Robert Dallek author of major new work on LBJ

In April Oxford University Press published the second volume of Professor Robert Dallek's study of President Lyndon Johnson, Flawed Giant: Lyndon Johnson and His Times, 1961-1973. Within a few weeks the book had garnered favorable reviews from both the daily and the Sunday New York Times, the Boston Globe, and other newspapers as well as Newsweek magazine. We are pleased to reprint the Preface to this work:

Like Lyndon Johnson’s contemporaries, historians disagree about his presidential standing. A 1996 assessment of his White House record by thirty-two scholars was notable for its differences: fifteen historians saw him as a near great President; twelve thought him only average; and five described him as either below average or a failure.

I wish this second volume on LBJ’s life, which principally focuses on his presidency, more clearly defined his place in history. But it doesn’t. His contradictions—flaws and virtues, successes and failures—are on full display and will both enhance and detract from his historical reputation.

More important than the book’s impact on Johnson’s presidential ranking is its contribution to our understanding of the man and his actions. Presidential standing, especially of recent Presidents, is subject to constant change; explanation has a more enduring influence.

As in his pre-presidential career, Johnson was an outsized character who did his utmost to hide his intentions. Believing that understanding was power and that uncertainty about his views shielded him from opposition, he worked to baffle his contemporaries. He remembered FDR’s comment to Treasury Secretary Henry Morgenthau, Jr.: “You are my right hand, but I always keep my left hand under the table.”

Unpredictability was a political weapon. Occasionally, when reporters got advanced word on a presidential appointment, Johnson would name someone else to throw the press off-balance. Trip itineraries were kept from journalists until the last possible minute and changes along the way were commonplace. Task force reports describing domestic problems and remedies were “state secrets”; premature revelations of presidential intentions were “impediments” to the Great Society.

Outlandish comments and behavior were other parts of Johnson’s political calculations. Urinating in a sink, inviting people into the bathroom, showing off a scar, exposing his private parts—after a while nothing surprises the biographer. For Johnson, they were meant to shock and confuse and leave him in control.
Richard Fox co-edits new work on moral inquiry in American scholarship

Cambridge University Press and the Woodrow Wilson International Center have just published In Face of the Facts: Moral Inquiry in American Scholarship, co-edited by Richard Wightman Fox of Boston University and Robert B. Westbrook of the University of Rochester. This collection of essays stems from a conference at the Wilson Center in Washington after the death in 1994 of Christopher Lasch, whose writing was, the editors say, "exemplary of the sort of moral inquiry we had in mind." We are pleased to reprint a section of the Introduction to this work:

The phrase "moral inquiry" is bound to give some readers a start. Moral inquiry will suggest the moralists squad, the righteous fervor of self-appointed judges, the closed-mindedness of petty dispositions and pinched spirits, the restoration of Victorian constraint after nearly a century of ever-expanding openness, exposure, and toleration. Moral inquiry implies moralism and poses a menace to a modern ethic of live-and-let-live pluralism. Ironically, many critics of such open-ended pluralism will themselves find fault with "moral inquiry," since it implies that human deliberation is supposed to settle moral questions—questions better left to faith, revelation, or the dictates of unchanging natural law. Bitterly opposed to one another, both camps agree that the moral life, as they see it, is only threatened by the intrusions of inquiry.

The coupling of "moral inquiry" with "scholarship" will also cause some readers to recoil. In their view the terms are mutually exclusive since scholarship should be based upon the dispassionate pursuit and assessment of fact, not preaching or even deliberating about values. Modern scholarship has been premised, they will say, upon the repudiation of earlier generations' joining of moral zealotry with supposedly scientific but actually parochial investigation. To speak of moral inquiry in the same breath with scholarship is especially risky in this day and age, some will add, because partisan appeals to "political correctness" of both the right- and left-wing varieties are liable to divert universities from the free pursuit of the truth. Inquiry and scholarship, as they see it, are only undermined by the concerns of the moral life.

What the fearful and wary on all sides here share is the conviction that facts and values can and should be sealed off from one another and that scholarly inquiry—and scholarly institutions such as universities—will traffic only in the former. Insofar as scholars examine the moral life, they should ask only "how do we (or they) live?" (a question of fact) not "how should we (or they) live?" (a question of value). And they should resist any temptation to ask whether the first sort of question might bear some relation to the second, for it does not and cannot.

This common view of the university as a haven for disinterested truthseeking and of the scholar as a pursuer of facts, not a professor of values, still reigns throughout much of academia in the United States. But it has recently come under criticism—and not only from politicized forces of the left and right, each of which aspires to supplant value-neutrality with an ideological alternative of its own. Dissatisfaction with the fact-value split is growing even among those with scant desire to take sides in the "culture wars" that wrack contemporary America.

A quick tour of some recent American intellectual history suggests the sources of this disenchantment. A generation ago scholars in many disciplines in the social sciences and humanities were united in a commitment to common "scientific" methods and goals: to conduct research and come to verifiable truths about an ever-proliferating range of topics. Researchers were to be detached, dispassionate; objectivity depended on impersonality and neutrality. Political, religious, social, or moral concerns were to be kept at bay lest they contaminate the professional sifting of evidence. Much sport was made of the genteel amateurs of the nineteenth or early twentieth centuries who routinely injected their historical, literary, or sociological works with sentimental hopes about the moral advance of civilization and with celebratory gestures about the greatness of this nation or that great leader. Modern-day scholars by contrast checked their beliefs and values at the academy's door.

In the 1950s and 1960s this ideal of impassive value neutrality came under fire—first by a few pundits on the right (William Buckley Jr.'s God and Man at Yale was the key document), and then

---

Co-editors Robert Westbrook and Richard Fox with their new book on the Eiffel Tower, with Invalides and the Pantheon in the distance

See FOX, page 11
Donald Ostrowski publishes book on Muscovy

In April Cambridge University Press published Donald Ostrowski's *Muscovy and the Mongols: Cross-Cultural Influences on the Stepp Frontier, 1304–1789*. The book deals with the Mongols' impact on the Rus lands, something which has been recognized by many scholars, although its precise nature and extent is very contentious. While diverse opinions exist on the origins and development of Muscovy, Ostrowski argues that no society arises ex nihilo and that Muscovy is no exception. He considers the outside origins and influences, as well as the indigenous origins and development, to advance an understanding of Muscovy as a political entity, its political institutions and political culture. He examines Muscovy not in traditional isolation but as an integral and important part of world history. We are pleased to reprint an excerpt from the Introduction:

The forms of civil and military institutions in fourteenth-century Muscovy were overwhelmingly Mongol in origin. The Church found itself in the unusual position of trying to modify and account for Mongol institutions and practices within a Byzantine-based frame of reference. This hypothesis might help to explain why the sources provide such seemingly contradictory information and why historians provide such opposing interpretations. It might also help us to accept as legitimate the contributions of those historians who have such widely divergent views. Part of the rationale for presenting the argument contained herein, while so much of the research remains to be done, has been to encourage others to join in that research either to confirm or to refute specific assertions and speculations made here, to open new lines of investigation, and to reopen some older lines that may have been abandoned prematurely.

