
“FORTY ACRES AND A MULE” AS A PEDAGOGICAL MOTIF

Kerry Burch
Northern Illinois University

INTRODUCTION

Asked what he understood by slavery, Frazier responded: “receiving by irresistible power the work of another man, and not by his consent.” Freedom he defined as, “placing us where we could reap the fruit of our own labor,” and the best way to accomplish this was, “to have land, and turn it and till it by our own labor.”

□ Eric Foner, *Forever Free*¹

To have given each one of the million Negro free families a forty-acre freehold would have made a basis of real democracy in the United States that might easily have transformed the modern world.

□ W.E.B. DuBois, *Black Reconstruction in America*²

I am proposing therefore, that, just as we granted a GI Bill of Rights to war veterans, America launch a broad-based and gigantic Bill of Rights for the Disadvantaged, our veterans of the long siege of denial.

□ Martin Luther King, Jr., “The Days to Come”³

This essay revisits an iconic yet now languishing phrase in United States political culture—“Forty Acres and a Mule”—to clarify the meaning of freedom and to assess the contemporary meaning of its betrayal by the U.S. government immediately after the Civil War.⁴ Among the few citizens for whom the phrase still retains a semblance of meaning, it stands as a largely forgotten indictment of the federal government for breaking its officially stated promise to provide forty acres of land to the newly freed as the best means for securing their genuine, substantive citizenship. I suggest that the phrase’s pedagogical retrieval has significant implications for debates about reparations and for thinking in terms of reparations when considering possible remedies to the seeming intractability of public school inequality.

The cultural forgetting of “Forty Acres and a Mule” is not surprising given that a critical analysis of its symbolism immediately raises unsettling questions about how factors of race and class interacted to deny full citizenship and freedom to African Americans during and after Reconstruction. For the former slaves, land ownership could have served as an enduring basis upon which to achieve their substantive freedom and citizenship; without land, freedom and citizenship had no material basis from which to develop, making an empty farce out of the newly adapted fourteenth and fifteenth amendments.⁵

Despite the institution of these formal civil rights, then, could African American *citizenship* even be said to *exist* absent land ownership and economic autonomy? And in exposing the majority culture's general ignorance of both the phrase and its historical context, how might teachers use the motif to reveal to whites their own whiteness? How might the exposure of such civic ignorance become educative?

The following exploration of "Forty Acres and a Mule" as a "generative theme" in U.S. political culture is anchored in a Freirean approach:

I have termed these themes "generative" because (however they are comprehended and whatever action they may evoke) they contain the possibility of unfolding into again as many themes, which in their turn call for new tasks to be fulfilled.⁶

As is well known, Paulo Freire's literacy projects involved mapping the "thematic universe" of the oppressed, a universe made up of constituent "generative themes." These themes, images, phrases, or narratives circulating in any given culture are seen to contain educative, if hidden, contradictions and meanings that require pedagogical intervention to be rendered visible. Even though "Forty Acres and a Mule" occupies only one small space in the vast heterogeneity of "our" cultural heritage, it can nevertheless be understood as a richly endowed generative theme within the larger symbolic universe of U.S. political culture. Its value as a uniquely American pedagogical motif resides in its capacity to bring about an awareness of social contradiction, an awareness that can intensify the internal tension that animates all processes of *conscientization*.⁷

Owing to its "civic generativity," "Forty Acres and a Mule" "unfolds" thematically in ways that point directly to some of the most antidemocratic and repressed elements of the national identity negotiation: specifically the structural power relations that link race and class to the production of unequal forms of public education. Civic inquiries directed toward these relationships have the potential to "call for new tasks to be fulfilled," new quests to be pursued, and perhaps new actions to be taken. It should be noted that my primary aim here is not to work out the details of how a concept of educational reparations might be practically implemented. Rather, as a "pedagogy of questions" my aim is to suggest how teachers might theorize this iconic phrase to help students learn to better perceive U.S. history by learning to better "perceive the contradictions" sequestered within one of its seminal popular slogans.⁸

Each of the following four sections investigates a different dimension of the phrase for purposes of pedagogical development. In the first section, I provide an historical overview of "Forty Acres and a Mule" and emphasize its putative meaning as a reparative principle of justice. Section two makes the case that the freedoms and rights afforded by the fourteenth and fifteenth Amendments, equal citizenship and suffrage, were rendered hollow, dead

letters when substantive land ownership as a form of reparations failed to be granted to the newly freed. I adopt this interpretation of the central failure of reconstruction as an opportunity to discuss why “Forty Acres and a Mule” is an attractive vehicle to clarify the difference between procedural and substantive conceptions of freedom.

