

Constitution Day

Bradford P. Wilson

In May 2005, university administrators were rudely awakened from their civic slumbers by a “notice of implementation” from the U.S. Department of Education. With little advance comment from the academy, Congress had passed and the President had signed into law a requirement that “[e]ach educational institution that receives Federal funds for a fiscal year shall hold an educational program on the United States Constitution on September 17 of such year for the students served by the educational institution.”¹

The new requirement met a chilly reception from the One Dupont Circle lobby, which on most days is working to increase federal support for and involvement in the business of higher learning. The American Association of State Colleges and Universities quickly issued an “Alert and Advisory” announcing the concern of “higher education groups” that Congress’ action “pav[ed] the way for federal curricular mandates for higher education.” Becky Timmons, director of government relations at the American Council on Education, informed the media that “Our members find it very intrusive. . . . They are concerned about the precedent it holds for Congress telling them what to teach.”²

It soon was apparent that very few universities found the Constitution of the United States a fit object of commemoration in an academic setting. Said Barmak Nassirian, associate executive director of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, “There is a general atmosphere of bewilderment as to what they’re supposed to do.”³ Why that should be so is, I believe, a question that deserves consideration.

Was the absence of a recognition of Constitution Day in our colleges (and no doubt our high schools) explicable in terms of a turning away, in a spirit of tolerance and inclusion, from prideful rituals of a broadly political nature—rituals that may make some alien, or alienated, group feel like it is not a full and respected member of the campus community? Perhaps that is what was meant by an emeritus professor of English in his letter to the *Chronicle of Higher Education*: “Such a [federal] mandate is deeply troubling and reflects a blind jingoism that should not be confused with patriotism.”⁴ But then how to account for the omnipresence of public campus celebrations of various “identities” that by their very nature are exclusive—to take one of countless examples, Princeton University’s annual celebration of National Coming Out Day, announced with great relish to faculty, staff, and students by the Dean of the College’s Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender Center? Political, to be sure, and bound to annoy or alienate some parts of the campus community.

Bradford P. Wilson is editor of *Academic Questions* and associate director of the James Madison Program in American Ideals and Institutions, Princeton University; bpwilson@princeton.edu.

There is a simpler explanation, of course: perhaps, before the Department of Education's intervention, no one on most campuses had *known* about the significance of September 17. This is a real possibility. A 2002 survey of students at the nation's 55 best colleges and universities revealed that fully four out of five of their graduating seniors scored a D or an F on test questions drawn from a common high school history curriculum.⁵ And now we have been given the important September 2006 report of the Intercollegiate Studies Institute's National Civic Literacy Board, *The Coming Crisis of Citizenship: Higher Education's Failure to Teach America's History and Institutions*.⁶ The Literacy Board hired the survey research team in the University of Connecticut's Department of Public Policy to ask questions of more than 14,000 randomly selected college freshman and seniors at 50 American colleges and universities with a view to providing a "high-resolution image of the state of learning about America's history and institutions" in American higher education. The results are deplorable. The average score of seniors on a straightforward multiple-choice civics test was 53.2 percent. Even more astounding is the fact that college seniors scored just 1.5 percent higher on average than did college freshmen, with seniors at 16 schools scoring lower than freshmen at the same institutions—what the report calls "negative learning." (Schools with negative learning include Yale, Duke, Georgetown, Cornell, Brown, Johns Hopkins, and the University of Chicago.) For a sense of the substantive nature of the students' academic impoverishment, consider that over 55 percent of the students surveyed did not know that Yorktown was the battle that concluded the Revolutionary War; half of that majority gave the honor to the battle of Gettysburg. And fewer than half of the students were able to identify the documentary source of the most succinct statement of the American political creed, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal."

There is an obvious reason for this lamentable state of historical understanding. Such awareness, once thought relevant to thoughtful citizenship and human understanding, is no longer part of the mission of the American university. The National Association of Scholars' study of curricular trends in American higher education from 1914 to 1993 revealed the following: In 1964, 28 of the top 50 American schools had mandatory or preferred survey courses in Western or European history; in 1993, only one of these schools had such a course.⁷ Sixteen schools had mandatory or preferred survey courses in *American* history in 1964; *not one* of those 50 schools did so in 1993. In other words, *not one* used its general education guidelines to encourage the study of American history. As the report of the National Civic Literacy Board puts it, "Students don't learn what colleges don't teach." Schools where students took more courses related to American history and institutions outperformed schools where students took fewer such courses.