Finally, if my argument has any value, it means that we must train future historians of Muscovy not only in Slavic and western European languages and history, as we have been doing, but also in Byzantine, Central Asian, and Chinese languages and cultures. Otherwise, our scholarly descendants will not have the research tools needed for furthering the study of Muscovy, its culture and institutions, and their antecedents. Such training will allow our field to connect as well with the growing realization in the historical profession in general that we need to get beyond teaching and researching only national histories. Otherwise, the study of Muscovy will continue to remain isolated from the study of world history. Over forty years ago the British diplomat and scholar G. B. Sansom made an appeal at the University of Tokyo for the study of Japanese history within a world history context: "I am pleading for the study of Japanese history not as an end in itself, not as a mere record of events occurring in isolation, but as an integral and important part of world history." For too long, we have studied Muscovy "as an end in itself" and "as a mere record of events occurring in isolation," rather than "as an integral and important part of world history." And for too long, we have studied world history without an accurate understanding of a significant area of cross-cultural influences, Muscovite Rus'.

---

Since 1988 Donald Ostrowski has been Research Advisor in the Social Sciences at the Harvard University Extension School and, since 1992, a Lecturer at that school. In addition, he has been appointed Lecturer at Boston University for the past two years to teach courses in Russian and Soviet history; he will teach world history in BU's Summer Term this year. Besides his field of specialization, he is particularly interested in various techniques of pedagogy.

Gift for directory received

The department extends its appreciation to Professor Emeritus Reinhold Schumann, the first to give a donation toward the new building directory to be installed in the lobby (described in last month's newsletter). Additional contributions to this fund will be most welcome.

For up-to-date information on all things departmental, check the Web site:

- Departmental commencement ceremonies
- Summer Term courses in history
- Changes in fall 1998 courses (additions, cancellations, classroom assignments)
Chers collègues:

The École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales (EHESS) has been a marvelous place to teach. It's a large, publicly funded Institute for Advanced Study with its own graduate students. I teach a weekly seminar on "Modern American Thought" to a loyal core of twelve students, supplemented each week by visitors interested in the topic of the day. The group consists of doctoral candidates, professors from various institutions, and auditors from the general public. (All EHESS courses were advertised on a large affiche posted around town last fall.) As an EHESS professor one gets particularly Parisian fringe benefits: reduced admission rates at many cinemas, free entry to national museums, a multi-course lunch in the EHESS cafeteria for 25 francs (now four dollars as the dollar has gained steadily since the fall).

The year began with my "inaugural lecture," sponsored jointly by the École and the French-American Foundation, which established the chair I'm occupying. The audience was divided between the non-academics from the foundation and the academics from the École and various Parisian universities. I read a paper in French on "The Problem of Love in American History and Culture." Everyone in the audience had a copy, handed out at the door. So as I read it one could hear the pages turning, like the pages of a hymnal in a church. The people from the foundation loved the talk, no doubt partly because it was in French. As Jim Johnson is my witness (he was in Paris doing research last fall), the universitaires were very decidedly less enthusiastic. In the débat following my talk, I was cut up pretty badly by a professor of American literature. In elegant and ironic prose littered with literary references, he pronounced me naïve to think one could talk historically about the experience of love, since all we have access to are texts about love. I was not persuaded, since the experience of love is itself in part a process of story-telling between lovers. Various audience members engaged in good Gallic sparring. At the reception afterwards, a French professor came up to me and divulged with a smile that I had been "bien baptisé."

I've been working on my liberal Protestantism book, in this incarnation a study of the Beecher-Tilton scandal of 1875, in which renowned preacher Henry Ward Beecher was taken to court by Theodore Tilton for having allegedly engaged in "criminal conversation" with his wife Elizabeth. I was sparked to finish this book by my experience last fall in locating Theodore Tilton's gravesite near Fontainebleau. It was the kind of experience one can have only in a foreign country. I knew from a Beecher biography that Tilton was buried in Barbizon, where he had wished to be interred beside the Barbizon School painters Théodore Rousseau and Jean-François Millet. The Gare de Lyon information counter assured me there was a bus to Barbizon from Fontainebleau, but when I arrived in Fontainebleau there was of course no bus. I turned down a taxi driver's offer of a "roughly" 500-franc (almost 500 then) ride of 12 kilometers and went back disconsolately to the train station ticket window. The young man at the window suggested brightly that I rent a bicycle next door. So off I rode through the Fontainebleau forest, the huge expanse of woods where François Ie went hunting.

A string of Barbizon residents pointed me to the cemetery, but the municipal gravedigger informed me that only people who died after 1950 were buried there. Since Tilton died in 1907, he would have to be in the "vieux cimetière" located in Chailly-sur-Blère, the next town over. It was another 5 kilometers to Chailly. A clerk in the Mairie there found no reference to Til-
realize that spring is finally here; otherwise, why would they turn off the heat in our building? But then again it could be a case of local sabotage, or perhaps even a mass-scale government operation to force the citizens out of their frozen apartments and back to their work places, in spite of the fact that they have not been paid for months. Admittedly, this conjecture is a little far-fetched, and in any case it does not explain why there is no hot water in the building either. So, it must be the long-awaited change of seasons; who needs hot water in the spring? Then, if my logic is correct, going to the University this fine April-going-on-January morning will be a waste of time because none of the Russian students will show up for classes on a “spring fever” excuse....

