusing their attention on narrow, local choices that are of little real impact. Indeed, what is left in curricula for "civic skills" is often little different from teaching skills for social interactions in the workplace in place of the essentials of democratic control and oversight.

Civic educators everywhere appear to have been taught not to ask or have not been allowed to ask the three most basic questions that almost any child would ask when introduced to civics. These are the questions that political scientists and political sociologists once asked as the starting points of their disciplines and that imply the need for specific civic skills that now are only taught at the university level in social contract democracies if at all, rather than in a general civics education, where they belong:

- *Who has political power* (and how, where and on what do they exercise it)? (the essential question of political science, "Who gets what, when, and how?" posed by Harold Lasswell, (Lasswell, 1936) and by political sociologists (Domhoff, 2015, based on decades of work));

- *How do those who have power keep it* (and keep it from the citizenry in ways that prevent and distort the actual full exercise of citizen authority)?; and
- *How can citizens retrieve or take political power that is not in their hands, hold on to it, and use it in their long-term interests*?

The contemporary failure in civics education has not been the unwillingness or inability to teach skills at all, but in the lack of clear guidance or the unwillingness, in the face of political pressures and taboos, on *how* to choose which skills for which kinds of participation, oversight, and control, in which institutions, on which kinds of decisions, at which levels, with which kinds of protections and with which goals. The choice of skills without any logic linking their use to social contract democracy does not mean that those skills which are taught are not useful or relevant, since many of them are. It means that there is no logic to their choice that ensures that citizens are fully equipped with all of the skills that they need to protect their interests and promote them in a consistent and comprehensive way. There is also little flexibility to allow civics education curricula to adapt to ensure that education meets new needs and does not just generate into parroting and obedience to existing political power and institutions, which is always the danger. With no clear framework, civics education faces the danger of becoming nothing more than a muddle of skills without a logic, distorted by political elites and forms of manipulation.

An analysis of the skills lists currently existing in civics education and proposed by the experts today in the available literature suggests that they focus mostly on very basic analytical skills that are in fact not substantively different from those used in business or in pure functionary roles in organizations, with little that is really specific to citizen empowerment and impact in political decision-making. Skills-teaching in the area of civics is limited today to only on a few of the basic skills of representative government and understanding of a very limited number of institutions and actions, with few of the real skills of social contract democracy.

An examination of current lists of civic skills presented in academic literature helps to identify several missing elements that belong in a logical framework of social contract democracy in general and, in particular, in a list of specific skills that are of particular relevance today in "democracies" in decline. Below, in are presentations of the skills lists that are found in the civics education literature today along with an analysis of their shortcomings, and a review of two recent attempts to generate more comprehensive lists to address those shortcomings, with an attempt to generate the basis for a comprehensive framework that addresses a full set of real needs. That framework and a linked skills list are presented in the next section of this article, directly addressing the three essential questions, above, and the skills associated with them.

<u>The Typical Civic Skills Lists that Exist Today and How they Differ Little from Most Skills for Corporate Communications and Analysis of White Collar Workers</u>: Most lists of civic skills seem to repeat a short list of "four" analytical and communications skills with a lack of standardization and clarity of what these skills are and how they have any real impact on promoting political rights and interest. What one finds in the academic literature is the use of different terms meaning the same thing or use of terms that are not well defined (little clarity on what is actually to be taught, how the skills would be used, and how they are measured). One of the works that is often used as a basic reference in the field summed up the situation nearly a generation ago, with little visible change since then: "Despite the significant number of authors directly or indirectly referencing civic skills, very few have actually gone on to specify what civic skills are and even fewer have done empirical work specifically looking either for the presence or the impacts of civic skills" (Kirlin, 2003, page 14). Other authors have tried to catalogue and compare the various lists (Torney-Purta, Cabrera, Crotts, Ou, Liu and Rios, 2015).

This very basic and short list of "four' skills can essentially be summarized as follows:

- "*Critical thinking*" (basic comparative analysis of perspectives, also not well defined and vulnerable to political influences);
- *Communications* skills (starting originally with discussion, advocacy and written and oral presentation (Verba and Nie, 1972; CIRCLE 2010) and listening skills, that are all typically found in language curricula rather than civics, and now including electronic social media);
- "*Research*" skills that are not clearly defined (Gould, 2011) including search for and use of evidence (National Council for the Social Studies, 2013); and
- "*Collective decision-making*" but generally not the full range of negotiation skills (CIRCLE, 2003), apparently analogous to "jury" or caucus decision-making;

Surprisingly, this is really all that there is … nothing more than these four basic skills that hardly appear to be limited to civics, at all!

Applying a simple test of this skills list, in Table 2, makes it clear that if this list is really the extent of civic skills teaching today, as it appears to be, there is little difference today between civic education in Western democracies and basic skills preparation for employees for standard communications. Column 1 in the table lists the "four" main civic skills listed above and Column 2 analyzes each of the four to determine whether or not they are unique to civics education and a democratic citizenry or are equally valid preparation for corporate or functionary roles.

The analysis makes it clear that none of these categories are unique to civics education for a democratic citizenry. There are potential aspects of these categories where there are specific skills that are an essential part of social contract democracy, but unless they are specifically defined, the skill categories themselves are not at all unique to civics. Indeed, most are skills that are just as much a part of family responsibilities as they are citizen skills for promoting political rights and interests in governmental systems.

See Table 2. **Comparing Current Approaches in Civics Education in the U.S. to Education for Corporate or Functionary Roles: p.98.**

<u>The Emerging Attempts at Comprehensive Lists that Start to Point to the Missing Categories</u>: After reviewing the existing skills lists above, two different groups have sought to expand on it in recent years; (1) a group of scholars whose focus was on higher education civic skills (Torney-Purta, Cabrera, Crotts, Ou, Liu and Rios, 2015) and (2) the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) (NCSS, 2017), through its College, Career, and Civic Life (C3) Framework. Both of these more comprehensive skills lists deserve a detailed discussion (below) but are, themselves, problematic for use in actual civic education for the simple reason that they focus on college skills, thus specifically excluding a large percentage of the citizenry and starting with citizens who have passed the age of full civic maturity (i.e., 18, the general age of high school graduation). Nevertheless, the approaches are interesting to discuss here because the lists stimulate thinking on what belongs in a list of civic skills and can help to generate a more comprehensive and effective list. As a short overview, the Torney-Purta list lacks a clear logic and seems to just toss together ideas randomly, often mistaking "skills" for "knowledge" or "concepts" while still managing to include several fundamentals that can help to flesh out a skeleton list of key skills. Meanwhile, the C3 Framework is interesting not for what it includes but for some of the comments that it solicited from psychologists, sociologists, and anthropologists about their suggested list of skills that *should* be included and their recognition that skills come out of disciplines and are then applied in a political context using specific goals, even though their own list ignores this approach. This is how I will use these lists, as a springboard for something more comprehensive that can be constructed by analyzing the lists in a structural framework for both social contract democracy needs and for basic education.

Back in the 1990s, [when I founded a non-governmental organization, Unseen America Projects, Inc., specifically to introduce and promote "democratic experiential education" curricula at the university level that fit into a concept of social contract democracy (Lempert and colleagues, 1995)], the approach to skills

teaching that I and others used in the Unseen America courses was one recognized the need for general civics education in primary and secondary education as a backbone for developing higher skills at the university level. That backbone of civic skills, that we also developed and accredited at a deeper level in "democratic experiential education" curricula, mostly as students seeking to create the education that our universities were not providing, included the range of civic skills for interacting with diverse (and "unseen") cultures, groups and institutions (including military, police and economic), for developing specific skills on a range of public policy issues, and for oversight of government functions like sustainable development planning. (The courses also included additional skills of social modeling and social science theory that were specifically appropriate to a university, while many of the other skills were those of civic education that should have been but were missing in secondary school education.) I will use some of that logic here in organizing these general skill frameworks as I analyze these two civic skills lists and use them as a springboard for moving towards a single, unified framework in the next section.

(1) *The Torney-Purta, Cabrera, Crotts, Ou, Liu and Rios civic skills list* : What makes the Torney-Purta, Cabrera, Crotts, Ou, Liu and Rios' civic skills list (2015) different from the previous lists of four skills, described above, is that they expand that list to roughly 40 categories of skills (some containing multiple skills and others not clearly "skills" but "knowledge" and "concepts") in a way that starts to fit citizen activities to specific tasks for which they need education preparation. The list contains two "domains", "civic competency and civic engagement", placed into six (somewhat fuzzy) categories; the first three in the "civic competency" domain and the next three in the "civic engagement" domain. These are: civic knowledge (that again confuses "skills" and "knowledge"), analytical skills (that seem like a renaming and expansion of "critical thinking" and "research"), participatory and involvement skills (which is partly a renaming of "collective decision-making" and "critical thinking"), motivations, attitudes and efficiency (that again confuses "perspectives" with "skills"), democratic norms and values (that also confuses "perspectives" with skills"), participation and activities (which is a list of places to apply skills, like public speaking or "collective decision-making") and various sub-categories of understanding (which are also a renaming of civic "perspectives" and not really a list of "skills"), That may sound like a pile of confusion but there is a way to sort it out and organize it in a way that is more logical and useful.

While, in my view, the Torney-Purta, Cabrera, Crotts, Ou, Liu and Rios list starts with just a rehash of the four basic skills listed above, placed now into six categories in two "domains", in ways that are still filled with jargon, lack of clarity of what each skill actually is and where it comes from, and not following any tangible logic of social contract democracy that is based on identifying real sources of political power and institutions that citizens have to manage and control, there is something interesting among the 40 or so sub-categories that then follow. The exercise of brainstorming by the authors has led to the generation of a number of important additions that are the meat of civic education skills. In my view, what is missing in what is largely a sprawling vagueness of the list, just needs to be added in to the insightful brainstorming in order to form the basis for a list of hard skills that is rooted in actual disciplines (cognitive theory, management science, jurisprudence, sociology, group processes and cultural behaviors) that would train citizens for practical exercise of civic responsibilities.

Among the list of some 40 skills (depending on how they are counted given that the list mixes different levels of analysis) that are identifiable skills, about one third are core skills areas. In **Table 3 [See pp.99-101]** I place 13 of them in 12 rows (including two that overlap placed together in one of the rows; the second row in the second level of analysis which is the fourth of the 12 rows of skills). I arrange them in an order of what I define as priority steps to explain their relevance to civic education. After tossing out about two thirds of the categories that the authors present as mostly redundant or not really skills, or just low level skills (like writing and speaking) that are not specific to civics, I use Table 3 to create a basic framework that leads directly to the generation of

a coherent, larger set of civic education skills that can be presented in the next section as a basic framework for civic education, not at the university level but through public education through the secondary school level.

In Table 3, I identify four framework categories for civic skills as the basic structure. These four categories merge the missing framework concepts that were identified in (in the fourth column: **pp.99-101**) into a hierarchical skills framework for social contract democracy civic education. In other words, Table 3 takes the concepts from Table 1 that were found missing in current literature, and uses them to organize those 13 actual civic skills that are among the long list of 40 skills presented in the work of Torney-Puta. Here are the four different categories introducing the 13 different roles. I have given them long titles to also indicate how each category provides answers to the three key questions of civic education that I listed above at the beginning of this section:

- ***Level One****: Overarching Social Contract Skills: Locating Political Power and Creating a Social Contract Constitution for Equal Power and Oversight* (answering the first question, "Who has power?" and the following questions of how citizens should contract to hold it),
- ***Level Two****: Overarching Government/Public Institution and Public Policy/Decision-making Management Skills for Sustainability, Protection and Measurement of All Assets* (answering the third question on oversight skills and the management functions of governance),
- ***Level Three****: Specific Institutional and Cultural Policy Involvement and Oversight through Direct Field Visits and Application of Quantitative and Qualitative Skills* (also answering the third question with a set of skills for policy context, both for the underlying sources of political power and for balancing interests), and
- ***Level Four****: Specific Skills for the Effective Exercise of Citizen Power, through Direct and Indirect Democracy, and for Protecting that Authority against manipulation* (answering the second and third questions on how power is exercised and how citizens can hold it through the formal administrative mechanisms).

Table 3 [See pp.99-101] *consists of two columns, with the 13 important skills categories* (12 rows with one overlap) taken from Torney-Purta, Cabrera, Crotts, Ou, Liu and Rios (2015) in the first column and then with an analysis in the second column, clarifying how the skill they identified fits into civic education for social contract democracy. The table is a bit detailed with long explanations in each box. The purpose here is to help explain the basis of creating a civics curriculum that fits the reality of how political power works and that draws on clear teachable and measurable skills with each box serving as a short form of discussion of types of skills.

The importance of the details in the table is that it stresses the need to push civic educators to think more deeply (and freely) about social contract democracy and the real skills citizens need not only for basic civic functions but for real exercises of power at every place where it is essential in democracy and with every kind of action (in representative and direct democracy), for protection against the many deceptive practices that undermine real democracy, and for meeting the functions of government for sustainability. For readers who might get lost in these mini discussions that actually have much more detail behind them and could be extended, the clear explanations of how these mini discussions helps to generate lists of targeted skills for a civics curriculum is shown in parallel in the following section of this paper and then in the civic education indicator in the section after that.

[Note that while I actually derive 13 categories of civic skills later in this paper, the 13 skills categories that I have used do not directly follow the 13 that I have used from Torney-Purta et.al. in Table 3, though I do use the same four levels of skills that I present here as a basic framework. The organization here is part of a transition that leads to a comprehensive framework, step-by-step.]

See Table 3. **Recognition of Civic Education Skills**

in Torney-Purta, Cabrera, Crotts, Ou, Liu and Rios (2015), with clarifications to show their relevance to Social Contract Democracy and the Disciplinary Rooting of the Skill: pp.99-101.

(2) *The National Council for Social Studies College, Career and Civic Life (C3) Framework*: Like the Torney-Purta, Cabrera, Crotts, Ou, Liu and Rios list (2015), the National Council for Social Studies College, Career and Civic Life (C3) Framework (2013) also included some sprawling lists of skills, not in their main civic education framework discussed earlier in this article, but in "companion documents" with additional perspectives from the disciplinary associations in the U.S. for psychology, sociology and anthropology. While the skills identified by professionals in these companion documents are not well elaborated and applied to civics education, probably because the associations are comprised of university scholars whose teachings are not geared to civic empowerment skills for civic responsibilities and to real applications for social contract democracy and governance, they do provide the basis for opening up discussion on how these disciplines can be applied to empowering citizens. The second column in Table 3, above, already makes some references to the disciplines from which several key civics skills emerge, including psychology, sociology and anthropology, where some of the listed skills in the Torney-Purta, Cabrera, Crotts, Ou, Liu and Rios list would require drawing on those disciplines.

In recognition of these useful perspectives offered by professionals, I have generated a table below, Table 4, as a way to also promote discussion of skills categories that can be added into a civic education skills framework. Table 4 follows a similar form to Table 3. but I have not used the four levels framework from Table 3. Instead, I just take the skills categories that are most useful for citizens in a democracy and place them in Table 4 for discussion, with the sections of the table corresponding to the disciplinary associations that offered the ideas. The first column is ad hoc in the form of a list, taking four ideas mentioned by the three different professional associations. In the second column, I offer capsule discussions, putting the advice the discipline gives for civic skills into a clear context of civic education where I try to identify the specific skills that should be taught that are rooted in the disciplinary advice.

- For example, citizens today in most societies are subject to a variety of psychological manipulation techniques and propaganda from elites who seek to maintain their power and limit social contract democracy. This means that specific psychological skills can empower citizens to counter this manipulation and to assure their effective oversight.
- Similarly, sociologists recognize that power is exercised through social structures and networks that work to hide its locus and to exclude citizens, meaning that skills taught by sociologists can empower citizens to identify the locus of political power and to effectively regulate it.
- Further, most citizens also remain in the dark about situations of other groups in mass society, not only elites but indigenous peoples, foreign communities with whom they are manipulated to engage in war or exploitation or learn to fear, and other individuals unlike themselves, meaning that skills teaching from those disciplines is also essential to equip them effectively for policy making and negotiating.

Overall, the social sciences could and should play key roles in preparing citizens in primary and secondary school education for protecting themselves and for engaging effectively and actively in governance, including transforming their political systems to those that reflect the principles of social contract democracy. Table 4 just highlights a few of these and provides examples of how this framework can be added and integrated into a larger curricular framework of civic skills for social contract democracy, in the next section.

