

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

in virtually every region of the world. As new democracies become more globally engaged, wars and insecurity fall off. Although global economic growth is uneven, it is strong and sustained enough to have checked prolonged economic crises in Southeast Asia and Latin America. The European Union, the United States and other international actors have made large political and economic investments to promote democracy, security and economic growth in post-communist states and south of the equator. Witness the recent G-8 decision to facilitate debt reduction for developing nations. The key is to increase the overall magnitude of international engagement so as to bind potentially conflicting parties into a global network that constrains extremists.

We also need to understand how we can better handle conflicts once violence breaks out. More effective multilateral interventions through early deployment of international monitors, mediators or peacekeeping forces can keep conflicts from escalating. Many experts now agree that Rwanda might have been spared the horrors of genocide if intervention had been early and consistent. Bilateral assistance programs like the U.S. Agency for International Development should encourage the extension of democratic rights to

a country's minorities as well as to its majority, along with promoting equitable economic development. In the Caucasus and the Middle East, we have found that a more culturally sensitive preventive diplomacy that engages both the opposition and the government defuses ethno-political conflicts before they explode. This task is not always easy for diplomats who are accustomed to dealing with governments alone. Second-track or citizens' diplomacy emphasizing people-to-people contacts across lines of conflict can be especially helpful in building trust.

The ability of peacemakers to promote settlements of wars within nation-states has improved dramatically. We need to recognize what has worked to reduce conflict and build on the successes. The violent pasts in Kosovo and Congo will become the future only if we turn away, saying, "It's your problem, not ours." More sustained international engagement, not less, is needed to keep peace up and conflict down.

EDUC - Technology

Don't Blame Teachers for Low Computer Use in Classrooms **By Larry Cuban**

Special to the Los Angeles Times

Here's a puzzle for both cheerleaders and critics of using computers in classrooms: Fewer than two of every 10 teachers are serious users of computers in their classrooms (several times a week). Three to four are occasional users (about once a month). The rest four to five teachers of every 10 teachers never use the machines. When type of use is examined, these powerful technologies most often perform word processing and low-end applications. This after hundreds of millions of dollars have increased access to computers, the Internet and software in the last decade. In other organizations hospitals, major corporations, supermarkets computer use is ubiquitous. Not so in schools.

Why? For hard-core techno-enthusiasts, the answer is simple: Look no further than the teachers themselves. They lack training, don't have time to learn, too many are too old or are technophobic, etc. Some of these reasons help explain teachers' infrequent use of computers in the classroom. But they ignore a few seldom-noted facts. About seven of 10 teachers have computers at home and use them to prepare lessons, communicate with colleagues and friends, search the Internet and conduct personal business. There are few technophobes here.

These facts should puzzle taxpayers, educators and parents confronting limited classroom use of new machines amid technology money spilling over schools. They also point to other reasons to explain this phenomenon: Experts offer contradictory advice; schools have intractable working conditions; external groups make constant demands upon teachers; the technology is inherently unreliable; and policy-makers don't respect teachers' views. Combined, these reasons help account for why teachers use computers at home but far less in classrooms.

For almost two decades, academic and corporate experts have exhorted teachers to use new technologies in their classrooms so their students will learn more, faster and better. Exactly what have these self-appointed gurus told teachers about using computers in schools?

When desktop computers began appearing in schools in the early 1980s, corporate leaders urged teachers to get their students to learn BASIC programs. Experts said that learning to program would prepare students to think clearly and get jobs. By the late '80s, however, BASIC had disappeared. Now, different experts prodded

teachers to teach computer applications word processing, spreadsheets, using databases because knowing these applications would pay off in college and at the workplace. Districts invested in more labs, more teachers were trained and students learned software applications.

In the mid-1990s, the prevailing wisdom among experts shifted again. Teachers were asked to integrate new technologies into their daily classroom routines. Four to six new machines were put in each teacher's classroom, and students were no longer sent to computer labs. Teachers were urged to learn and teach hypertext programming (HTML) to help their students create multimedia products. Experts and their allies wanted students to do Internet searches, communicate via e-mail and create their own Web pages.

Let's imagine an average high school math teacher in either the heart of the Silicon Valley or Los Angeles Unified who has been around for these years of shifting advice. She has taken courses on software applications that the district offered. She bought a computer and uses it at home to prepare lessons, record grades and search the Internet for lessons that she can use in her classes. She is enthusiastic about using computers with students. She has listened to the experts, but since the advice keeps changing, she has largely ignored the bumper-sticker wisdom of the moment. What gives her pause is not the experts' contradictions but other factors.

Although information technologies have transformed most corporate workplaces, our teacher's schedule and working conditions have changed very little. She teaches five classes a day, each 50 minutes long. Her five classes contain at least three different preparations. She has two classes of introductory algebra, two of geometry, and one calculus class. In those five classes, she sees between 125 and 175 students a day, depending on how affluent the district is and how determined the school board and superintendent are to keep class sizes down. High school teachers do have at least one period a day set aside for planning lessons, seeing students, marking papers, making phone calls to parents or vendors, previewing videos, securing a VCR or other equipment and using the school's copy machines for producing student materials.

