



STUDY GUIDE

HOW TO FIX THE WORLD, NYPD-STYLE

KEY TERMS: foreign policy national interests model
policing disorder enforced

NOTE-TAKING COLUMN: Complete this section <u>during</u> the video. Include definitions and key terms.	CUE COLUMN: Complete this section <u>after</u> the video.
<p>What is the underlying principle of the ‘broken window’ theory?</p> <p>What did the ‘broken windows’ approach to policing high crime areas demonstrate?</p> <p>What should a ‘broken windows’ foreign policy emphasize?</p>	<p>What is the basic problem with how America approaches foreign policy?</p> <p>How can America find a good balance in regards to enforcing foreign policy?</p>

DISCUSSION & REVIEW QUESTIONS:

- Towards the beginning of the video, Mr. Stephens asks, “How can the U.S. enforce basic global norms of decency, deter enemies, and reassure friends without losing sight of our national interests?” How would you answer his question? What are our national interests? What are ‘basic global norms of decency? Should the U.S. enforce basic global norms of decency? Why or why not?
- Mr. Stephens informs us that Kelling and Wilson postulated that “Disorder and crime are usually inextricably linked, in a kind of developmental sequence” and used broken windows as an example because “...one unrepaired broken window is a signal that no one cares, and so breaking more windows costs nothing.” Do you agree with Kelling and Wilson’s conclusions? Why or why not?
- After describing some examples of world leaders engaging in bad behavior, and President Obama reacting only with stern warnings, Mr. Stephens points out that, “...the warnings didn’t amount to much. Bashar Assad stayed in power, and continued to use chemical weapons. And Russia’s invasion of Ukraine carried on. This is how we arrive at a broken-windows world: Rules are invoked but not enforced. And when rules aren’t enforced, more rules will be broken. One window breaks, then others.” Do you agree with Mr. Stephens’ assertion that if world leaders are allowed to engage in bad behavior without meaningful consequences that more bad behavior is inevitable? Why or why not? Do you agree with the ‘broken windows’ analogy being a valid comparison when characterizing world events and America’s foreign policy? Why or why not?
- Mr. Stephens explains that the application of a ‘broken windows’ foreign policy would emphasize, “...short, mission-specific, punitive police actions, not on open-ended occupations with the goal of redeeming broken societies, as was tried in Iraq. A broken-windows foreign policy doesn’t try to run every bad guy out of town. Nor does it demand that the U.S. put out every geopolitical fire. But it does prevent big fires and it does punish the worst dictators.” Do you think that this strategy would be the ‘Goldilocks’ solution to America’s foreign policy? Why or why not? What do you think the consequences for America not holding other leaders accountable for their actions to some degree would be?
- Mr. Stephens closes the video by stating, “Perhaps it is time for a strategy that enshrines the principle that preventing tragedy should enjoy greater moral legitimacy than reacting to it.” What do you think Mr. Stephens means by ‘greater moral legitimacy?’ Why do you think that Mr. Stephens values prevention of bad behavior over reaction to it? Do you agree with his position? Why or why not?

EXTEND THE LEARNING:

CASE STUDY: Empty Threats

INSTRUCTIONS: Read the article “Why Threats Don’t Work: Parenting Effectively,” then answer the questions that follow.

- What happened when Ms. Chua tried to threaten her 3-year old? Why do you think that parents feel compelled to threaten and over-threaten children in an attempt to stop or mitigate bad behavior? Why do you think that parents often do not actually follow through on the threat? What are the negative consequences of empty threats?
- Teachers and parents often learn early on that ‘If you let a bad behavior continue, it often will’ and that “If you threaten a consequence for a bad behavior but don’t follow through with the punishment, then the children learn that the threat is an empty one and that they can get away with whatever the bad behavior is.” How do these principles translate to foreign policy? Considering that President Obama is a parent, why do you think he didn’t apply these learned lessons about empty threats to foreign leaders and their bad behavior? Why do you think that after the first time, President Obama continued to use the empty threat tactic even though it didn’t work the first time?
- When describing the likelihood of an unwanted behavior occurring, Dr. Darling states, “There’s always a next time.” Since empty threats don’t work, what is Dr. Darling’s advice for what to do next time an unwanted behavior occurs? How does Dr. Darling’s advice relate to Mr. Stephens’ recommendations?