See Table 4. **Recognition of Civic Education Skills from specific Social Science Disciplines in the National Council for Social Studies College, Career and Civic Life (C3) Framework (2013), with clarifications to show their relevance to Social Contract Democracy and the Disciplinary Rooting of the Skill: p.102.**

III. A Framework and List of Indicative Skills for Civic Education for Social Contract Democracy in the Modern Context

This section takes the essential starting questions for citizens to ask in a democracy, the conceptual categories for civic education in a social contract democracy, as well as essential recognized and missing skills that citizens need in social contract democracy that were presented in section II, above, considers how they would logically fit together, and then organizes them into a coherent list of needed civic skills in a comprehensive framework of civic education for contract democracy today.

This section starts with the basic questions at the heart of what social contract democracy is designed to do and why it fails and uses these questions to generate a framework for civic education in social contract democracy. These key basic questions are those very questions that most civic educators today are taught not to ask or are prevented from asking, at the levels of overall political decision-making, goals of government, and about the full set of institutions and areas in which politics take place:

- "Who has power?";
- "How do they keep it?", and
- "What do citizens need to do to hold it and keep it in ways that promote long-term interests?"

In following these questions and the issues they raise, to generates a framework for civic education in social contract democracy, identifying key levels of analysis and included subjects, and a set off indicative skills, linked to their disciplinary roots, that can serve as a guide for primary and secondary school educators, globally, I organize this chapter using the four "levels" of skills that I presented in Table 3.

I then take the various categories of skills identified in Tables 1, 2, and 3 and organize them within the four "levels" in more specific skills areas. In the previous section, I identified more than a dozen civic skills that have been mentioned at various places in academic literature and began to organize them in a logical hierarchy of topics and into clusters, where the three essential questions of politics could be applied to assuring that the appropriate specific skills were included. In this section, I continue to build that framework as a starting point for elaborating a coherent and effective civics education curriculum for social contract democracy, building a framework that consists of four levels (those that were presented above in Table 3) and some 13 thematic included areas now presented here, fitting into those four levels, with indicative skills to be taught in a civics curriculum in those thematic areas areas. The presentation in this section follows the levels of analysis offered in Tables 3 and 4, with explanations and citations to social science and management literature from which the thematic concepts and skills are drawn.
Note again that while skills are directly linked to "knowledge" and "concepts", knowledge and concepts, alone, do not effectively equip citizens to have a real impact on political institutions, frameworks and political decisions. For each of the four levels and the 13 thematic areas presented here in the framework, there are of course associated knowledge and concept learning, but the list here focuses on measurable skills, assuming that the knowledge and concepts are part of the teaching of the skills, reversing the false assumption that other work offers in which knowledge and concepts replace or eliminate the teaching of the actual skills.

The framework that I offer here is only an outline as a guide to educators for specific program and teaching design. It does not fit the skills learning into specific years of the primary and secondary school curriculum where civics education needs to be placed. It does not sequence them, note pre-requisites or how they can be clustered. It does not directly describe methods (other than noting the importance of direct and field experiences rather than simulations), materials, skills testing, time requirements, costs, required instructor qualifications, curriculum safeguards to ensure quality and prevent against political influence. The focus here is on the overall strategy rather than on tactical aspects of curriculum implementation that would follow.

Moreover, the skills categories that I have identified may not include all potentially essential

civic education skills. There may be others that I have missed, not only because other work has not keyed me to consider them but because there may be other governmental failings that are not pressing today or that remain hiding but for which civic education is still essential. My goal here is simply to create the framework and to recognize the possibility that there may be other civic skill categories that can fit into it that I have overlooked.

Since this framework offers a list of skills categories for comprehensive civic education, it can be translated into an indicator, in section IV., to measure and promote the quality of civic education.

Level One: *Overarching Social Contract Skills: Locating Political Power and Creating a Social Contract Constitution for Equal Power and Oversight:* This level of the framework for civic education and civic skills in a social contract democracy deals with the questions of "who has power" and "how do they exercise it" by focusing on the skills citizens need to locate real political power and its exercise, as well as how they can design a better constitutional system and set of institutions for asserting and maintaining democratic citizen rule.

Most types of authoritarian regimes today, including those that favor elites under the rubric of "democracy", where citizens actually have little real power, present civics education in a way that is really more akin to a kind of religious indoctrination to promote support for governments and elites. The curriculum they design and implement focuses on a mythological view of "founding fathers" (sometimes including some women) and doctrinal documents like constitutions with list of "rights" that are in fact unenforceable paper slogans (and with no explanation of how they can be enforced), with descriptions of "branches and powers of government" that focus only on administration but not on power behind the administrative structure and influencing it (which is claimed to be "democratic" and in representative of "the people" without testing whether or not it is) and on minor acts in which citizens demonstrate their obedience (voting for elite approved candidates and referenda) following mass campaigns that either require voting or use a variety of manipulative techniques to promote voting and directed outcomes. "Learning" is reduced to rote repetition of texts, historical presentations and "concepts", without measures or challenge.

By contrast, social contract democracies contain two basic thematic areas of skills at the overarching level of the social contract, itself: locating actual "political power" and mechanisms by which it is exercised and then the skill of designing and contracting the system of government in which citizens control those powers and are able to act with equal and full ability to negotiate their needs.

A. *Locating and Measuring Political Power and Control:* At the heart of citizen participation in social contract democracy is having the skills to answer the first and part of the second of three key questions and one that is the fundamental question of political science and political sociology: Who has political power (and how, where and on what do they exercise it)? (the essential question of political science, "Who gets what, when, and how?" posed by Harold Lasswell, (Lasswell, 1936) and by political sociologists (Domhoff, 2015, based on decades of work)) and "What aspects of the political and social system enable them to keep and exercise this authority that can be transferred to the citizenry?"

   What political science and sociology have taught for decades is that political power does not reside in paper documents like constitutions or in administrative structures but is rooted in elite networks (Mills, 1956; Parenti, 1988), military or economic hegemony (Wallerstein, 1979), international corporate power (Barnet and Muller, 1974; Korten, 1995), in domestic economic institutions (Lindblom, 1977), by control of information through secrecy in national security agencies (Raskin, 1976) and by bureaucratic authority within institutions (Weber, 1947

[1925]). It is exercised in particular decisions through forms of control of violence and weaponry by military and police (Lempert, 2017b). Some of it is outside of countries, themselves, and rooted in international organizations (Payer, 1982; Trimble, 1997) as well as private actors. It is also exercised through media (Chomsky, 1991) and socialization, including education and symbols. This is not a complete list of potential sources of real political power (which can derive from economic and institutional power and not just from institutions and individuals exercising force) since the structure of power differs across societies. Some refer to the overall civic skill here as the ability to analyze the "deep structure" of politics, which is a term from anthropology.

In order to exercise their control and political authority as citizens in a democracy, citizens need the political science skills for locating real power and the areas of decisions on where it is exercised as well as the ability to measure all of the aspects of whether their systems are "democratic".

Among the sub-skills here are:

- Measuring human rights and power balances with specific tools, including measures of power at the level of cultural rights and individual rights (Barber, 1994; Lempert, 2017a);
- Measuring the factors and outcomes for equality of participation, including not only access to political leverage (Dahl, 1961; Brady, Verba and Lehman Schlossman, 1995) but also equal contextual factors such as nutrition for infants, equal education, and opportunity to learn the full range of civic skills (the list presented in this article and additional skills that may be identified).

B. Negotiating an Enforceable Social Contract Constitution that allows for full empowerment and control by the citizenry. At the heart of citizen "social contracting" (and not simply endorsing an existing system without knowing if, where and how, it transfers away actual citizen oversight) is the second of three key basic questions for citizen democracy from the perspective of citizens: How do citizens manage powers now in the hands of elites in ways that allow for the full exercise of citizen authority? Contract negotiation is a legal skill and one that all citizens can learn in order to protect their own interests. In the case of social contract democracy, citizens also need to understand their roles in management of different types of organizations and power (part of Level 2 and Level 3 skills, below) combined with the idea of balancing different interests, best presenting preferences, effectively delegating authority so that they still maintain it, and balancing time so that citizens rotate their responsibilities and are able to concentrate and focus when they are called upon to do so, without having to participate on all decisions in ways that would be shallow and ill considered (the failure of many shallow "direct democracy" schemes) or having to delegate away all power to "representatives" (the failure of "representative" "democracy").

In my analysis of the several balances of powers of the "citizens" in the original U.S. constitution, I offer a textbook analysis of how different group and individual interests were balanced in multiple ways that no longer exist in the U.S. (Lempert, unpublished trilogy but partly on-line), such as how the U.S. Supreme Court once directly (rather than simply on the basis of purported "identity") balanced different ethnic interests, how the executive branch balanced different political interests (in the offices of President and Vice President), control of economic power through chartering of corporations to

ensure they meet standards of public purpose and oversight, and how the exercise of power included other pre-existing institutional power balances that did not require costs at the time but now do (like more equal media access in earlier communications technologies for those who were "citizens"), as well as how the Anti-Federalists also introduced rights protection balances of military power through state militias and jury systems and jury powers (many of which no longer exist and have been forgotten) (Brutus and Henry, 1965 [1787]). I have explained how some of the mechanisms can be reintroduced in the modern industrial state context for new forms of balancing (through a set of what I call "Return to Democracy" and "Return to Federalism" amendments) with various mechanisms like private attorneys general/private rights of action to enforce laws, socialized access to lawyers, equal access to media (through "common carrier" schemes), ethnic rather than "state" voting to ensure minority balancing of courts and of executive oversight including over military and police powers, citizen panel/citizen jury oversight of bureaucracies and businesses and organizations of certain sizes, diminution of the power of the President and return to more legislative power, restoration of citizen power in the courts as jurors with power to "nullify" the authority of judges, and others (Lempert, unpublished trilogy). There are other potential interest balancing mechanisms that can be incorporated into a political contract including minority group vetoes, specific guaranteed cultural representation, ranked choice voting, more open party registration and participation, elimination of the corruption of money in political campaigns, the role of corporate media and finance in lobbying and in access to representatives.

To assure effectiveness in learning the skill of negotiating a social contract that balances all of these interests effectively, teaching must include introduction to all of the mechanisms and direct citizen involvement as part of the learning of the constitutional and legislative drafting process.

Level Two: ***Overarching Government/Public Institution and Public Policy/Decision-making Management Skills for Sustainability, Protection and Measurement of All Assets and for International Long-Term Aspirations:*** This level of skills is an adjunct to the first level that focuses on the actual goals of democratic government so that citizens are able to maintain focus on the purpose of government and public policy and have the skills to measure whether they are being achieved. In answering the third essential question of governance, of how citizens can take back control of governance and maintain it, citizens need to have the clear skills to assure that the power that they do have as citizens is used to achieve the long-term objectives of good governance and that they are measuring the performance of the systems of political decision-making and action in achieving that.

Where civic education today introduces governance and its purpose, it is limited to describing or listing mechanical tasks like "writing legislation" or "making policy" and functional policy areas, often presented in the form of generalized slogans like "protecting national security", "declaring war" and "public education". At best, the role of leadership in meeting the needs of the citizenry and the goals of citizen advocacy are described in short-term appeals for decisions like "jobs" or "war" or specific spending decisions.

By contrast, effective civics education teaches the skills of measuring the long-term roles of government in ways that are integrated (for maintaining sustainability in order to protect future interests and for measuring, promoting and maintaining the values of the country and global values) as well as teaching the skill of screening and defining the different roles of institutions so that government exercises its proper roles and that public institutions have clear missions that

citizens can measure for effective oversight. These overarching government/public institution and public policy/decision-making management skills fall into three thematic areas.

A. *Long-Term Sustainability Planning and Measurements in order to protect future interests of the society as a whole, the sustainability and survival of individual ethnic groups, and communities, including the measurement and protection of the full set of public assets*. At the heart of the role of government is the protection (and development) of all forms of public assets in order to pass them to the next generation in an equal or higher value (ideally, a higher per-capita value). Government agencies that are effectively organized, serve to measure different kinds of assets (the full set of resources and physical assets as well as "human assets") and their missions are to "protect and develop" them. Among these assets are human cultural diversity. The integrated role of government is that of planning the sustainability of all of these assets together. The general skill category is analyzing and designing the structural and functional roles (missions/functions and tasks) of formal government for sustainability (found in the disciplines of Environmental management; Cultural survival; Strategic management)

   Note that while many civics programs now focus on "morality" and "ethical" appeals as "civic concepts", it makes much more sense to teach the "skill" of learning how to be long-term oriented, rather than short-term oriented and how to overcome pressures for short-term preferences or personal gain with those of long-term benefits. This kind of risk management is part of psychological techniques of decision-making, interests assessment, and self-control that are teachable skills and also of basic legal education (skills of long-term institution building and systems-thinking). *Some of the psychological skills techniques are*:

   - Controlling susceptibility to fears and denial that impede decision-making; and
   - Learning to accurately assess risks and value of long-term, postponed benefits.

   The key sub-skills to learn here are:
   - Basic sustainable development planning (Lempert and Nguyen, 2008, 2017, based on international conventions; Nguyen, 2008);
   - Planning and protection of cultures/communities (Lempert, 2010b, 2016, based on international conventions); and
   - Key public management skills of setting function/missions (Lyden, 1975; Bryson, 1988)

B. *Measuring, promoting and maintaining culturally specific and sustainable country values specific to cultural survival and with long-term visionary objectives (and those of each separate ethnic group of the country) and global values*. In most forms of civic education today, national and ethnic values are reduced to slogans and "buzz words" or ideologies that have no measurements attached to them. Like the components of "democracy" and cultural survival and sustainability, there are in fact professional measures of these goals and it is the role of citizens to learn these overarching measures so that they can use different skills of political action to hold governments accountable to them and for effectively measuring whether they are being achieved. The key measurement skills to learn here, that I have packaged in indicators to make them easier to learn and to use for accountability (taking them from international treaties and professional disciplines) include the cultural survival measurement approach cited above as well as:
   - Measuring "social progress" and regress using international standards (Universal

Development Goals) (Lempert, 2014, 2017a); and
- Measuring compliance with international "development" concepts in a variety of public policy intervention areas (Lempert, 2018 a and b).

C. *Identifying and holding government agencies to their proper roles while also holding non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and businesses to their appropriate roles (and charters) and assuring that public institutions have clear missions that citizens can measure for effective oversight*. The boundaries between government and private interests have been continually confused and civics courses have shied away from teaching the skills that citizens can use to assure the appropriate boundaries between governments and business (Lindblom, 1977, Mills, 1956, Galbraith, 1967) to assure that governments are not captured by business interests and that the appropriate roles of government in regulation, in investment in citizens, in protecting public assets and sustainability, in promoting political equality for citizen participation in social contract democracy, in ensuring equal balance of powers and protections of rights, eliminating conflicts of interest in use of its power, and also in limiting its power so as not to invade individual citizen privacy, are not usurped.

Similarly, citizen oversight skills are essential to assure that the roles of political parties, in one-Party states and two-Party duopolies, as well as in some multi-Party states are not usurped by small groups, and that Parties fill their appropriate roles as mission-based organizations with measurable long-term goals, and do not replace those goals with those of power simply for the leadership. Citizen oversight is similarly necessary to prevent abuses in civil society, by religious organizations, media, and various forms of non-governmental organizations that are also prone to blurring their appropriate boundaries and merging with corporate interests, foreign interests, and bureaucratic agencies or groups of political actors in ways that undermine the roles of each in different directions. By focusing only on basic tasks of government administration, civic educators have avoided this discussion and have not prepared citizens to exercise an appropriate oversight role. Like civic education literature, much of the literature on appropriate roles has also been distorted by politics and ideology in the way that governmental and non-governmental organizations have also been subject to distortion, globally. In pointing to some simple literature that can be used for skills teaching, I note the following:

- Standard organizational management literature on how to hold government organizations to specific missions for solving harms (as opposed to the general missions noted above for measuring, protection and developing assets), for setting cost-benefit measures and benchmarks, and for evaluating fulfillment of promises: (Bryson, 1988; Emmanuel, Merchant, and Orley, 1988; Garrison, Noreen, and Brewer, 2005);
- Appropriate roles for non-governmental organizations (Lempert, 2017c); and
- Appropriate roles for government (Lempert, 2016).

