

What Makes an Earlham? Our Values and Our Value

Douglas C. Bennett
President, Earlham

Convocation Address
January 18, 2006

I. Introduction

In *The First New Nation*, sociologist Seymour Martin Lipset said that what is distinctive about the United States of America is not just that we were the first deliberately created new nation, but that we were the first nation to be defined by our *values*.¹ While other nations are defined by their place on the planet, or by the racial or ethnic stock of their people, the United States came to define itself by its commitments to liberty, equality, opportunity and democracy. Lipset also argued that this foundation in values is what makes the United States a country of special importance to the world—a country of special value.

Without asking you to accept Lipset's proposition about the United States (and there are many who disagree with him), I'd like to advance a similar proposition about Earlham: that we are primarily constituted by our values, and that there is unusual value in Earlham because of how well we live up to these commitments.

This is what I want to talk about today: what does Earlham value? And why should others value Earlham, if we are good at serving these values?

We serve an array of values, not just one. Truth-seeking, community, diversity, respect, responsibility, peace and reconciliation, equality and justice, and stewardship of the earth, just to name a few of the more prominent ones.

We honor plural values, and often uncritically assume an easy harmony among them. It is the relationship among our values—the logic that holds them together—that I want to explore today.

Today I want to focus on three values or clusters of values:

- First, truth-seeking, learning and teaching;
- Second, community, consensus and diversity;
- And third, peace, justice, and stewardship of the earth.

This is hardly an exhaustive list, but it does include most of our core values, I think. I want to say why we value each, and how they relate to one another. I want to say a little about how these are grounded in our history and mission, and also say something about how

these make EC a distinctive and valuable institution. I have given you a handout today that includes our current Mission Statement and the text of a few other important statements of Earlham's values

II. Truth-Seeking

“The mission of Earlham College, an independent, residential college, is to provide the highest quality education in the liberal arts, including the sciences, shaped by the distinctive perspectives of the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers).”

This is the opening—and most important—sentence of our mission statement, and everything I want to say today is a kind of reflection on what this means.

An education in the liberal arts and sciences is an education in freedom. We seek, in Albert North Whitehead's words, “to give an individual all the uses of himself”—or herself. We seek to bring out all the powers and capabilities potentially at our disposal, especially those connected with reason because of how this frees human beings from being strictly tied to instinct, chance and immediacy.

We are the heirs of a many-centuries old debate about how best to provide such an education. By no means will I try to thread my way through all the issues in this debate, but rather start, simply, with the assertion that a liberal arts education is first and foremost an education in the cultivation of intellect. It is an education that establishes the primacy of reason, and accepts no boundaries and no conditions on intellectual activity.

One of the most important statements of this understanding of liberal education as ‘the cultivation of intellect’ is Robert Maynard Hutchins, *The Higher Learning in America*, a book he wrote in 1936 while he was President of the University of Chicago.² Hutchins argued with unusual clarity and force a position that had come to represent the highest and best thinking about what we seek to achieve in education.

Someone once said that “an education is what's left after you have forgotten everything you have learned” – recognizing that most of us retain only a tiny fraction of the material we encounter. Hutchins is not dismayed by this recognition, but rather argues that the ‘cultivation of intellect’ means, primarily, the development of a set of disciplined habits we call the *intellectual virtues*: demonstration from evidence, criticism, judgment, prudence, and skill in making.³

Particularly in the last century, with a recognition of the rapid expansion of knowledge, we have come to emphasize among the intellectual virtues a conscientious distrust of certainty or final conclusion; a kind of humility and openness to new truths has become a central element of our understanding of the liberal arts and sciences. The emphasis is on truth-seeking, not truth-concluding.

The college's mission statement places Earlham squarely in this broad approach of the liberal arts and sciences, but also puts a distinctive cast on our approach in saying the following:

“A basic faith of Friends is that all truth is God’s truth; thus Earlham’s education emphasizes

- pursuit of truth, wherever that pursuit leads;
- lack of coercion, letting the evidence lead that search;
- respect for the consciences of others;
- openness to new truth and therefore the willingness to search;
- veracity, rigorous integrity in dealing with the facts;
- application of what is known to improving our world.”

I want to note several things about this passage:

First, it emphasizes the primacy of intellect. It stresses the exercise of reason and the weighing of evidence. It takes intellectual activity to be the main avenue to seeking truth at Earlham. It is grounded in the cultivation of the intellectual virtues.