In section three, I propose that as a form of compensatory justice, we should begin to see the “contemporary moral equivalent” of “Forty Acres and a Mule” as taking the form of a guaranteed right for all citizens to an equal quality public education.⁹ I contend that the recognition of such state-enforced landlessness in the nineteenth century—the historic injury “Forty Acres and a Mule” symbolizes—offers students different angles from which to view reparations for African Americans, as well as possible remedies for ameliorating inequality in U.S. public education.

The final section identifies a “culture of silence” which works productively to submerge the many radical questions a fuller understanding of the phrase would likely engender. I critique a recent article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* on “Forty Acres and a Mule” to show how the legitimate claims for compensatory justice embedded in the phrase are routinely dismissed thus serving to reproduce ongoing patterns of collective ignorance and historical amnesia.¹⁰

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND: “FORTY ACRES AND A MULE” AS AN UNFINISHED REPARATIVE PRINCIPLE OF JUSTICE

According to Claude Oubre, the origin of “Forty Acres and a Mule” as a narrative of meaning cannot be conclusively determined. He speculates that the *idea* of the former slaves thinking that they might receive forty acres of land from the government as their rightful due likely started before 1865 among black soldiers of the union army. Within this scenario, these soldiers interpreted the wartime Confiscation Acts as apparent proof that the slaveholders’ property was going to be redistributed among the bondsmen. As Union forces penetrated deeper into the south, particularly during General Sherman’s “march to the sea,”¹¹ black soldiers told the slaves they encountered that the federal government was planning on granting them land once the Confederacy was defeated.¹²

Although we may never grasp the exact mechanisms of its genesis as a narrative, it is accurate to assert that the underlying political and moral *principle* these soldiers announced—that confederate lands would be turned over to the slaves once the war concluded—spread like wildfire among growing numbers of bondsmen.¹³ In 1865, this general principle of justice and restitution found expression in an executive branch proclamation that functioned as law, if only for one year. Its brief statutory existence began with General Sherman’s Special Field Order 15 (January 16, 1865), and it ended with the many amnesty orders President Andrew Johnson issued to former

Confederate landholders, orders which effectively nullified those lands “reserved and set apart” for the former slaves.

It is worth recalling that what is referred to as the “Colloquy in Savannah” was initiated at the request of Secretary of War Stanton, who wanted to confer with local black leaders about the logistical problems created when tens of thousands of slaves abandoned the plantations and followed Sherman’s army into the city. However, as Eric Foner describes, this colloquia soon turned into a pedagogical moment *par excellence* for Sherman and Stanton, as the former slaves expressed, among other things, their astute perceptions about the meaning of slavery and freedom. One leading figure, Garrison Frazier, asked how he thought freedom could be accomplished, replied: “To have land, and to turn it and till it by our own labor.” Days later, Order 15 was issued granting forty acres of land to the former slaves within a large swath of land that came to be known as the “Sherman Reservation.”¹⁴

That the U.S. government failed to deliver on its *executive* deed-to-land, as well as on its sound yet defeated *congressional* legislation, meant that the newly freed and subsequent generations would be officially encouraged to exist in a general condition of economic dependency and state-enforced civic peonage. W.E.B. DuBois, in his magisterial *Black Reconstruction in America*, captures the tragedy of this lost opportunity in nothing less than global terms: “to have given each one of the million Negro free families a forty-acre freehold would have made a basis of real democracy in the United States that might easily have transformed the modern world.”¹⁵ Imagine if this opportunity had been seized: A new class of landed black yeomanry would have been created, providing a substantive basis upon which their democratic citizenship could be authentically enacted. Alas, the moment has passed for redeeming the literal promise of “Forty Acres and a Mule.” However, as a proper question for a democratic society to pose to itself today, why shouldn’t the “contemporary moral equivalent” of “Forty Acres” assume the form of a guaranteed right to an equal quality public education?