Level Three: ***Specific Institutional and Cultural Policy Interaction and Oversight through Direct Field Visits and Application of Quantitative and Qualitative Skills in the full range of institutions and peoples in society, starting with those in "political" roles:*** This level of civic skills addresses the third key question of democratic governance, on how citizens can take back political power, hold on to it, and use it in their long-term interests. To do so, citizens need to have the skills to manage political institutions, to effectively regulate those non-government institutions that exercise political power, to represent, protect, and

negotiate with the diverse interests within a complex society and also outside it and impacted by it, and to also advocate for their own skill needs and understand the political socialization process in their educational institutions and communities, themselves. The logic of this level of civic skills education is to focus on the society, itself, beyond the walls of the school where they learn these skills as well as within the administration of schools as institutions so that citizens are prepared to fully understand and interact with the full set of social institutions and interests that citizens must manage in a democratic society. This is not something that can be learned within the classroom in books or through media or through simulations or in just some selected representation of local governance or service institutions because that is not what citizens in a democratic society manage. While the focus here at this level is on institutions and interests, there is a bit of overlap with level four skills that focus on specific citizen political actions for taking and using political power.

Perhaps one of the most overwhelming failures of civics education and of education in general, today, in modern societies is that it starts with the same perspective of the 18th century that assumes that individuals grow up in communities where they are familiar already with the people, institutions, and economic conditions around them simply by living in their communities and that it is in school where they must learn those skills that they won't learn elsewhere; basics of reading, writing, arithmetic, and now, scientific and technical concepts for use of contemporary technological inventions like computers and telecommunications. In fact, the first part of the assumption is clearly false and schools have not adapted. Today, other than through two-dimensional electronic images and through possible interaction with the workplaces of their parents, citizens have next to no contact with most institutions of economic production or governance at all, including nothing but incidental contacts with international organizations, the military, the national security state, the courts, the police, most government bureaucracies, and most types of non-governmental organizations outside of perhaps one or two to which they may belong. They have no contact with indigenous peoples or most minority groups or with most types of minorities, and little contact with most of the communities of their own country, let alone their own neighbors of different socio-economic classes. Simulations, televised or Internet or social media images, written materials, or "tours" of the differences cannot and do not provide the understanding about these aspects of society that prepare citizens for policy-making, negotiation, or any other real informed participation in roles as citizens.

In recognition of this failure and in an attempt to begin to develop the basics of a civic education curriculum to meet this gap, starting at the undergraduate level in the university with some higher level skills but developing a basic curriculum that could be adapted in secondary education, I founded "Unseen America Projects, Inc." in the 1980s as a California non-profit and published several curricula in a book form (Lempert, 1995), raising basic policy issues and citing some of the literature. I have designed additional public approaches since then (Lempert, 2013 and 2020).

The five categories below focus on the thematic areas where citizens need clear introductions to public and private institutions with the specific skills for their oversight and incorporation into policy: managing government bureaucracy and its failures to serve citizens and law (self-interest and capture), monitoring short-circuiting of public purpose by organizations subject to public chartering (corporations and non-profits), recognizing the interests of and maintaining direct contacts with unfamiliar communities (indigenous peoples, ethnic groups, regions, rural versus urban areas, social classes, migrants) and individuals; recognizing the interests and situations of foreign communities subject to military power and other policy impacts; and recognizing and challenging the legal and democratic failures of education and socialization institutions.

Note that this civic skills level assumes a pre-existing base of analytical skills that are then to be applied here to public management and policy by citizens. These are basic quantitative and

qualitative analytical skills that are generally taught in mathematics classes, social studies and in research classes. They include journalistic skills of interviewing and participant observation. Unfortunately, as with basic skills today of literacy, presentation, general social interaction and awareness, primary and secondary school curricula vary in whether and how well they teach these. These skills can also be taught at a higher level in universities (e.g., qualitative skills of analyzing body language, space and environment, deconstructing language and quantitative statistical methods). I am not including those higher levels of professionalism here in the list of civic skills but focusing on what citizens need from the level of mandatory education.

A. *Managing government bureaucracy to correct and prevent its failures to serve citizens and law (self-interest and capture)*: From the classic studies of bureaucracies (Weber, 1947 [1925]) to recent indicators on accountability of bureaucracies in general (Duncan, 2014), there is a well-recognized understanding that routinized systems while efficient for routinized tasks are inflexible and ill adaptable, self-protective and difficult to control, often captured by the elite groups they are set to regulate or from whom they purchase goods and services, through various mechanisms of conflict of interest, and that they are prone to seek to expand their authority while minimizing accountability, increasing secrecy and obfuscation. This is particularly true of bureaucratic systems that are given real power over citizens to extract funds through taxation or licensing (in which they often turn to "rent seeking") or to grant benefits (in which they are prone to delays/avoidance and harassment), or to make decisions over resources and liberty (ombudspersons, administrative courts, and judicial systems) and those that have military and police powers with use of weaponry and license to use violence or access to private information or to exercise punitive control (prisons, mental hospitals, and to some extent schools). Seeking to exert public control over these institutions is often difficult because they are generally able to make their own rules so as to thwart access, monitoring or exchange and interpretation of any kind of information that they do not already manipulate and control. Given the weaknesses in assuring oversight by elected representatives as a result of not only capture and manipulation of representatives by agencies but the very broad electoral mandates that do not hold elected officials accountable for specific institutional monitoring even if they had the staffs and resources to do it (generally there are thousands of government employees per elected government official, in dozens of administrative areas), a common lack of incentives to protect minority rights (e.g. police abuses), incidences of harms to specific individuals that are rarely reported (by media organizations that are themselves not representative of citizens or their interests, with conflicts of interest) or compiled, oversight requires public skills in creating and using other kinds of enforcement mechanisms, including recall, lawsuits, and private attorney general approaches, as well as investigative skills. While citizens are theoretically the controlling authorities over public agencies, the relationships are often reversed in ways that create fear in the citizenry and demean citizens who would seek to appropriately exercise their oversight. Even when there is an existing "law" that supposedly prevents abuse, including international laws, there may be little enforcement of such laws given the tendency of government officials to protect each other, first.

The skills that citizens need to exercise oversight of these institutions require visits, insider meetings, and those of investigation and whistleblowing, understanding of the roles of each type of organization, the measures of performance and how they are derived

and enforced, as well as how "public servants" are held legally and politically and professionally accountable. Some specific oversight skills that can be taught include:

- Freedom of Information Requests and legal actions;
- Private rights of action and legal recall mechanisms;
- Investigation into various forms of government corruption;
- Investigations and oversight of government abuse of military and police power as well as abuse of relationships with the press, including political assassinations and imprisonments and smear campaigns as well as government blackmailing.

At the same time, rights protections of citizens also require that citizens have full knowledge on how to enforce specific rights when they are confronted by government authority. These include:
- Training in response to state power and plans to find assistance under police arrest or questioning or custody, searches/court orders and requests for contacts or information, or seizures/confiscation of property, imprisonment or torture (one curricular package that offers some of this is that developed by the Street Law project (Street Law, 2021).

B. Monitoring the short-circuiting of public purpose by organizations subject to public chartering (corporations and non-profits). In theory, all economic and social organizations in society that are above a minimum size are subject to public charters that can be revoked if organizations act against the public interest and their purpose. In reality, today, citizens no longer have this oversight power due to the short-circuiting of controls through the linking of these organizations with political actors through money, elite networks, and shared interests. As with the exercise of citizen authority over these organizations to assure that they do not corrupt public decision-making or that they do not abuse the rights of citizens engaged within them (rights of speech and association or organizing by workers, for example), these organizations thwart oversight in much the same way as do government bureaucracies (described above), with the additional advantage being that their "private" status allows them greater ability to refuse any kind of public scrutiny and to evade it (even when they may be political parties or lobbying organizations or "private contractors for government" that are directly exercising public functions). Many are able to evade scrutiny because of their multi-national status.

As with government bureaucracies, the skills that citizens need to exercise oversight of these institutions require visits, insider meetings, and those of investigation and whistleblowing that includes and understanding of the roles of each type of organization, the measures of performance and how they are derived and enforced, how they are held accountable to their charters, including mechanisms that citizens can use to revoke those charters. Key investigative skills include those into the incentive structures of these organizations and their networks, including the appropriateness or inappropriateness of "corporate responsibility" as an alternative to direct citizen oversight, corporate "Boards" and the salaries of Board members to create elite linkages (including government officials and families) and interlocking relationships among businesses, corporate "foundations" and other public relations activities that are used to thwart oversight and to avoid taxation of these entities to put money in the public treasury for solving public problems rather than allowing it to be used strategically by elites to undermine public functions.

For effective oversight, citizens also need the skills to oversee consulting and lobbying contracts, "revolving door" contracts with public officials and law firms, hiring of family members as ways to disguise influence, and the splitting of production by major corporations into several districts in order to assure that elected representatives vote for areas of public spending that will assure continued contracts (a typical practice of military industrial contractors to promote endless military spending), among others. In the case of business, there are key sectors that also require special focus in civics education, including: the financial industry (its concentration, incentives, ideology, compensation, oversight, and the linkage between it and government officials), military industries, and general manufacturing industries and agriculture. There is also a need for training in the types of issues of local control and accountability (and concerns of country production and security in time of epidemic and war) that citizens need to understand in order to monitor impacts. Similar skills can be taught for analyzing non-governmental organizations including foundations and charities, to examine their sources of funding and how funding is used to promote agendas that at best treat symptoms, continue problems rather than solve them, and promote hidden agendas of those contributing funds.

In the case of corporations, there are also specific skills that can be used for seeking information from corporations as "shareholders" including shareholder rights suits for information and accountability, prior to mechanisms for charter revocation.

C. *Recognizing the interests of and maintaining direct contacts with unfamiliar communities (indigenous peoples, ethnic groups, regions, rural versus urban areas, social classes, migrants) and individuals along with the skills of enforcement of international rights protections at community and individual levels, for cultural survival and for equality under law*: While there is an increasing focus in schooling globally on individual identity and individual rights, with issues of gender, sexuality and minority identity for "integration" and assimilation into labor forces, most of this focus on the one of two levels of rights (individual rights rather than ethnic/ community rights), not only fails to concentrate on specific communities and their sustainability (indigenous peoples as well as ethnicities) in terms of protections and teaching of language, separate political cultures, economic systems, and social systems (where it is taught, it is often trivialized to only food, artistic practices, clothing and religion) as well as cultural heritage on the environment and landscape, but it is almost entirely classroom learning or some form of "service learning" with selected groups. The skill set here that is a key part of civic education is that of analyzing the survival and rights concerns of communities (indigenous peoples, ethnic/language communities, and geographic communities within their natural environments) as well as individual rights, values and specific concerns that they face (trauma of immigrants and mental health issues, needs for specific legal support for equality/ oversight/ representation and veto power).

Empowering curricula in these areas that are not simply advocacy, book learning or "service learning" have been a focus of my work with Unseen America Projects, Inc. (Lempert, 1995, 2010 a and b, 2013, 2017a) as well as a recently founded heritage protection and tolerance education approach in Southeast Asia (Lempert, 2020). While there is some overlap here with the skills taught for drafting the social contract (Level One) and for appropriate roles of government

(Level Two), the focus here is on actual field work with groups and individuals to develop the skills of recognizing and protecting their specific needs in practice.

D. *Recognizing the interests and situations of foreign communities subject to military power and other policy impacts:* Typically, civic education has focused on protecting one's citizens, while only recently in the time of globalization has there been some focus on "international civics education" to create a "global consciousness" of international organizations, international rights regimes and trade. What appears to be missing from this internationalism in civics education is the set of specific skills that enable citizens to rationally and critically understand the nature of information on international conflicts and to collect their own information on conditions that government and elite actors claim as providing the basis for war (or other kind of selective action against foreign populations, such as embargoes and restrictions), as well as for understanding all of the alternatives to global conflict resolution and rights protections, including citizen diplomacy (a form of civic action that governments increasingly seek to limit or criminalize). The UNESCO approach to a curriculum for "peace" is typical in focusing on the very types of government platitudes that hide military agendas and are part of the propaganda that a civics education for democracy needs to overcome with real skills (UNESCO, 2015).

There are several different sets of skills here and many have found themselves into the discipline of "Peace Studies" at the university level, where they generally do not reach the citizens that need them because they only reach a small subset of citizens (they attract those who already recognize the distortions in international policies and how to analyze them) and are presented at the wrong level (university, rather than university primary and secondary education) (Raviv, Oppenheimer, and Bar-Tal, 1999). The necessary civic skills include:

- Public diplomacy skills for building international contacts and seeking accurate information from citizens and groups in other countries and cultures;
- Skills for resolving international conflicts and protecting rights that are alternatives to use of military power or the threat of military power and how their impacts can be monitored and measured; and
- A large set of psychological skills to aid in rational decision-making and overcoming human tendencies to follow appeals to primitive parts of the human brain. These include (and have some overlap with other forms of political manipulation that are the focus of civic skills of Level Four):
    - Recognizing and resisting appeals to fear/ overcoming the animal instinct of fear;
    - Overcoming de-sensitization to violence and appeals to animal instincts for violence;
    - Recognizing and overcoming the pressures of "group-think" (Janis, 1972) and social cohesion;
    - Recognizing the use of scapegoating and the motives for it as a diversionary tactic;
    - Recognizing how populations are manipulated into war through use of media appeals, false flags and other standard techniques of fabricating conditions for use of violence; and
    - Measuring the financial and psychological benefits to those individuals promoting war, their ideologies and training and recognizing appeals of false "patriotism" and calls for sacrifice, including sacrifice of citizen rights and powers.

E. Recognizing and challenging the legal and democratic failures of education and socialization institutions: It should be self-evident that the teaching of civic skills for democratic oversight also requires that students be active in exercising skills for the democratic oversight of their own education (with the recognition that primary and secondary school students do not yet have this full authority until they reach maturity but that they are learning the mechanisms that they will have as citizens and parents). In many cases, the mechanisms for exercise of democratic skills by students that did exist have now been limited and need to be re-opened, particularly in extra-curricular participation in the form of councils that include students, teachers, administrators and parents[4], student run media (newspapers, bulletin boards, closed-circuit television or radio), as well as student councils (with the procedures of running for office and the drafting of constitutions[5]). Students can also participate in Parents-Teacher-Association meetings and Board of Education meetings, including analysis of budgets, school procedures, rights of appeal, and legal rights in the courts. I have outlined some measures for these skills in previous works (Lempert, 1995, 2010a).

Level Four: ***Specific Skills for the Effective Exercise of Citizen Power, through Direct and Indirect Democracy, and for Protecting Citizen Authority against manipulation:*** The skills in Level Four are where civic education has traditionally focused but in a way that simply prepares citizens for participation in existing and established forms of political decision-making that are limited, mostly reflecting only a small amount, at best, of actual potential citizen input on political decision-making that are part of true social contact democracy. As the common adages about politics state it in French, using the "grammar" of conjugations: "Je vote, tu votes, il/elle vote, nous votons, vous votez, ils/elles reglent" ("I vote, you vote, he/she votes, we vote, you (formal) vote, they rule") and, in English, "If voting actually changed anything, they would make it illegal." Here, by focusing on the exercise of skills in politics in ways that make a real difference and which citizens actually rule, Level Four skills focus on answering the third key question of politics, on how citizens can take back power, hold on to it, and exercise it through specific political actions: representative democratic actions, and direct democracy actions. The assumption here in Level Four skills is that citizens combine the skills of Levels One, Two and Three, in understanding the actual systems they need to build and monitor to have real power and to govern effectively, and in direct experience with the full set of institutions and concerns that they need to manage, with the actual skills of forcing the changes that are necessary in the overall system and, prior to that and after that, using these skills in all existing opportunities for exercise of citizen authority.

I have structured Level Four skills into three categories:

- The General context of political action: determining where best to use political skills in the confrontation with existing power and also in the normal exercise of citizen political activities; and the political and psychological skills for confronting power [protection of citizen against abuses of power and

[4] I was head of one such council in the Ardsley High School in New York in the U.S., S.T.A.E.C. (the Student Teacher Administration Educational Committee) in the 1970s as a high school senior, though this form of democratic participation has long since been eliminated.

[5] I was the head of the drafting committee for the first student council constitution of the newly opened Ardsley Middle School, in Ardsley New York, serving as elected "Corresponding Secretary" of that council in the early 1970s. I believe that the constitution has long since been eliminated, given current views in the U.S. on democracy, though it was approved then by the school's principal. Readers are free to investigate this history and the current situation, though most such records have also been destroyed despite being held for years in the Ardsley Public Schools libraries and despite the possibility of digitalizing them. I have maintained several historical files of materials in the hope of protecting this history, but if the Ardsley Schools and even the Ardsley Historical Society exemplify what has been happening in the U.S., the current approach to history where it exists is that of story-telling while the actual historical records are destroyed.

confrontation of that power] and for political communications (including mass media);
- Effective political skills in the institutions of representative democracy; and
- Effective use of skills in direct democracy, including forms of civil disobedience and protest.