But second, in emphasizing that “all truth is God’s truth,” our mission statement allows that spiritual activity is a second and complementary road to truth seeking. We organize the curriculum around the disciplines and strategies of the intellect (the intellectual virtues), but we want to leave open the possibility—even support the possibility—that spiritual seeking will also lead to truth. We impose spiritual seeking on no one, and we remain open to a broad array of spiritual paths for members of our community; but we nevertheless encourage and support spiritual seeking as a complement to intellectual seeking.

I am fortunate to have Joseph Moore’s cabinet in my office. Joseph Moore was an Indiana Quaker, an Earlham graduate and subsequently a member of the Earlham faculty. In 1859 he went to Harvard to take an MA in Biology. 1859 was the year that Darwin’s *Origin of Species* was published. On his return to Earlham, Moore taught evolution, probably the first person west of the Allegheny Mountains to do so. He was recorded as a Friend’s minister. He also gathered the extraordinary collections that make up the core of our Joseph Moore Museum. Moore believed both in Darwin and in the Bible. He wasn’t sure how to reconcile Darwin and the Bible, but he never ceased thinking about that. He became President of Earlham from 1868 and served for fifteen years. He believed, as our mission statement puts it, that “all truth is God’s truth,” and for this reason I am honored to have his cabinet in my office.

All truth is God’s truth: primacy of intellect, openness to spiritual insight. A third implication of our mission statement is that emphasize truth-seeking, not truth declaring or truth insisting. Rather than insist on the inculcation of established truths, we emphasize “the willingness to search” and “openness to new truth.” This is a comfortable proposition for spiritual seeking in the manner of Friends (or Quakers), who believe that God is always prepared to reveal fresh truths to us if we will only listen carefully.

It is noteworthy, I think, that our mission statement speaks more frequently of learning than of teaching. This in no way denigrates the excellence of our teaching or our teachers, but rather a recognition that it is what students do and become that matters most. Our faculty model intellectual exploration for our students more than declaim what they

have learned. And in our emphasis on learning, we especially lift up the possibilities of discovering new truths.

A liberal arts education is grounded in a confidence that students have the capability to become critical and imaginative self-sustaining learners for the rest of their lives. In what is surely the mission statement's most memorable phrase, we say we view "education as a process of awakening the 'teacher within'." We are all learners—and all teachers.

If we believe that we should always be searching for new truths, we also have confidence that there is a truth to be found. If "all truth is God's truth," that truth may be elusive and may be extraordinarily complex, but it is also whole and definite.

A final implication of that passage in our mission statement is that we expect knowledge to have constructive purposes. We look to apply "what is known to improving our world." Knowledge is a force for good. In this assertion, we depart from Hutchins and others who have come to define, for today, the central tradition of the liberal arts and sciences.

Hutchins argues that we should pursue "knowledge for its own sake." In this he draws, especially on Cardinal Newman's *The Idea of a University*, a seminal statement of the purposes of education written by an Irish Roman Catholic in 1852. (Parenthetically I'll say that Michelle Easton's mention of Newman was the only interesting moment in her Convocation address, but her subsequent remarks made it clear she did not understand Newman.)

One thing Hutchins and Newman mean by "knowledge for its own sake" is that the pursuit of knowledge through intellect should not be constrained by any consideration. Our truth seeking should be fearless and unfettered. With this I agree. But they also take it to mean that we should not expect an education in the liberal arts and sciences to have moral purposes. With this I do not agree. I especially like the way our mission statement puts it: that we seek to apply "what is known to improving our world," and that our education "is carried on with a concern for the world in which we live and for improving human society."

We do not look to subordinate intellect or truth-seeking to any given purposes or understandings. But in gathering together, we pledge ourselves to be alert to the constructive and the positive uses to which knowledge may be put. We make consideration of these constructive possibilities a central element of what we do. *Growing into Goodness*, the title of Paul Lacey's recently published book of essays on Quaker education, captures well, I think, the hopeful expectations we bring to education—expectations that set us importantly apart from the dominant understanding of liberal education today.⁴

Before proceeding to discuss other Earlham values, I want to note an important implication of stressing the primacy of cultivating intellectual virtues, especially a disciplined distrust of certainty or final conclusions. That skepticism about final conclusions *puts a limit on any other values and commitments we might have*. We always have to be prepared to recognize that something else we are doing, or something else that we are pursuing, needs to be changed. When we turn to consider community or diversity, peace or justice, we need to

recognize that our subscription to these values needs to be subordinated to our primary commitment to truth-seeking.

