Preparing Individuals for Public Life: Facing the Challenge

Guoping Zhao
Oklahoma State University

INTRODUCTION

This paper reflects on the challenges facing philosophy and education at a time when the survival of democracy depends on our ability to engage with people across social and political divides as democratic citizens and encourages us to consider how we prepare individuals for public life in education. Starting with an observation of the public life in the US from a "citizen-scholar" perspective with a foot in "two places" across cultures, I draw on historian Tony Judt's idea of "the burden of responsibility" as "foreigners" in an increasingly polarized and partisan world.[1] As someone who witnessed the Tiananmen Square Massacre and escaped the Chinese regime to pursue political liberty and academic freedom in the US, I have observed uncanny parallels between the techniques and practices used to restrict liberty and freedom in China and those used to pursue social justice in the US. While recognizing the essential difference in their origins and purposes, as one initiated at the top for political control and the other motivated by justice and inclusion, I nevertheless cannot ignore or dismiss the uncanny parallels in techniques and strategies. Reflecting on the source of and justification for the techniques, I ponder whether the techniques and practices will eventually compromise the purpose they serve. Acknowledging that academia is a central part of the struggle, both subject to and the perpetrator of the practice, I suggest that many of the ideas and theses that permeate public discourse need to be examined and rigorously debated by philosophers, and that educational philosophers should contribute to the debate through their particular position in education. I further suggest that the distinctive nature of philosophical inquiry, which teaches the crucial life skill of free and critical thinking, can help change the trajectory of how we engage with social and political differences in this polarized world.

THE UNCANNY PARALLELS

We live in unprecedented times. The devastating COVID-19 pandemic,

PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION | Winston Thompson, editor

the unsettling developments in Hong Kong, Taiwan, and the South China Sea, the recent US-China confrontation such as the world has not seen in the last 70 years, and the racial tension and BLM movement in the US and worldwide…all challenge us to understand our profoundly changed world and to respond to it in a way that strengthens us as a civic, democratic society. The ways in which the Chinese government managed the COVID crisis at the very beginning and its use of brutal force to curtail the rights and freedoms of Hong Kong people seem to be a wake-up call to remind the world that China does not represent just an economic rival, but a totalitarian regime that is a threat to the freedom of its own people and the world. With the seemingly united front of government, business, and academics, the general US populace all seem to be on the same page—that the Chinese communist system portrays the opposite of liberty and justice and is against everything we hold dear in democracy. The confrontation is one between democracy and a totalitarian regime, freedom of thought and control of the mind, and the rule of law and the rule of man. In the context of growing international confrontation, within the US, the powerful Black Lives Matter movement has arisen as a reaction to the tragic death of George Floyd. Protests calling for racial justice and greater equity and inclusion for all have spread across the US and all over the world.

As someone who grew up in China but has lived in the US for decades, I have dedicated much of my time to the collective effort for diversity, equality, and justice in this country. However, at this time of cross-movements, I cannot help but notice uncanny parallels between some of the all-too-familiar techniques and strategies used in China for political control and the techniques and practices used in the social justice movements. As a philosopher, and a philosopher of education, I am particularly alarmed by the emerging signs of techniques specifically targeting dissenting minds and speeches, even though they are often used with good intentions and noble purposes. An atmosphere of intolerance to opposing views seems more and more pervasive, and scholars find it increasingly difficult to engage in open, honest conversations. Similar to what happened in China, all the measures of control and suppression are justified on allegedly higher moral grounds, in the name of "the people," or in

the name of justice.

Does a parallel really exist between the vastly different political environments? The day I was asking myself this question, I received a news report that a Chinese professor at a university was reported by volunteer informers and was fired by her university for making "inappropriate" comments about the government's handling of the outbreak of the pandemic, comments that do not align with the government-sanctioned narrative intended to produce "positive energy" in society. On the exact same day, a call was made to fire a University of Chicago professor because he questioned the logic and effectiveness of "defunding the police" for the protection of minority groups.[2]

