
The Making of Patriots

Leslie Lenkowsky

Leslie Lenkowsky is CEO of the Corporation for National and Community Service, a government agency that engages more than 2 million Americans each year in improving local communities through three initiatives: AmeriCorps, Learn and Serve America, and the Senior Corps. He has been president of the Hudson Institute in Indianapolis, professor of philanthropic studies and public policy at Indiana University/Purdue University Indianapolis, president of the Institute for Educational Affairs, director of the Philanthropy Roundtable, deputy director of the United States Information Agency, and a fellow at the American Enterprise Institute in Washington, D.C. A graduate of Franklin and Marshall College, he earned a doctorate at Harvard. He spoke at a Center of the American Experiment luncheon in July 2002.

Pat Tillman of the Arizona Cardinals football team has recently been in the news for giving up a lucrative athletic career to join the army. A number of athletes, including Ted Williams and Joe Louis, joined the armed forces during World War II and the war in Korea. At that time, it was the expected thing to do. What's interesting about Pat Tillman is how unusual everybody thinks it is for a person in the prime of an athletic career to be so moved. We live in a different era.

My theme touches on some of the things that might have motivated the athletes of another era that we can't count on motivating people today.

One of the most satisfying aspects of being in an office such as the one I am privileged to hold is discovering that in ways unbeknownst at the time, you have been heading to this point most of your life. In my case, that was brought home especially clearly when, shortly after I appeared on C-SPAN, an e-mail arrived at the Corporation for National and Community Service Web site that asked of me: "Are you the grown-up version of that bright little boy who survived my first year as a teacher in 1956?" Sure enough, it was from my sixth grade teacher, now retired in Vermont and obviously prone to exaggerating the abilities of his students.

Today, I probably wouldn't recognize him, but I do remember his class. It was there that we studied civics and I first read the Constitution of the United States. In the course of studying, I stumbled across a comment attributed to William Gladstone, the late-nineteenth-century prime minister of Britain and a great admirer of our country. "The United States Constitution," he is supposed to have said, "is the greatest document ever produced by the hand of man." No small praise from a devoutly religious Victorian for whom the Bible was the greatest document ever produced. Since the Holy Book wasn't done by "man," that made the Constitution second only to the word of God in Gladstone's eyes—quite a tribute indeed.

I would like to think that the reverence I developed back in 1956 for the Constitution—and the responsibilities of citizenship it both enables and requires—has more than a little bit to do with my passion for public service and my being here today. For the question I wish to discuss with you is whether today's young people will have the experience I—and, doubtless, many of you—had of learning about, understanding, and developing an appreciation for the principles of government that have enabled our nation to be, in Lincoln's famous phrase, the "last, best hope" of mankind for over two centuries. Many of us worry that today's students will not have such an experience and that as a result, we face a serious problem not just for the future, but for the present, when our principles are under attack and we may

be called upon to bear sacrifices in their defense.

We in the Bush administration have been thinking a great deal about what we can do to change this and improve the state of civics education. As some of you may know, we are working on an initiative in that area. I don't have any specifics to report yet [in July], but I can speak broadly about what a good program of civics education should look like.

A Call to Service

Of course, the first question you might have is why am *I* addressing this question at all? What do the programs of the Corporation for National and Community Service—AmeriCorps, Senior Corps, and Learn and Serve America—have to do with civics and civics education?

I can give you any number of answers to that question, including technical ones concerning line items and budgeting and so forth. But the real answer is that under the umbrella of a new White House council, the USA Freedom Corps, the Bush administration is looking to tie a number of program areas—education, national service, homeland defense, and so forth—into a broad-based initiative that seeks to build a new culture of "citizenship, service, and responsibility," as the president puts it. National service programs of the kind administered by the corporation are an important part of the mix, partly because they aim to develop the habits of volunteering among the young and partly because through service, people go deeper into

the nation's web of civic associations, where they learn what being a responsible citizen really means.

But in addition, we want Americans to think of service and volunteerism as important ways to serve the nation in a time of war. On December 8, 1941, if you wanted to serve your country, you could go down to a recruiting office and sign up, at least if you were a physically fit young man. On September 12, 2001, if you wanted to serve your country and went to sign up, the recruiters would probably tell you they were looking for just a *few* good men and women. Unlike during World War II, the nation will not need to place a high number of its young people on the front lines, with other Americans filling in back home. The war on terror is not that kind of war. But we are all called to pitch in some way, and national service is one important way to do that.