I went to Russia last summer on a contract with the recently established International University in Moscow. In addition to my teaching duties, I was to participate in building its brand-new program of post-Soviet liberal arts education, to some extent based on western models. In retrospect, my enthusiastic attitude toward this year-long project was...well, shall we say, a bit idealistic and even sentimental. Presumably united, as they traditionally have been, into a numerically narrow, yet closely knit league of young intellectuals, the Russian university students seemed inquisitive, sophisticated, and thoroughly educated—largely thanks to the country’s superior secondary school system. Equally important, in my mind they were also eager to go beyond strictly intellectual endeavors, and as part of their studies to venture into such intangible spheres as pure aesthetics, social ethics, personal responsibility, and conscience. In a word, they appeared still to have been part of the famous Russian intellectualia, spurning materialistic concerns and invariably preoccupied with (and defined by) efforts to integrate its intellectual and moral aspirations. So I assumed, forgetting that in Russia things change too quickly, rendering reliance on history-based assumptions inappropriate. To my great surprise, I realized almost as soon as I started teaching that most of my students no longer attribute much value to education for its own sake; the harsh reality of primitive capitalism compels them to regard their studies as a way to “make it” in the world of competition. Consequently, increasing numbers of students tend to major in what is considered “practical” or “profitable” subjects—applied economics, public relations, marketing, accounting, and the like. It is very revealing that this sort of choice-making process is encouraged not only by objective economic circumstances but also by related social values; those who major in literature or history are looked down upon as social idiots or at best eccentrics, and treated as such by most of their peers. My best student last semester, a truly talented, straight-A sophomore, who had been recommended as a prestigious scholarship candidate to the theoretical physics department, chose to study management instead. He explained his position to me very frankly: “I could have become a big-shot scientist, distinguished, etc., but I would not get a single date. And even if there were a young woman crazy enough to go out with and eventually marry me, how on earth would I have supported my family? Surely not on a physicist’s salary!”

Many students admit their confusion as to why they are in school in the first place. Increasingly, young people leave prestigious universities to earn quick money, for example by washing windows in public buildings or by selling essentials—from bubble gum to automatic guns—in the kiosks, expecting, if need be, simply to buy black market diplomas at a later day. Many students continue with their courses half-heartedly only to please their old-fashioned parents, who do not seem to understand the new times and the obvious fact that education is primarily beside the point. Among those who stay in schools there are many “foreign students”—former Soviet citizens from the non-Russian republics—who remain registered only because this gives them the right to reside in Moscow. (Alternatively, they could remain in the capital illegally, in which case their only choice would be to sell vegetables on open street markets.) Still others remain in college to make the right connections and to learn what they describe as “a few relevant things” essential for their steady progress along the road of material success.

Interestingly, this sort of mentality is not the result of a situation in which indigent families allot their meager resources to the education of their sons and daughters, expecting the investment to pay off in the long run and solve their financial troubles. The fact is that many students in state schools—and most students in private ones—are wealthier than their poverty-stricken peers. Consider a typical early morning scene at the International University: a female student, dressed in ritz clothes, adorned with conspicuously high-priced jewelry, and equipped with the latest toy of the local well-to-do—a portable telephone—is getting out of her new Mercedes. Politely, yet somewhat condescendingly, she greets her elderly professor, who is wearing a suit that evokes nostalgia for the now legendary Brezhnev period; he is trying to regain his normal shape after having been squashed flat in the crowded metro and then frozen in that form in an unheated trolley bus.

Given so much emphasis on money and wealth in the Russian society today, it is no wonder that the young people have little respect for their teachers, most of whom are barely making it on their unbelievably low (and rarely paid) salaries. It is very common to encounter the attitude similar to that in a restaurant: we pay good money and you provide good service. By service the students usually mean entertainment rather than intellectual stimulation, and even when they do look for knowledge, they expect their professors somehow to stuff their heads with it, preferably without any significant effort on their own part.
Not surprisingly, it is now common knowledge that the level of higher education is drastically down in Russia. Most college-level students are no longer the young intellectuals they used to be: they read very little, write poorly, and lack analytical skills. And they don’t know much, Russian teachers lament in unison. The other day a fellow-historian even reported the impossible—his students had no idea that human progress depended solely on the class struggle, which makes history go forward, according to Marx. Personally, I could live with this particular lacuna in higher education, if this were the only lacuna. Sadly enough, my colleague’s complaint, nostalgic and naive as it was in this post-Soviet phase, was legitimate in principle.

A truly fascinating thing about university life is epidemic cheating. Like any Russian teacher, I am now exceptionally adept at finding hidden notes, at erasing scribbles from body parts (please allow me to be discreet about details!), and at confiscating earphone tapes labeled with popular rock titles but in fact containing nothing but important names and dates. As part of completing my assignment for a “think-paper,” most students in my sophomore history class copied articles from the Internet, claiming that this was their “research” and actually getting very upset when I did not accept their “work.” One of them returned with a new paper, and when I asked whether it was really his, he was admirably sincere in informing me that he wrote it together with a friend; he was ignignant when I accepted the work, promising to divide the grade between the two of them.

If cheating was not a culture shock to me (given my first-hand experience as a student in Russian secondary schools, bribe-giving (and-taking!) was indeed. From my college days I always assumed that being a historian was not a very lucrative business, but now I realize that I had simply been impractical. Dear colleagues, do not despair; consider the Russian example: students offer bribes to their professors—enough to keep them afloat for weeks! At some schools the going price is $3,000 per course. I was never offered money directly (my students must have assumed that I was too much of an American, corrupted by all this wealth), but once a student of mine showed up with a late paper and, giving it to me, said that perhaps all this trouble was unnecessary, and we could have settled the issue much more easily. I turned the matter into a joke, told her that I “accepted only hunting dogs” as payoff (quoting the famous line from Gogol’s Inspector General), and this was the end of the conversation. When I related it to my Russian colleagues, one said thoughtfully: “Now you are really in trouble: they will all get the hint, and what are you going to do with all these puppies?”

Given the above, it is amazing that some deans tend to take the students’ side on various disputed issues. This is because tuition money is the administrators’ constant concern, and they are unwilling to lose a single student, even if he is beyond hope. So, occasionally the administrators will actually order a professor to give a passing grade “for practical considerations.” Teachers often oblige, but sometimes the deans are faced with what they regard as insubordination, when professors insist that grades must be at least loosely related to the students’ academic performance.

If the picture appears hopeless, I have darkened the colors perhaps a bit too much. One encounters some exceptionally gifted young intellectuals, hungry for knowledge and for unbiased scholarship. And a few of them are intent on qualifying as members of the nearly extinct intelligentsia, even if this means that they will be regarded as dinosaurs by the “new Russians.” Additionally, most of those working in academia are quite aware of the difficult situation they are dealing with but, far from being dissuaded, realize that to a large extent the problems in Russian higher education are part of the generally grim state of affairs in a society still going through a period of transformation from totalitarianism to democracy. There are many able scholars, teachers, and administrators who devote themselves wholeheartedly to rebuilding Russian colleges and universities, addressing not only the problems that linger from the Communist past but also the new ones that have emerged after the beginning of perestroika. Some enthusiasts, such as Galina Kitaigorodskaya, a well-known philologist, talented pedagogue, and dean at the International University, now try to implement a number of unconventional approaches to teaching, some of which are already proving successful. As in the case of many other aspects of Russian life, it appears that precisely this sort of “local initiative”—and not any state-controlled directives or campaigns—is likely to produce positive results.