A. The General Context of Political Action: Determining where best to use political skills in the confrontation with existing power and also in the normal exercise of citizen political activities; and the political and psychological skills for confronting power [protection of citizen against abuses of power and confrontation of that power] and political communications (including mass media): Effective political activities, like other human activities, have two dimensions: strategy and tactics. In the case of politics, the activity is not primarily a physical one (it is not construction or motion or production) but communications to influence behavior (though it can, of course, include physical coercion, violence and use of resources, in its rawest form that essentially represent the failure or replacement of a democratic social contract system with an authoritarian/coercive one). There are a number of teachable skills in both categories, coming out of strategic management literature (Bryson, 1988; Emmanuel, Merchant, and Orley, 1988; Garrison, Noreen, and Brewer, 2005) and literature of social change theory in anthropology and sociology, as well as out of the literature of communications/ media and psychology, which has a long and extensive record of explaining various forms of psychological manipulation and propaganda, as well as how individuals can protect themselves and others against them. One might say that the overall mix of skills here is that of "book smarts" (effective planning) and "street smarts" (understanding how systems are rigged and manipulated and having the savvy to protect oneself).

While contemporary civics education today sometimes teaches the buzz words of "social change" and "social justice" as part of the lavishing of praise on current systems and focusing on aspects of identity politics and neo-liberalism and their fantasy explanations of "social progress", what they avoid teaching are the real skills of measuring actual social and cultural and institutional change and impact, as well as teaching managerial skills of strategic planning, communications/ social marketing strategy and measures of their effectiveness. They may teach the technical mechanics of certain communications, including social media, letter writing and public speaking, but they rarely teach the strategy for where and how to use these and how to measure results.

The failure of most contemporary civics education is that it works on an apparently deliberately false assumption that all existing mechanisms and communications are fair, equal, and in good faith and that a simple knowledge of participation offers citizens no excuses when citizen interests are continually thwarted by the known failures built into the system. Civics education fails to protect citizens against the known psychological manipulation and propaganda used by States and elites to override free and rational choices, almost purposefully leaving citizens open to this manipulation in ways that allow elites to claim that systems were "democratic" and "fair", even though the skills for citizens to protect and counter this kind of manipulation are essential and easy to teach as part of civic education. There is a similar apparently intentional failure to teach the psychological mechanisms and protections against emotional appeals to nationalism and militarism in foreign relations and for direct content and full information on scapegoated nations or groups.

Strategic political action, social and cultural change strategy and social marketing strategy skills: While the skills of strategic political action are relatively straightforward, combining strategic planning (problem tree analysis focusing on root causes of the problem and measures of the problem, creating a chain of steps to a solution, focusing on the behavioral and other changes needed to achieve each step, and considering cost-benefit efficiency) with political analysis (identifying institutions, political actors and behaviors, including ideologies, socialization processes, and existing financial and other incentives to action and then the potential tools for creating pressure and changing behaviors, including competing pressures) and overlap with social marketing strategy (reaching target audiences with specific messages to change specific behaviors including awareness of the problem and overcoming psychological and other impediments to action in ways that convince individuals to act), social and cultural change strategy (from sociology and anthropology) is more complex (and not well developed as an applied social science). Models of societies/cultures and of social change (and measures) are still disputed with only rudimentary agreement so far on how societies change, by what pathways, and with what potential backlashes, as well as what can be changed. (I have been part of the current debates (Lempert, 2016b).) Some of this can be taught in civics education at the secondary school level to guide thinking.

Media manipulation, propaganda and citizen protection skills and other political communication skills: While several political communication skills are themselves important to include in a civic curriculum, including political mobilization and group processes (which is applicable to both representative and direct democracy), strategic bargaining and negotiation skills, they are necessary but not sufficient for effective political communication. These skills generally assume that politics is a contest based on "rational" behaviors, but the reality is that human communication and decision-making are influenced by "irrational" biological drives (including social pecking order behaviors and group behaviors) and human psychology. I highlight these categories, their relevance in political decision-making and the key skills that can be taught in civic education as follows.

The study of mass media, itself, how it is controlled, how it works, and how humans process different kinds of information in ways that distort rational thinking or are linked to fears and emotions are themselves, and how citizens need to prepare themselves for this are themselves a skill set (Orwell, 1949; McLuhan, 1964), with the politicization of media itself a subject for analysis requiring specific skills (Hermann and Chomsky, 1988). Learning to find alternate sources of information including multiple alternative newscasts and serials on a regular basis, to distinguish and find first hand empirical information oneself without having to rely on filtered or processed information at all and learning to rely on it and one's own judgments as a reality check on second and third-hand presentations from "official" sources, measuring actions of individual actors rather than accepting words and promises and being able to find accurate historical records, knowing how to judge information by "what is missing" and not presented rather than what is presented, being able to analyze body language, behavioral choices of others, and to recognize words and short-cuts that are forms of propaganda and censorship, recognizing canned messaging and diversions away from direct evidence and responses, and discounting "establishment" and corporate sources

that are given status only through elite recognition and title rather than by first-hand empirical reliability, are all part of skills for media analysis and finding objectivity.

Effective psychological protection against manipulation from powerful actors includes a list of skills for recognizing and combatting specific psychological and cognitive techniques (Miller, 1975). These include:

- Recognizing and resisting social pressures for conformity that are built
- into human systems and social behaviors in ways that subconsciously promote obedience to authority (Milgram, 1974);
- Recognizing and overcoming the natural tendency to actually alter one's perceptions and accept false perceptions just to fit into a group and follow social pressure (Asch, 1955);
- Recognizing and not being manipulated by the pervasive use of "cognitive dissonance" techniques to induce support for something one does not believe in, such as "voting for the lesser of two evils" in a rigged political system or "voting" itself in a rigged system, or for a single social or hot button issue or a personal identity characteristic of a person in authority (the use of tokenism and identity politics) when everything else a candidate represents and that have much more significant implications on one's economic situation and future, is something one does not believe in, as part of a strategy used by elites to convince people that they really have supported what causes them harm (Festinger, 1957);
- Learning to recognize and to resist how one is being manipulated by prepared settings of political authority and symbols and space (Proshansky, 1970);
- Learning to recognize and resist the social roles and behaviors that are created for one's class or race or age or other characteristic in comparison to others with "status"/position or "fame" in order to create subconscious pressures for conformity, fear, self-doubt and obedience or insensitivity (Haney, Banks, and Zimbardo, 1973);
- Learning to recognize and to challenge "doublespeak", bullying, and stonewalling by authority figures and being able to challenge it without any feelings of social stigma or fear and to force direct and clear answers as well as respect (Lutz, 1972);
- Learning to resist the group and to take an independent stand and to hold to it firmly in face of every kind of pressure as a voter, juror, or conscientious objector to militarism, hatred or other group actions (Janis, 1972);
- Recognizing, resisting and overcoming the use of intimidation techniques of "gas-lighting" and bullying techniques that subtly or directly challenge one's status or sanity or ability or right in order to suppress and manipulate and that cause a loss of concentration, poise, self-confidence and create self-doubt;
- Learning to recognize and overcome co-dependencies on problems, false framing and false choices, and false dualities of "either-or" (e.g. for use of violence) when there are other possible choices and ways to frame issues;
- Recognizing one's position of being subject to abuse and manipulation in general and learning to overcome a syndrome of being addicted to an abusive and oppressive political relationship;
- Recognizing and overcoming typical "bait and switch" techniques used by collusive government and political factions, as well as "sheep-dogging" of minority or alternative opinions and approaches;

- Recognizing the tendency in modern media culture and mass society to worship celebrities and to create personality cults, symbolism, and religious like identification with groups and individuals to fill inner needs and learning to overcome these shallow and dangerous attachments in politics and to focus instead on rational measures rather than emotions and passions;
- Learning to recognize and resist
- messages that stigmatize and demonize and that appeal to the lowest primal motives of fear, violence, anger, vengeance, materialism/greed for short-term results, rather than to long-term measures and law; and
- Learning to recognize and overcome one's own vulnerability to denial of complicity in group behaviors that are in violation of long-term interests and principles.

B. *Effective political skills in the institutions of representative democracy.* The skills required for effectiveness in representative democracy fall into four categories: general skills for effectively using electoral mechanisms (political parties, candidacy, electoral choice, and overseeing balloting) and then specific skills for effective participation in each of the three areas of formal representative government: executive (including use of recall mechanisms), legislative, and judicial authority (in the role of a plaintiff in lawsuits and in the role of a juror in prosecutorial and investigative grand juries and in petit trial juries, as well as an enforcer of international law and domestic law). While a full list of skills in these categories would be very long, I focus here on some of the key indicative skills for areas that are not generally stressed in civic education, such as the real power that citizens have in each of these areas that are not usually taught or stressed. While Level One skills are those of redesigning the citizen role in these areas as well as for offering more mechanisms of direct citizen participation and oversight, and while Levels Two and Three are skills for understanding the workings of political institutions to assure their proper functioning in the role of citizens taking on full management responsibility, the skills listed here are those general skills for performance in the existing structures that are common today to governments.

General representative democracy skills: Among the key skills of representative democracy are:

- Drafting of a mission and vision statement for a political party with a specific, long-term ideology with measurable achievements regarding specific problems and with clear and enforceable long-term and short-term promises/steps for achieving them that serve as a contract with supporters, and having the skills to register such a party and to compete for support with other parties;
- Candidacy skills for launching and running a campaign that is competitive and that has grass roots support without military or corporate backing, with a track record of achievements and consistency for fulfilling promises, and that is able to resist, overcome and effectively retaliate against smear campaigns/character assassinations;
- Skills to assess candidates based on: 1) past performance and specific skills rather than promises/rhetoric/intent/advertising or position with a clear measurable record of fulfillment of promises, correct decisions; 2) actual motivation and interests as determined by sources of funding, career, and personal decisions; 3) compliance with international and domestic laws; and 4) specific fit with the voter's interests in a list of weighted needs/goals/views for

specific public services and outcomes.
- Skills to oversee and challenge the many forms of rigging of electoral machinery and campaign competition including paper trail rather than electronic ballots, oversight of electoral counting and reporting, fair polling place access, fair and open registration, equal and fair access of candidates to media and to voter supervised debates.

Executive branch oversight skills: Beyond the set of investigatory and regulatory skills listed in Level Three for oversight of government bureaucracies, specific representative democracy skills are those of use of impeachment and recall mechanisms for public officials in ways that focus on the full and impartial list of visible legal violations, as well as the ability to effectively use offices of inspector generals, the press and the courts for reporting on violations and failures of public officials and for seeking redress.

Legislative skills, including referenda: The three key legislative skills for citizens in a social contract democracy that are easy to teach are those of drafting legislation (and constitutional amendments) (Seidman, 1991), drafting referenda and seeing that they are placed on ballots, and lobbying for legislation with representatives as a counterweight to corporate and insider lobbying.

Multiple areas of judicial skills: For effective participation in the judicial system in a social contract democracy, civic education needs to teach citizens to:
- understand and how to use their full authority as jurors to "nullify" and override judges and to act as direct representatives of law;
- use their role as grand jurors both to appropriately investigate and to prevent the abuse of power by government seeking to use citizens to rubber stamp the criminalization of citizens without real due process;
- use their role as potential plaintiffs in the courts to enforce laws where governments fail or are corrupt by acting as "private attorneys general" and by issuing "writs of mandamus" to force government action where it does not act;
- initiate and participate in class action lawsuits against governments or other concentrations of power; and to
- uphold international law against government officials, knowing where and how to bring matters internationally for scrutiny.

C. *Effective use of skills in direct democracy, including forms of civil disobedience and protest:* Traditions of civil disobedience in democratic systems are long-established (Thoreau, 1849) and most of the world's governments today also hark back to foundations on the base of anti-colonial and other "revolutionary" movements that are also a form of civic action that they praise. Yet, while praising these historical acts, in theory, few governments actually teach these skills of democratic democracy along with their implications (the lessons of Orwell's children's story, "Animal Farm" that "revolutions" often do not actually change much other than for the benefit of a new group of leaders (1945). Among the key skills of direct democracy are:
- Civil disobedience to exert costs on government (tax withholding, conscientious objection to military service, peaceful interference with government activities leading to arrest);
- Organized protests that use economic costs as a form of political pressure (boycotts, strikes, sit-ins) and the protective skills of countering and documenting police suppression, preventing or exposing police infiltration and threats, preventing

and exposing undermining of peaceful protest by police funded violence used to discredit legitimate protest, as well as effective use of freedom of information laws;
- Forms of whistleblowing including safe "leaking" and publication of public information, including the protective skills of encryption; and
- Historical analysis of secession and sovereignty movements, utopian communities, revolutionary struggles, tactics, alliances and their failures/legacies.

IV. **An Indicator for Civic Skills Teaching for Social Contract Democracy to Measure Effective Civic Education:**

The 13 skills categories in the above section can easily be turned into an indicator in order to test whether or not countries are fulfilling a responsibility to train citizens for social contract democracy (and to offer a perspective on whether they are really democratic or in danger of becoming authoritarian in the next generation) and also for troubleshooting proposed civics curriculum of education departments and schools.

In the indicator, I have turned each of the categories from Section III into the basis of an evaluative question that can be scored. This indicator and its scoring can used easily, even by non-experts, including students as an exercise in looking at their own civics education, as a litmus test of the quality of civics education, differentiating quickly between effective systems for social contract democracy and those that promote elite and authoritarian rule over obedient, disempowered citizens. By asking a set of 13 "Yes or No" questions in four different performance areas that correspond to the four different levels of civic education skills, above (with negative points on a few questions where civic education actually works *against* social contract democracy), and then tallying up the results in each of the four areas, it is easy to score the relative quality of any civic education system and reveal its weaknesses against the standard of social contract democracy civic education. When the results are tallied, here is how the scoring can be scaled and what the scores mean.

Scale:	
10 -13 points	Comprehensive approach to Civic Education for Social Contract Democracy in line with Rousseau, Dewey, the Federalists and Anti-Federalists, International Human Rights Conventions and best practices in Public Administration and Social Science
6 - 9 points	Civic Education for a partly but not fully open society, maintaining elite controls and inequalities in several sectors
0 – 5 points	Civic Education in an Authoritarian Society with token citizen participation
< 0: (-6) – 0 points	Education for Elite Control with Propagandistic Programming

Before beginning the scoring, note that the indicator is not an absolute scale to measure the absolute quality of civic education since some of the civics education areas could be considered to be more comprehensive or more significant and could be weighted with additional points. The indicator is "relative" rather than "absolute" and each person doing scoring might score higher or lower, but should produce similar overall relative measures. Like most indicators, answers to each question would need to be "calibrated" if the goal were to assure that different observers make the exact same determinations. To do so would

require a longer manual for standardized, precise answers across observers.

Measures/ Sub-Factors: Below are the 13 questions of the indicator in the categories described above. Most of the questions are clear cut "Yes" (1 point) or "No" (0 points or negative points for harms) in scoring, but in cases where there is a judgment call, it is possible to opt for a "Debatable" (0.5 points for benefits). For some questions, where the civic education that seeks to fit the category actually works as a form of propaganda and disempowerment, there is an option of offering a negative penalty (-1) points to acknowledge the harm). (Note that the questions are numbered by their category, rather than from one to 13.)

I. Level One Skills: Overarching Social Contract Skills: Locating Political Power and Creating a Social Contract Constitution for Equal Power and Oversight: Does the civic curriculum deal with the questions of "who has power" and "how do they exercise it" by focusing on the skills citizens need to locate real political power (and not just formal political institutions that represent that power) and its exercise, as well as how individual citizens can design a better constitutional system and set of institutions for maintaining democratic citizen rule (2 questions with a possible score of 2 points or negative 1 point)

Question I.1. *The Civics Curriculum teaches Citizens how to Locate and Measure Political Power and Control in their Countries (and Globally)* – The curriculum teaches citizens to look beyond formal political institutions and to identify power held in military, police, and the national security state domestically, in economic institutions and collections of wealth, in international institutions or foreign institutions, and in networks, as well as to consider how to measure and control that power and to understand the concepts of "deep structure" of power and to measure "democracy" in terms of balances of this "real" power. A negative point if the civic education teaches only the formal institutions of power, describes them as "democratic" and seeks to promote worship of the existing system and constitutional documents as a form of superior wisdom.

Scoring: Yes - 1
Debatable - 0.5
No – 0
Disempowering – (-1)

Question I.2. *The Civics Curriculum Prepares Students with the Skills for Negotiating an Enforceable Social Contract Constitution at the National Level that allows for full empowerment and control by the citizenry* – The curriculum teaches citizens how to design constitutions for effective balancing of ethnic interests (federalism) and individual interests and rights in ways that are not just statements of "rights" but that have enforceable military or institutional power behind them and that are effective in actual balances of "real" political power as identified in Question I.1. and not just platitudes about power of regions or "government branches" and includes teaching several mechanisms of direct rather than representative citizen oversight and control of military, police and economic power and networks.