Unfortunately, the parallels have also been noticed by other Western and Chinese American scholars in the US. David Harsanyi used "Welcome to America's Cultural Revolution" as the title of his recent *National Review* post to describe the perceived parallels between what is happening here and what happened during the Chinese cultural revolution, a communist cultural movement of the 60's and 70's that has destroyed much of the country's remaining cultural heritage as well as the social order. "We're in the dawn of a high-tech, bloodless Cultural Revolution; one that relies on intimidation, public shaming, and economic ruin to dictate what words and ideas are permissible in the public square," Harsanyi notes.[3] "Words are violence" has become the guiding policy of major newspapers such as the *Philadelphia Inquirer* and the *New York Times*.[4] He points out that while the *Times*' editors would not hesitate to run "fabulist histories or odes to Communist tyrannies," they do not push back against the idea that "engaging in debate [is an] act of violence."[5] You must also not remain silent, however, as "silence is violence" as well. In this environment, we are all cornered because "to speak out in the wrong way is violence. Not to speak out is violence. Not to speak out in the way progressives dictate is violence," and since nobody wants to be "accused of harboring counterrevolutionary sympathies," we all have to appear to dedicate ourselves to the political orthodoxy.[6]

This extremely high expectation, on the alleged high moral ground of protecting and supporting vulnerable minorities, has left no room for dissent,

nor room for simple questioning and examination of the validity of underlying assumptions. "Virtually anyone in the public square who doesn't conform (save those who work for conservative political journals, perhaps) risks being humiliated and ruined."[7] Public shaming and ostracism are major techniques to enforce conformity. Harsanyi notes that there have been "struggle sessions" and group humiliations when the "little generals" of social media, just like the "little red guards" in the Chinese cultural revolution, ferret out suspicious characters "and drag them in front of the digital tribunal."[8] For example, Saints quarterback Drew Brees has offered repeated "public self-flagellation" for saying the words: "I will never agree with anybody disrespecting the flag of the United States of America or our country."[9] Anyone who lived through the Chinese "cultural revolution" can feel a "déjà vu"—how Chinese intellectuals were forced to claim allegiance to the party line for fear of being accused of harboring counterrevolutionary thoughts or ideas.

Besides public shaming, expelling people from jobs and positions and out of basic economic and social safety nets is another tool often used in the Chinese cultural revolution and in contemporary China. Harsanyi lists several public figures who have been fired for saying the wrong thing or expressing a slightly different thought: "Sacramento Kings play-by-play announcer Grant Napear, who's been calling games since 1988, was forced to resign after saying the words 'all lives matter,'" and without his public apology, Brees was unlikely to be able to continue to work with teammates "who are offended." Calling for swift and severe retribution in response to perceived transgressions of speech and thought apparently is more common in the current environment, and when it has happened, no friends or co-workers have risen to the accused one's defense: "No, they participate in the ritual shaming along with everyone else," says Harsanyi.[10]

Harsanyi's detailed description of the parallels is stunning, yet he is not alone. In July 2020, the VOA (Voice of America) station invited several Chinese American scholars and public intellectuals to comment on the similarities between the street protests in China then and in America now; they confirmed the

parallel.[11] The Chinese scholars noted how often volunteer informers reported "violations" to the government, which then led to public humiliation, struggle sessions, and expulsion from job positions both during the cultural revolution era and now under the rule of Xi Jinping. They also pointed out how tearing down statues, burning books, and redefining history were other major techniques in the Chinese cultural revolution to erase all that was deemed unfit for the new political and moral standards. In the US context, we also see the many symbols of American history becoming the targets of dismantlement. "What started as another iteration of perennial and often reasonable calls to dismantle statues of Confederate leaders has metastasized into loud denunciations of American icons such as Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln."[12]

What is different between the two situations, however, is that in China, the tactics were pursued with the backing of the full force of a very punitive regime, thereby not only livelihoods were threatened, but also lives were destroyed in large numbers. In the US, all the "call-outs" and protests were initiated and carried out by the public with little government interference, and so even job losses as a result of an orchestrated campaign are rare. This may mark the essential difference between these two fundamentally different political systems.