High school teachers are expected to know their subjects inside and out; maintain order in their classrooms; be both friendly toward and demanding of each and every student; be accountable for their students doing well on tests at a time when taking tests can spell the difference between graduating high school or staying in school longer; and be infinitely patient. Furthermore, ask even the most dedicated users of computers how often their machines and their software break down. Most schools can't afford on-site technical support. When they do have coordinators and students who trouble-shoot problems and do repairs, there are still software glitches and servers that crash repeatedly, torpedoing lessons. New and upgraded software requires more memory and speed from machine that are sorely limited in their capacity. More breakdowns.

Teachers have seldom been consulted on which technologies make the most sense for them to use with their students, what configuration of machines and software work best in their classrooms. Instead, classroom space disappears in place of labs fully stocked with donated or purchased equipment. Machines pop up on teachers' desks. Administrators exhort teachers to take courses on technology that the district just made available. Few teachers ever get asked what they think.

So the obvious but seldom asked question is: Why should busy teachers who are enthusiastic about using computers listen to experts' changing advice on technologies when they daily have to face unyielding work conditions, internal and external demands, unreliable machines and software and disrespect?

Corporate cheerleaders, policy-makers and vendors prefer to put teachers under a microscope rather than examine the role they play in selling unfriendly technologies to schools, while ignoring the conditions under which teachers work and disrespecting teachers' views. By doing so, they avoid the hard and expensive remedy to teachers' infrequent use of computers: lower teaching loads, small classes and on-site technical assistance.

Say No to North Korea **Los Angeles Times**

The following editorial appeared in Tuesday's Los Angeles Times:

The word from North Korea is that it is ready to negotiate with "hostile nations" meaning the United States, Japan and South Korea about calling off its test of a new long-range missile, a prospect that has heightened tensions in northeast Asia. The unspoken condition in Pyongyang's offer is that it expects to be

regulators of aggression have worked in the United States, a largely free and open society. While it is appropriate to account for the apparent erosion of social controls, it is equally important to ask how we have been so effective in containing violence.

According to Sigmund Freud, human beings are animals motivated primarily by their sexual and aggressive impulses. In his "Civilization and Its Discontents," the psychoanalyst argued that civilization, through principles of morality, law and order and social propriety, controls human aggression to protect us from each other. These learned regulators, however, do not guarantee that our basic animal nature will not rear its ugly head, particularly in a democracy in which aggression is widely tolerated. Nonetheless, mass murder in America is quite rare.

So what, if anything, has broken down in the American psyche?

Since the perpetrators of recent attacks have had severe psychological problems, perhaps part of the answer lies in the radical shift in the diagnosis of mental-health patients since the 1960s, from inhibited neurosis to impulse-ridden and narcissistic disorders. Neurotics are overly controlled by strict consciences, right and wrong, and their fears of disapproval for expressing sexual and aggressive impulses.

Through the guilt-ridden 1950s, the American nuclear family was the primary emissary of society's moral values. Outbreaks of violence were largely confined to an isolated murder here and there. In the '60s, the rising divorce rate undercut the nuclear family. American values embraced the freedom to pursue pleasure: sexual, drug-induced, etc. Guilt became bad, impulsivity good.

From the late '60s till now, therapists have noticed that their patients no longer mainly suffer from inhibition and guilt. Instead, impulse disorders, drug and sexual addictions, eating disorders and victims of sexual and physical abuse have proliferated. These patients are much more difficult to treat than neurotics. They tend to be extremely egocentric, infantile, filled with aggression and possessing little empathetic sensitivity toward their fellow man.

Their family histories are strewn with parental neglect, abandonment and abuse. Many come from broken homes and thus lack the regulatory experience of a united, parental couple whose moral standards they can emulate and internalize.

A flagrant absence of guilt and a lack of empathetic sensitivity were certainly evident in the minds of Buford O. Furrow Jr., who confessed to wounding five at a Jewish community center in Los Angeles and to slaying a postal worker, and Mark O. Barton, a day trader in Atlanta who killed 12, including his family, before taking his own life. For these killings, the primary psychological mechanism was projective identification. Furrow, who has a history of job problems and a failed marriage to the ex-wife of a founder of the racist group the Order, and who had threatened to kill her and himself, displaced his homicidal impulses onto Jews. By identifying with the "racially superior" Aryan Nations, he compensated for his inferior self-image, which he then projected into Jews. In trying to kill Jews, Furrow was attempting to kill off the hated, disowned parts of himself. Similarly, Barton's slaying of day traders, whom he described as out to "greedily destroy" him, was an effort to kill his own greedy, destructive impulses that were causing him so much anguish.