As for history professors, they have become preoccupied with social and cultural history, pushing political history to the side, or with colonial, or post-colonial history. The consequences for the study of the American Founding, including the Revolution of 1776, are evident in Alan Taylor's *American Colonies: The Settlement of North America to 1800*,⁸ the first in Viking's new five-volume series, the Penguin *History*

of the United States. A page and a quarter of this 544-page book are devoted to the American Revolution, and not as something exceptional. Here is what Taylor has to say about the Revolution:

[T]he dominant colonial power on the Pacific rim became the United States, the hypercommercial nation founded by the Americans who won their independence from the British by revolution and war in the years 1775-83. Far from ending with the American Revolution, colonialism persisted in North America, but from a new base on the Atlantic seaboard.⁹

Taylor's American colonial history ends not in the eighteenth century, as the title suggests, but extends to the nineteenth century as the United States "colonized" the Hispanic West. As one historian has observed of Taylor's book, "In short, here the Revolution marks only a moment in which a onetime colony became a colonizer."¹⁰ Another scholar wrote in the *William and Mary Quarterly*,

For much of the 20th century, historians dominated scholarly studies of the founders' political ideas. In recent years, however, the field has been almost entirely dominated by political scientists, legal scholars, philosophers, and even a few journalists. . . . Graduate students in some of our best history programs are more likely to study quilting than they are the political writings of Alexander Hamilton or James Madison.¹¹

So perhaps, before May 2005, no one knew it was Constitution Day. Even if they did, however, as the above description of history departments suggests, they were not wont to think it significant.

How did the American academy become indifferent, if not hostile, to civic education as traditionally understood? The contemporary university is the postmodern university. The postmodern university is a species of the post-liberal university. Let us recall what the liberal university was: As described by Allan Bloom, it was a university built with all the confidence of the Enlightenment that free thought, protected by academic freedom and tenure, could take place in full view of the public without becoming compromised or endangered by the public's passions. It was a university confident of its humanizing mission and devoted to high standards. And it was a university whose curriculum centered on those disciplines whose purpose, in Bloom's words, was to provide "intellectual clarity about the most important things."¹²

After World War II, particularly in the immediate aftermath of the Soviet Union's launching of Sputnik in 1957, both the mission and the structure of the universities were dramatically transformed.¹³ Two dominant strains of that change are still with us: Fragmentation and specialization in the undergraduate curriculum, and the politicization of academic life, from that of the New Left of the 1960s to that of the Postmodernist Left of today.

In the 1950s, the university fast became the multiversity, a term coined by Clark Kerr, who presided over the transformation of the University of California at Berkeley into America's leading public multiversity. The liberal university's version of a liberal education gave way to a commitment to specialization, fueled by the public need for well-trained specialists. New disciplines, new courses, and new research aimed at

satisfying social and political interests resulted in ever increasing incoherence in the program of general education. Every specialization demanded equal respect and an equal opportunity to compete for the loyalties of freshman and sophomore students. The consequence for general education was a sharp decline in content, structure, and rigor. And all unity and hierarchy in the curricular structure of the university were sacrificed to the principle of mutual tolerance and respect among all disciplines.

The countercultural attack of the New Left against the universities that erupted from within during the late 1960s was launched in the awareness that the university as a whole had lost its sense of unifying purpose. The questions that are perennial features of the human condition—the questions of how we should live, of the ends of life, of the best political order—were no longer in evidence in the curriculum of specializations. The questions agitating radical students no longer had a privileged place, or any place, in the multiversity dominated by increasingly technical natural sciences built on methodology and social sciences built on the fact-value distinction, that is, the assumption that social reality could be divided into two types of phenomena—“facts,” which could be ascertained and organized according to the method of the natural sciences, and “values,” which were matters of subjective preference and thus subrational, unscientific, and impervious to scholarly inquiry. Such a social science, as Leo Strauss famously wrote, is one that “cannot speak of tyranny with the same confidence with which medicine speaks, for example, of cancer.”¹⁴