So, ending on this optimistic note, I will bundle up in countless layers of clothes and go to the University after all, hoping to contribute to what still seems to be a worthy cause. In this “letter from Russia” I focused on my impressions of the academic life, leaving aside some of the more dramatic experiences of the past year. Such as my research-related travels in the Russian countryside, when I visited underdeveloped and deserted rural areas considered unsafe even by local criminal convicts. Or the ego-boosting episodes in which I was being recruited to the Interior Ministry’s project on combating terrorism and also as a participant in the KGB (whatever its new name is nowadays)—sponsored conference on “secret operations of primary importance.” Instead of giving away all the stories at once, I will save them for my colleagues and students, all of whom I am looking forward to seeing in the summer. By the way, I just looked the word up in the dictionary and now seem to remember vaguely: “summer” is the time of year when there is no snow.
Learning in Nanjing

BY WENDY HAZARD

Outside the Center, Wendy Hazard (right) with Prof. Shen Han, who teaches women's issues in contemporary China

I have recently returned from five months in Nanjing, China, living and working at the Hopkins-Nanjing Center for Chinese and American Studies. David Meyers, who is there now, has urged me to write you with some of my impressions of life in the "new China" and of the extraordinary group of young Chinese men and women with whom I worked. It's a fun assignment, and one that I wouldn't dream of shirking.

The Center was established in 1986 as an joint educational venture by Johns Hopkins University and the University of Nanjing. The only one of its kind in China, it provides a year-long program of graduate study for 50 American and 50 Chinese students pursuing careers in teaching, government, or business. The Chinese students, who are recruited from universities all over the country, choose from courses taught by an American faculty, in English, that include U.S. history, foreign policy, law, economics, and political theory. The American students choose from a similar range of courses taught by Chinese faculty, in Chinese. They are paired as roommates and share doubles on the third and fourth floors of the Center complex. The opportunities for bi-lingual, cross-cultural exchanges of ideas and sensitivities, in the dorm rooms and the hallways, at parties and in the cafeteria, in seminars and at the ping pong tables, are rich. The American faculty lives upstairs in cushy accommodations that included, for each of us, a kitchen, bath, bedroom, and living room, complete with CNN and Star TV!

Nanjing, the once-elegant southern capital of the Ming dynasty and of the Kuomintang government, is today a booming metropolis where past and present collide in furious energy. A magnificent fifteenth-century stone wall still encircles much of the city. Pagodas and beautifully restored temples stand in elegant grandeur, and the city's parks with their lakes and lilies, waterfalls and plum orchards offer refuge from the torrent of traffic—bikes, cars, buses, and diesel trucks—that careen down Nanjing's broad boulevards, horns blaring, cargo flying, and exhaust spewing. Wrecking balls and jackhammers keep noisy rhythm, clanging, smashing, and flattening old neighborhoods to make way for the banks, department stores, Holiday Inns, and office buildings of the new China. In the side alleys, people play checkers, fry vegetables, and steam dumplings, and the farmers' markets burst with the fresh produce of the Yangzi River basin—rice and peanuts, cabbages and peppers, turtles, crabs, eggs, and noodles. But billboards hawking McDonald's, KFC, Marlboros, and Avon proliferate, and earnest young entrepreneurs, mostly men, dash about in crisp Armani knockoffs, pockets bulging with cell phones and calculators.

The Center's Chinese students are poised between colliding worlds, eager to cash in on the dazzling opportunities that the global economy promises, but fiercely proud of China's rich cultural heritage and determined to see it assume a rightful place in any ascendant new world order. They hurry to enroll in the corporate finance, international law, and economics courses, convinced that these will provide the precise tools needed. Many are eager, too, for a shot at an internship with a multinational corporation or joint venture enterprise that the Center helps to arrange. And they are keen to explore and imbibe things and ideas American. Saturday night movies with Gary Cooper, Sly Stallone, Spike Lee, and Jamie Lee Curtis usually pack a full house.

Western form and methods often confound them. Accustomed as they are to quoting learned authorities and appropriating wisdom from the past, they came to the Center with no training in or appreciation for the importance of citing sources or developing arguments of their own. Plagiarism was a problem, not insurmountable, but initially troublesome. So too was the idea of free-wheeling class discussions. Chinese professors do not encourage student participation, and my students, at the beginning, found the exercise both embarrassing and terrifying. All that began to change over time, slowly.

The students in my recent American history course were particularly fascinated by modern civil rights movements, the ideas, the passions, and the sacrifices of leaders and participants alike. The activism of the modern American women's movement and the environmental movement also intrigued them. We spent a lot of time in and out of class talking about the significance of Dr. King's work for America and the world, his challengers' critiques, the persistent divisions of class, race, and gender in the United States, and the successes and limitations of popular grassroots movements. But my students were wary too when some of those same ideas and the cultural assumptions that accompany them were applied to an analysis of Chinese society. They were usually defensive, for example, when their own country's human rights record was questioned or its
grave pollution problems cited. China, they would insist, is poised for progress and great power status. Chinese leaders cannot afford and should not tolerate civil unrest or foreign criticism that may impede or derail the gathering momentum. These students are bright and inquisitive and are armed with an intelligent skepticism about the West’s intentions toward China, but the habits of a civil society and a tradition of citizen action are not yet theirs.

A mock summit that we held following President Jiang Zemin’s visit to the United States dramatized this for me early on in the semester. Everyone was invited to the gathering, and most attended. But the meeting was conducted in English and tempers soon flared when a few American students attempted to make the case that human rights were a legitimate concern for the American public and its policy makers. Several of the Chinese students, voices shaking, defended their government’s past actions—in Tibet and during the Tiananmen “incident”—and dismissed as “arrogant” and “obstructionist” the U.S. blocking of China’s entrance into the World Trade Organization.

Weeks later, in a smaller gathering in my room, a more reflective mood prevailed. Two of the students who had been particularly angry in the earlier session quietly acknowledged what they in fact believed was the Chinese government’s excessive use of violence in smashing the popular pro-democracy movement. As they see it now, both government and citizens had learned from the massacre at Tiananmen. The government learned that it needed to buy back its tattered claim to legitimacy and had begun to do so by further opening China’s markets and encouraging free market enterprise—or “capitalism with Chinese characteristics.” The public “learned” that the government meant business and that great displays of democratic activism wouldn’t be tolerated—ever. Everyone, they said, had gotten smarter. New economic opportunities had purchased time, if not legitimacy. I learned from all this not to crowd these students, that tribal instincts on both sides had flared at the earlier gathering, but that real feelings were far more nuanced than they had appeared at first.