Nevertheless, the attempt to distort academic and public discourse about the issues at stake by chilling out and de-legitimatizing views that dissent from a preferred narrative is the same, and the purpose is to strengthen a certain faction of "the left" in academia and silence unwelcome voices that present nuanced disagreements.[13] The increasing restriction of liberty and forced conformity in public life has caused great concern among scholars and writers. On July 7, 2020, an open letter signed by more than 150 writers was published in *Harper's Magazine*. "Our cultural institutions are facing a moment of trial," states "A Letter on Justice and Open Debate."[14] The needed demand for racial and social justice "has also intensified a new set of moral attitudes and political commitments that tend to weaken our norms of open debate and toleration of differences in favor of ideological conformity."[15] Noam Chomsky, a longtime critic of American capitalism, signed the letter. According to the writers, the free exchange of information and ideas, which is "the lifeblood of a liberal

DOI: 10.47925/77.3.125

society," is daily becoming "more constricted."[16]

It is puzzling that, across the radically different political systems, there are such parallels in techniques and practices. Harsanyi suggests that the intolerance and lack of free discussion of ideas come from decades of the coddling of American minds: they are the results of "a generation of coddled and brittle college students."[17] An opinion piece in the *New York Times*, however, suggests that the problem "comes from the left: from liberal elites who, when tested, lack[ed] the courage of their liberal convictions; from so-called progressives whose core convictions were never liberal to begin with."[18] Sandra Dzenis and Filip Nobre Faria trace the idea of "political correctness" to the "historical forces [of] Marxism and Maoism."[19] Aiming at "preventing social discrimination by curtailing offensive speech and behaviour towards underprivileged groups of individuals," "political correctness" now "widely represents the advocacy of censorship that aims at protecting vulnerable groups."[20] Some also point out that while the BLM movement is home to "an inspirational sentiment," it is also partly rooted in a Marxist ideology; thus the parallels in techniques and practices between the movement and the Chinese communist regime seem to be anticipated.[21]

While their theoretical origins may overlap and the BLM and other social justice movements may share some of the Marxist ideological roots, Marxism itself does not inevitably lead to intolerance or deprivation of liberty. In fact, Marxism originated out of humanistic concerns for the working class and has the emancipation of humanity as its ultimate goal; therefore, it has had long-lasting appeal to intellectuals and activists even after the known failures of all the communist regimes. Many progressives and leftists in the West associate the failures of the communist regimes with bad leaders and bad intentions and assume that if we are all good people genuinely pursuing emancipation of the oppressed, we can benefit from Marxist ideas and create a new, better social order. What is not scrutinized by its proponents is what Marxist ideas are good and beneficial and in what ways they are good and beneficial, and what ideas lead to results at variance with its original purpose. Sergiu Klainerman, a professor of mathematics at Princeton University, lived under the communist regime in

Romania and, like me, a "foreigner" with a "burden of responsibility," wrote with his colleague that "we all know how the Communist experiment turned out in Eastern Europe."[22] The Communists thought they could achieve their professed goals of eliminating inequality by sending those who resisted to prisons or labor camps or by simply killing them, but they produced none of the New Men they envisaged. "Let's spare the next three generations of Americans another such experiment."[23]

All the techniques and practices of control and unfreedom are precisely part of the reason the Marxist regimes turned into tyranny and became the source of oppression. These techniques, in Kant's terms, have no intrinsic moral worth because the actions are only the means to the alleged justifiable, hypothetical ends. Whether or not the ends, either social justice, equity, or emancipation, will be consequential is not guaranteed. In fact, ample evidence shows that freedom and liberty cannot be achieved through unfreedom and oppression. Oppression begets oppression and unfreedom begets unfreedom. Despite the inspiration of the social justice movements, some of the practices and techniques used can lead only to the opposite results and hence compromise their own social justice purpose. "What is sinister," as Orwell wrote, "is that the conscious enemies of liberty are those to whom liberty ought to mean most."[24]

But all these ideas and practices could be examined, discussed and debated, and rejected if proven faulty. After all, "In a free and healthy nation, no issue should be above criticism or debate. We once called that liberalism."[25] But the current movements do not allow such open discourse and debate within the public sphere. With the good intention of protecting and supporting vulnerable groups, only one kind of narrative is allowed. Even in academia and scholarly circles, these discussions have become taboo.