Nothing much stood in the way of a determined group who wished to reorder university life around a new direction and purpose, one of commitment to a political agenda of social justice and “pure” democracy. The fact that this agenda was anti-intellectual, that it was incapable of seeing its commitments as dogmatic answers to fundamental questions which, instead, deserved methodical, dispassionate, open-minded investigation, did not deter many faculty and administrators from welcoming the new sense of purpose. Courses and disciplines were redesigned to make them relevant to the new political agenda. Indeed, the cultural relativism of the New Left—think of the ease with which it embraced the totalitarian systems and ambitions of the Soviet Union, the National Liberation Front in Vietnam, Castro’s Cuba, and the Marxist revolutionary movement in general—was merely an application of the moral relativism at the heart of the value-free social science dominating the social science profession.

The distinctive characteristics of the liberal university at its best were then destroyed. The disengagement of the university from the passions and pressures of contemporary politics and culture was replaced by a particularly activist idea of the university as the vanguard of social and political engagement and improvement; equality of opportunity respectful of, and attentive to, differences in talent and merit was replaced by a demand for equality of results, its absence blamed on dark forces of oppression; professionally established standards of intellectual and aesthetic quality and scholarly performance were eroded by egalitarian resentment of anything that smacked of exclusivity and elitism; and requirements, books, and courses relevant to the perfection of the students’ rational faculties, independent of time and place, were

jettisoned in favor of those that addressed the immediate problems, real or imagined, of contemporary democratic society.

This postliberal university dominates the educational scene today. What we call postmodernism incorporates within it all of the primary features of this university, while grafting onto the university an even more radical hostility to the idea of the university as defined by dispassionate inquiry and rational discourse.

The two pillars of postmodernism within the post-liberal university are multiculturalism and the various forms of relativism or nihilism traceable back to the thought of Nietzsche and Heidegger, but re-packaged in Derrida's theories of deconstruction and Foucault's reduction of all human phenomena to power relations.

Postmodernism first swept through literary theory,¹⁵ and having secured the beaches there, steadily moved out into anthropology, history, philosophy, law, and theology. The metaphysical, scientific, political, and moral traditions of Western civilization are indebted to Greek philosophy's original aspiration: to transcend through thought the limits, the horizons, the authoritative opinions, of one's own time and place, of particular cultures, of history. Socrates' image in Plato's *Republic* of the philosopher's ascent from the shadows of the cave into the light of the truth captures the nature and intent of philosophy as originally understood. Postmodernism denies the possibility of this ascent, insisting that truth is nothing but someone's, or some group's, will to power. It harnesses this radical skepticism to a mode of dogmatic analysis that reduces all inquiry into literary meaning to a matter of the race, class, and gender of the author. (A typical argument: Shakespeare is a prisoner of his time and place. He thus shares the prejudices of his time and place. His plays must therefore be read as instruments of those prejudices, which are constitutive of Western culture—imperialism, racism, sexism, and class-consciousness.)

Multiculturalism marches under the banner of Diversity, making it part of the conventional wisdom of the academy. The centrality of diversity is nothing new. Here again is Allan Bloom, writing 20 years before the appearance of his surprising 1987 bestseller, *The Closing of the American Mind*:

In popular discussion today, the goal of almost everything, including the university, is said to be diversity. To the extent that this is not merely a means to avoid discussing what is good, we mean that in a free society many high or noble ways of life must exist for men and women to choose among. But the concentration on diversity as such is self-defeating. For in order for a new and serious way of life to emerge and maintain itself, its founders must believe in its truth and its superiority to other alternatives; hence they cannot hold that diversity is simply desirable. The quest can never be for diversity but must be for the truth—the truth about the highest good and the end of life. Diversity will take care of itself, given the various talents and characters of human beings. Never has there been so much talk about diversity and so little true difference among persons.¹⁶

Bloom was referring to the spread of specialization in the name of diversifying the curriculum and to the eclipse of a serious engagement with great minds who have argued at a very high level over the best way of life. But he also had in mind another trend that buried the quest for important knowledge in an even deeper cave:

To supplement the diversity of specialization, there has arisen what might be called the diversity of perversity. Writers, in their escape from the desert in search of interest and variety, have taken to celebrating the obscure peculiarities which can afflict some of us. But this too becomes boring, for there is no depth in mere deviation; once our clinical curiosity is exhausted we discover that it is less interesting than the merely “normal.”¹⁷

The diversification that Bloom saw 40 years ago has continued its momentum. The new fields he saw arising then in response to the demand for courses that were personally relevant are now firmly entrenched in curricular life. (A number of years ago, Syracuse University unveiled to great fanfare a well-endowed program for undergraduates in the study of popular television shows. Think of it. Students leave the homes of their youth to discover for themselves how they should live, only to be treated to re-runs of *Gilligan's Island*.)