SUBSTANTIVE VERSUS PROCEDURAL FREEDOM: A CRITICAL SUBTEXT OF “FORTY ACRES AND A MULE”

Another educative feature of “Forty Acres and a Mule” is its emergence at a time when the shaky bridge between slavery and freedom was being crossed. The explicit linkage of property ownership and education to the process of emancipation and to the realization of substantive, as opposed to merely procedural, freedom reflects a lucid understanding among those held in bondage that the viability of their citizenship depended on land ownership and public education.

Inquiry into the discursive career of “Forty Acres and a Mule” leads us to revisit nagging questions about the meaning of freedom, questions the crucible of war foisted upon a reluctant nation. One such dilemma Congress grappled with concerned the relationship between freedom, property, and citizenship:

Could authentic freedom and citizenship come to exist for the former slaves without their ownership of property? Despite eloquent appeals in Congress for granting land and for creating a new class of black freeholders, popular majorities in both houses all too easily defeated such attempts. The “actionless actions” of the federal government were to exercise a particularly destructive influence on the delicate formative stages of African American civic identity.

These defeated pieces of legislation are still examination-worthy since they can produce pedagogically fertile moments if rightly encountered. Freire consistently pointed out that conscientization depended on a certain quality of historical awareness:

Intervention in reality—historical awareness itself—thus represents a step forward from emergence, and results from the conscientization of the situation....Every thematic investigation which deepens historical awareness is thus really educational.¹⁶

If students familiarized themselves with the debates in Congress over the relationship between land and freedom and the influence this exerted on citizenship formation, curiosity about the current status of these relationships might also be stimulated.

Take, for example, Senator Charles Sumner’s testimony that without land for the former bondsmen the work of reconstruction would necessarily be incomplete:

I believe that all familiar with the process of Reconstruction have felt that our work would be incomplete, unless in some way we secure to the freeman a piece of land....the more you reflect upon it, and the more you listen to evidence, the stronger will be your conclusion as to this necessity.¹⁷

In the House of Representatives, Thaddeus Stevens similarly called for a bold plan of land redistribution that extended far beyond the southeastern coastal areas identified within the Sherman Reservation. The political and moral heart of this legislation called for the distribution of “forty acres each to one million freedmen,” land that was to be expropriated from 70,000 landholders within the confederate power structure.¹⁸

In an 1867 speech in Congress, Stevens explained how and why the U.S. government should seize the property of Confederates holding more than 200,000 acres or with possessions worth more than 20,000 dollars.¹⁹ Stevens argued forcefully for mandating the “forty acres of land” clause, reminding lawmakers that substantive land ownership for the former slaves was far more vital to their citizenship than the procedural right to vote:

Whatever may be the fate of the rest of the bill, I must earnestly pray that this may not be defeated. On its success, in my judgment, depends not only the happiness and respectability of the colored

race, but their very existence. Homesteads to them are far more valuable than the immediate right of suffrage, though both are their due.²⁰

On striking display here is the distinction between what a democratic state could be offering the newly freed in terms of substantive freedom and what a timid state actually did offer in terms of procedural freedom. Land, economic security, and the autonomy it would give the freedmen from their former slave-masters is described as the foundation of their happiness, respectability, and very existence, “far more valuable” than a formal right to vote. While these reparative forms of legislation were never made into law, the proposals advanced by Sumner and Stevens, not to mention the “compensatory” proposal outlined one century later by Martin Luther King, Jr.,²¹ serve as reminders that legitimate democratic visions and practical remedies have been available to the nation as it has sought to reconstruct itself on a more democratic basis.