That's the message at the heart of the president's call to service, his challenge to all Americans to give 4,000 hours—the equivalent of two years—of service to their neighbors and their nation over the course of their lifetimes. Like the civics initiative, the call to service is not a government mandate or federal regulation, but a deep and abiding challenge to all Americans to reconnect to their country and their communities.

Civic Knowledge

But we also wish to go deeper, to revisit and revise some of the attitudes and practices that have caused such tremendous civic disengagement in the

first place. Can we recapture the civics education and civic practices that transformed generation after generation of American kids into patriots? Where along the way did civics education get broken—and how can we fix it? If we are to prevail in this war and have a stronger country afterwards, we must do a better job of helping Americans understand not only what we are fighting against, but also what we are fighting for.

At the base of any civics education is, of course, civic knowledge. Are our children familiar with the basic facts, figures, and dates of American history? Are they aware of the basic principles that inform our nation? Are they familiar with the speeches and documents that illuminate those principles—the Declaration, the Constitution, the Federalist Papers, Lincoln's Second Inaugural, the Gettysburg Address, Letter from a Birmingham Jail? Do they know the facts about how government and the political process work? Some will object that learning, even memorizing, civic facts is less important than civic understanding—thinking through the broader concepts and issues that are at stake—and to a certain extent that's true. But factual or rote knowledge, as educators are beginning to rediscover, is closely connected to, if not the basis of, that deeper kind of thinking that teases meaning out of facts. Civic facts and civic understanding together constitute civic knowledge, which is an essential prerequisite for civic practice.

I say that civic knowledge is “of course” the basis of civics education. But the connection has not been so

readily acknowledged for many years, and we have our work cut out for us when it comes to restoring civic knowledge. Now, here I may be poaching a bit on territory that is rightfully the purview of my colleagues at the Department of Education. But as the recent National Assessment of Educational Progress in history demonstrated, things in the civic knowledge arena are not at all well. Yes, there was some improvement among the fourth and eighth graders. But when only 18 percent of fourth graders, 17 percent of eighth graders, and 11 percent of twelfth graders are at or above proficiency in knowledge of American history, we have a serious problem.

And it is a problem that goes beyond education, one that reverberates out to every civic institution in America. If young people cannot construct a meaningful narrative of American history, then there is little hope that the nation can live up to the highest task of a pluralistic liberal democracy: forging a common strength of purpose out of disparate and sometimes alien parts. If they don't know what made George Washington or Abraham Lincoln or Jane Addams or Martin Luther King Jr. great, they won't know how to find greatness in themselves and in their fellow citizens. If they don't understand why we should commemorate Independence Day, Columbus Day, Thanksgiving, and other national holidays, great and small, they won't understand the events, great and small, that shape their present and future. The British have their monarchy and the French their nationality;

what we Americans share are our country's principles, made meaningful and accessible through the great lives and great events of our heritage.

This lack of civic knowledge is a problem even in the best of times in America. This nation's political and economic system naturally emphasizes the individual, autonomous actor whose first impulse is to satisfy personal desires. In wartime, the inability to bind the nation together—which begins with knowing the nation's history—is a potentially deadly flaw. In peacetime, it is a recipe for paralysis and decline. For the narratives of American history and government—the American story—are the glue that holds us together, whether we have been citizens for generations or have just arrived.

Civic Skills

The abysmal historical ignorance of American students spills over into the next component of civics education: civic skills. Everyone agrees that it's good for schools to teach the importance of voting and other forms of political activity. Certainly, we want young people to feel as if they can make a difference in their communities and in the political sphere, and we want them to have a voice in setting the local as well as the national agenda. America, even at two and a quarter centuries old, is a young nation, and we need the enthusiasm and participation of youth to keep us strong.

But it is dangerous for schools to let loose a generation of young activists if they are not also teaching students the

art of reasoned, informed political reflection, which enables them to judge well. And this, of course, gets us back to the importance of civic knowledge. If young people don't know the facts and their significance, then their political judgment and consequent action is just as likely to do harm as it is to do good.

Just look at the Founders, for example—many of them comparatively young men when they embarked on the Revolution (John Adams was forty, Jefferson only thirty-three). No generation of Americans has ever engaged in deeper, more meaningful “political action.” But their action was animated and given force by a broad, intellectually coherent set of notions about what political life in America should be like. When they pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to independence, they could do so only because they had already declared, in deep and stirring detail, what they knew to be true, and why.