As time went on, I began to believe that maybe, just maybe, some of the readings they had done about Americans’ recent struggles for justice and democracy had found resonance. A recent message from another of my students suggests, poignantly I think, that this may be so. He writes, “I can’t help wondering how my mind has been widened and enriched. However, knowing more may increase a person’s pain. My view is that once you know more, you’ll try to seek a kind of power, a power to influence others. To do that, you need a lot of external conditions. If the reality can’t meet those conditions, you get into trouble, which few can share with you.” He’s right, of course.

I was sorry to leave Nanjing when I did, and miss my students and friends there keenly. Their great warmth and playful curiosity, their eagerness to show me about and explain China to me were gifts that I treasure and miss. But e-mail is a great facilitator and correspondence is lively. Several students have written to tell me how “knowledgeable and calm,” “kind and funny” Professor Mayers is and that his classes have given them important new understanding and insight into American foreign policy. I can’t wait to see him when he comes home—to compare notes and to reminisce.

UROP becomes a reality

Earlier this academic year Sharon Prado, Director of the newly established Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program (UROP) spoke at a department meeting on the services offered by the program, a university-wide effort to connect faculty research interests with undergraduates who want to participate in research projects, whether for academic credit, for a stipend, or on a volunteer basis. The UROP office serves as a clearinghouse for research opportunities, publicizing and promoting faculty interests and projects and providing a vehicle for students to identify projects, prepare proposals, and ultimately disseminate their research findings. UROP conducts much of its business through its Web site (www.bu.edu/UROP), where faculty members may post a research opportunity and students may browse through research possibilities.

The director’s presentation sparked keen interest from department faculty members, and Professor Jill Lepore pursued this interest to the point of gaining funding for a summer project. Danielle Lightburn, a double major in history and French language and literature, describes the department’s first UROP endeavor:

“Over the summer, I will be working with Prof. Lepore as a research assistant for her ‘Native Tongues’ book. As a part of this project, I will also be writing my own original research paper. My tentative working topic right now deals with the critical reception of Noah Webster’s 1828 dictionary. The grant, a $2,500 Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program Summer Stipend, covers 22.5 hours of research a week for 10 weeks. Any student assisting a faculty member with a research project is eligible to apply for different types of UROP funding. Faculty members in all departments looking for student research assistants, paid or unpaid, can post listings on the UROP Web page.”
Professor William Keylor will spend the summer working on a book-length manuscript tentatively entitled "The History of International Relations since 1945," which was commissioned by Oxford University Press for publication in 2000. He will also lecture on a tour sponsored by the Smithsonian Institution to France in July. When not glued to the word processor or declaiming in France, he will be organizing trips of interested faculty colleagues to Fenway Park, where discussions about possible faculty searches for the 1998-99 academic year will be conducted.

Professor Fred Leventhal writes: "In late June I will be going to London as usual to do research, attend an editorial board meeting of Twentieth Century British History, chair a session at one conference, and deliver a paper at another. At the end of July I will be continuing on to Harrogate in Yorkshire, where I will be serving as the faculty guide for a Boston University Alumni Tour. During most of August I will be enjoying what is left of the summer at our house in Dublin, N.H., while finishing an article for a collection that I am co-editing."

Professor Jill Lepore will be traveling to New York, Philadelphia, D.C., Tulsa, Chicago, and London this summer, conducting archival research for her new project, "Native Tongues."

"After waiting fifteen years," Professor Robert Schulmann writes, "I will finally be allowed to examine the Nachlass of Michele Besso, Einstein's closest friend and scientific adlatus. The Besso papers are in a bank vault in Geneva, and I hope to be able to convince Guil-laume de Syon, a sometime local contact, to accompany me."

Professor Thomas Glick will attend a milling workshop at the Hanford Mills Museum in East Meredith, N.Y., on May 16-17 and lead an expedition to visit colonial mills in Quebec at the end of August. In addition, he will again teach his course "Darwin, Freud, and Einstein" at Harvard Summer School.

Professor Regina Blaszczyk will spend the summer putting the final touches on her book, "Imagining Consumers," for Johns Hopkins University Press. Lest moss grow underfoot, she will begin work on her next project, "The Color Revolution."

Of her plans, Professor Merle Goldman writes: "In early June I will go to Prague to speak at the Oriental Institute, a famous center for the study of Chinese civilization before the Communist period, on the Chinese view of citizenship in the twentieth century. In late June I will attend a conference, sponsored by the Confucian Society, in Beijing on 'The Confucian Tradition and the Issue of Human Rights.' I plan to spend the rest of the summer working on my new book, 'From Comrade to Citizen in the People's Republic.'"

"Summer? Oh yes, summer, the solstice, and all that," replied Professor Bruce Schulman to the editor's repeated queries about his summer plans. Schulman claims to have none, other than to present himself at 226 Bay State Road as usual. After "clearing out the wreckage from 1997-98," he will complete as many as he can of the five remaining chapters of his book on American public life in the 1970s and 1980s "before the first leaves fall and the Red Sox are eliminated from the pennant race."

Between May 15 and July 1 Professor Richard Landes will be working with 36 interns on various aspects of the Center for Millennial Studies' archives and Web site and writing his book, "While God Tarried." In July he will travel to Tokyo, Australia (where he will deliver a paper on the year 2000 at a conference on millennialism), Israel, Rome, and England (delivering a paper on the First Crusade at the Leeds international medieval conference). Then in mid-August he will attend a conference on heresy in Carcassonne, France.

Professor James McCann will attend commencement and then travel to Ethiopia. His plans include renegotiation of Boston University's linkage agreement with Addis Ababa University and discussions on library exchanges of Ph.D. and M.A. theses. He will also begin work on his new book project, "Maize and Grace: A History of Corn in the Old World," by meeting with officials of President Jimmy Carter's project Global 2000 now working in Ethiopia. McCann then expects to conduct research among farmers and maize breeders to learn about how, when, and why farmers have responded to the introduction of this New World crop and what changes it has wrought.