Projective identification is a powerful instrument for the discharge of murderous rage since it involves the denial of victims' separate existence, thereby eliminating the possibility of empathizing with another person. Accordingly, the perpetrator can freely use the victim for his or her own exploitative homicidal purposes without being impeded by guilt or remorse.

But do these individual murderous acts highlight a more general breakdown of the regulators that society uses to control aggression? The overwhelming majority of mental patients are not violent. They are more likely to be withdrawn and fearful than to attack others, as indicated by the behavior of the insane homeless on our streets. Our extreme fear and panic over the shootings in Los Angeles and Atlanta may have been due to our lack of preparation for such violent outbreaks precisely because they are so infrequent.

Some have contended that the media, because of television's immediate, unrelenting coverage of violent events, and the Internet instigate copycat killings or may even help potential perpetrators procure and use lethal weapons. On the other hand, saturation coverage incidentally informs the public how to best protect itself. In this sense, the media serve the function of an ubiquitous, societal superego, monitoring our lives for potential threats. For example, as a result of the public being informed about recent shootings, there has been a crescendo of calls for tougher gun control, for stronger standards of propriety and more empathetic sensitivity to isolated loners.

It is fascinating to note that after Furrow's rampage, the conversations among hate-group members over the Internet were extremely divided, with a majority of participants critical of Furrow's action, not from a sense of conscience but from the standpoint of reason. Many thought his actions were self-defeating and likely to provoke a backlash against their group. This open, diverse exchange, made possible by the Internet, may modulate the more violent members of these groups.

In addition, superego controls have been strengthened through a resurgence of interest in religion. Marriage is on the rise, and the divorce rate is declining, which may buttress moral values. In high crime areas, community policing has increased. Unfortunately, since guilt no longer plays a prominent regulatory role in the American psyche, society must rely more on external controls than on internal ones.

We are responding in part to the challenge of a weakened moral fiber with a greater emphasis on family values and education. Nonetheless, even with its fissures, the thin veneer of American civilization is thicker than one might think.

Fewer Nations Are Making War

By Ernest J. Wilson III and Ted Robert Gurr
Special to the Los Angeles Times

COLLEGE PARK, Md. It's a classic case of doing better and feeling worse. Since the fall of the Soviet Union, it is commonly believed, interethnic and religious wars have dramatically increased. There is just one problem with this picture: It does not reflect reality. No matter how you count it—number of deaths, number of new outbreaks of violence or severity of the violence—the evidence shows a steady downward trend in conflicts since the early 1990s. Peacemaking is prevailing over war-making.

The total number of armed conflicts among and within nation-states reached a peak just before the end of the Cold War. Between 1989 and 1992, eight new ethnic wars, on average, began each year. Today, the average is two a year. The number of civil wars also has decreased since 1992.

Since 1991, settlements have been achieved in 18 ethnic wars, compared with only seven in the previous 35 years. Of the dozen most serious ethnic conflicts in Europe, east and west, every one of them either has diminished in intensity or been settled in the last five years.

Northern Ireland has never been closer to a long-term peace. In the African Great Lakes region, Rwandans have turned from genocide to rebuilding their society, while rebels in the Democratic Republic of Congo are negotiating a settlement of their grievance. In El Salvador, Nicaragua and Guatemala, successful negotiations have ended civil wars.

Unfortunately, settlements receive far less media attention than wars. In early 1998, a 10-year war between secessionists on the island of Bougainville and Papua New Guinea came to a close with the rebels agreed to a cease-fire. The conflict claimed at least 20,000 lives, yet the story rated only four lines in a leading national newspaper. A month earlier, a peace agreement concluded a 25-year secessionist war between Chakma rebels and the Bangladesh government. Tens of thousands died in this war; 100,000 refugees fled the fighting. But neither the war nor its settlement received one-hundredth the attention lavished on Kosovo.

Internal wars have always been with us, but they were largely overshadowed by the Cold War. With the end of the U.S.-Soviet struggle for world domination, however, conditions are more conducive than ever before for resolving and managing regional global conflicts. International norms governing the acceptability of tribal or ethnic conflict appear to have changed from indifference to intolerance. The international community has acquired a more extensive set of peacekeeping and conflict-management tools, more experience and perhaps a greater will to reduce conflict.

Yet, despite these positive trends, there is a danger of complacency. Recent settlements in Kosovo and elsewhere are fragile and may break unless the international community takes immediate steps to sustain them. A settlement is only the beginning of a peace-building process, as we have seen in the Balkans and Haiti. How do we move beyond ethnic cleansing in Kosovo, communal killings in West and Central Africa and ongoing unrest in Indonesia?

To maintain the momentum toward peacemaking, two courses of action are necessary: proactive conflict management and early intervention.

The past few years have shown that the United States has much more influence over the course of international conflicts than previously imagined. Democracies have replaced autocratic reg-