Scoring: Yes – 1
Debatable - 0.5
No - 0

II. Level Two Skills: Overarching Government/Public Institution and Public Policy/Decision-making Management Skills for Sustainability, Protection and Measurement of All Assets and for International Long-Term Aspirations: Does the civic curriculum equip citizens with the skills of good governance (including sustainability planning) and effective public management oversight? (3 questions with a possible score of 3 points or negative 2 points)

Question II.1. *The Civic Education Curriculum Prepares Students to Oversee Long-Term Sustainability Planning and Measurements in order to protect future interests of the society as a whole, the sustainability and survival of individual ethnic groups, and communities, including the measurement and protection of the full set of public assets* – The curriculum prepares citizens with the skills of drafting a basic sustainability plan for several generations to balance consumption/population and production and to understand the need for and the components of such a plan at all levels of government and for ethnic groups and communities. It also prepares students to recognize and evaluate the functions of government bureaucracies and officials as measuring a list of resources to be passed on to future generations with understanding of what those resources are (human, economic, environmental, material, cultural) and how they are measured in each category.

Scoring: Yes - 1
Debatable - 0.5
No – 0

Question II.2. *The Civic Education Curriculum Prepares Citizens to Measure, Promote and Maintain Culturally Specific and Sustainable Country Values specific to cultural survival and long-term visionary objectives (and those of each separate ethnic group of the country) and global values as part of the civic role of their country's governance* – The curriculum prepares citizens directly to understand and measure social progress elements as defined under international law and treaties and to measure, promote and maintain those specific, unique and sustainable elements of cultural heritage, including the relationship with the environment, political ideals, economic approaches and social systems as well as language, history, and other elements of patrimony as part of the role of government. A negative point if the discussion of national values is one only of nationalism, service, sacrifice and a form of power and if it assumes that all ethnic groups follow this single definition through assimilation, or if discussion of ethnic or regional differences assumes they have the same goals but are simply fighting for recognition and equality without protection of real cultural differences reflecting the full set of elements of culture.

Scoring: Yes - 1
Debatable - 0.5
No – 0
Disempowering – (-1)

Question II.3. *The Civic Education Curriculum Prepares Citizens to identify and hold government agencies to their proper roles while also holding non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and businesses to their appropriate roles (and charters) and assuring that public institutions have clear missions that citizens can measure for effective oversight* – The civic curriculum prepares citizens to hold government officials accountable to measurable "missions" (promoting value of resources and preventing harms to resources) as well as to holding government accountable in oversight of non-governmental organizations and businesses, understanding both how to hold

them legally to their public charters and also to private functions without usurping the role of government for promoting and protecting a country's range of assets and sustainability. A negative point if the civics curriculum is used to promote "service learning" or "volunteerism" to provide labor to government or non-governmental organizations without empowering citizens to examine the full and appropriate missions of those organizations and potential conflicts of interest.

Scoring: Yes - 1
Debatable - 0.5
No – 0
Disempowering – (-1)

III. Level Three Skills: Specific Institutional and Cultural Policy Interaction and Oversight through Direct Field Visits and Application of Quantitative and Qualitative Skills: Does the civic curriculum focus on the society itself (the full range of institutions in society) beyond the walls of the school as well as in its own administration as an educational institution so that citizens are prepared to fully understand and interact with the full set of social institutions and interests that citizens must manage in a democratic society and have the field and street skills to do that? (5 questions with a possible score of 5 points or 2 negative points)

Question III.1. *The Civic Education Curriculum Prepares Citizens with the skills to manage government bureaucracy and to correct and prevent its failures to serve citizens and law (self-interest and capture)* – The civic education curriculum arranges field work directly with military, police, prisons, national security and line bureaucracy offices of government as well as with critics of those agencies, teaching the skills of effective oversight of government spending and of the use of different forms of government authority in compliance with domestic and international law, and trains citizens with the skills for private rights of action lawsuits and other direct confrontations and challenges with authority, service on public investigation bodies, and for making freedom of information requests as well as prepares citizens for response and protection if and when they become subjects of these uses/abuses of government authority. A negative point if the civic education trains citizens for obedience to public authority, to special adulation or support of military, police, national security or prosecutorial authorities.

Scoring: Yes - 1
Debatable - 0.5
No – 0
Disempowering – (-1)

Question III.2. *The Civic Education Curriculum Prepares Citizens with the skills to monitor the short-circuiting of public purpose by organizations subject to public chartering (corporations and non-profits)* - The civic education curriculum arranges field work directly with economic institutions including financial institutions, manufacturing, and agriculture, and with various forms of non-governmental organizations, and with critics from those organizations, teaching the skills of investigation and oversight of violation of public purpose and harm to the public by those organizations. A negative point if the civic education trains citizens for cheerleading and praise of the roles and activities of economic actors and non-profit organizations, including political parties, without explaining their incentives and practices that violate public purposes and how citizens can be watchdogs to

prevent abuses and hold them more accountable.

Scoring: Yes - 1
Debatable - 0.5
No – 0
Disempowering – (-1)

Question III.3. *The Civic Education Curriculum Prepares Citizens with the skills to recognize the interests of and to maintain direct contacts with unfamiliar communities (indigenous peoples, ethnic groups, regions, rural versus urban areas, social classes, migrants) and individuals along with the skills of enforcement of international rights protections at community and individual levels, for cultural survival and for equality under law*. - The civic education curriculum arranges field work directly with indigenous peoples, ethnic groups, rural and urban areas, and diverse groups of social classes and various types of individuals with discussions on their rights and how these have been violated, including with victims of such violations and the mechanisms that they used and/or those that failed in protecting them.

Scoring: Yes - 1
Debatable - 0.5
No – 0

Question III.4. *The Civic Education Curriculum Prepares Citizens with the skills to recognize the interests and situations of foreign communities subject to military power and facing other policy impacts* - The civic education curriculum arranges contacts with various members of foreign communities and particularly those who are considered "enemies" or "violators" by government and/or elites, and trains citizens with the skills for spotting and resisting demonization of foreigners and the types of propaganda used to incite war and violence as well as in other psychological techniques for resisting group pressures and appeals used by those promoting war, trains citizens in public diplomacy and alternatives to use of military force, and in ways of collecting and analyzing information on foreign policy situations that do not rely on government or corporate sources.

Scoring: Yes - 1
Debatable - 0.5
No – 0

Question III.5. *The Civic Education Curriculum Prepares Citizens with the skills to recognize and challenge the legal and democratic failures of education and socialization institutions* - The civic education curriculum is offered in a public or private school that itself makes available a full range of democratic mechanisms in which students participate and are trained with skills for oversight of the school, including budgets, administration and procedures as well as in concepts and skills of education and socialization of citizens for social contract democracy.

Scoring: Yes - 1
Debatable - 0.5
No – 0

IV. Level Four Skills: Specific Skills for the Effective Exercise of Citizen Power, through Direct and Indirect Democracy, and for Protecting Citizen Authority against manipulation: Does the civic education curriculum teach the exercise of skills in politics in ways that make a real difference and which citizens actually rule, through effective use of both representative democracy skills and direct democracy skills? (3 questions with a possible score of 3 points or negative 1 point)

Question IV.1. *The Civic Education Curriculum Prepares Citizens with the skills to*

adapt to the general context of political action: to determine where best to use political skills in the confrontation with existing power and also in the normal exercise of citizen political activities; and prepares them with the political and psychological skills for confronting power [protection of citizen against abuses of power and confrontation of that power] and political communications (including mass media) - The civics education curriculum prepares citizens with strategy and tactics for political influence, as political analysts understanding strategies of behavior change/social marketing and the social science realities of social and cultural change, political leverage, movements, and influence, and with the psychological skills to understand, resist and overcome the manipulative techniques used by mass media, propaganda and advertising.

Scoring: Yes - 1
Debatable - 0.5
No – 0

Question IV.2. *The Civic Education Curriculum Prepares Citizens with effective political skills in the institutions of representative democracy* - The civics education curriculum prepares citizens to effectively use electoral mechanisms (political parties, candidacy, electoral choice, and overseeing balloting) and for effective participation in each of the three areas of formal representative government: executive (including use of recall mechanisms), legislative (drafting legislation and lobbying), and judicial authority (in the role of a plaintiff in lawsuits and in the role of a juror in prosecutorial and investigative grand juries and in petit trial juries, as well as an enforcer of international law and domestic law).

Scoring: Yes - 1
Debatable - 0.5
No – 0

Question IV.3. *The Civic Education Curriculum Prepares Citizens for the effective use of skills in direct democracy, including forms of civil disobedience and protest* - The civics education curriculum prepares citizens to understand and effectively use civil disobedience, several types of forms of organized protest to exert real political pressures as well as the skills of protecting and countering and documenting governmental undermining of such protest, effective whistleblowing and protections against retaliation, and historical understanding of secession and sovereignty movements, utopian communities, revolutionary struggles, tactics, alliances and their failures/legacies. A negative point if this form of political activity is taught as disloyal/supported for foreign enemies, illegitimate, illegal, and/or pathological, ridiculed or discredited, with attempts to seek help from citizens in reporting and suppressing it.

Scoring: Yes - 1
Debatable - 0.5
No – 0
Disempowering – (-1)

V. **Results of Applying the Indicator: The Global Failure of Civic Education for Democracy:**

The indicator can be easily applied to several cases, demonstrating the effectiveness of the indicator in differentiating between systems and offering a large range of aspiration for improvement. At the same time, the indicator

offers some surprises for those who have accepted ideological dogmas and labels about differences between systems without putting them to an actual comparative test. The indicator also exposes closer than expected scores (though still some significant differences) in the civics preparation of citizens in "Western democracies" and in one Party, or generally recognized "authoritarian", states, which should serve as an alarm bell for democracy advocates and for civic educators, globally.

The Validity of the Indicator and How Countries Do Comparatively in Measures of their Civic Education Curricula: Based on my own experience globally as a professional in democracy, governance and human rights interventions in some 30+ countries over some 35+ years, as well as my experience as a U.S. citizen and educator, having studied in a public school system from grades 2 through 12 (in suburban New York, in the 1960s and 1970s), I test the indicator, below, on a number of examples with which I am most familiar (a total of six different cases): my own public education, current civics education in the U.S. (from materials cited in this article as well as experience of family members), education in the former Soviet Union (1989-90) and historically (the pre and post- World War II Soviet period), transition countries of the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe in the 1990s, Southeast Asian countries (Vietnam, Laos and Thailand between 2000 and 2015), and contemporary European civic education (from sources cited here and from field work living in Germany between 2017 and 2022). These countries offer a range of country types (multi-Party Western "democracies, one-Party "Communist" states, and "emerging democracies") over different time periods.

Note that the potential range of scores for the indicator is over 19 points (13 points over 0 and a potential for 6 negative points, to (-6)) and that I have split this range into four different categories to differentiate the outcomes. For each of the examples that I have tested, I have gone through the 13 questions of the indicator and offered scores, using a constant interpretation in the scoring for all of the cases and reporting the results.

I have presented the results for the six cases that I have tested in Table 5 (p.62), listing scores and the categorization of the scores in columns 1 and 2 of the table, in descending order of scores, and then placing the cases in column 3 of the table, on the bases of their scores. Below the table I offer detail on the results for each of the six cases that I tested, noting the scores and explaining how I allotted points for each case.

The six different cases yield a spectrum of results that are spread relatively evenly over a range of 9 points out of the total 19 point range, which shows differentiation, but the cases only fall into two of the four categories at the low end of the scale. Note that none of the cases meets the standards of either a comprehensive or a partly effective civic education approach. Table 5 and the expanded information on the six cases shows the following.

- The indicator is sensitive to differences between a totalitarian system such as Stalinist Russia (or Asian feudal autocracies) and "democratic" countries in the West since the scores differ by as much as 9 points on a total scale that allows for differences from best to worst of some 19 points.

Perhaps not surprising, given the findings of those who have studied civic education and democracy and presented above in this article, civic education is largely failing globally to prepare citizens anywhere for what would resemble either a comprehensive or even a partly effective preparation for social contract democracy, with the indicator offering a large range of missing civic education skills in civic education globally. Even my public schooling education in the U.S. in the 1960s and 1970s, that scores five points better than civics skills preparation than schools in the U.S. today, only meets the standards of civic education in a society with token citizen participation that was largely top-down ("authoritarian") rather than really democratic, while scores today are in the range of a society that is no longer (is significantly on the road to being no-longer) democratic.

See Table 5. **Contemporary Civics Education as Scored by the Indicator: p.103.**

How each of the different countries do is presented as follows, generally following the descending order of scoring shown in the table:

- **Public school in suburban New York in the U.S.**

Source: the author's experience in the 1960s and 1970s
Score: *3 points: Civic Education in an Authoritarian Society with token citizen participation*.
Analysis: My high school education earns a total of 3 points: half points for questions I.1, II.1, III.4, III.5 and one point for question IV.1. The English curriculum included a "Media" course for 10th graders that was strong on recognizing propaganda techniques and "programming" and helping prepare to analyze it, including political manipulation (with direct analysis of the Watergate hearings during class). Social studies classes included films on military propaganda and encouraged debates with students taking sides of unpopular groups (Palestinians versus Israelis) and research papers and presentations on alternative perspectives (the riots in American cities; the Japanese reasons for bombing the U.S. at Pearl Harbor as a result of American economic blockades; the history of U.S. imperialism). There was also some discussion of environmental and sustainability planning and alternative communities and lifestyles as well as of Thoreau and civil disobedience. A school debate team participating in the National Forensic League encouraged drafting of constitutional amendments for Presidential and Vice Presidential selection and for a guaranteed annual income/Universal Basic Income. The curriculum and school procedures had a number of aspects of student democracy.

- **Civics education in Europe since 2017**

Source: Observed by the author; prior to the Corona Virus outbreak and the emerging nationalisms with the exit of the United Kingdom from the European Union
Score: *0 points or (-1) point: Civic Education in an Authoritarian Society with token citizen participation, with a tendency towards Elite Control*
Analysis: European systems have many aspects of democracy today and tolerance for dissent but there are also strong European traditions of bureaucratic hierarchy, corporatism, and of homogeneity. There is ideological support for the political system as well as for business and established non-governmental organizations, leading to negative points (for I.1, and III.2) but not the adulation of the military that one finds in the U.S. Arguably, there would also be a loss of a point under II.2 in individual countries with strong assimilation policies of "integration" like Germany, though this is debatable for the European Community as a whole given the neo-liberal view of "social justice" as the erasure of all differences and promotion of a homogenizing form of equality without real cultural diversity or long-term visions. There is education on formal political skills for representative democracy but not adequate (0.5 points for IV.2) and some on forms of protest though also not adequate (0.5 points for IV.3). In some countries there may be a clear identity and commitment to international law, earning 1 point under II.2, though other countries seem to just produce goods, suppress identity and remain under U.S. hegemony (such as Germany) and would not earn a point.

- **Current civic education in the U.S**.

Source: Reports from civics educators and from relatives and contacts of the author

Score: *(-2) points: Education for Elite Control with Propagandistic Programming*
Analysis: While there is now some discussion of social movements (such as use of Howard Zinn's work) (Zinn, 2003), social justice and racial issues, and the environment, there is actually less opportunity to develop real skills, less democracy in the curriculum, and a greater focus on patriotism and obedience with corporate texts and curricula in most schools today and that the ideological approach is one that focuses on voting and historical and political dogma. U.S. education is now more ideological in support for the political system and for the military as well as for business and established non-governmental organizations, leading to negative points (for I.1, III.1 and III.2). Arguably, there would also be a loss of a point under II.2, though this is debatable given the neo-liberal view of "social justice" as the erasure of all differences and promotion of a homogenizing form of equality without real cultural diversity or long-term visions. There is more education on formal political skills for representative democracy but not adequate (0.5 points for IV.2). Debatably, in the era of "social justice" there may be a bit of attention to the civil rights movement in the U.S. and the forms of democracy that were used then, as well as some Native American rights (0.5 points for IV.3).