Professor Clifford Backman writes: "I'll be in Boston throughout the summer, except for a brief trip to California for a family wedding in June. Then I'll spend the next three months finishing my new book on the medieval Mediterranean (the publisher, Oxford, has promised not to summon the Inquisition until 1 September) and putting the
finishing touches on two articles—one on Arnau de Vilanova's Revelations commentary and a longer piece on ethnic strife in Catalan Sicily. If all goes according to plan (which it won't, of course), I'll finish these things just about the time when my wife finishes her dissertation (English Lit., Brown University)—and then we'll celebrate with a trip to visit friends in Paris, Limoges, and Bordeaux."

Professor James Johnson reports: "Lydia and I will return to Venice for the summer, where I'll resume last year's research in its vast archives on the city's long history of carnival."

Professor Nina Silber writes: "Despite rumors that I may be lounging about aimlessly, I anticipate a fairly busy summer. Mostly, I will be focusing on my somewhat revised research project—a study of women and politics in the Civil War North. In addition, a couple of family excursions are planned to southern California/Mexico in July and to Maine in August. Finally, when I have some time, I fully intend to lounge about aimlessly."

And from Professor Dietrich Orlov: "I will be returning to work on a manuscript on relations between the Nazis and Dutch and French fascists (I had put this manuscript aside some years ago in order to work on the post-war European socialists). To that end I will be spending most of the summer in Germany and Austria, although, to make up for the absolutely miserable weather in Austria last year, we will be taking a two-week holiday in Mallorca as well. And oh yes, the fascinating task of preparing an index for the fourth edition of A History of Modern Germany."

From Professor Norman Bennett (about to retire): "A couple of weeks in Portugal in May, then finishing cleaning out the accumulation of 37 years worth of junk from my office, then to finishing my contribution to a planned five-volume history of the Douro region of Portugal, and to other port-related topics. Research on all aspects of wine and its consumption will be a daily task."

Graduate student Doug Kierdorf will be avidly following the fortunes of his rotisserie baseball team this summer. He will also prepare for his orals and will, in July, travel to London and Valencia, where he will be "living the good life and posing as a scholar."

See SUMMER PLANS, page 15

---

Graduate admissions process for September 1998 nearly complete

The deadline for applications to the master's and doctoral programs of the department was April 1; 121 applications were received in the period since the beginning of January—a return to the over-100 numbers interrupted last year for the first time since 1989. The chart above displays the fluctuations in applications in the years since 1980. For most years the proportion of admissions has remained fairly steady at one-half to one-third of applications. Due principally to the relatively small amount of financial aid available for incoming students, the number of students enrolling has continued to be small (with the exception of the notable 1985 class, which included 23 students). As of late April, nine students had accepted an offer of admission for fall 1998, including two with University Fellowships and one with a Martin Luther King Scholarship.

Professor Fred Leventhal is Director of Graduate Studies; other members of the admissions committee were Professors Jill Lepore and James McCann and graduate student Stacy Stein.
...as complicated and controversial a character as ever sat in the White House

DALLEK (cont. from page 1)

Johnson was an actor, a role player who in turn could be curtly and crude, gentle and overbearing, magnanimous and vindictive. There was no trusting anything he said or did on a given day, recall those in constant attendance at his White House. Posturing was a device for extracting information and influencing political friends and foes.

The events described in my first volume about Johnson’s rise to prominence as a congressional secretary, National Youth Administration director, congressman, and Senate Majority Leader are a prelude to understanding his more consequential actions as President.

There is no question but that LBJ wished to be the greatest presidential reformer in the country’s history. In his first State of the Union message in January 1964, he asked Congress to do “more for civil rights than the last hundred sessions combined,” and “to build more homes, more schools, more libraries, and more hospitals than any single session of Congress in the history of the Republic.”

The war on poverty and the Great Society flowed from Johnson’s impulse to transform the nation’s domestic life. But we have been left with numerous questions as to how Johnson intended to reach “the promised land,” as he called it. The many laws passed in 1964 and 1965 were works in progress, not finished acts of calculation defining LBJ’s welfare state. Thirty years later, the opening of presidential records gives us insights into Johnson’s intentions that we hadn’t fully understood before.

Beginning in 1965, the Vietnam War slowed and sidetracked LBJ from implementing and adding to the domestic changes of his first two years in office. Whatever his public rhetoric about having both guns and butter, the war decisively shifted his focus and energies from altering America to shaping events overseas.

Vietnam is a particular conundrum. From the start, Johnson knew that the war was a potential disaster for the country and his administration. He was far more misguided by the conflict and much less certain about how to proceed than we have previously thought. And yet, he pursued the conflict with a determination that defies good sense. The sources of Johnson’s commitment to fighting the war are among the principal questions I address in this book.

The 1968 election is another part of the story that yields to greater understanding than we have had—about both Johnson’s motives and actions, which he obscured during the campaign.

Most of all, though, this is a biography about a brilliant, highly effective, but deeply troubled man. At times, Johnson came frighteningly close to clinical paranoia. His presidency raises questions about executive incapacity that can neither be ignored nor easily addressed.

For all my research effort, the book is hardly the last word on so important a twentieth-century President. The release in coming years of some 6,600 taped conversations will be an inducement to future biographers to recount Johnson’s presidential career. As with the approximately 3,700 tape recordings of the LBJ presidential library has already made available, I expect that the unprocessed materials will add rich depth to the story rather than fundamentally alter it. Nevertheless, I hope that this story will lay the groundwork for others in trying to understand and measure as complicated and controversial a character as ever sat in the White House.

FOX (cont. from page 2)

by many on the left, including many professors. Not only did the critics observe the failures of academics to abide by the positivist, “objectivist” ideal, but they also questioned the ideal itself. No scholarship, they argued, was disinterested, least of all the prevailing wisdom, much of which thinly disguised a liberal ideology serving powerful interests beneath a veneer of disinterestedness. Since every perspective was interesting, the argument went, every scholarly work should explicitly embrace its own position and expose those of others.

Yet few of these critics were relativists. They considered their own values, whether grounded in the truths of Christian revelation or Marxist history, superior to all others. Such critics assailed the fact-value distinction by raising their own values to the status of objective, disinterested, “foundational” fact—an approach that remains characteristic of conservative critics of the academy. Ideological unmasking and the “hermeneutics of suspicion,” of both the right- and left-wing varieties, were applied to others but not to one’s own position.