QUIZ

HOW TO FIX THE WORLD, NYPD-STYLE

1. **What does one unrepaired broken window signal?**
 - a. Repairing windows is too expensive.
 - b. Glass repairers are very busy.
 - c. No one cares.
 - d. The window was broken by teenagers.

2. **What was a policing technique used that was based on the broken-windows theory?**
 - a. Strict enforcement of immigration laws.
 - b. Strict enforcement of laws against federal drug trafficking.
 - c. Strict enforcement of traffic laws.
 - d. Strict enforcement of laws against petty crimes.

3. **How do we arrive at a broken-windows world?**
 - a. England and Ireland are not allies.
 - b. Rules are invoked but not enforced.
 - c. Rules are strongly enforced.
 - d. Open borders between European nations.

4. **After Bashar al-Assad used sarin nerve gas to murder more than 1,000 people in 2013, what actions did President Obama take?**
 - a. He declared war on Syria.
 - b. He reported him to NATO.
 - c. He ensured Bashar al-Assad was taken out of power.
 - d. Essentially, none.

5. **How do we arrest the slide into a world of international disorder?**
 - a. More involvement by the United Nations.
 - b. Increase taxes on imported goods.
 - c. Limit international travel.
 - d. Sharply punish violations of basic geopolitical norms.



QUIZ - ANSWER KEY

HOW TO FIX THE WORLD, NYPD-STYLE

1. What does one unrepaired broken window signal?
 - a. Repairing windows is too expensive.
 - b. Glass repairers are very busy.
 - c. No one cares.
 - d. The window was broken by teenagers.

2. What was a policing technique used that was based on the broken-windows theory?
 - a. Strict enforcement of immigration laws.
 - b. Strict enforcement of laws against federal drug trafficking.
 - c. Strict enforcement of traffic laws.
 - d. Strict enforcement of laws against petty crimes.

3. How do we arrive at a broken-windows world?
 - a. England and Ireland are not allies.
 - b. Rules are invoked but not enforced.
 - c. Rules are strongly enforced.
 - d. Open borders between European nations.

4. After Bashar al-Assad used sarin nerve gas to murder more than 1,000 people in 2013, what actions did President Obama take?
 - a. He declared war on Syria.
 - b. He reported him to NATO.
 - c. He ensured Bashar al-Assad was taken out of power.
 - d. Essentially, none.

5. How do we arrest the slide into a world of international disorder?
 - a. More involvement by the United Nations.
 - b. Increase taxes on imported goods.
 - c. Limit international travel.
 - d. Sharply punish violations of basic geopolitical norms.

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/thinking-about-kids/201101/why-threats-dont-work-parenting-effectively>



[Nancy Darling Ph.D. Thinking About Kids](#)

Why Threats Don't Work: Parenting Effectively

Threatening kids is ALSO bad because it just doesn't work.

Posted Jan 19, 2011

This piece is not about parents who are abusive, who threaten kids physically, or who are hostile. We know about those parents and why they harm children.

This piece is about loving parents who use threats to try to get their kids to behave and why that often backfires and makes kids behave worse instead of better.

It builds on what I think is one of my best pieces: [How to Create A Juvenile Delinquent With Materials Easily Available At Home](#), and uses one example from Amy Chua's book, *Battle Hymn of the Tiger Moms* to illustrate why threatening kids can backfire and teach them to misbehave MORE, not less

How To Create a Juvenile Delinquent starts with this absolutely true story:

The mom looked down, shocked, at her bare legs and worn underpants. She was standing at the edge of a crowded gym. Her 4 year old crowed triumphantly, holding the skirt he had just tugged to her ankles, his eyes on her face and ready to run.

She snatched up the skirt, snagged him by the waist, and strode from the room.

I never saw her again.