III. Community and Diversity

How are our commitment and our approach to truth seeking different at Earlham than at other colleges and universities? Not at all in emphasizing the primacy of intellect. Not at all in our belief that there is a definite, even if complex and elusive truth. On the other hand, we are unusual (though not unique) in believing that intellect and spirit can complement one another in truth seeking.

We are more unusual in the ways we *organize ourselves* for truth-seeking. Our values here radiate around respect for persons, community, consensus and diversity.

We began this afternoon, as we always do, with “a moment of silence” – or, as Mary Garman reminded us at Faculty Retreat this year, what we might better call “a moment of stillness.” Of course this is a practice characteristic of Quakers: to gather in stillness, preparing ourselves to listen as best we can, and waiting on the voice of God to arise within one or another of us. As Mary also reminded us, “We are not all Quaker, we are not all Christian, we are not all people of faith, we are not all believers in God. So what is the point of beginning...convocations, and other events, with quiet?” And here’s her answer: “We are a Quaker place – in a way that is intentionally hospitable to all who come here.”

But why do we want to be hospitable to all who come here? Why does this matter? Hospitality is undoubtedly a good thing, but for Earlham it is not a good thing simply in and for itself. Rather, we value hospitality because it serves truth-seeking. We believe we can all learn from one another: learn more and learn better. We gather in stillness, we welcome one another, because we have a deep intuition that we will each gain more understanding under those conditions.

The same point is expressed in a statement we put at the beginning of our publications:

“Earlham welcomes all who come to seek for truth in a diverse community that accords respect to every individual. Each is asked to contribute to the understanding of all.”

Implicit in this is an ideal—and an expectation—of respect for each and every individual. We approach one another with recognition that each of us may have the capacity to see or understand something vital that no one else is likely to grasp.

In according one another unreserved respect we take upon ourselves an equally strong expectation that we will act with integrity. This is an expectation that we will be fully honest and straightforward, one with another, an expectation that we will be trustworthy in what we say and do. Who will hold us to these expectations? Each of us is responsible for seeing that our own conduct accords with the requirements of this community. Each of us also has a responsibility for encouraging others to fulfill the expectations of respect and

integrity. As “Principles and Practices” puts it, we strive to be a community of *mutual* support, responsibility and accountability.

These conditions—gatherings in stillness, a welcome to all, unreserved respect, an expectation of integrity, individual and collective responsibility—are all elements of what daily, casually and profoundly, we call community at Earlham.

We can and should value community, respect, integrity and responsibility for a number of reasons, but this reason is the most important for Earlham: we value them because we believe these create the best conditions for intellect and truth-seeking. The ways we organize ourselves and relate to one another are not just consistent with but are intended to be conducive to the primacy of truth-seeking.

It is possible to value and pursue truth-seeking as an isolated individual. But at Earlham we believe we do it better because we do it together. We believe that each and every one of us has a capacity to discern the truth. Because of different gifts and because of different preparation and experience we do not have this capacity equally, but we all can make contributions. As our welcome statement puts it, “each contributes to the understanding of all.”

It is through free, unfettered dialogue and discussion that “each contributes to the understanding of all.” If a liberal arts education seeks to make us free, we pursue that learning most powerfully and effectively through the exercise of freedom in discourse. As much as possible, it is the consideration of evidence and the giving and taking of reasons that sets the social framework of our community.

To the best of our abilities, we do not enforce our conclusions on one another. We believe in one truth, but each must draw his or her own conclusions.

I think our effort to put truth-seeking at the center of our community is most clearly to be seen in our adherence to governance grounded in broad consultation and consensus. In the United States, we are accustomed—almost in an unthinking way—to associate democracy with the collective exercise of freedom. But democracy at bottom involves majority rule, and majority rule can be seen straightforwardly as an exercise of power, a majority dominating a minority. Once a majority can see that it has the votes, it has little incentive to listen with care or to hear the reasons of those who disagree. In consultation and consensus, we strive to listen to all and to derive thereby the best understandings possible.