These programs too demand equal respect, and they too wish to see themselves represented in general education requirements. Indeed, according to a large survey conducted in 2000 by the Association of American Colleges and Universities,¹⁸ the leading proponent of replacing the old curriculum with one organized around group identity, nearly two-thirds of American universities now have a diversity requirement of one or more courses as part of their core curricula. And lest one think that diversity requirements are welcome support for courses that follow the model of the study of non-Western cultures found in traditional liberal arts curricula, only 44 percent of the colleges reporting such a requirement allow a course on a foreign country or culture to so much as count toward meeting the requirement. Rather, what count are the types of courses identified as Women's Studies, Gay and Lesbian Studies, Ethnic Studies, and so forth—none of them having an essential non-American component.

Universities have chosen the easy path of welcoming the new courses and concentrations in race, class, gender, and postmodernist theory as progress toward ever more diversity. And diversity is the only criterion of inclusion and exclusion that any longer is felt to have moral weight. What goes unremarked, however, are the negative consequences of this diversity for the undergraduate experience. With a syllabus, for every book that is added, one has to exclude something else to make room for it. So too with the curriculum: if courses are added to a set of offerings from which to choose, enrollment in other courses will necessarily decline. But the university no longer has confidence in its ability to distinguish the most important kinds of knowledge from the least important. And so anything goes.

As Bloom pointed out, universities abandon responsibility for the intellectual climate that shapes the student by refusing to exercise judgment about what should or should not be part of that climate. It is passing strange that educational institutions seek a neutral stance toward the nature of the knowledge to be pursued on their premises. What is worse is the actual consequence for academic pursuits: conformism, conformity to the contemporary zeitgeist, whether it be the shallow relativism of postmodernism or the superficiality of popular culture.

But the triumph of multiculturalism and identity politics has consequences that go beyond a fragmenting of the curriculum and the loss of intellectual mission. Universi-

ties commit themselves to racial and gender goals and preferences in hiring, racial and ethnic goals and preferences in student admissions, mandatory sensitivity training, and speech codes.

This is all well documented and well known.¹⁹ Let me just offer one illustration. The higher education association that correctly describes itself as the major coordinating body for all the nation's higher education institutions issued a study a few years ago that asserted that the traditional curriculum somehow disadvantages people of color in securing teaching positions, whereas a "redefined curriculum" opens up new positions. In this view, now triumphant, multicultural curriculum reform is to be regarded not in terms of its merits as conducive to the university's mission as a place where truth is sought and ideas are debated, but in terms of its merits as a job program.²⁰

Questions that are perennial features of the human condition—the questions of how we should live, of the relationship between one's status as a human being like other human beings and one's status as a citizen of a particular political order, of the nature of the human and of the divine—these questions are no longer evident in the life of most American universities. If a student seriously engages these concerns, particularly by grappling with the profound works of the Western tradition, it is a stroke of great good fortune rather than a consequence of institutional design and intent.

Would not a restoration of the study of American constitutional forms and their history provide a realistic path back to a truly humanizing education? Through that study, we could recover the American principles of public right that stand as stumbling blocks to the postmodernist ethos which has taken over the humanities and much of the social sciences. A new attention to the American Founding, and to the Western philosophical and religious traditions without which the new American nation could not have been imagined, would serve as a powerful antidote to the relativism, nihilism, and identity politics that have effectively closed the doors to Plato's Academy.

Consider here the import of the rejection or ignorance of the animating ideas of the American Founding and that achievement's historical consequences. The philosophical principles, constitutional forms, and political histories of liberal democracies are unintelligible apart from their recognition that natural rights, what we now refer to (more vaguely) as human rights, cannot be claimed by groups as groups, however these groups are defined, but only by each and every individual. Laws or customs by which the institutions of civil society, including the universities, treat the liberties and opportunities of individuals as a function of their race, ethnicity, or sex must answer to a higher standard in nature. That natural standard is especially beneficial to the purpose of universities.