- **Civics education in the Soviet Union and then in the Newly Independent compared with Stalinist era Soviet Union**

Source: States observed by the author in the 1990s, with historical research
Score: **Stalinist era Soviet Union***: (-6), Education for Elite Control with Propagandistic Programming*, **Late Soviet period and some of the early post-Soviet period**: *up to 2.5 points for the, Civic Education in an Authoritarian Society with token citizen participation, though now slipping back in many of the post-Soviet states to negative scores like those for Southeast Asian countries, below*.
Analysis: The Stalinist era Soviet Union is easy to score since it earns all of the negative points for teaching obedience and control, with none of the skills for democracy. The late Soviet era that I observed and some of the early years of Newly Independent States like Moldova, were slightly open, with a direct critique of the Soviet era and its constitutions and approaches as well as the earlier curriculum that had critiques of the structures of power in "capitalist democracies" that revealed the location of power. That earns half points for I.1, III.5 and IV.1. There was also a new openness to foreigners and the global economy with a re-examination of the Cold War, which earns 1 point for question III.4.

- **Civics education in Southeast Asia**

Source: observed by the author between 2000 and 2016:
Score: *(-4) Elite Control with Propagandistic Programming*:
Analysis: No civic skills are taught at all in the "market based" "socialist" one-Party states of Vietnam and Laos or in the "market economy" multi-party democracy" with monarchy and military rule of Thailand and most of the teachings in history and culture curriculum promote nationalism, assimilation, and worship of elites and their institutions. The only difference with the Soviet Union is that there is less forced labor/service learning.

Discussion of the Indicator Results by Different Types of Political Systems and what the Similarities Indicate: While critics living in Western countries might disparage the scoring here as "too harsh" as well as unrealistic because

the scores show little difference today between the civic education in Western multi-party "democracies" (the U.S. and Europe) and the transition eras of the Soviet Union and post-Soviet Union, it is important to examine what these results are showing and what the implications actually are.

The Stalinist era Soviet Union and the contemporary one-Party autocracies of Southeast Asia score where one would expect to find them; at or near the rock bottom of the scoring with only negative points, at (-6) and (-4). The U.S., during the period of the author's direct experiences in schooling, in the 1960s and 1970s, is significantly different from these at some 7 to 9 points away. So, the indicator is certainly recording significant differences.

What is unwelcome for those who are raised in mythology or who see their role as educators as that of maintaining State and/or elite mythologies in Western democracies, is the decline the U.S. is showing and the similarly relatively low score of European countries. This, however, is completely consistent with the warnings that scholars of democracy and of civic education in these countries have been making.

Note that the higher scores in the transition period for the Soviet Union are consistent with observations showing that there is more democratic activity and participation and discussion in countries in transition (Hoskins, Villalba and Saisana, 2011, p. 3). Following those transitions, however, the scores are also likely to decline again. Regimes like the Russian Federation under the new Putin constitution are likely to now be closer again to that of the Soviet era if civic education is now promoting allegiance to the new constitution and to State authority.

The more important area on which to focus is not the relative position of civic education in different systems, given the amount of social science work suggesting similarities between the contemporary industrial states in the globalization era (Galbraith, 1967; Lempert, 1996; Duncan, 2014), but the large discrepancy between civic education for social contract democracy and contemporary civic education globally.

VI. **Conclusion: Facing Realities**

This article presents what may be the first comprehensive outline (albeit what is still a rough outline and only an outline) of a public civic education for social contract democracy that would apply to contemporary complex industrial societies. In doing so, it demonstrates how far civic education is today, everywhere, from offering this kind of curriculum. The two questions that arise from this presentation are:

- whether such a civic education curriculum can really be implemented logistically (or whether critics would find it unfeasible) and, given that nothing seems to come close to it anywhere today,
- whether political or cultural realities would prevent such a curriculum from ever being widely taught.

The answer to the first question is that it is certainly possible to implement this curriculum in public school education through primary and secondary level, within a public school curriculum of some 12 years. There is (even if it is disappearing and under attack) an understanding (or at least a written legacy) in Western culture of what social contract democracy is and there are identified skills that can fit into a primary and secondary school curriculum in a way that would prepare citizens effectively. There is, however, a paradox of culture and political change that makes it improbable that this kind of curriculum will be funded and taught, today, though that does not mean that educators and the public should not try to advocate for it.

<u>How Public Civic Education for Social Contract Democracy Could be Implemented</u>: The typical argument today facing educational reformers who seek to uplift public education from pressures that many say have "dumbed it down" (Gatto, 1992), is that given how public schools in countries like the U.S. are now failing to teach students even the basics of literacy and abstract thinking and analytical reasoning, that it is impossible to add anything that uses those prerequisite

fundamental skills as a basis for other subjects like civics skills. Others argue, globally, that school curricula are so packed today with basic skills (and testing), or that students and teachers seem so unmotivated and distracted, that there is no room to add in even basic concepts agreed upon in treaties internationally (such as environmental protection). These claims appear to be political arguments and self-fulfilling prophesies that have been part of the actual deteriorations that have been observed. Given that teaching facilities and tools as well as research on cognition, learning and methods was much less developed today than it was decades ago, the fact that civic education was better in the past than it is today presents the empirical evidence that it is certainly logistically possibly to impart a significantly better civics education curriculum today, that reflects the principles of social contract democracy and that would likely engage, empower and excite students who feel that their concerns and futures are being discarded by their parents' and grandparents' generation.

Indeed, some of the civics skills identified in this article were once taught in standard public school curricula but such skills teaching has been replaced with propagandistic corporate and state textbook learning to promote ideological conformity and regurgitation on testing or simply to prepare citizens for positions in the corporate workplace for forms of productivity that are undermining environments, cultures and future prospects at great cost.

There are many places in current curricula where real civic skills have been abandoned and where they could easily fit, particularly in areas of language arts (reading, writing and communications), social studies (history and culture), as well as in areas of mathematics (applications to real world budgeting and sustainability), and health/psychology, all at the primary and secondary school level.

- Most public schools globally already have language arts curricula in the national language that are essentially "media and communications" courses that indoctrinate with texts in place of skills and protections that would be part of a civics education curriculum.
- Most public schools globally already have social studies or history or ethics in some form that are essentially "civics education" courses that teach doctrine and current "politically correct" and ideological "official histories" instead of civics skills.
- Most public schools globally already have some teaching of health and community and forms of acceptable social behavior, but without psychological protections and empowerment that are key civics schools.

Public schools already capture students for some 12 years and international agreements (like the SDGs and the earlier Millennium Development Goals, MDGs) increasingly assert that they should but without the necessary focus on incorporating civics skills like those outlined here. If civics education skills amounted to merely one tenth of the public school curriculum in most countries, it would prepare students for civic life that would extend their happiness and fulfillment with a system that actually met their needs, for a commitment of only 1.2 years out of the 12. Only in an authoritarian world is it imaginable that this kind of rational commitment would be impossible.

<u>Why Civic Education for Social Contract Democracy is Improbable in the World as we Know It</u>: There is a social science truism that cultures replicate themselves and do not change unless outside conditions force them to change, in the ways that most quickly respond to the source of the pressure for change, rather than along the path of the ideal. The paradox of political and cultural change is that wishing it or organizing for it, alone, does not create it. Without a form of compulsion or the force of necessity, it is difficult to imagine a transition to social contract democracy or to an education for social contract democracy, particularly in the current political context where forces have sought to dismantle democratic institutions and to deliberately eliminate teachings on how to maintain them. There is little discussion today and there has been little for decades over mechanisms for ensuring social contract democracy or even equal access to education.

Paolo Freire, the Brazilian educator, appears to have been proven right after asserting that those who are "oppressed" too often turn to an ideology of defeatism and learned helplessness rather than one of empowerment, learning to fear and to no longer hope that anything can be changed (2007 [1968]). What we have seen globally in the name of "resistance" is largely, in fact, surrender and denial in a way that seeks to save face while hiding the reality that the "oppressed" have been co-opted by tokenism and identity politics, by "resistance" as narcissism, escapism, and co-dependency through the release of mere symbolism that has no real impact. The "moral" approaches of "progressives" in education today have replaced the teaching of skills, measures, procedures, and active empowering initiatives in institution building and law with doctrines that can be described as tantrums that are anti-science, anti-standards, and symbolic charade that is co-dependent on the same institutions, elite funding, militarism and neo-liberal ideology that they claim to be challenging (Restructuring the Social Sciences, 2018). In place of empowering civics education and initiatives are "simulations" and "social media literacy" and "service learning" that work to subsidize the same donor driven, system supporting institutions that disempower, divert, and dumb down the citizenry so that they are incapable of effective civic action and do not even know what it is or where to start if they wanted to make a real difference. Energy for real citizen empowerment is dissipated as a result of lack of strategic and effective skills.

As I write this years after the Corona Virus 19 pandemic, there is a continuing movement to shift most of those remaining formal human interactions that were not yet electronic, into electronic form. The movement of communications to electronic form may offer some educators the possibility of increasing contact with institutions and individuals outside of their home areas and to widen experience of citizens with the global responsibilities of citizenship, but at the same time it also poses threats for eliminating informal and spontaneous forms of oversight and the development of qualitative skills that are also essential parts of civic education. The trend seems to be to limit citizen oversight and contacts in the false perception of convenience.

This is not to say that acceptance and implementation of a civic education curriculum for social contract democracy is impossible. One could potentially found a school that teaches the model of civic education for social contract democracy and could then seek to make that model available as an alternative for adoption. The fact that this model can be written and made available to the public in a refereed journal is a sign that the ideas do exist in our culture and can be considered. But, that still begs the question as to whether social change and "progress" are likely or possible and whether the presentation of ideas without real power behind them has any impact (Lempert, 2016c).

…….

Figure and tables below

Figure 1. [p.54-55].

Formal "Best Practices" in Civics Education in U.S. and Europe:

Skills for Representative Democratic Participation:

- Writing political advocacy documents of different formats (articles, letters)
- Analyzing a policy issue and drafting a policy brief;
- Debating a policy;
- Meeting with a government representative to present a policy idea in the form of lobbying;
- Analyzing candidates' positions and voting choice.
- Negotiating solutions in a mock legislative role or a lobbying group exercise
- Class interactions to discuss differences in areas of rights with classmates (gender, physical characteristics, religion, race, ethnicity)
- Working in a civil society organization in a small capacity or a political party (such as political canvassing of votes)

Informal Best Practices for Developing Civic Skills [Extra-curricular activities]:

Skills for Representative Democratic Participation:

- Running for a school political office
- Managing a school newspaper, closed circuit television news program or other media
- National Forensic League or other debate competition with Proposal presentation and defense

Table 1. (section a.), [pp. 52-55].

What are civic life, politics, and government? These questions focus on understanding why government and politics are necessary and articulating what purpose they serve, the nature and purpose of constitutions, and understanding alternative ways constitutional governments function. 10%	**"Citizen Values"** (include "understanding the importance of volunteering, voting and protesting")	*No substantive difference in the method or claims* only the country content and the form of control that exist and the implications of the actual system. The Soviet Union and Southeast Asian one-Party states all present their constitutions and branches of government to students and explain the importance of voting and working for the nation. All claim to be democracies protecting human rights and U.N. conventions that they have signed and they present their understandings of rights (and responsibilities).	- None of the educational systems explore the location of "political power" and control beyond formal institutions and describe the specific skills to impact it at every locus. - None of the educational systems train students to negotiate and create a social contract/ constitution that would allow for full empowerment and control by the citizenry. - None of the educational systems teach specific functions and missions of governments for measuring and protecting assets and sustainability of cultures and as a whole.

Table 1. (section b.), [pp. 52-55].

What are the foundations of the American political system? These questions focus on students' understanding of American constitutional government and its history as well as the distinctive characteristics of American society and American political culture (e.g., religious freedom, individualism) that are linked to American constitutional democracy. 20%	**"Knowledge and Skills for Democracy"** [called in some of the frameworks "Cognitions about Democratic Institutions" that seem to be limited to skills like "interpreting political campaign messages"]	*No substantive difference in the method or claims* only the country content and the form of control that exist and the implications of the actual system. The Soviet Union and Southeast Asian one-Party states all present their political histories as "revolutionary struggles" against either a foreign power or against feudalism, in order to protect freedom, rights and nation and to keep the people safe and prosperous. They all point to provisions in their constitutions and in U.N. treaties and note sacrifices of ancestors. They promote skills of reading, writing and analyzing materials from the perspectives of the "democratic values" of "the people" and for harmony and prosperity.	- None of the educational systems offer direct exposure to all of the public and types of private institutions and groups and their different interests and mechanisms of activity, that play roles in the political process. - None of the educational systems teach the psychological mechanisms and skills for protecting against psychological manipulation and propaganda used by State and community to override free and rational choices, though all teach basic ""thinking" and "analytical" skills of use to existing authority. - None of the educational systems teach the mechanisms for holding elites accountable to the claims of law or justice on which the country's political system is based and for measuring movement away from it.

Table 1. (section c.), [pp. 52-55].

How does the government established by the Constitution embody the purposes, values, and principles of American democracy? These questions focus on understanding the specific responsibilities and organization of the national government, the role and function of state and local governments, and the role of the law in the American constitutional system. 25%	[Same as above]	*No substantive difference in the method or claims* only the country content and the form of control that exist and the implications of the actual system. The Soviet Union and Southeast Asian one-Party states all have levels of governments and branches of formal government structure, including courts, lawyers, a press, and national security organs, labor unions, and private businesses as well as forms of civil society. Basic administrative forms are essentially the same.	- None of the educational systems teach the skills of institutional and administrative management and oversight of national and local level bureaucracies, particularly of military powers, national security state powers, police, arbitrary powers of courts and judges, and of line bureaucracies and introduce students directly to these institutions. - None of the educational systems teach the skills of appropriate and effective regulatory authority over economic power/institutions (global and domestic businesses of different sectoral types) or civil society organizations.

Table 1. (section d.)

What is the relationship of the United States to other nations and to world affairs? These questions focus on understanding how the world is organized politically and nations influence one another in world affairs. The questions focus on understanding specific, historical, and contemporary foreign policy decisions. 20%	[Same as above]	*No substantive difference in the method or claims* only the country content and the form of control that exist and the implications of the actual system. The Soviet Union and Southeast Asian one-Party states all claim commitments to peace and international law in protection of the nation, while promoting policies that homogenize the culture and seek to eliminate internal cultural and regional differences.	- None of the educational systems teach the psychological mechanisms and protections against emotional appeals to nationalism and militarism in foreign relations and for direct content and full information on scapegoated nations or groups through direct contacts.

Table 1. (section e.), [pp. 52-55].

What are the roles of citizens in American democracy? These questions focus on the meaning of citizenship and ask students to evaluate, take, and defend positions on specific rights and responsibilities of citizens. Questions in this area also explore the complexity of the relationship between civic participation and the preservation and improvement of American democracy. 25%	**"Participatory Attitudes"**	*Major difference (in the best case schools) in the teaching of minimal skills of representative democracy and methods used* such as local lobbying and analysis of law, campaign and issue debates, letter writing and opinion essays, candidacies for school office, mock government *but no substantive difference in the basic claims of general responsibilities and rights.* The Soviet Union and Southeast Asian one-Party states use the "rights and responsibilities" rhetoric to promote obedience to the State in the name of "rights" and teach the role of citizens in protection of the state and nation and following "law" and the "will of the people" as placed in the constitution by previous generations. They exhort citizens to "join the Party" and vote. They all offer "discussions" and opportunities for "candidacies". They include teachings of military preparedness to protect the community and various community work (cleaning areas or harvesting or other "volunteer"/service/service learning) and promote "family values" and love of country/Fatherland. They do teach and urge "protest" in the forms of rallies and strikes and "campaigns" within the framework determined by the State.	- None of the educational systems teach strategies of civil obedience or mechanisms for bringing the leadership to account under international law. None of the educational systems teach the democratization of the schools and educational systems, themselves, by students. - None of the systems teach measurements of democracy. - None of the educational systems teach alternatives that would change the systems of participation and representation and the powers of citizens versus other groups within state and non-state institutions that exercise military, police, economic and administrative authority.

Table 1 (section f.), [pp. 52-55].

-	**"Social Justice Values"**	*No substantive difference in the method or claims* only the country content and the form of control that exist and the implications of the actual system and the current approaches in the U.S. and Europe to "identity politics" and competition in industrial market economies.. The Soviet Union and Southeast Asian one-Party states all claim that they are "socially just" and "progressive" (both industrially modern and more advanced in rights) because of claimed superiority to Western European colonialist and imperialist legacies, histories of racial inequity and inequalities, that are taught as doctrines. They claim the superiority of the local religions and state religions over Christianity, and teach them as doctrines.	- None of the educational systems offer field education to promote direct understandings of the different ethnic groups, communities and cultures affected by political decisions or the different individual rights holders or prepare students in understanding the interdependence, value and values of those with these differences.

Table 2., [p.59].