What’s the basis of this belief that we pursue truth-seeking better because we do it together, in a community grounded in respect for each and every person? It is something, I believe, that can be justified in reason—by intellect. But it is important to note that this belief is grounded in core spiritual understandings of Quakers. Quakers believe that there is that of God within each and every one of us. In gathering together under a commitment to listen with unusual respect and care for one another, we have a greater possibility of encountering truthfulness in a way that is deeper, more round and whole.

In reaching this understanding on a dual basis, I believe we can see the worth of being open to spiritual as well as intellectual seeking.

Diversity. In this context, I want to say a word about diversity, because this, too we value. And I have already touched on why.

To the search for truth and understanding, each of us brings our own background, our own talents and interests, our own experience. Within the human family, we know there is enormous and delightful variety in these. The more similar we are in gathering together for the common seeking of truth, the more impoverished we are for the journey. The more we draw on the whole of human experience and possibility, the more we are likely to see and understand together.

Asking your indulgence, I want to repeat something I said in my inauguration remarks nine years ago:

We aspire to become a crossroads community that extends an invitation and a welcome to the whole of the human family. Why? For this simple reason: we believe we will educate each individual better if our community genuinely embraces the whole of the human family. Diversity is not a goal in addition to educational excellence. It is a goal at the very center of educational excellence. We learn from each other what it means to be human, and what the possibilities are. We will learn much less if we only learn from others who closely resemble us.⁵

We aspire to diversity; we value diversity; but we do not value diversity in all things. We gather here into one community human beings from across these United States and around the world. We gather people from a wide variety of racial and ethnic backgrounds, growing up experiences, religious practices, interests and talents. We expect (and we hope) that we will not blur or extinguish all those differences. At the end of the day, we expect we will still experience (and powerfully) differences in backgrounds, practices, talents and interests. Because truth is complex, elusive and constantly new or newly understood, we also recognize that, at the end of any day, there will be disagreements among us. We hope and expect that we will engage these differences and disagreements in a spirit of civil discourse, mutual exploration and even delight.

But we also gather ourselves together with a common purpose in truth-seeking. We gather to pursue together, as best we can, an understanding of the world and an understanding of human possibilities that, however complex and elusive, we have confidence can be seen as whole and undivided. We may not all be equally comfortable with this formulation, that “all truth is God’s truth,” but I believe our commitment to truth-seeking requires that we share a commitment to seeking common truths.

IV. Peace, Justice, Stewardship

I want to say a word—a very brief word—about peace, justice and stewardship of the earth, because these, too we value. But why, and how do these relate to truth-seeking, learning and teaching; and to community, diversity and consensus.

It is easy and also accurate to say we have come to value them because Quakers value them, and this is our heritage. These are ‘testimonies’ of Friends.

But I believe this is an insubstantial reason for valuing peace, justice and stewardship of the earth. Taken in that way, we set truth-seeking to one side and try to value these as givens from our past.

It is why these are testimonies that we value them. Quakers believe (and I think Earlham believes) that knowledge has moral implications, even moral imperatives. We cannot know something and yet that feel that we remain uninterested in what we might do about it. We do not sever knowing and doing. Our knowledge inclines us to action.

I think we value them better as extensions and elaborations on the principles by which we organize this learning community for truth-seeking. Consistency inclines us to think that the ways we organize ourselves as a small, face-to-face community are ways the world should be organized across the human family. I don’t want to take the time (and it would be worth the effort on another occasion) to explore this in depth, but I believe that we value peace, justice and stewardship of the earth as values for the world for reasons largely analogous to why we value community, diversity and consensus as values for Earlham.

If truth-seeking is conducted better under conditions of community, diversity and consensus, we believe that human potential is more fully realized under conditions of peace, justice and stewardship.

I should pause and ask who is the ‘we’ who believe this. It is not a view to which all of us need to subscribe. While we do need some basic agreement among all of us on how we organize ourselves within Earlham to pursue truth-seeking, we do not need agreement among all of us about how the world should be organized.

And were we to insist upon such agreement, we would seriously compromise our commitment to truth-seeking. However easy or straightforward the extrapolation of Earlham’s community values to the whole world seems to some of us, we must remain open to the possibility that others of us will disagree.

And I think we need to acknowledge, however passionate our beliefs about the world, that there is room for a great deal of disagreement about what constitutes peace, justice or stewardship of the earth, and what best serves these goals. As a consequence, I believe we must give unusual attention—frequent hearings—to those who, in ways consistent with Friends testimonies, espouse peace, justice and stewardship of the earth. But we also must not close our ears to the reasoned arguments of those both within and outside our community, have different views.