One's race, one's sex, one's "culture" are, in the context of the ends of liberal education, caves from which education is meant to be an ascent. It is a betrayal of the idea of the university to engage in recruitment practices, organize extracurricular student life, and open the curriculum to innovations that have the explicit goal of confirming students in their origins rather than giving them the intellectual depth by which they can transcend those origins.

W.E.B. Du Bois, a founder of the NAACP and no stranger to oppression, writing at the dawn of the last century, expressed eloquently the experience of liberation that a serious education gave him:

I sit with Shakespeare and he winces not. Across the color line I move arm in arm with Balzac and Dumas, where smiling men and welcoming women glide in gilded halls. From out the caves of evening that swing between the strong-limbed earth and the tracery of the stars, I summon Aristotle and Aurelius and what soul I will, and they come all graciously with no scorn or condescension. So, wed with Truth, I dwell above the Veil.²¹

That the universities of our time have been willing to embrace the scorn and condescension that postmodernism heaps on this vision of the life of the mind is a melancholy fact.

There is another reason for our universities to embrace a renewal of the study of American constitutionalism, of free institutions and free societies—and that is the universities' own self-interest. I am amazed at the generosity of the American people, unrivaled in recorded history, in supporting higher learning. And I am equally astonished at the near absolute autonomy our colleges and universities enjoy in setting and carrying out their collegial missions.

It is not farfetched to describe a decent college as a little republic, a “small republic of the intellect,” as Eva Brann asserts in her meditation, *Paradoxes of Education in a Republic*.²² Brann draws out the evident implication for us as members of these little republics:

Precisely because these little republics are not self-sufficient, they need a ground from which to draw life, and that ground is the larger republic. There is something inexpressibly foolish in the sight of an institution bent on ignoring or despising its own source. That educational communities should foster reverence for the Republic seems to me obvious.²³

A reinvigoration of the study of constitutionalism, and in particular the American Constitution, is a direct way for us to rediscover the ground of freedom and political security provided our academic republics by the American polity. Whether reverence for our republic will result from sober reflection on its origins and nature will depend on the conclusions teachers and students draw from that reflection. Reverence, after all, is something elicited by the intrinsic excellence of the object being observed. I'm confident that, at the very least, “respectful admiration” for our political institutions can be expected from an open-minded engagement with the philosophers and statesmen who together deserve to be considered the architects of our political life.²⁴

And for those of us who, perhaps as a consequence of the corrosive cynicism and conceit that inhabit the postmodern university, balk at the idea of an education that hopes to foster reverence for our constitutional regime, let us listen anew to the plea of Abraham Lincoln, who in his lifetime witnessed the shaking of the foundations:

Let reverence for the laws, be breathed by every American mother, to the lisping babe, that prattles on her lap—let it be taught in schools, in seminaries, and in colleges;—let it be written in Primmers, spelling books, and in Almanacs;—let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice. And, in short, let it become the *political religion* of the nation; and let the old and the young, the rich and the poor, the grave and the gay, of all sexes and tongues, and colors and conditions, sacrifice unceasingly upon its altars.²⁵

Lincoln understood the always urgent necessity of civic education. We have been bequeathed a “political edifice of liberty and equal rights,” he said. “If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen, we must live through all time, or die by suicide.” These words remind us what is at stake in the battles over curriculum and institutional mission in our colleges and universities, and why we should care. For Lincoln, it was beyond cavil, as it was to the Founding generation, that our educational institutions have a crucial role to play in transmitting our political edifice of liberty and equal rights to the “latest generation that fate shall permit the world to know.” Fostering a thorough understanding and appreciation of that edifice and its foundations is, he suggested, a part of nothing less than a “task of gratitude to our fathers, justice to ourselves, duty to posterity, and love for our species in general.”²⁶

Lincoln’s sense of the dependence of liberty on a certain kind of learning is now largely foreign to higher education, for reasons discussed in this article. Few institutions are willing to commit their resources and structure their curricula in ways that advance civic learning of a high and useful kind. And then there are the contemporary academic prejudices that make a perfectly reasonable civic baby-step like a Constitution Day mandate appear as an ominous threat to institutional mission—as if there any longer were such a thing.