A CHANGE OF ACADEMIC CULTURE AND INTELLECTUAL TRADITION

Academia, named after Plato's school of philosophy, comprises the institutions where knowledge is developed, accumulated, and transmitted. As institutions of higher learning, academia has long ardently defended free thinking

DOI: 10.47925/77.3.125

and free speech based on the idea that "people who cannot speak freely will not be able to think clearly, and that no society can long flourish when contrarians are treated as heretics."[26] This idea, as old as Socrates, has been a powerful institutional defender guiding "universities, news media, book publishers, free-speech groups, and major philanthropies."[27]

But things have changed drastically in recent years. Diminished space for critical and independent thinking and free and open exchange of ideas and information has become commonplace in universities. Jonathan Turley suggests that "we are experiencing one of the greatest threats to free speech in our history and it is coming, not from the government, but from the public."[28] There is "a crackdown on academics and writers who criticize any aspects of the protests today."[29] People are fired for writing in opposition to protests. "Professors across the country are being targeted because they object to aspects of these protests or specific factual claims."[30] Many academics are afraid of voicing views that conflict with mainstream thinking. Journalism is increasingly merged with advocacy in academia, "where intellectual pursuit is now viewed as reactionary or dangerous."[31]

Yet recognizing that universities as major sites of struggle are often subject to political pressures through practices and techniques of (self-) censorship, they are also often the perpetrators of such censorship. Most academics in higher education consciously align themselves with mainstream or the most progressive points of view. Faculty members denounce their fellow academics for criticizing protests or social justice movements. Hiring committees accept only likeminded applicants. Uniformity of thoughts and ideas is expected, and anyone deviating from the norm is punished, as shown by the stunning case at the University of California, Berkeley.

In June 2020, an anonymous open letter sent to colleagues was reprinted in its entirety by *Zero Hedge*. The letter, allegedly written by a Berkeley professor, himself a person of color, questioned and criticized the widely accepted narratives of "racial injustice" and "institutional racism."[32] As a historian himself, the writer questioned the hypothesis that "the difficulties that the black community faces are entirely causally explained by exogenous factors in the

form of white systemic racism, white supremacy, and other forms of white discrimination" and suggested that such a hypothesis should be "vigorously challenged by historians."[33] He lamented the lack of a counter narrative and an alternative narrative to explain the difficulties faced by the Black community and the fact that BLM's problematic view of history has been "treated as an axiomatic and actionable truth without serious consideration of its profound flaws."[34] With reasoning and evidence, the author attempted a counterargument but was unwilling to reveal his name for fear of being expelled as a dissenter. At the end of the letter, the author stated that he was writing it because he wanted to "protect the practice of history. Cleo is no grovelling handmaiden to politicians and corporations. Like us, she is free."[35]

In response to this letter, however, U.C. Berkeley's history department issued a statement on their Twitter account History@UCBHistory: "We have no evidence that this letter was written by a History faculty member. We condemn this letter: it goes against our values as a department and our commitment to equity and inclusion."[36]

Without demonstrating a basic tolerance for dissenting viewpoints or welcoming a variety of historical interpretations, and without the appearance of engaging in an analysis of the merits and flaws of the counterargument, the Berkeley history department simply "condemned" the attempt. The hostility was justified on the grounds of the commitment to "equity and inclusion." What has become transparent is that the Berkeley history department has given up on its own spirit of historical inquiry in marshalling its members to a predetermined historical conclusion.

The loss of intellectual honesty when it is unpopular, when it is inconvenient, is the loss of the spirit of academia.

The question is, when you compromise your pursuit of free and independent thinking, when you allow external values to determine the outcome of your inquiry, will you be able to achieve your professed goal of "equity and inclusion"? Can the goal of "equity and inclusion" be achieved at the expense of honest and rigorous inquiry? Genuine equity and inclusion, the equity and

DOI: 10.47925/77.3.125

inclusion worth having, would, it seems, be based on a truthful assessment of situations, a careful examination of problems, and thoughtfully proposed solutions. Unfortunately, as Christian O'Brian states, "The classical tradition of Western learning since the ancient Greeks seems to have disappeared from the higher education campuses."[37] Yet,

> If every member of a given university's faculty is in alignment, the flaws in their reasoning will remain unchecked; there is no denying that every perspective should be subject to rigorous scrutiny so that only the most thoroughly considered ideas survive. If we fail to seriously re-establish the proper function of universities as being the workshop of ideas, the end result is that free speech will slowly be erased—the relic of a dead civilization.[38]