V. Truth-seeking today

As much as we at Earlham value truth-seeking, as much as we in the academy value truth-seeking, we need to recognize that not everyone shares our commitment. The exercise of reason can be troubling. If truth-seeking is our primary value, then we must be especially alert to the objections and threats to truth-seeking.

Truth-seeking can certainly be seen as subversive. We see this with unusual clarity in the three dialogues through which Plato dramatizes the trial and death of Socrates: *Euthyphro*, *Apology* and *Crito*. Socrates stands accused of believing not in Athens' gods, but in other, false gods; and he is accused of "making the weaker argument appear the stronger." In these dialogues Plato shows that Socrates has a superior understanding of divine things, and that he is peerless in the disciplined exercise of reason. But he also shows us how infuriating Socrates can be in challenging conventional, unreflective opinions. Socrates may be right, but he is sentenced to death.⁶

The threat to truth-seeking in these Platonic dialogues comes from tradition and convention, from established and comfortable ways of thinking. Certainly that same threat is with us still. But there are two other threats today to intellectual truth-seeking that loom larger: a threat from fundamentalist religion, and a threat from claims arising from reason itself.

Fundamentalist religion. Within both Christianity and Islam there are those who believe that intellect and spirit provide complementary avenues to true understanding. Both religions have centuries of careful, sophisticated reflection on how all truth is God's truth and on how the fruits of reason and the fruits of faith can connect and deepen one another.

But within both Christianity and Islam, there are also elements today who believe that simple, uncritical readings of religious texts yield all the understandings we should ever want or need. In the views of these fundamentalists, reason yields dangerous conclusions and must be actively combated. On this understanding, truth-seeking via the intellect is not to be tolerated.

I have already spoken of Joseph Moore's confidence that Darwin's understanding of evolution could be seen as consistent with the book of Genesis. Moore faced considerable criticism and opposition, however. A colleague of Moore's attested that "the poor man was hounded to death almost."⁷ Controversy over Darwin waxed and waned over the ensuing 140 years even as scientists have amassed voluminous evidence consistent with evolution's main tenets and subjected the theory to considerable rational scrutiny. Today, proponents of "creationism" and "intelligent design," grounded in fundamentalist Christianity, continue to try to exclude the teaching of evolution from the nation's schools.

In the early 20th century, Elbert Russell, a respected and popular Professor of Religion at Earlham, urged that the Bible be read using modern methods employing reason and historical evidence. Over a decade, he drew withering criticism from some Quakers, Methodists and others who insisted on a literal reading of the Bible. Though Russell eventually left Earlham to go to Johns Hopkins, he was supported through this conflict by

students, his faculty colleagues, the President and the Board.

The Russell controversy, Tom Hamm tells us, “confirmed the direction in which Earlham was to move.”⁸ Earlham became more committed to reason and evidence, more committed to hiring faculty based on scholarly credentials, and more committed to participation in professional networks grounded in the disciplines of intellect. From the early 20th century forward, Earlham has had a primary commitment to intellectual truth-seeking.

In our times, the most horrifying fruits of fundamentalist religion have been incitements to and justifications of terrorist violence. For some fundamentalists, the requirements of faith require absolute fidelity and can tolerate no compromise. Those who have different beliefs put themselves beyond the legitimate boundaries of human possibility.

In our commitments to community and diversity, and to the constructive possibilities of dialogue, we stand squarely against this kind of fundamentalism and the door it opens to violence. But the foundation of those commitments to community, diversity and dialogue is a common commitment to truth-seeking.

If all we need in this world are correct religious belief and faithful action, and if those beliefs and actions are already available to be known by us in reading specific sacred texts in a specific, received way (no questions asked or welcomed) then there is no justification for Earlham today.

Post-modern Relativism. Another major threat to truth-seeking today arises, paradoxically, from understandings arising from reason reflecting upon itself and reflecting on the conditions of its exercise.

Without question, the human pursuit of truth can be (and often is) biased by one’s self interest. We see what we want to see, even as we tell ourselves we are seeing clearly and objectively. The pursuit of truth can also be (and regularly is) distorted by the exercise of power. History, we often note, is regularly written and re-written by the victors.

