



STUDY GUIDE

ARE YOU ON THE WRONG SIDE OF HISTORY

KEY TERMS: history arrogance cowardice
fate socialism cause

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 common, uniting factor of the phrases “our activism is vindicated: things are going our way!” and “you’re winning and I can’t, or won’t stop you!”?</p> <p>What was Karl Marx’s argument concerning the inevitability of socialism?</p> <p>When does defeat come in life?</p>	<p>What does the ‘Wrong side of history’ mean?</p> <p>What makes the phrase ‘Wrong side of history’ a bogus notion?</p>

DISCUSSION & REVIEW QUESTIONS:

- How deeply has the notion of ‘Wrong side of history’ shaped the Obama administration’s foreign policy? Do you believe that this maxim should be the guiding principle upon which to decide on how to handle foreign affairs? Why or why not? What might a better approach to deciding foreign policy be?
- Part of what makes the phrase ‘Wrong side of history’ so weak is that it is based on the false presumption that the person uttering it as part of taking a position on a social issue is automatically on the higher moral ground. What are some examples where a person could take this position (of presumably being on the ‘right side of history’) and be wrong? What is a better position to start from when taking sides on a moral issue?
- Mr. Goldberg states, “...one thing is certain: when people come to believe that they are not masters of their own fate – because history is not on their side – they will be less likely to take their fate into their own hands.” What does this mean? Why is this such an important point? What are the consequences for those who don’t take their fate into their own hands?
- Mr. Goldberg further asserts that, “Freedom has no meaning if we give over to the idea that we are powerless against the cold impersonal forces that shape our destiny. In life, but particularly in a democracy, defeat only comes when the losing side accepts defeat.” What does he mean by all of that? What is the implied call to action here? What is an issue or policy that you believe mainstream America is currently ‘on the wrong side of history’ about?
- Mr. Goldberg ends the video with the following: “To paraphrase the English poet, T.S. Eliot, “There is no such thing as a truly lost cause because there is no such thing as a truly won cause.” So long as you are willing to fight for what you believe in, the cause endures.” Is Mr. Eliot’s claim true? What does he mean by ‘...there is no such thing as a truly won cause?’ What is an example of a cause that has not been truly won? What makes any cause worth continuing to fight for? Why?

EXTEND THE LEARNING:

CASE STUDY: Iran Nuclear Deal

INSTRUCTIONS: Read the article “America will pay the price for Obama’s Iran deal ‘victory,’” then answer the questions that follow.

- Do you think that President Obama will be proven to have been on ‘the wrong side of history’ in regards to supporting Iran with this deal? Why or why not? What if Iran actually carries out a nuclear attack on Israel, or any other nation?
- What side of history do you think President Obama thinks the U.S. should be on in regards to supporting Israel? Do you agree with him? Why or why not?
- Mr. Goldberg points out in the video that espousing the idea that there is a ‘right side to history’ is undemocratic because, “...it amounts to saying “shut up” to anyone who wants to keep the argument going.” He explains that President Obama and other liberal activists use this tactic quite often, citing the examples, “Oppose gay marriage? You’re on the wrong side of history. Against pot legalization? You’re stuck in the past.” Then the article shares with us that only 21% of the American people support the Iran deal. Is this really the way the leader of the greatest democracy in the history of the world should act? Doesn’t completely shutting down opposing voices amount to childish behavior that borders on tyranny? Is automatically assuming the moral high ground, especially when the stakes are so high, wrong? Why or why not? How can the president know that he’s ‘right?’



QUIZ

ARE YOU ON THE WRONG SIDE OF HISTORY

1. What happens when people come to believe that they are not masters of their own fate?
 - a. They believe they are on the wrong side of history.
 - b. They believe they are on the right side of history.
 - c. They will be less likely to take their fate into their own hands.
 - d. They will be more likely to take their fate into their own hands.

2. Domestically, what does telling someone they are on “the wrong side of history” mean?
 - a. “You’re going to lose eventually, so why don’t you give up now?”
 - b. “I’m powerless to stop you, but one day, long after I have any responsibility to do anything at all, someone else will say you were wrong.”
 - c. “Keep fighting the good fight. You’ll get there someday.”
 - d. None of the above.

3. In foreign policy, “the wrong side of history” means _____.
 - a. “You’re going to lose eventually, so why don’t you give up now?”
 - b. “I’m powerless to stop you, but one day, long after I have any responsibility to do anything at all, someone else will say you were wrong.”
 - c. Keep fighting the good fight. You’ll get there someday.
 - d. None of the above.

4. When used at home, “the wrong side of history” is a sign of _____; internationally the phrase is a sign of _____.
 - a. strength; weakness
 - b. weakness; strength
 - c. cowardice; bravery
 - d. power; fortitude

5. Freedom has no meaning if we give over to the idea that we are powerless against the cold impersonal forces that shape our destiny.
 - a. True
 - b. False



QUIZ - ANSWER KEY

ARE YOU ON THE WRONG SIDE OF HISTORY

1. What happens when people come to believe that they are not masters of their own fate?
 - a. They believe they are on the wrong side of history.
 - b. They believe they are on the right side of history.
 - c. They will be less likely to take their fate into their own hands.
 - d. They will be more likely to take their fate into their own hands.