When students learn more about the historical context out of which the phrase developed, it is difficult for them to escape the conclusion that the concept of freedom means more than not having the legal status of a slave, more than having a formal right to vote, and more than being able to attend (theoretically) “desegregated” schools. The analytical distinction between these two conceptions of freedom provides a sound basis for students to make other important analytical distinctions (for example, the distinction between “liberal” and “democratic” as homologous to the distinction between procedural and substantive freedom). Indeed, taken in yet another direction, students may begin to see with fresh eyes how factors of economic class and race are more densely woven into the fabric of U.S. history than they had imagined, and why, on the grounds enumerated above, the moral premise underlying reparations for African Americans is not only well-founded but worthy of far more serious curricular and public attention than it has received.

Deployed in this manner as a pedagogy of questions, the motif of “Forty Acres and a Mule” can be used to challenge commonsense notions of freedom and to raise untimely questions about the ways in which the “unfinished” character of Reconstruction is implicated today in the growing inequality we see in the sphere of public education.

EDUCATIONAL REPARATIONS AS THE “CONTEMPORARY MORAL EQUIVALENT” OF “FORTY ACRES AND A MULE”

Just as Sumner and Stevens failed to muster majorities in Congress that would have provided the freedmen with substantive parcels of land, Frederick Douglass’s private-sector attempt to initiate a lending company that would channel credit to the freedmen to acquire land also failed. Benjamin Quarles, in his biography of Douglass, attributes this failure to the fact that very few capital investors in the north wanted to create a class of black free-holders.²²

Given this overview, a strong case can be made that a long-term civic injury was inflicted on a category of people the state itself artificially constructed: an injury which a complicit state should seem to have an obligation to recognize and to make restitution for in one form or another. As Randall Robinson reminds us, there is no recognized statute of limitations with regard to reparations.²³

In 2007, legislation on the subject of reparations was introduced in the House of Representatives by John Conyers, chair of the House Judiciary Committee. The number of the bill, not coincidentally, is H.R. 40. The preamble reads:

To acknowledge the fundamental injustice, cruelty, brutality, and inhumanity of slavery in the United States and the 13 American colonies between 1619 and 1865 and to establish a commission to examine the institution of slavery, subsequently *de jure* and *de facto* racial and economic discrimination against African-Americans, and the impact of these forces on living African-Americans, to make recommendations to Congress on appropriate remedies, and for other purposes.²⁴

Section III (D) of the bill further states that if compensation is found to be warranted, the commission will consider “what form of compensation should be awarded, and who should be eligible for such compensation.” Disagreements about the exact form reparations should take are nothing if not problematic. I am interested here in the restitution the U.S. government ought to make apart from whatever restitution corporations might make. Significantly for the purposes of this essay, Robinson contends that, “compensation need not necessarily take the form of capital transfer but could include *service to the victims or other forms of restitution agreeable to both parties.*”²⁵

Today, perhaps the greatest “service to victims” the state could provide would be in the field of education, as one of the primary agencies of democratic citizenship and economic viability. If the U.S. government raised its contribution to public education to two or three times its current levels (from seven to thirty percent of the total monies spent on education), the nation would begin to create the material conditions in which a quality, world-class education would become a guaranteed right for all citizens regardless of demography or wealth. Obviously the amelioration of public school inequality requires more than the provision of material resources alone. Such an advance would have to be accompanied in the first place by a thorough democratic reconstruction of the underlying purpose and mission of education along the lines suggested by John Dewey in his article “Nationalizing Education.”²⁶ The positive civic effects that would flow from a reform movement of this kind could be seen to represent an admittedly partial form of reparations, for the benefits would flow to all young citizens, not only young African American citizens.

In this regard, it bears mentioning that King wrote that the various “compensatory measures” the U.S. government ought to adopt to redress past grievances should also benefit poor whites. “While Negroes form the vast majority of America’s disadvantaged,” King declared in 1964, “there are millions of white poor who would also benefit from such a bill.”²⁷

King advocated a “Bill of Rights for the Disadvantaged,” the legitimacy of which was traced not only to “common law,” but to the precedent of the G.I. Bill. Specifically attempting to redress centuries of unpaid (slave) labor, King asserted:

The payment should be in the form of a massive program by the government of special compensatory measures which could be regarded as a settlement in accordance with the accepted practice of common law....It is a matter of simple justice that America, in dealing creatively with the task of raising the Negro from backwardness, should also be rescuing a large stratum of the forgotten white poor.²⁸

Once again, the purpose of this inquiry is not to elaborate how a tidy solution to the problem of public school inequality could be brought about. It is rather to explore how this iconic phrase—by virtue of the difficult, repressed questions it raises—can be theorized pedagogically as an instrument of conscientization.