The last two centuries of reason reflecting upon itself have been especially focused on the ways in which truth-seeking can be obscured, dissembled and disguised by passions, self-interest and power. This understanding is the point of intersection among Karl Marx, Friedrich Nietzsche, Sigmund Freud and hundreds of others across a wide range of scholarly fields who have reflected on their seminal insights. None of us can consider ourselves well educated without some understanding of these distortions of passion, interest and power.

Recognizing the sources of these distortions must make us especially wary of received truths, of official declarations, of creeds, of final statements of certainty. Thus has a critical skepticism come to be one of the most important of the intellectual virtues that delineate an education in the liberal arts and sciences.

We need as a consequence recognize that in our seeking, truth will be elusive, almost impossibly complex, certainly never complete

We need a consequence be especially tender to dissenters—to those who do not see things today just as we see them. Earlham has a long history of valuing such dissent. Valuing such dissent lays upon us the obligation to immerse ourselves in the most important disagreements of our time, in recognition that what may seem a finished conclusion to us will be exposed by the dissenter as infected with distortion. A willingness to listen and a humility about our own conclusions becomes us all.

But we must not conclude that because truth is complex, elusive, and vulnerable to distortion that there is no truth to be pursued. Skepticism and criticism cannot transmute into a relativism that imagines we will have different truths one from another, you with yours and me with mine.

If we accept that kind of relativism, there is also no justification for Earlham today. We would have undercut the primary value and the primary justification for this college and indeed for every institution of higher education.

‘We must not conclude that there is no truth to be pursued.’ I would be dishonest not to bracket that statement. The commitment to truth-seeking is thorough-going. We must follow the truth wherever it leads, even to unpleasant conclusions or ones that undercut our cherished beliefs or treasured institutions. But let us also note that it would be very odd and self-defeating to declare that the most important truth we know is that there is no truth to pursue.

VI. Conclusion: Earlham’s Value

If you do a web search on “Earlham” you will find a town in Iowa, a manufacturer of wind instruments, a street in London, a mansion in Norwich, a cemetery in Indiana, and an institution of higher education right next door. Of all these Earlhams, we matter most of all.

We are the one Earlham that is defined not by place or material, but by values and commitments.

And it is our values that give us value. Our value lies in our being an institution unusually committed to truth-seeking, in seeking truth under unusually favorable circumstances, and in being unusually alert to the positive and constructive purposes of knowledge.

Earlham is an institution that subscribes, in the most important ways, to the central tenets of the liberal arts and sciences. Within the liberal arts and sciences, however, we have taken some unusual positions. We have set ourselves apart; we have made ourselves distinctive.

In these three ways, primarily:

- In recognizing the primacy of intellect in truth-seeking, we also value, as a complement, spiritual exploration. There may be more than can be known than reason alone can know.
- We do not accept a narrow view that knowledge is its own purpose. We commit ourselves to applying what is known to the improvement of the world.
- And in the unusual ways we construct community, embrace diversity, and make decisions through broad consultation and consensus, we have organized ourselves to be unusually effective in truth-seeking.

I do not think these simply make us unusual or distinctive. I do not think these are curious features of Earlham shaped by our particular place or saga. I do not think these are right for Earlham, but arguably not right for other institutions of higher education. Rather, I believe these points of distinction make us *better*. They make us a model for others, for the best that is possible in an education in the liberal arts and sciences.

In these values, taken together, lies our value to the world.

I thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today. And, particularly because of the argument I have been advancing, I would especially appreciate hearing your questions and comments, disagreements and further points of clarity.

Footnotes

¹ Seymour Martin Lipset, *The First New Nation: The United States in Historical and Comparative Perspective* (New York: Basic Books, 1963).

² Robert Maynard Hutchins, *The Higher Learning in America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936).

³ On the intellectual virtues, see, for example, Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book VI, and Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Part II, Q 57, Art 2-4. For more modern statements, see Michael DePaul et Linda Zagzebski, *Intellectual Virtue* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), and Rudolf Weingarten, *Undergraduate Education: Goals and Means*.

⁴ Paul A. Lacey, *Growing Into Goodness: Essays on Quaker Education* (Philadelphia: Pendle Hill Publications, 1998).

⁵ Douglas C. Bennett, "Earlham as a Crossroads Community," Inauguration address, Earlham College, March 1998.

⁶ Plato, *Euthyphro*, *Apology* and *Crito*.

⁷ Thomas D. Hamm, *Earlham College: A History, 1847-1997* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1997), p 68.

⁸ Thomas D. Hamm, *Earlham College*, p 113.