Table 2. Comparing Current Approaches in Civics Education in the U.S. to Education for Corporate or Functionary Roles

Key Civic Skills Mentioned in the Literature	***Whether they are Unique to Civics and a Democratic Citizenry or are Equally Valid Preparation for Corporate or Functionary Roles***
Critical Thinking	**Not unique to Civics**. All workplace and life decisions require (constructive) critical thinking. Unless this skill is specifically tied to things like analysis of media propaganda, government misinformation, and specific forms of political manipulation particular to institutions and policy areas, which require more targeted skills including those from psychology, it is not a part of civics skills.
Communications Skills	**Not unique to Civics**. All workplace and life interactions require communication skills. Unless this skill is specifically tied to mobilization and negotiation of political power, it is not part of civics skills.
Research	**Not unique to Civics**. Many workplace decisions require research skills. Unless research is specifically tied to investigating particular institutions and types of policies in a way that enhances citizen political power and specific governmental functions under control of the citizenry, it is not part of civics skills.
Collective Decision-making	**Not unique to Civics**. Most workplace decision require standard "team" work as do parenting/family decisions. Unless collective decision-making is tied to specific political interactions in groups that require specific political balancing and projections for control and exercise of specific governmental powers (e.g., secret/security decisions, balancing of community rights and allowing for specific minority vetoes, cross-generational/future and other protections), it is not part of civics skills.

Table 3. (section a.), [pp.60-63].

Table 3. Recognition of Civic Education Skills in Torney-Purta, Cabrera, Crotts, Ou, Liu and Rios (2015), with clarifications to show their relevance to Social Contract Democracy and the Disciplinary Rooting of the Skill

Skill as listed by Torney-Purta, Cabrera, Crotts, Ou, Liu and Rios (2015)	***How this Skill can be Rewritten (expanded or targeted) to Clarify its Relation to Social Contract Democracy and its actual disciplinary source where an identifiable skill is rooted***
Level One: Overarching Social Contract Skills: Locating Political Power and Creating a Social Contract Constitution for Equal Power and Oversight	
Analyze social or political systems to plan processes of problem solving and public action	**This skill can be expanded to the entire context of Social Contract Democracy** and the overall political system and locus of decision-making as well as list of decisions. *The skill is to conduct a political power analysis of the system and its deep structure to locate sources of military/police, economic and security state power in institutions and networks (rooted in Political Science, Political Sociology and Psychology)*
Fundamental principles of democratic processes, human and civil rights, and rule of law	**This is really civic knowledge that can be linked with and expanded into an essential skill of Social contract democracy**: *Negotiating the social contract for citizen control, following fundamental principles of governance, oversight, law and rights (rooted in Political Science and Contract Law)*

Table 3. (section b.)

Level Two: Overarching Government/Public Institution and Public Policy/Decision-making Management Skills for Sustainability, Protection and Measurement of All Assets	
Factual information about and understanding of institutions and processes of government, major political, economic, and social conditions or issues, stands of political parties	**This is really civic knowledge that can be linked with and expanded into an essential skill of Governance: protecting and promoting resources of all kinds (human and material/environmental) and building long-term sustainable governance and social progress**: *The skill is analyzing and designing the structural and functional roles (missions/functions and tasks) of formal government for sustainability (Environmental management; Cultural survival; Strategic management)*
Apply ethical standards to evaluate political decision-making practices, processes, and outcomes and to understand principled dissent and effective leadership *Similarly*: Understanding Distinctions between personal and group goals	**This is an appropriate skill (along with an appropriate civic concept) that is misnamed and is in danger of being misapplied**. Human ethics for governance are already a part of long-term protections (passing resources on to the next generation, assuring sustainability, promoting social justice objectives that are already part of international laws and documents) versus short term goals while the idea of distinguishing between "personal" and "group goals" calls attention to the need to understand long-term goals of democratic systems and cultures/groups for survival (the level of group rights) versus short-term interests and needs (at the level of individual rights). *The skills are in long-term planning (Environmental management; Effective applications of law for rights protections)*

Table 3. (section c.), [pp.60-63].

Level Three: Specific Institutional and Cultural Policy Involvement and Oversight through Direct Field Visits and Application of Quantitative and Qualitative Skills	
Foundational and conceptual knowledge of government structures and processes enabling attentive and effective civic/political participation	**This is really civic knowledge that can be linked with and expanded into an essential skill of Quantitative and Qualitative Research into Institutions that Exercise Political Power (Formal and Informal).** *The skills are those of policy research through direct visit to and analysis of the structural workings of all of the types of institutions of formal (AND INFORMAL, HIDDEN) power, how it is used and how it can be subject to citizen control (through key applied Social Sciences of Political Science, Public Management, Sociology, Anthropology)*
Understanding of: Cultural and human differences that frequently bear on political activities and related perspective taking	**This is really civic knowledge that can be linked with and expanded into an essential skill of Quantitative and Qualitative Research into Groups Categories that have Specific Community and Individual Rights.** *The skills are those of policy research through direct visit to and analysis of needs of different groups and individuals, including indigenous peoples, communities, and individuals across recognized minority and rights holding categories (through key applied Social Sciences of Sociology, Anthropology)*

Table 3. (section d.)

Level Four: Specific Skills for the Effective Exercise of Citizen Power, through Direct and Indirect Democracy, and for Protecting that Authority against manipulation	
Vote, voice an opinion, protest, take consumer-oriented action, join or originate petitions	**This list of citizen skills needs to be recognized by the full category and sub-categories: Representative democracy skills (including voting, full competition of multiple political parties, equal ability to run as candidates, prevention of direct and indirect electoral rigging and manipulation, skills of voter decisions and protection against manipulation) and Direct democracy skills.** *The direct democracy skills that are partly mentioned here, of "consumer oriented action" (boycotts) and petitions need to be expanded to include civil disobedience, private rights of legal action, jury nullification, recall mechanisms, citizen grand juries, charter revocation lawsuits, class action lawsuits and others (coming from Social contract democracy theory).*
Identify pressure points in a given context	**This is a general category of skills for political strategy that can be expanded within different contexts**. *The general skill is that of conducting analyses of political change and impacts (Anthropology and Sociology), adding tools of behavior change (Social marketing) and change management (Managerial accounting) and then using an arsenal of more specific skills depending what the needs are [those of representative democracy/campaigns/legislation, those of direct democracy and civil disobedience, etc.]*

Table 3. (section e.), [pp.60-63].

Organizational leadership and group skills: modes of enhancing cooperation in groups, building cohesiveness, avoiding the premature closing of discussion	**These are really several different democratic skills which should be separated**, in a general category of strategic skills for democratic citizenship and applications in specific contexts, including those of political mobilization (applicable to representative and direct democracy), jury skills of protecting minority opinions (skills for participation in the judicial system), resistance to imposed conformity and power
Recognize potential effects of laws or policies on different communities or groups and understand their perspectives	**This is just a tiny public policy skill that needs to be expanded as part of the context of effective policy within the framework of appropriate governance structures (above) and that can include the skill of appropriate legislative drafting, policy evaluation, and monitoring**. *The skills here include 1) Legal drafting for democratic social change (coming out of Law/legislative skills and Policy/Public Administration), and 2) Direct contact with institutions and impacted groups and individuals with specific rights (described above, coming out of Sociology, Anthropology, and International Laws) and 3) Appropriate roles of government for protection of future generations and sustainably protecting assets (coming out of Sustainable Development, Resource Accounting, Cultural survival).*

Table 3. (section f.)

Distinguish evidence-backed facts from unsubstantiated opinions	**This is just a tiny research skill that applies to all research and that needs to be expanded and targeted to the set of skills for protecting against being manipulated by media and propaganda and abuse of psychological techniques as well as how to collect appropriate policy information and how to base decisions on historical actions and impacts rather than on promises.** *The skills here are those of citizen protection against manipulation (coming out of Cognitive and Behavioral Psychology; Media and Communications).*
Media and information literacy relating to political and social issues. (considering use of social media, journalistic, and scholarly sources, and including graphic presentations)	**This skill category needs to be focused to go beyond just the skill of media research on political and social issues so as to protect citizens against abuses and manipulation through the media and to train citizens in how to use the media for expression of citizen views and to assure that media meets the needs of social contract democracy for equal citizen access regardless of income, social status, or networks**. *The skills here are those of protection against manipulation through media (coming out of Cognitive and Behavioral Psychology; Media and Communications), how to use media for social and behavior change (Social marketing, Advertising) and skills of social contracting for equal media access (Social Contract Skills; Institutional oversight of media).*

Table 4. (section a.), [p.62-63].

Table 4. Recognition of Civic Education Skills from specific Social Science Disciplines in the National Council for Social Studies College, Career and Civic Life (C3) Framework (2013), with clarifications to show their relevance to Social Contract Democracy and the Disciplinary Rooting of the Skill

Skill as listed in "Companion Documents" from Social Science Associations to the C3 Framework	***How this Skill can be Rewritten (expanded or targeted) to Clarify its Relation to Social Contract Democracy and its actual disciplinary source where an identifiable skill is rooted***
Recommendations of the American Psychological Association	
D2.Psy.9.9-12. Describe biological, psychological, and sociocultural factors that influence individuals' cognition, perception, and behavior. (page 70)	**These psychological skills are important when applied to specific political participation concerns that are noted in Table 3, helping citizens to protect themselves against manipulation and to assure the effectiveness of their actions.** *[See the above table for the application of these skills in political contexts like social pressures for conformity and propaganda manipulation and note that there are additional psychological skills that are necessary for effective participation including dealing with and overcoming short-term fears and threats, dealing with cognitive dissonance manipulation strategies that convince people they are committed to inequalities and manipulations by forcing them to agree to minimal acts against their interest.]*
Recommendations of the American Sociological Association	
D2.Soc.3.9-12. Identify how social context influences individuals. (page 75) [including workplace]	**This is the sociological skill that is important when applied to interpretation of media and stated beliefs/commitments/roles/judgments of political actors (on the basis of social standing, networks, and interests), ability to exercise rights and exercise political responsibility from one's position within institutions (economic, political and social), as well as subconscious pressures for conformity and acceptance of systems and decision-making that is not consistent with long-term interests.**

Table 4. (section b.)

Recommendations of the American Anthropological Association	
Nutrition levels and their biological effects. (page 81)	**This is one of the many sub-skills for effectively participating in constructing a democratic social contract in which citizens have an equal start to participation**. *The overall set of skills is to recognize the essentials for preconditions of political equality and for maintaining it through social contract.*
In-depth, open-ended interviews, and fieldwork on everyday behavior. Case studies of neighborhoods, social service institutions, workplaces. Content analysis of news reports, academic studies, and everyday conversations. Comparison of qualitative and quantitative information across neighborhoods, regions, and countries. (page 81)	**This is a list of anthropological/social science field skills that are part of the basis for interpreting political institutions, interest groups and rights in order to exercise political responsibilities.** *[The skills are described in Table 3 as part of Specific Institutional and Cultural Skills through Direct Field Visits and Application of Quantitative and Qualitative Skills]*

Table 5., [pp.87-89].

Table 5: Contemporary Civics Education as Scored by the Indicator

Scoring in the Civics Education Indicator	***Scoring Category***	***Contemporary Examples***
10 -13 points	Comprehensive approach to Civic Education for Social Contract Democracy	Ideal, Not Observed
6 - 9 points	Civic Education for a partly but not fully open society, maintaining elite controls and inequalities in several sectors	Not Observed
0 – 5 points	Civic Education in an Authoritarian Society with token citizen participation	Public school in suburban New York in the U.S. (the author's experience in the 1960s and 1970s) [Score: 3 points]
		Civics education in the Late Soviet Period/ Early Newly Independent States, 1990s [Score: 2.5 points]
		Civics education in Europe as observed by the author since 2017 [Score: 0 points or (-1) point]
< 0: (-6) – 0 points	Education for Elite Control with Propagandistic Programming	Current civic education in the U.S. [Score: (-2) points]
		Civics education in Southeast Asia as observed by the author between 2000 and 2016 [Score: (-4) points]
		Civics education in the Soviet Union, Stalinist Era: [Score: (-6) points]

Author

David Lempert, Ph.D., J.D., M.B.A., E.D. (Hon.) was a Visiting Scholar at Humboldt University of Berlin, Institute for Asian and African Studies, a California attorney, and an international consultant in law and development who has worked in some 35+ countries with international development agencies, governments at various levels, non-governmental organizations, universities, and businesses. He is the author of the first treatise of international development law, including some 15 development accountability indicators, and the first textbook on national sustainable development planning. He has also worked on the reform of law school and social science curriculum internationally with universities, governments and international organizations, and is the founder and CEO of Unseen America Projects, Inc., promoting democratic experiential education.

References

Almond, G., and Verba, S. (1963) *The Civic Culture or The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*, Sage Publications.
Asch, S. (1955) 'Opinions and Social Pressure', Scientific American 193(5): 31 – 35: http://www.panarchy.org/asch/social.pressure.1955.html
Amadeo, J., Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Husfeldt, V., & Nikolova, R. (2002) ,Civic knowledge and engagement: An IEA study of upper secondary students in sixteen countries', Amsterdam, The Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.
Barber, B. R. (1994) *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*, University of California Press.
Barnet, R. J. and Müller, R. E. (1974) *Global Reach: The Power of the Multinational Corporations*, New York: Simon and Schuster.
Brady, H. E., Verba, S. and Schlozman, K. L. (1995) 'Beyond Ses: A Resource Model of Political Participation', *American Political Science Review*, 89(2): 271-294.
Brutus, J. D., Henry, P. (1965 [1787]) *The Anti-Federalist Papers* (ed. Morton Borden), Lansing: Michigan State University Press.
Bryson, J. M. (1988) *Strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations: A guide to strengthening and sustaining organizational achievement*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
Campbell, D. E. (2019) 'What Social Scientists Have Learned About Civic Education: A Review of the Literature', *Peabody Journal of Education*, 94(1): 32-47: https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2019.1553601
Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE) and the Carnegie Corporation of New York (2003) 'The Civic Mission of Schools': https://circle.tufts.edu/sites/default/files/2020-01/civic_mission_schools_2003.pdf
Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement. (2010) 'Civic skills and federal policy' [Fact sheet], Medford, MA: CIRCLE.
Citizens Education Initiative website: https://www.civiced.org/programs/project-citizen
Chomsky, Noam (1991) *Deterring Democracy*, London: Verso.
Congressional Research Service (2019) 'Foreign Aid: An Introduction to U.S. Programs and Policy', U.S. Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.: https://fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R40213.pdf
Dahl, R. (1961) *Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City*, New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.
Delli Carpini, M. X., & Keeter, S. (1996) *What Americans know about politics and why it matters*, New Haven, CN: Yale University Press.
Dewey, J. (1916) *Democracy and Education*, New York: Macmillan. https://www.gutenberg.org/files/852/852-h/852-h.htm
Diamond, L. (2019) 'The Global Crisis of Democracy', *Wall Street Journal* (May 17).
Domhoff, G. W. (2015) 'Wealth, Income and Power: Who Rules America?': http://whorulesamerica.about/power/wealth.html
Brooks, D. (2014) 'Convergence Theory Revisited: Kafkaesque Global Bureaucracies of Our Times: With an Example of a Tool for Measuring Whether Approaches to Accountability are Real or Sham', *Social Evolution and History*, 13(1), March: 67 – 98: http://www.sociostudies.org/journal/articles/242735/
Emmanuel, C., Merchant, K., Otley, D. (1990) *Accounting for Management Control*, Chapman & Hall.
European Commission (undated, accessed in 2003) 'Handbook on Promoting Good Governance in EC Development and Cooperation', European Aid Cooperation Office, publication J54-07/20: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2003:0615:FIN:EN:PDF
Festinger, L. (1957) *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
Freire, Paolo (2007 [1968]) *Pedagogy of the*