Still, there is something to be learned from the collapse of the academy in the late 1960s: You can’t fight something with nothing. The energy and initiative of faculty, alumni, and trustees devoted to bringing to America’s campuses a form of civic education grounded in respect for the achievements of the American regime and the civilization it represents are palpable. Something beats nihil, at least in time. Our colleges are shameless in their lack of discrimination in considering novel suggestions. Let’s put forward curricular and programmatic proposals that feature sober inquiry into what every great statesman has had to know. The burden will be on the opponents of change. They’ve been losing for decades.

Notes

1. Section 111 of Division J of Pub. L. 108-447, “Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005,” 8 Dec. 2004; 118 Stat. 2809, 3344-45.
2. “Education Dept. Issues Rules on ‘Constitution Day’ Requirement,” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 3 June 2005, A19.
3. “Colleges Scramble to Plan Events to Comply with Federal Mandate for Constitution Day,” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 2 September 2005, A34.

4. "The 'Jingoism' of a New Law," Letter from R. Baird Shuman, 30 September 2005, A55.
5. *Restoring America's Legacy*, A Report of the American Council of Trustees and Alumni, September 2002 (issued, by the way, on Constitution Day).
6. "The Coming Crisis of Leadership," Intercollegiate Studies Institute, 2006. Available at www.americancivilliteracy.org.
7. *The Dissolution of General Education: 1914-1993*, A Report of the National Association of Scholars, 1996.
8. Alan Taylor, *American Colonies: The Settlement of North America to 1800* (New York: Penguin Books, 2002).
9. Quoted in Pauline Maier, "Teaching the Nation's History," *Humanities* (July/August 2004).
10. *Ibid.*
11. C. Bradley Thompson, review of *Power versus Liberty: Hamilton, Wilson, and Jefferson*, by James H. Read, *The William and Mary Quarterly* 60, no. 1 (2003). Political theorists are leading the recovery of the scholarly study of the American Founding. See, e.g., Alan Gibson, *Interpreting the Founding* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2006); Ralph Lerner, *The Thinking Revolutionary: Principle and Practice in the New Republic* (NY: Cornell University Press, 1987); Peter McNamara, *Political Economy and Statesmanship: Smith, Hamilton, and the Foundation of the Commercial Republic* (Dekalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1998); Gary Rosen, *American Compact: James Madison and the Problem of Founding* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1999); C. Bradley Thompson, *John Adams & the Spirit of Liberty* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1998); Karl-Friedrich Walling, *Republican Empire: Alexander Hamilton on War and Free Government* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1999); and Michael P. Zuckert, *The Natural Rights Republic* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1996). These scholars would readily acknowledge their debt to the pioneering work in the political thought of the Founding of political scientists Martin Diamond and Herbert Storing.
12. Allan Bloom, "The Crisis of Liberal Education," in *Giants and Dwarfs* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1990): 348-49.
13. For an excellent account of this transformation, see Robert A. Nisbet, *The Degradation of the Academic Dogma* (New York: Basic Books, 1971).
14. Leo Strauss, *On Tyranny* (New York: The Free Press, 1991), 177.
15. See John Ellis, *Literature Lost: Social Agendas and the Corruption of the Humanities* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997).
16. *Ibid.*, 363.
17. *Ibid.*
18. Elizabeth Greene, "Most Colleges Require Diversity Education, Survey Finds," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 3 November 2000.
19. See, e.g., Alan Charles Kors and Harvey A. Silverglate, *The Shadow University: The Betrayal of Liberty on America's Campuses* (New York: Free Press, 1998).
20. *Achieving Diversity in the Professoriate*, A Report of the American Council on Education (1997).
21. *The Souls of Black Folk*, in Du Bois, W.E.B., *Writings* (New York: Library of America, 1986), 438.
22. Eva Brann, *Paradoxes of Education in a Republic* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press 1979), 146.
23. *Ibid.*, 147.
24. *Ibid.*
25. "Address to the Young Men's Lyceum of Springfield, Illinois: The Perpetuation of Our Political Institutions," in Abraham Lincoln, *Speeches and Writings: 1832-1858* (New York: Library of America, 1989), 32-33 (emphasis in original).
26. *Ibid.*, 28, 29.