PHILOSOPHERS OF EDUCATION FOR PUBLIC LIFE

There is no denial that our public life is deteriorating, and the past years' presidency and this recent election have only exacerbated the situation. To be clear, the deterioration is not just caused by the above mentioned techniques and strategies of the often well-intentioned left, but is also the result of the "branding and banishing" practices of the conservative right that mark and condemn anything they do not like "socialist" or "communist." Conspiracy theory runs rampant in secrecy and half-uttered predictions. We are living in a world of separate realities now, and the separation is made possible only by the echo chambers, facilitated by social media, of self-circulating and self-fulfilling narratives and hypotheses. Such intense division puts our democracy and civil society at risk of utter fragmentation. To a certain degree, the deteriorated public life is also the result of a failed education to prepare individuals to engage with people across social and political divisions openly, peacefully, and respectfully. As Plato insists, education is a pervasive feature of a society. It is therefore essential that we in education, particularly in philosophy of education, do our part to change the situation.

I suggest that the first thing we should do as philosophers, just as his-

torians portraited in the anonymous open letter, is to do our duty to participate directly in social and political debate. The ideas and theses that entrench convictions and mobilize actions in public squares need to be carefully examined and rigorously debated by philosophers. In a democratic society where what people think matters, our role as philosophers is to help clarify and test uncontested assumptions and hypotheses. For example, given that the concepts of emancipation, oppression, and social justice are so central to the current social and political debate, we should participate as public intellectuals to explore what concepts of liberation and emancipation are being used, and whether there are contradictions between the concepts and claims of diversity and equity. How are rights, responsibilities, and social justice linked to each other? Vague and incoherent concepts often lead to confused beliefs and unfortunate actions.

Secondly, we should contribute to the public discourse as philosophers of education by engaging in the public discourses particularly from our situatedness in education. As educational philosophers, we are better positioned to appreciate the issues and complexities concerning social and educational disparities. Thus, when the prevalent thesis explains social and educational disparities entirely by power structures, we can provide a more balanced and more complex explanation. We can further analyze what the unintended implications are about students as individuals, how educators and students are framed ontologically and epistemologically in the thesis, what assumptions are made about learning and teaching, and whether the thesis can help mitigate the disparities. As philosophers of education, we must go beyond adopting and applying the work of canonical philosophers to education to engage current problems.

Thirdly, we need to expose and engage students in intellectually honest and rigorous inquiries in our classrooms and on campus, and model the practice of open, respectful, and peaceful dialogues in clarifying, interpreting, and analyzing concepts, assumptions, and hypotheses important for social discourse. Higher education in a liberal society is where students learn to become responsible thinkers for public life, and we have done too much in brushing away inconvenient facts, avoiding controversial perspectives, and hardening problematic but preferred narratives. We may have contributed to the problem

DOI: 10.47925/77.3.125

we are facing today. But philosophy of education courses are particularly suited to break the echo chambers by introducing a wide spectrum of perspectives and theoretical frameworks. By teaching students the ability to examine, evaluate, and judge narratives and counter narratives, interpretations and alternative interpretations, they can form their own views in a thoughtful and consistent way. Education is the process through which we become free beings, liberated from ignorance and vice, and the knowledge we acquire of right and wrong can help us instantiate a social and political order in which we can truly promote justice.

As a field of study, philosophy is where "we learn to identify, and think carefully about, our most basic ideas and theories."[39] At a time when we make and face many unwarranted assertions and allegations, philosophy teaches us to look behind what we take for granted, to "examine whether our beliefs, theories, and arguments contain hidden assumptions or gaps which might lead us to jump to unwarranted conclusions, or to hold inconsistent opinions."[40] "In studying philosophy . . . we learn to identify hidden connections and flawed reasoning, and we seek to develop our thinking and theories so that they are less prone to such errors, gaps and inconsistencies."[41] Philosophy helps develop in us the propensity to search for truth and knowledge, to carefully and reflectively inquire into issues and problems, rather than allowing prejudices, unguarded opinions, and unexamined assumptions to close off our minds to others. "Love of knowledge" has always been the motto of philosophers. Such an ability and propensity are vital to democratic public life.

I hope, at this moment more than ever, that we can bring our resources as philosophers of education to bear on the challenges we face today. I am hoping that we are able to maintain our spirit as intellectuals and philosophers and that we are still lovers of knowledge, not the "grovelling handmaiden[s] to politicians and corporations." If we still hold to the truth of the Socrates dictum that "the unexamined life is not worth living," we know that only by examining our lives "can we be led away from a state of abject ignorance towards that knowledge of the good which gives us the wisdom to live well"[42] with others.