Oppressed, New York: Continuum.
Galbraith, John Kenneth (1967) *The New Industrial State*, New York: Houghton Mifflin.
Garrison, R.H., Noreen, D., Brewer, P.C. (2005) *Managerial Accounting*, Irwin/ McGraw Hill.
Gatto, J. T. (1992) *Dumbing Us Down: The Hidden Curriculum of Compulsory Schooling*, New Society Publishers.
Godsay, S., Henderson, W., Levine, P., Littenberg-Tobias, J., & CIRCLE (Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and, Education) (2012), 'State Civic Education Requirements': CIRCLE Fact Sheet: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED536256.pdf
Gould, J., ed. (2011) 'Guardian of Democracy: The Civic Mission of Schools. The Leonore Annenberg Institute for Civics of the Annenberg Public Policy Center at the University of Pennsylvania and the Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools': https://media.carnegie.org/filer_public/ab/dd/abdda62e-6e84-47a4-a043-348d2f2085ae/ccny_grantee_2011_guardian.pdf
Haney, C., Banks, W. C., Zimbardo, P. G. (1973) 'Interpersonal dynamics in a simulated prison', *International Journal of Criminology and Penology* 1: 69–97.
Hermann, E. and Noam C. (1988) *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*, New York: Pantheon Books.
Herz, J. H. ed. (1982) From Dictatorship to Democracy: Coping with the Legacies of Authoritarianism and Totalitarianism, Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
'Hey Policy Makers! Tests Are Not the Answer for Better Civics Education' (2017) The Civic Educator, (September 13): http://civiceducator.org/tests-wont-fix-civics-education/
Hoskins, B., Villalba, C. M. H. and Saisana, M. (2012) 'The 2011 Civic Competence Composite Indicator (CCCI-2) Measuring Young People's Civic Competence across Europe based on the IEA International Citizenship and Civic Education study', Luxembourg: European Union Publications Office.
https://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/bitstream/JRC68398/lbna25182enn.pdf
Hurtado, S., Ruiz, A., & Whang, H. (2012a) 'Advancing and assessing civic learning: New results from the diverse learning environments survey', *Diversity and Democracy*, 15(3): 10–12.
Hurtado, S., Ruiz, A., & Whang, H. (2012b,) 'Assessing students' social responsibility and civic learning', Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, New Orleans, (LA, June 2012).
https://heri.ucla.edu/present/AssessCivicLearning.pdf
Janis, I. L. (1972) *Victims of Groupthink: a Psychological Study of Foreign-Policy Decisions and Fiascoes*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
Jefferson, Thomas (1787) ,Letter to William Stephens Smith', *Thomas Jefferson Encyclopedia*: https://www.monticello.org/site/research-and-collections/tree-liberty-quotation
Kaufmann, D.; Kraay, A. and Mastruzzi, M. (2007) 'Governance Matters VI: Aggregate and Individual Governance Indicators,1996-2006', The World Bank, WPS4280.
http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/887981468315334023/pdf/wps4280.pdf
Kirlin, M. (2003) 'The Role of Civic Skills in Fostering Civic Engagement' https://circle.tufts.edu/sites/default/files/2019-12/WP06_CivicSkillsFosteringCivicEngagement_2003.pdf
Korten, David (1995) *When Corporations Rule the World*, Kumarian Press.
Lagemann, E. C. & Lewis, H. R. (2012) 'Renewing Civic Education: Time to Restore American Higher Education's Lost Mission', *Harvard Magazine*, (March-April): https://www.harvardmagazine.com/2012/03/renewing-civic-education
Langton, K. P., & Jennings, M. K. (1968) 'Political socialization and the high school civics curriculum in the United States', *American Political Science Review*, 62(03): 852–867.
Lasswell, H. (1936) *Who Gets What, When, and How*, New York: Whittlesey House.
Lempert, D. (1995) *Escape From the Ivory Tower: Student Adventures in Democratic Experiential Education*, Jossey-Bass Inc. Publishers/ Simon & Schuster.
Lempert, D. (1996) *Daily Life in a Crumbling Empire: The Absorption of Russia into the World Economy*, Columbia University Press/ Eastern European Monographs.
Lempert, D. (2010a) 'A Human Rights Democratic Education Indicator for NGOs and International Organizations', Interamerican Journal of Education for Democracy, 3(1): http://scholarworks.iu.edu/journals/index.php/ried/article/view/617/713
[and supplementary file:] https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342234047_Human_Rights_Education_Project_Indicators_for_NGOs_and_International_Organizations_supplementary_file_for_published_article
Lempert, D. (2010b) 'Why We Need a Cultural Red Book for Endangered Cultures, Now', International Journal of Minority and Group Rights, Fall/Winter 2010, 17(4): 511-50.

Lempert, D. (2011) 'A Democracy Building Democratic Project Indicator for NGOs and

International Organizations', *Global Jurist*, 11(2), Article 4. http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/gj.2011.11.issue-2/1934-2640.1385/1934-2640.1385.xml?format=INT
Lempert, D. (2013) 'Taking History Back to the People: An Approach to Making History Popular, Relevant and Intellectual', Democracy and Education, 21(2), (Article 1), (Fall 2013). http://democracyeducationjournal.org/home/vol21/iss2/1
Lempert, D. (2014) 'Universal Development Goals for This Millennium', Consilience, Summer, (Issue 12): http://www.consiliencejournal.org/index.php/consilience/article/viewPDFInterstitial/383/207
Lempert, D. (2016a) 'The Logic of Imperial Economics: Distinguishing Development Agencies from Colonial Bureaus Exercising Soft Power', *Journal of Globalization Studies*, 7(1): 87-111, May: http://www.sociostudies.org/journal/files/jogs/2016_1/Lempert%20Full%20version.pdf
Lempert, D. (2016b) 'Predicting Political Systems Using Economic, Environmental and Relational Variables', *Social Evolution and History*, 15(2): 164-194, September. [Longer Version:] https://www.sociostudies.org/journal/articles/588599/
Lempert, D. (2016c) 'The Myth of Social Progress, Revisited', Human Figurations: Long Term Perspectives, 5(1), (March 2-16). http://quod.lib.umich.edu/h/humfig/11217607.0005.107/--myth-of-social-progress-revisited?rgn=main;view=fulltext
Lempert, D. (2017a) 'Measuring "Progress" and "Regress" in Human Rights: Why We Need a Set of Social Contract Measures to Replace Indices of Violations and Slogans', *DePaul Journal for Social Justice*, 10(2), Article 5 (Summer 2017): http://via.library.depaul.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1143&context=jsj
Lempert, D. (2017b) 'The 'Deep Structure' of U.S. Political Culture: An Anthropological View of 'Deep Politics'', *Peace Studies Journal* 10(1): 20-56, February 2017): http://peaceconsortium.org/peace-studies-journal/archives/psj-vol-10-issue-1
Lempert, D. (2017c) 'A Screening Indicator for Holding International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) to Standards of Professionalism and Accountability', *Journal of Social Research and Policy*, 7(1), (July 2017): https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&pid=sites&srcid=ZGVmYXVsdGRvbWFpbnxqcnNwb25lfGd4OmE3NTYzMTU3ZTBmYjlkOA
Lempert, D. (2018a) 'A Treatise on International Development Law', *DePaul Journal for Social Justice*, 11(1), Article 6, Winter: http://via.library.depaul.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1152&context=jsj
Lempert, D. (2018b) 'We Now Have the Tools and Infrastructure to Hold Donors and NGOs in International Development to their Own Standards', *Journal of Multi-Disciplinary Evaluation*, 14(31): 61-83. http://journals.sfu.ca/jmde/index.php/jmde_1/article/view/506/459
Lempert, D. (2020) 'A New Approach to Heritage Tourism in Southeast Asia', *Transcience: Journal of Global Studies*, 11(2): https://www2.hu-berlin.de/transcience/Vol11_No2_28_105.pdf
Lempert, D. [unpublished trilogy] 'The Theory Behind the Modern Democracy and Modern Federalist Amendments'; 'A Return to Democracy: The Modern Democracy Amendments'; 'A Return to Community: The Modern Federalist Amendments': https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339717794_THE_MODERN_DEMOCRACY_AMENDMENTS_Proposed_and_THE_MODERN_FEDERALIST_AMENDMENTS
Lempert, D. [unpublished Vietnam Research] 'Modern Sparta: Daily Life of the Kinh Vietnamese: The Hanoi Hillbillies' [180,000 word Ethnography of Vietnamese Kinh life].
Lempert, D. and Nguyen, H. H. (2008) 'A Sustainable Development Indicator for NGOs and International Organizations', *International Journal of Sustainable Societies*, 1(1): 44-54: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/249922998_A_sustainable_development_indicator_for_NGOs_and_international_organisations
Lempert, D. and Nguyen, H. N. (2017) 'Accounting for Threats to Sustainable Development: An Indicator for Holding NGOs and International Organizations Accountable to Creating the Context for Sustainable Development', *Consilience*, Issue 17: http://consiliencejournal.org/article/accounting-for-threats-to-sustainable-development-an-indicator-for-holding-ngos-and-international-organizations-accountable-to-creating-the-context-for-sustainable-development/
Levine, P. and Kawashima-Ginsberg, K. (2017) 'The Republic is (Still) at Risk—and Civics is Part of the Solution' (Medford, MA: Jonathan M. Tisch College of Civic Life, Tufts University), iCivics: https://www.civxnow.org/sites/default/files/resources/SummitWhitePaper.pdf
Lin, A. (2015) 'Citizenship education in American schools and its role in developing civic engagement: a review of the research', *Educational Review*, 67(1): 35–63.

https://escholarship.org/content/qt5h02n43z/qt5h02n43z.pdf
Lindblom, C. (1977) *Politics and Markets: The World's Politico-Economic Systems*, New York: Basic Books.
Lipset, S. (2004) *The Democratic Culture*, University of Oklahoma Press
Lutz, W. (1997) *The New Doublespeak: Why No One Knows What Anyone's Saying Anymore*, Perennial.
Lyden, F. J. (1975) 'Using Parsons' Functional Analysis in the Study of Public Organizations', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 20(1): 59-70.
Madison, James Alexander Hamilton, and John Jay (1788) The Federalist. The Independent New Journal.
McLuhan, M. (1964) *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*, New York: McGraw Hill.
Milgram, S. (1974) *Obedience to Authority*, New York: Harper Collins.
Miller, G. (1975) *The Psychology of Communications*, New York: Harper and Row.
Mills, C. W. (1956) *The Power Elite*, London, Oxford University Press.
Moore, B. (1966) *The Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*, New York, Beacon Press.
National Assessment Governing Board (2010) 'Civics framework for the 2010 National Assessment of Educational Progress' (NAEP), Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
National Center for Education Statistics (2011) 'The Nation's Report Card: Civics 2010' (NCES 2011–466), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pdf/main2010/2011466.pdf
National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) (2013) 'The College, Career, and Civic Life' (C3) *Framework for Social Studies State Standards: Guidance for Enhancing the Rigor of K–12 Civics, Economics, Geography, and History*. Silver Spring, MD: NCSS.
National Council for the Social Studies, Silver Spring, MD, 'College Career and Civic Life (C3) Framework for Social Studies State Standards' (2017) https://www.socialstudies.org/sites/default/files/2017/Jun/c3-framework-for-social-studies-rev0617.pdf
National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (2012) 'A crucible moment: College learning and democracy's future', Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities: https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/research/pubs/college-learning-democracys-future/crucible-moment.pdf
New York State Board of Regents, Task Force on Civic Readiness (2020) 'Civic Readiness for Students' (overlapping document online: https://www.regents.nysed.gov/common/regents/files/CCCRWG%20-%20Civic%20Readiness%20Initiative%20Presentation.pdf
Nguyen, H. N. (2008) 'Toxic Omissions and Cancerous Growths: Addressing the Unexamined Assumption of Sustainable Consumption in Technologically Innovative Societies', Masters' Thesis, Department of Environmental Policy, Central European University.
Niemi, R. G. and Julia Smith (2001) 'Enrollments in High School Government Classes: Are We Short-Changing Both Citizenship and Political Science Teaching?' PS: *Political Science & Politics*, 34 (2): 281-287.
Orwell, G. (1945) *Animal Farm: A Fairy Story*, London: Seker and Warburg.
Orwell, G. (1949) *1984*, New York: Harcourt Brace.
Parenti, M. (1988) *Democracy for the Few*, New York: St. Martin's Press.
Payer, C. (1982) *The World Bank: A Critical Analysis*, Monthly Review Press.
Proshansky, H. (1970) *Environmental Psychology: Man and His Physical Setting*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
Raskin, M. G. (1976) 'Democracy versus the National Security State', *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 40:3:189-220.
Raviv, A., Lewis Oppenheimer, and Daniel Bar-Tal (1999) *How Children Understand War and Peace: A Call for International Peace Education*, Jossey-Bass.
Rebell, M. (2018) *Flunking Democracy: Schools, Courts, and Civil Participation*, University of Chicago Press.
'Restructuring the Social Sciences' (2018) *Catalyst: A Social Justice Forum*, 8(1): https://trace.tennessee.edu/catalyst/vol8/iss1/1
Rhodes, T. L. (2010) 'Assessing outcomes and improving achievement: Tips and tools for using rubrics', Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities: http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/civicengagement.cfm
Rouseeau, J. J. (1762a) *The Social Contract*.
Rousseau, J. J. (1762b) *Emile, ou De l'education*.
Schulz, W., Fraillon, J., Ainley, J., Losito, B., & Kerr, D. (2008) 'International civic and citizenship education study': http://www.iea.nl/fileadmin/user_upload/Publications/Electronic_versions/ICCS_2009_Framework.pdf
Sehr, D.T. (1997) *Education for Public Democracy*, SUNY Press.
Seidman, R. (1991) 'Legislative Drafting for Democratic Social Change: A Manual for Drafters', Kluwer Law International.
Shapiro, S. and Catherine B. (2018) 'The State of Civics Education', (February 21), Center for American Progress:

https://www.civxnow.org/sites/default/files/resources/CivicsEducation-brief-updated.pdf
Sly, P. (2018) 'The Nonsense and Non-Science of Political Science: A Politically Incorrect View of 'Poly-T(r)icks'', *Catalyst: A Social Justice Forum*, 2018, 8(1), Article 9: 268-300: http://trace.tennessee.edu/catalyst/vol8/iss1/9
Snyder, B. R. (1970) *The Hidden Curriculum*, Alfred A. Knopf.
'Street Law: A Course in Practical Law', 10th edition (2021) McGraw Hill.
Thoreau, H. D. (1849) *Civil Disobedience*. Torney-Purta, J.; Julio C. Cabrera, Katrina Crotts, Roohr Ou, Lydia Liu, and Joseph A. Rios (2015) 'Assessing Civic Competency and Engagement in Higher Education: Research Background, Frameworks, and Directions for Next-Generation Assessment': (December 2015): https://www.schev.edu/docs/default-source/about-section/additional-activities/assessing-civic-competencyetsreport.pdf
Trimble, P. (1997) 'Globalization, International Institutions and the Erosion of Sovereignty and Democracy', *Michigan Law Review*, 95:6: 1944-1969.
United Nations (2015) 'Draft outcome document of the United Nations summit for the adoption of the post-2015 development agenda', August 12, A/69/L.85.
https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/800852?ln=en; also: https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/education/
United Nations (2011) 'Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training', U.N. General Assembly Resolution 66/137: https://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Education/Training/Pages/UNDHREducationTraining.aspx
United Nations (2017) 'Global indicator framework for the Sustainable Development Goals and targets of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development', Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on Work of the Statistical Commission pertaining to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (A/RES/71/313), Annex. https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/indicators/Global%20Indicator%20Framework%20after%202020%20review_Eng.pdf
UNESCO (Vegard Skirbekk, Michaela Potančoková, Marcin Stonawski) (2013) 'Measurement of Global Citizenship Education': https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000229287
UNESCO (2015) 'Education for peace: planning for curriculum reform: guidelines for integrating an Education for Peace curriculum into education sector plans and policies': http://www.ibe.unesco.org/sites/default/files/resources/education-for-peace-2015.pdf
UNDP (2020) 'Civic Engagement': https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/2030-agenda-for-sustainable-development/peace/governance/civic-engagement.html
U.S. Agency for International Development, Center for Democracy and Governance (1998), *Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators*, PN-ACC-390. http://www.managingforimpact.org/sites/default/files/resource/handbook_of_democracy_and_governance_program_indicators.pdf
USAID, Office of Democracy and Governance (Sharon Morris) (2002) 'Approaches to Civics Education: Lessons Learned': https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNACP331.pdf
U.S. Code (2002) 'No Child Left Behind' (NCLB) Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, § 115, Stat. 1425.
Verba, S. and Norman H. N. (1972) *Participation in America: Political Democracy and Social Equality*, New York: Harper and Row.
Wallerstein, I. (1979) *An Historical Perspective: The Emergence of the New Economic Order', The Capitalist World Economy*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
Ward, H. (2013) 'The Tools For Democracy', Sustainable Governance Indicators News, (September 25) https://news.sgi-network.org/index.php?id=158
Weber, M. (1947 [1925]) *Theory of Social and Economic Organization* (trans. A.M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons), New York: Free Press.
Wolin, S. (2003) 'Illiberal Democracy', *The Nation*, (May 19).
Zinn, H. (2003) *A People's History of the United States*, New York: Harper & Row.