It goes on to discuss how a pattern of ineffective parenting - combining threats that are never carried out, erratic [punishment](#), nasty, aversive parent-child interactions, and a child who doesn't back down easily - results in a cycle of interactions where kids essentially train their parents to back down and themselves to become delinquent. This carries over from home to school, where teachers give up on the child and kids who don't misbehave reject troublemakers as friends. It is built on an outstanding program of research and effective intervention carried out by Gerald Patterson, Tom Dishion, and Deborah Capaldi over the past three decades.

Now let's go to example from Amy Chua. Amy Chua's parenting is described in the media as very strict. In many ways it is, and I discuss the benefits of high, consistent standards in my [Tiger Mom](#) piece.

But Chua's parenting also involves a lot of threats, as well as insults. Pundits have focused on the psychological harm of insulting kids. I want to talk about something else: the self-described ineffectiveness of Chua's threats.

Bottom line: Laying out clear standards of behaviors is good parenting. Letting kids face the consequences of their actions and punishing them when they misbehave is a necessary part of teaching. Empty threats teach kids to misbehave.

[From an NPR interview with Ms. Chua: \(link is external\)](#)

***Ms. CHUA:** This was amazing. I thought, oh, great, you know, it's just Lulu and me together. She's about 3. I can teach her to play the piano. And I sat her down on these comfortable pillows, and I said, look, Lulu, just play one note three times evenly.*

And Lulu and I are so similar in [personality](#). She's a fireball. She decided that, instead, she would smash at the piano with both open palms. And so, we had a little back and forth that she just wouldn't do it and then she was kicking and screaming and thrashing. And finally, I said, you know what? I am determined to raise an obedient "Chinese" child. I took her, you know, to the front door and I said - it was a very cold day - and I said, now, if you don't stop screaming and if you don't behave, I am going to put you outside in the cold.

She looked at me and she's 3 years old and she steps outside into the cold. And I start to [panic](#), you know? The whole book is full of Lulu calling my bluff. I didn't think she would go out there. So I quickly said, okay, you're quiet now, come back in here. And she just shook her head and she wouldn't come in. I had to bribe her back in with hot chocolate and brownies . . .

Ms. Chua is not a parent who backs down easily: that's one of the points of her memoir. Lulu doesn't back down either. This is a great example of how NOT to threaten your child. Not only because of any emotional issues. **The threat didn't work.**

Although over the top, it's pretty typical of the kinds of threats used by parents who are either authoritarian or - SURPRISE! - permissive.

- The threat is extreme.
- It's not one the parent could carry out in good [conscience](#).
- The child knows the parent won't do it and calls their bluff.
- The parent backs down.

This interaction will happen if

- **The parent speaks before thinking through their strategy**
- **The child is strong enough to stand up to the parent.** Some kids - apparently Chua's oldest - back down in the face of threats. Other children would become upset or withdraw. Different kids react differently. **Willful, non-compliant children are most likely to get involved in this type of cycle because they're more difficult to start with and they just don't back down.**
- **It happens more each time the parent backs down.**

What is really sad about this cycle, is that the more often it HAS happened, the more likely it is to happen in the future.

Every single time a parent makes a threat, the child calls them on it, and the parent withdraws the demand, learning has occurred.

- **The child learns that non-compliance can pay off.** If they are difficult enough, the parent won't ask them to do things they don't want to.
- **The parent learns not to make demands.**

Recovering from a threat you can't carry through on.

If the parent is really smart, they will realize that they've made a mistake. Chua obviously did - she describes that sinking feeling of panic you get when you know your kid has you over a barrel. She bribes her child to come in with brownies and hot chocolate.

How do effective parents recover when they know they've blown it?

- **They will hit restart.**
- **They will apologize** to the child for going too far.
- They will sit down with the child and **re-establish a positive relationship** so the child will listen.
- **They will stick to their guns**, tell the child they STILL aren't happy with what the child is doing and try another way of getting the child to [cooperate](#).
- **They'll figure out a more reasonable strategy for next time.** There's always a next time. Thinking things through when you're calm increases the likelihood you'll do better the next time you just lose it.

All parents have bad interactions with our kids. Parenting is a tough, tough job and research shows that parents of young children try to correct them DOZENS of times every HOUR. You're not going to get that right every time.

When you make a mistake - we all get ourselves into situations where we've realized we just have - correct your course.