By contrast, we too often today encourage political action among the young without encouraging them to first engage in political, historical, and civic reflection. We do the young a disservice, and do our nation a disservice, by allowing them to think that all opinions, all actions are equally valid, no matter how uninformed those opinions and actions may be both by experience and by knowledge. In evaluating the merits of political action by the young, we too often allow depth of feeling to become the only way to distinguish between alternatives. Depth of feeling, which the Founders had in

spades—remember, they were risking their lives, which students passing around a petition certainly aren't—ought to come from a certitude that your cause is just. And that certitude ought to proceed from reasoned reflection and deep knowledge. Without those things, political action is just **activity**—and no more or less just than any other activity.

I experienced this firsthand in the blissful days when I was a college professor, when I ran a summer institute at Indiana University for undergraduates from around the country who were leaders in campus service programs. In our first year, we wound up sharing the campus hotel with a far more important institute, at least in the eyes of the university: a summer camp for high school basketball prodigies, sponsored by Nike.

As soon as the young behemoths arrived on campus, my students moved into action. Several of them had been involved with anti-Nike protests on their campuses and felt that the high school students should know about the company's manufacturing practices before signing lucrative shoe contracts. So they prepared an unsigned leaflet to slip under the doors of the rooms in which the basketball players were staying.

Fortunately, I got wind of the plan in advance and was able to talk to the young lady who had organized the protest about the leaflet she and her friends were going to distribute. If you believe in your cause, why is your leaflet unsigned? I asked. The answer was partly that they were afraid of

being caught, and partly that they were circulating someone else's critique of Nike, downloaded from the Internet, and didn't want to take credit for it. That led to one of those great "teachable moments" in which we talked about civil disobedience and the obligation—articulated by Gandhi, Martin Luther King Jr., and others—of those who disagree with laws to accept the consequences of violating them.

This young lady was one of my best students and has gone on to remain active in public service. But because of her limited grasp of civic knowledge, she was unable to bridge the gap between her feelings and her actions. And that, in turn, made her protest less effective as well (though truth be told, I doubt there was anything she could do to keep those basketball players from their shoe contracts).

Civic knowledge and civic skills should go hand in hand in any program of civics education. They are both necessary components of the task of training new citizens—necessary, that is, but not sufficient. For there is a deeper, more important task: the inculcation of civic attitudes, the habits and emotions and mores that lie beneath the whole structure of civic life. Really, "civic attitudes" is just a fancy way of talking about love of country, or, to use a word that has become somewhat suspect, patriotism.

Civic Engagement

We've heard a lot about patriotism in the wake of the horrors of September 11 and the ensuing war on terrorism. It is said that Americans have been jolted

back into reconsidering their nation, its purpose, its strengths, and its values. And most importantly, it is said that September 11 has made it acceptable, even fashionable, to express a love of country again.

Certainly, we are now in an extraordinary moment in our nation's history, and those of us who have long decried the lack of civic engagement in America have to be heartened by the response to tragedy we saw in the months after September 11. But we have to ask: is this wave of patriotic fervor—as President Bush recently said in Columbus, Ohio—a rising tide or a receding wave? Having put away our flags, cleaned up Ground Zero, and rebuilt the Pentagon, do we withdraw again to our private cares and concerns, and let somebody else take care of the country?

Obviously, I hope not. But we must find ways to capture this patriotic spirit if September 11 is to herald a new era of patriotism and not just a blip in a decades-long decline. For patriotism is, at bottom, an emotion; it is a response of the heart to your nation and the claims it makes on you. Like any emotion, it has to be channeled and sustained by education and good practice, or it will become attenuated. To steal an image from Robert Putnam, civic attitudes are a well from which the nation can draw, but that well of patriotism can dry up—and has dried up slowly over the past several decades.

Patriots aren't born; they're made. On that point, I think we can all agree. The question is, can we agree on how best to teach the young to be patriots—

and offer remedial instruction to the millions of adults who grew up in a time when patriotism was considered suspect? For what is striking is not that many Americans, after September 11, felt moved to fly the flag or express their love of country, but how new it seemed to many people, as if they were stretching muscles long unused. That's because that well of patriotism has been slowly drying up over the past several decades, replaced by an easy cynicism about America, its history, motives, and way of life. Sad to say, that cynicism has often radiated outward from many of our most important institutions, including the media, academia, churches, corporations, and, yes, our nation's schools. Just for example, my generation, the baby boomers, are often held up as models of political consciousness. But often, our marching and protesting and activism—even in the service of good causes—was not spurred by a healthy love of country. We did not call our nation to live up to its highest ideals, but attacked those ideals and the institutions that represented them in a desire to tear down, not build up. We spelled *America* with a *k*.