In the past two decades we have witnessed the crumbling in some quarters of this campaign to have one’s cake and eat it too. In our own time, under the influence of a postmodern sensibility and a declining faith in social progress and shared civic commitment, scholars have turned more and more to the view that all knowledge—including their own—is perspectival and that since each perspective is a product of discrete historical forces and particular interests, no perspective can ultimately be deemed superior to any other. The new catchwords are “localism,” “particularity,” “situatedness,” “positionality,” whereas “objectivity,” “universalism,” and “cosmopolitanism” draw a yawn at best and more typically elicit a look of amazed condescension, as if to say “right-minded thinkers gave those up years ago.” If earlier left- and right-wing critics questioned the value-neutrality of liberal academics while fashioning their own values into facts, the current
critical tendency, particularly in the humanities, is to reduce all facts to incommensurable and competing values, and consequently to diminish moral deliberation to little more than a struggle for power. Ironically, such postmodernism has brought us full circle to renewed skepticism about the capacity of scholarly inquiry to address ethical questions, a skepticism as thoroughgoing as that of earlier positivists.

Some scholars, however, have sought to recast moral inquiry by sustaining the logical distinction between facts and values while refusing to banish values from scholarship. These scholars are unhappy with the fact-value split that still holds sway in American social science and with the erasure of the distinction between them that reigns in many humanities disciplines. They aim not to abandon the logical differentiation between facts and values nor to reduce one to the other but rather to foster the traffic between facts and values and hence between scholarly inquiry and moral judgment. Often calling on the forgotten legacy of pragmatists such as Charles Peirce, William James, and John Dewey, they have followed Dewey in abandoning the “quest for certainty” while resisting wholesale skepticism. And they have affirmed the fallible yet still “warranted” assertions that might provide a link between inquiry and moral deliberation. Fruitful inquiry, such scholars argue, is attained to the moral dimension in all inquiry, and astute moral judgment is alert to the estimate of causes and consequences and to the appreciation of the fabric of lived experience that only inquiry can provide. Inquiry cannot free itself of values, and moral judgment without inquiry is impoverished. Not only does the moral life have nothing to fear from scholarly inquiry and scholarly inquiry nothing to fear from the moral life, but both are the richer for their marriage.

This latter view is gaining ground in American scholarship. Amidst the battles over postmodernism in colleges and universities and the struggles over a more general crisis of values in the wider public realm, scholarly work has emerged that places itself between or, better yet, beyond claims to moral certainty on the one hand and positivist and postmodernist moral skepticism on the other. Although we are both historians, we have done enough piecemeal reading across the artificial boundaries that separate one scholarly community from another to identify scholars in other disciplines who have neither exiled moral concerns from their scholarship, nor treated every exercise of the moral imagination as a power play.

Longstanding though this interest was for us, it took on particular intensity after the untimely death in early 1994 of our friend Christopher Lasch. His writing was exemplary of the sort of moral inquiry we had in mind. So with a friend equally bereft by Lasch’s death, Jean Bethke Elshtain, we gladly accepted the generous invitation of the Woodrow Wilson Center of the Smithsonian Institution to put together a conference that would assess the scope and character of moral inquiry in contemporary American scholarship. The essays in this volume are the product of that conference which took place in May 1995.

News of department searches

Unfortunately there is, as of late April, no definite conclusion to the department’s two faculty searches to report.

In the Middle East search the faculty recommended the appointment of Abdelmajid Hannoun, a specialist in North African history who received his Ph.D. from Princeton (and an earlier doctorate from the Sorbonne). The administration has not yet made a final decision on this recommendation.

In the Latin American search the Institute for the Study of Economic Culture and the department put forward Mariano Plotkin as their choice for the position. If this recommendation is approved, Plotkin will teach two courses in Latin American history each year in the History Department and spend the rest of his time in research at the Institute.

Yet another possible appointment surfaced in mid-April: The ongoing search for a director of the Afro-American Studies Program produced a candidate who is a historian. But detailed news of that possibility will have to wait until the September issue of the newsletter.

If and when these appointments are approved, the instructors’ classes will be added to the class schedule, and the information will be posted on the departmental Web site.
Professor Keylor's address was "Waging the War of Words: The Promotion of American Interests and Ideals Abroad During the Cold War." His article, "La propagande comme instrument de la puissance américaine dans les premières années de la guerre froide," will appear in the summer issue of the French journal Relations Internationales.

Professor Fred Leventhal lectured at the University of Toronto on May 1 on "Public Face and Public Space: The Projection of Britain in America Before the Second World War." He also served as an External Examiner for a Ph.D. dissertation at the University of Toronto.

Professor Jill Lepore delivered a series of talks about her new book in April, including one at the Cambridge Forum which will be aired on National Public Radio affiliate stations. In May she will deliver the keynote address at a conference on historical records, "Advocating History," at the John F. Kennedy Library in Boston....Along with Professor Nina Silber she serves on a committee to select the student speaker at commencement this year.


In April Professor Merle Goldman participated in a China briefing for members of Congress under the auspices of the Aspen Institute. Seven China scholars briefed ten Democratic and ten Republican Senators and Representatives for four days on the island of Lana'i in Hawaii. "In this isolated spot without the media and their staff around," she reports, "these members of Congress from all over the U.S. were open and engaged in spirited discussions on Chinese history, politics, economics, and foreign relations. They displayed far more intelligence, tolerance, and curiosity than is seen in their partisan debates and media appearances. The encounter renewed my faith in our legislative system, a faith which had faltered in recent months."

Professor James McCann is the project leader for a new Ford Foundation grant, "Africa's Urban Process," just awarded to the African Studies Center. The Ford Foundation solicited nineteen proposals from major research universities around the country and made a total of nine awards. Boston University's award is for $110,000 over two years. The project focuses on the social sciences, including history, but also incorporates the humanities and public health research. The grant provides for program support and a visiting scholar in addition to funding for graduate student pre-dissertation and faculty research travel awards.

Gregory O'Malley wins awards

Undergraduate history concentrator Greg O'Malley has won a Humanities Foundation Scholarship as well as a Harold C. Case Scholarship for 1998-99 (the Case recognizes "scholarly accomplishment and potential, as well as extracurricular activities which contribute to the University").

Before enrolling in BU, Greg was a successful rock musician and athlete, but his primary focus now is academics. He is particularly intrigued by issues relating to American racial and cultural diversity, a topic he plans to investigate in more detail next year in a senior distinction project dealing with a slave revolt in colonial New York City.
Gerald Ward named to Dibner Fellowship

The Massachusetts Institute of Technology’s Dibner Institute for the History of Science and Technology has named graduate student Gerald Ward a Dibner Institute Graduate Fellow for the academic year 1998-99. The award, which may be extended for an additional year, provides a substantial stipend and includes tuition remission at Boston University for the term of the award. The fellowship is intended, the award letter states, to “permit you the time and freedom to complete your dissertation,” with the additional hope that “residence at the Dibner Institute itself will bring you the stimulation that comes from sharing the work and opinions of accomplished colleagues in your field.”