2. Domestically, what does telling someone they are on “the wrong side of history” mean?
 - a. “You’re going to lose eventually, so why don’t you give up now?”
 - b. “I’m powerless to stop you, but one day, long after I have any responsibility to do anything at all, someone else will say you were wrong.”
 - c. “Keep fighting the good fight. You’ll get there someday.”
 - d. None of the above.

3. In foreign policy, “the wrong side of history” means _____.
 - a. “You’re going to lose eventually, so why don’t you give up now?”
 - b. “I’m powerless to stop you, but one day, long after I have any responsibility to do anything at all, someone else will say you were wrong.”
 - c. Keep fighting the good fight. You’ll get there someday.
 - d. None of the above.

4. When used at home, “the wrong side of history” is a sign of _____; internationally the phrase is a sign of _____.
 - a. strength; weakness
 - b. weakness; strength
 - c. cowardice; bravery
 - d. power; fortitude

5. Freedom has no meaning if we give over to the idea that we are powerless against the cold impersonal forces that shape our destiny.
 - a. True
 - b. False

<http://nypost.com/2015/09/12/america-will-pay-the-price-for-obamas-iran-deal-victory/>

[News](#)

[America will pay the price for Obama's Iran deal 'victory'](#)

By [Michael Goodwin](#)

September 12, 2015 | 10:53pm



Photo: Reuters

The word “disconnect” is the appropriate way to describe the chasm between America’s government and its citizens. We all have our favorite examples, but none can match the events of last week.

On the eve of the 14th anniversary of the worst attack ever against our nation, President Obama celebrated a nuclear pact with Iran, an Islamic theocracy whose leader calls the United States “Satan” and joins crowds in chanting “Death to America.”

A mere 21 percent of the American public supports the deal and a bipartisan majority of the Senate opposes it. Yet the filibuster rule blocked the Senate from defeating it, allowing Obama to hail the “historic step forward.”

His “victory” is a disconnect that will live in infamy.

The deal is essentially a nonaggression pact with Iran, a form of appeasement that renders unfair any further comparisons to Neville Chamberlain. At least Hitler promised peace at the 1938 Munich conference after the British leader engineered a German annexation of parts of Czechoslovakia.

Iran’s supreme leader doesn’t bother to pretend he wants peace. On the contrary, he vows that the nuclear agreement will have zero impact on the policies of the world’s largest state sponsor of terrorism.

Ayatollah Khamenei, who repeatedly declares that Israel will be “eliminated,” wrote just before the Senate vote that, “God willing, there will be no Zionist regime in 25 years.”

And he made it clear that Iran, which has militias and terror proxies in Lebanon, Syria, Iraq and Yemen, and supports Hamas and Hezbollah, would not be changing its stripes, writing: “During this period, the spirit of fighting, heroism and jihad will keep you worried every moment.”

Think of that: We are lifting punitive sanctions not in the aftermath of victory or as part of a comprehensive peace agreement. We, along with other so-called great powers, are unilaterally declaring peace while our adversary repeats its declaration of war against us and Israel.

Even Iranian “moderates” openly tell their allies that the \$100 billion they will get from the deal will help them carry out Khamenei’s terrorist agenda.

They say these things without fear the truth will scare off Obama or turn Democrats against him.

The Iranians are honest about their plans. Our leaders are dishonest when they insist we can safely disregard the rhetoric. We’ve been down this road before, thinking it a joke when Osama bin Laden declared war on us in the 1990s.

And yet, as lower Manhattan was again given over to the solemn anniversary of 9/11, and [as family members made the annual trek to hallowed ground](#), Democratic lawmakers, including some from New York, again failed to recognize evil. Their president said jump, and they didn’t ask how high. Although millions of refugees fleeing Islamists are spilling out of the Mideast and North Africa, their faith in Obama is not shaken.

Their willingness to take a risk for peace might be commendable if peace were the mutual goal. But trusting that Iran will drop its conquering ambitions and moderate its martyrdom culture is a foolish roll of the dice in a life-or-death casino.

Iran had no known role in 9/11, but shares with those who carried out the attack the goal of Islamic rule. Yet its world-wide aggressions were never part of the negotiations, with Obama soft-pedaling them as “nefarious activities.” That’s one way to describe military operations that killed upwards of 1,000 American soldiers in Iraq alone.

Equally appalling, the deal rewards Iran for promised nuclear concessions no one expects the mullahs to keep. Again, it’s almost as if 9/11 didn’t happen.

Long before the smoke had cleared from Ground Zero, ordinary Americans vowed to “never forget” the unbearable loss of innocent life. A united nation went to war, heroic young men and women volunteered to defend their country, and many made the ultimate sacrifice.

The world changed forever, it was often said. Certainly it did for those survivors who gather at the powerful memorial and museum, and for the millions of visitors from around the world who come to bear witness.

As it did Friday, the reading of the names and the playing of taps always lets loose the raw emotions of that awful day.

Yet the Iran deal says the world didn't change, and that America, or at least its president and his party, are holding fast to a 9/10 mindset. They are wrong, and the country will surely pay a price for their folly.