1 Jeffrey M. Perl, "Hong Kong: Wake-Up Call," *Common Knowledge* 26, no. 2

(2020): 197–211; Tony Judt, *The Burden of Responsibility: Blum, Camus, Aron, and the French Twentieth Century* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1998).

2 Jonathan Turley, "The Destruction of Statues Comes with More Attacks on Free Speech," *The Hill,* June, 23, 2020, https://thehill.com/opinion/civil-rights/504033-the-destruction-of-statues-comes-with-more-attacks-on-free-speech.

3 David Harsanyi, "Welcome to America's Cultural Revolution," *National Review,* June 9, 2020, https://www.nationalreview.com/2020/06/welcome-to-americas-cultural-revolution/.

4 Harsanyi, "Welcome to America's Cultural Revolution."

5 Harsanyi, "Welcome to America's Cultural Revolution."

6 Harsanyi, "Welcome to America's Cultural Revolution."

7 Harsanyi, "Welcome to America's Cultural Revolution."

8 Harsanyi, "Welcome to America's Cultural Revolution."

9 Harsanyi, "Welcome to America's Cultural Revolution."

10 Harsanyi, "Welcome to America's Cultural Revolution."

11 " ", July 2, 2020, https://www.wenxuecity.com/news/2020/07/02/9624450.html.

12 Sergiu Klainerman and John Londregan, "A Modest Proposal for A Name Change," *National Review*, July 16, 2020, https://www.nationalreview.com/2020/07/cancel-culture-democrat-belongs-in-dustbin-history/.

13 I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers' insightful comments and ideas. Some of the ideas are incorporated here.

14 "A Letter on Justice and Open Debate," *Harper's Magazine*, July 7, 2020, https://harpers.org/a-letter-on-justice-and-open-debate/.

15 "A Letter on Justice and Open Debate."

16 "A Letter on Justice and Open Debate."

17 Harsanyi, "Welcome to America's Cultural Revolution."

18 Bret Stephens, "Reading Orwell for the Fourth of July: As We Celebrate Freedom, Speaking Freely is in Danger," *The New York Times,* July 3, 2020, https://www.nytimes.com/2020/07/03/opinion/orwell-fourth-of-july.html.

19 Sandra Dzenis and Filipe Nobre Faria, "Political Correctness: The Two-fold Protection of Liberalism," *Philosophia* 48, no. 1 (2020): 95–114.

DOI: 10.47925/77.3.125

20 Dzenis and Faria, "Political Correctness."
21 Harsanyi, "Welcome to America's Cultural Revolution."
22 Klainerman and Londregan, "A Modest Proposal."
23 Klainerman and Londregan, "A Modest Proposal."
24 Stephens, "Reading Orwell."
25 Harsanyi, "Welcome to America's Cultural Revolution."
26 Stephens, "Reading Orwell."
27 Stephens, "Reading Orwell."
28 Turley, "The Destruction of Statues."
29 Turley, "The Destruction of Statues."
30 Turley, "The Destruction of Statues."
31 Turley, "The Destruction of Statues."
32 Katy Grimes, "UC Berkeley History Professor's Open Letter Against BLM, Police Brutality and Cultural Orthodoxy," *California Globe,* June 14, 2020, https://californiaglobe.com/section-2/uc-berkeley-history-professors-open-letter-against-blm-police-brutality-and-cultural-orthodoxy/.
33 Grimes, "UC Berkeley History Professor's Open Letter."
34 Grimes, "UC Berkeley History Professor's Open Letter."
35 Grimes, "UC Berkeley History Professor's Open Letter."
36 Grimes, "UC Berkeley History Professor's Open Letter."
37 Christian O'Brian, "The Modern University," November 27, 2017, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bid3EfCobEM.
38 O'Brian, "The Modern University."
39 Clare Saunders, David Mossley, George MacDonald Ross, and Danielle Lamb, *Doing Philosophy: A Practical Guide for Students* (New York: Continuum, 2007), 3.
40 Saunders et al., *Doing Philosophy,* 8–9.
41 Saunders et al., *Doing Philosophy,* 9.
42 David Carr, "What Relevance Has Plato for Education Today?" *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 25, no. 1 (1991): 124.