That attitude had real and troubling effects for us, our nation, and our children. Should we be surprised that young Americans are ambivalent about and disconnected from their country after years of subtle—and sometimes not so subtle—insinuation that politics is an ignoble profession; that the flag stands for racism, sexism, and oppression; that capitalism and the markets merely foster and reward greed; and

that government is irretrievably corrupt? The ambivalence these attitudes cause shows up even after September 11 in polling from William Galston, who reports that half of all young adults say that voting is “not at all important” or “only a little important,” and only 46 percent believe that they can make at least some difference in addressing community needs. Even more distressing for me, the number of young adults who said they never volunteer has risen to 37 percent, up ten points from 1998. After a cataclysmic event such as September 11, such ambivalence and disconnectedness is disturbing.

Pledging Allegiance

Recently the nation was shocked to discover that at least in one judicial district, it was ruled illegal to recite the Pledge of Allegiance in public schools, because it contains the words *under God*, a supposed violation of the Establishment Clause. Even here in Minnesota, the Pledge has recently been in the news, after Governor Jesse Ventura vetoed a bill requiring students to say the Pledge weekly.

I'll leave it to the full Ninth Circuit or the Supreme Court to comment on that decision. I would imagine they will offer the judges in that case a refresher course in civic knowledge, as it were.

But Governor Ventura's reasoning is worthy of reflection. He objects to requiring the Pledge on the grounds that, as he said in a letter explaining his veto, “Patriotism is voluntary. It is a

feeling of loyalty and allegiance that is the result of knowledge and belief. A patriot shows patriotism through their actions, by choice.” To which I would say, fair enough. Those of us concerned about civic knowledge and civic attitudes don’t do ourselves, or our children, much good if we allow patriotic displays such as the Pledge to be emptied of substance. We want a patriotism with heart, conviction, and guts.

But will Governor Ventura then join us in attempting to shape a civics education that builds exactly that kind of patriotism? To say that patriotism should be voluntary is not to say that we expect it to arise out of a vacuum. Again, patriots are made, not born. Young Americans will not learn to love their country unless they learn from us, the generations who go before them, that their country is worth loving—worth fighting for, as Governor Ventura did as a Navy SEAL, and sometimes even worth dying for, as men and women are doing now in Afghanistan.

Some of the governor’s later comments cut to the heart of the need for a civics education initiative. Speaking on a radio show after his veto, he compared compulsory recitation of the Pledge to Taliban indoctrination and, more appallingly, to the Hitler youth (which, by the way, AmeriCorps members have also been likened to): “They had those brown-shirted youth corps, and all that, that were asked to, you know, hail the Third Reich and all this stuff.”

The comparison is disturbing, yes. But it’s important to understand the way in which it is disturbing. At the

heart of Governor Ventura’s comments lurks the belief that there is no difference between other regimes and the political system of the United States. Governor Ventura looks at the Pledge on one hand and the Hitler Youth on the other, and all he sees is propaganda for the young. Which is a reasonable comparison, perhaps—if **you don’t believe that the United States, its government, and its laws are any better than those of other regimes.**

Here is the crux of the matter. America has, we know, an imperfect history, and our understanding of notions such as equality before the law have unfolded, often painfully, over time. Nonetheless, we need a civics education initiative because we need our young people to believe fervently, as did the Founding Fathers, that our representative democracy is the best of all governments. Being an American patriot means not simply being loyal to any set of principles one likes, but to those principles—those truths—we have every reason to believe are most conducive to protecting the “unalienable rights” with which, the Declaration of Independence proclaimed, our Creator endowed **all** people; principles, in other words, that are essential if we are to live as human beings are meant to live.

We need our young people to believe that our notions of equality, self-government, and freedom are better than other ways of organizing political life. And we need to have confidence in the essential justness of our civic life if we are to encourage the spread of free institutions around the world. Building that confidence in the

young requires civic knowledge, civic practice, and the right kinds of civic attitudes.