Gerald is researching Sir Francis Bacon’s involvement with trading companies and British plans for North American colonization and commerce.

Stacy Stein winner of Teaching Fellow award

Department faculty members have chosen Stacy Stein as the winner of the 1998 Graduate School Teaching Fellow Award. Stacy received her M.A. from Boston University in 1992 and re-entered the program this past September as a doctoral student. During the 1997-98 academic year he was a Teaching Fellow in the two halves of the Western Civilization survey course (the lecturer in the first semester was Gary Miller, and in the second, Thomas Glick). The department has selected Stacy as a TF for 1998-99 as well, with the same assignment.

Stacy will be honored at a reception held for all departmental winners in the Graduate School. The prize consists of a $100 gift certificate to the Barnes & Noble Bookstore, a gift the Graduate School intends to emphasize the connection between learning and the important work performed by TFs.

Timothy Walker selected for Humanities Scholarship

The BU Humanities Foundation has announced Timothy Walker as a winner of a Humanities Scholarship for 1998-99. Tim is engaged in writing a dissertation with the working title “Carrancideiros, Médicos e Inquisição: The Persecution of Popular Healers in Portugal during the Age of Enlightenment.” He recently completed several years of research on the topic in Portugal supported by grants from the Fulbright Program and the Portuguese Instituto Camões. His thesis will deal with the increase of Inquisition cases against popular healers and the systematic oppression that followed at a time when university-trained physicians were entering the paid ranks of the Inquisition. Tim will argue that this persecution reveals a conflict between learned culture and popular culture in eighteenth-century Portugal.
Merle Goldman updates noted book on China's history

Belknap Press of Harvard University Press has just published *China: A New History*. The book is a new edition of the work (described as the standard reference and textbook on China) by the late John King Fairbank, who was Francis Lee Higginson Professor of History and director of the East Asian Research Center at Harvard. Professor Goldman has brought the book up to date with a chapter on events in the post-Mao period and a new preface and epilogue. She provides an account of the wide array of changes—social, economic, cultural, and political—that have taken place in China over the past two decades.

One scholar says of Goldman's contribution to the the work: "Illuminating comparisons are drawn between the Deng Xiaoping and earlier eras. Although not soft-pedaling the insistently authoritarian character of China's leadership in the political realm, Goldman takes due note of the impressive gains in personal freedom that marked the Deng years. A compelling history. Authoritative, cogent, and skillful."

SUMMER PLANS (cont. from page 10)

Department administrator James Dutton plans his usual fresh-vegetable tour of Virginia's Shenandoah Valley in August. Although his parents have had health problems this past year and, for the first time, probably won't plant a full garden, he is promised tomatoes in abundance (his demands—at least in August—are simple). As far as department business goes, the amount of traffic the Web site is generating has prompted him to undertake an update of the faculty information available there. He admits that he will feel at loose ends this summer without having several tenure dossiers to assemble.

Department secretary Al Sargis writes: "Possible destinations include Sicily, Martinique, Mexico, Cuba, California, Pennsylvania, Maryland—or maybe none of the above. It all depends on financial resources, which right now look like slim pickings this year—something that makes day trips to New Bedford an affordable possibility! But minus the 2-3 weeks I'm gone to wherever, I hope to see some of your happy Summer Term faces around the department. Viva El Niño."

Office assistant Rebecca McIntyre (who is completing her second year with the department) writes: "The highlights of my summer will include the Bread and Puppet Theater Festival in Glover, Vt., along with getting a furry dog from an animal shelter, while the lowlights involve work and studying for the GRE."

Our other office assistant, Tim Sullivan, who began with the department last fall, hopes to work and also serve as an intern for a small magazine in New York City (though he has secured neither position yet). In the fall semester he will be studying Spanish literature at the BU program in Madrid. He hopes to return to work in the department in January 1999.
delivered a charming and insightful talk on his favorite subject entitled “Education Defective: Abraham Lincoln’s Preparation for Greatness.” The first part of the title refers to both how Lincoln labeled the schooling he received in the frontier west and what encouraged Donald to consider the relationship between Lincoln’s education, what he said about his education, and his statesmanship. Donald posed a problem: “Why, if Lincoln went to such terrible schools, did he emerge as such a remarkably skillful man who led the country so well?”

Governmentally funded common schools were only an idea in the frontier America of the early nineteenth century. In Kentucky and Indiana Lincoln attended proprietary schools where a teacher, qualified by the ability to read, write, and reckon to the “rule of three,” would take contributions and begin with split-log benches and floors, papered windows, and a fireplace. Donald called these “blab schools” because, without chalkboards or textbooks, the teacher would read from a book and have the class recite back what it had heard. The young Lincoln attended such schools sporadically, but acquired about the same total classroom hours as his average peer.

The old myth about Abe Lincoln reading diligently by candlelight before and after his chores seems to have been no yarn. He read the Bible, Pilgrim’s Progress, Noah Webster’s spelling book, Aesop’s Fables, a grammar by Kirkland, mathematics books, and Euclid’s geometry. The Aesopian moral—“a kingdom divided against itself cannot stand”—became politically cogent in 1858, and Noah Webster’s explication of humility’s role in social relations was not forgotten by a politician who called himself “humble” as early as 1832.

Lincoln exploited his paltry education to present himself as a simple, industrious, self-made man to a southern Illinois electorate suspicious of a candidate they perceived as representing wealth, pride, and aristocratic connections. More than political conniving, though, Lincoln’s denigration of his schooling pointed to an innate dissatisfaction with his upbringing. In the social circles of Springfield and the stuffy chambers of the House of Representatives, Lincoln must have suffered an acute awareness of his relative lack of polish. Nevertheless, his claim to being an autodidact was not a political fabrication: Lincoln taught himself trigonometry to become certified as a land surveyor, learned enough law to practice successfully, and “exercised” his mental muscle enough to, as Donald put it, tie Stephen Douglas “in knots.”

In his 1852 eulogy of Henry Clay, whom he admired, Lincoln expressed both one of his grounds of admiration and his growing self-acceptance. Noting what Clay added to his own patchy education, Lincoln drew a lesson: “His lack of a more perfect early education... teaches that in this country one can scarcely be so poorly brought up but that he can get through this world respectably.” By 1860, even against the flashy erudition of Charles Sumner and Salmon P. Chase, Lincoln exhibited peace with himself and realized that his education, backwoods though it was, had prepared him for greatness.