Reversing Civic Decline

We have, in the wake of September 11, an opportunity to begin to reverse the trends of civic decline. More importantly, we have a *duty* to reverse them, for we are at war, and victory will require unity of national purpose. How we build that unity will be the focus of the administration's civics education initiative. It will require input from a number of different sectors, and action on a number of fronts—in museums, schools, and historical institutions, from government and the private sector.

As John Adams said, "Liberty can not be preserved without a general knowledge among the people." From that knowledge flows the informed practice of civic skills. And from both flows the healthy civic attitude we call patriotism. All of these things have traditionally been taught to the young in Americans schools, the primary place where our nation passed on the lessons and virtues of citizenship. Our schools can and should be that place again—the place where we teach every young person the sacred duties and inestimable blessings of being an American.

In her popular history of the Constitutional convention, *Miracle at Philadelphia*, Catherine Drinker Bowen recounts a tale about Benjamin Franklin, one of only six people to sign both the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. As the momentous gathering was concluding, Dr.

Franklin, as his fellow Philadelphians knew him, was asked by an ordinary woman in the street, "What kind of government have you given us?" He replied, "A republic," but added portentously, "if you can keep it."

For over two hundred years, we have kept it. But if we are to continue to do so, the ordinary men and women of our country will need to know more about what a "republic" is—and why it is worth keeping.

Following his speech, Leslie Lenkowsky took questions from his American Experiment audience.

John Hinderaker: Isn't it a fundamental problem of civics education that a lot of teachers and administrators don't really share a very positive view of American history? And, if so, how would the administration plan to address that?

Leslie Lenkowsky: Today's teachers obviously are products of the times I described, but I wouldn't necessarily say "a lot." It's easy to overgeneralize, and there are some wonderful civic education initiatives. The Center for Civic Education works in classrooms to help educate teachers as a way of educating students. The Corporation for National and Community Service supports a program called Teach for America, which is bringing young people from some of the finest colleges into classrooms. They're coming in with new attitudes because they're of a different generation.

The education of American teachers is a challenge whether we're talking

about civics education or about reading. We have to be creative. I think teachers, like everybody else, have reacted to September 11 with new questions, new emotions. We need to develop efforts nationally, at the state level, and through private philanthropy to respond to those questions in a useful way.

Mike Weber: I'd like to go back to the survey that said only 46 percent of the young adults in this country feel that they can make a difference. I lead a local nonprofit, Volunteers of America, that sponsors four of the programs your organization supports, and our impact comes from over 3,000 senior citizens and retirees. Can you reflect on how we can turn around for young adults, at a time of unprecedented affluence, that sense of being able and willing to do something in the community as a volunteer?

Leslie Lenkowsky: The World War II generation and their immediate progeny are perhaps the most engaged civic generation the United States has ever had. Starting in the 1960s, we've seen a tailing off in those kinds of associations. So, while we still have that great generation around and active, engaging them in work across generations with younger people would also be very useful. Clearly, programs like the ones we run—AmeriCorps, Learn and Serve (our school-based program, in which we're teaching the habits of service in elementary and secondary schools, as well as in colleges and universities)—can play an important role, but they need to do it consciously. We can't just assume that because some-

body is helping to clean up a neighbor's yard, he or she is reflecting on the virtues of volunteering and of being an American.

Julie Quist: Would you address the problems that come up when the federal government takes charge of things that perhaps aren't its role and creates official attitudes or beliefs? Specifically, the Center for Civic Education, an NGO [nongovernment organization] that has been funded by the federal government, put together a curriculum called *We the People* that establishes standards for civic education and the basis for the National Assessment of Educational Progress, for example, and in textbooks.

That curriculum defines our country entirely differently than how it has been defined. For example, it defines "civic virtue" as placing the common good above individual good and elevates the Universal Declaration of Human Rights above our Declaration of Independence. There's a place for that, but our Constitution specifically establishes the inalienable rights of the individual above all else. What happens when the federal government establishes official truth?

Leslie Lenkowsky: It is an important problem, but I think you misstated a bit with respect to the standards. They are entirely voluntary. No one has to adopt the standards of the Center for Civic Education or anything else we're going to put forth. They are meant to give an example of what could be done. By and large, the Center for Civic Education has done a fine job through its *We the People* program. I don't see the

Universal Declaration above our Declaration, and we're talking about apples and oranges: the Universal Declaration applies to one thing, our Declaration applies to something else.

The Center for Civic Education folks would tell you, as well, that there's room for improvement in their work. We did come up against this issue; we've discussed it. It usually takes the form of the question I think you're asking: Will this civics education initiative get close to creating a national curriculum? The answer is this: If we cannot agree on what we mean by the American nation, what can we agree on?

The Preamble to the Constitution begins, "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union." The union is the essence of the Constitution. The problem the Founders were dealing with in writing the Constitution was that the Articles of Confederation didn't do enough to create a union. We need to have this debate—we shouldn't shy away from it—and we need to use the results to inform our teaching of American civics and history. It won't be without controversy.

Jim Lodoen: When do you expect the initiative to roll out, and is legislation or legislative approval needed?

Leslie Lenkowsky: Legislators probably will approve some parts. It's too early to say, and things are fairly uncertain around Washington these days.

Paul Pranghofer: We went through an extremely interesting election two years ago. A lot of young people looked at what went on very closely and came out of that election saying,

"My vote really doesn't count." How do we change that? What do we need to do so that we as a country never allow that to happen again?

Leslie Lenkowsky: This is what you hear in the mass media and elsewhere, and young people are picking it up because nobody ever tells them the opposite. The truth is that I can't think of a presidential election in my lifetime in which the individual vote mattered more. The vote in many states was a matter of less than a percentage point. It would not have gotten to the Supreme Court, it would not have rested on the hanging of chads in Florida, if people had gone out to vote. That's why it is so disturbing that in the poll I cited, taken in January of this year, 49 percent of fifteen- to twenty-five-year-olds said that it doesn't matter very much if you vote.

Your perception is absolutely right, and it behooves all of us who are educators to explain that those who think this way, including some of our leading pundits, are absolutely wrong.

Mitch Pearlstein: You've made several references to religion. Given the fact that much, maybe even most, of the volunteering in this country goes on in or through houses of worship, given what President Bush wants to do with the faith-based initiative, given our comfortableness or uncomfornableness with religion in this society, how does all that fit together when it comes to rebuilding patriotism? Could you talk about community service in a framework of religious activity and belief?

Leslie Lenkowsky: An important part of the American story is religion. Our ideas of tolerance and equality are rooted in religious beliefs early in our history, and sustained and reinvigorated at various later points. We have to acknowledge and gratefully embrace the importance of religion in creating the kind of country we are today. The Declaration of Independence talks about rights with which we have been endowed by our Creator. There it is, in a mild form, at the start of our history and rooted in our beliefs. We will argue, of course, about the practical applicability of religious beliefs, but we ought not neglect the importance of religion, certainly with respect to volunteering. Religious organizations are tremendously important.

We at the Corporation for National and Community Service worked extensively with what have now come to be known as faith-based groups. (I was actually told by our lawyers that I'm not to call them religious groups.) About 15 percent of AmeriCorps members are with faith-based groups, about the same percentage of our Senior Corps members. Why? Because they're the folks who are on the front lines, providing valuable community service. Our programs respect the Constitution and the importance of the separation of church and state, yet still work with these groups.

Habitat for Humanity sponsors more AmeriCorps members than any other group I know. Every morning, Habitat begins with a prayer. Our AmeriCorps members are allowed to participate in this prayer, but they have

to do it on their own time: they clock in after the prayer. That is a small example of how Americans have, over our history, developed a host of pragmatic accommodations. We have managed, quite successfully by any standard, to balance religion and state. The pendulum swings one way, then another, and the debate continues, but we have created a democracy that is both religious and tolerant, and it is free from the evils of religion that we've seen in other countries, in other contexts. That's an important part of the story that needs to be told a lot more and a lot more clearly.

The phrase "separation of church and state" originated with Thomas Jefferson in a letter he wrote to the elders of the Danbury Baptist Church in the early nineteenth century, and it pretty much died out through the nineteenth and early twentieth century. It was revived in a famous 1947 Supreme Court decision, *Everson v. the Board of Education*. New Jersey, confronted with the post-World War II baby boom, subsidized school busing; you could get a bus ride whether you were going to a public or a parochial school. They were sued for entangling public funds in parochial education. Justice Hugo Black, a renowned civil libertarian, wrote the decision, in which he invoked Jefferson's wall of separation between church and state. The decision Black wrote held that the New Jersey program **was** constitutional. It was a pragmatic accommodation that the justice, whose credentials as a civil libertarian cannot be questioned, felt was within our tradition. ■