“FORTY ACRES AND A MULE” AND THE DOMINANT CULTURE’S PASSION TO IGNORE

In “The Propaganda of History,” DuBois documents how educational institutions and the textbook industry conspired to impose a steady stream of racist representations in the decades after Reconstruction. DuBois quotes extensively from these textbooks, permitting us to see that all of them boiled down to the articulation of one outstanding principle: namely, that black people were incapable of citizenship. A cruel paradox thus emerged: first, blacks were denied genuine citizenship; then the majority of white Americans were subjected to a shower of racist ideologies in textbook histories, films, and print media informing them in objective tones that “the colored” were incapable of genuine citizenship. Reflecting on the scope of this officially sponsored form of structural violence, DuBois concludes: “In propaganda against the Negro since emancipation in this land, we face one of the most stupendous efforts the world ever saw to discredit human beings, an effort involving universities, history, science, social life and religion.”²⁹

The “stupendous effort” resulted in a dense weave of racialized assumptions becoming accepted as commonsense for broad sectors of the American public, generation after generation. It would seem that if white people were to somehow summon themselves and ask what, exactly, “Forty Acres and a Mule” means, their very ignorance of the phrase and its context

might come to reveal their own whiteness to them (us) and how this whiteness provides them (us) with a racist, antidemocratic lens from which to view U.S. history. Such a truncated version of American history and selfhood survives today through some of our most esteemed journals, professional magazines, and documentary films.

Take, for example, a recent article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* by John David Smith, professor of history at North Carolina State University. Entitled, “The Enduring Myth of Forty Acres and a Mule,” the author contends that the real “myth” of “Forty Acres and a Mule” consists in the fact that no promise of land was made to the freedmen in the first place. Smith crystallizes this position:

Significantly, proponents of land distribution *never defined their plans as reparations to former slaves for their centuries of servitude and unrequited labor*. Rather, Congressional Republicans used the prospect of distributing land to punish ex-Confederates, as well as to garner political support of black people and to establish the freedpeople as a landholding class, thereby guaranteeing their economic freedom.³⁰

I would be happy to remind the professor that Sumner’s 1867 bill is part of the historical record; more importantly, the debate surrounding its defeat exposes the fallacy of his claim that the provision of land was “never” linked to a principle of reparations. The contents of the bill and the debates surrounding it explicitly connect the acquisition of land to economic independence and to the development of full citizenship, measures that were said to be justified given the scale and duration of the past injury. In a Senate debate that followed the introduction of Sumner’s bill, Senator Fessenden of Maine observed with astonishment that providing land to former slaves “is more than we do for white men.” Sumner’s reply is crucial:

White men have never been in slavery; there is no emancipation and no enfranchisement of white men to be consummated. I put it to my friend, I ask his best judgment, can he see a way to complete and crown this great and glorious work without securing land for the freedmen?³¹

This exchange makes plain that legislation for the provision of land to the newly freed was absolutely intended to serve a reparative function in view of the destructive moral and civic consequences of U.S. slavery. Smith concludes his facile treatment of the myth of “Forty Acres and Mule” on another fallacious note: “What does history teach us? Yes, the historical record disproves assertions that the federal government reneged on promises to grant the freedpeople ‘forty acres and a mule.’”

As previously established, Order 15 was a federal, executive decree that functioned as law until Johnson rescinded it through issuing letters of amnesty to confederate landholders. Articles 1, 3 and 5 read:

The islands from Charleston south, the abandoned rice-fields along the rivers for thirty miles back from the sea, and the country bordering the St. John's River, Florida, are *reserved and set apart for the settlement of the negroes*.

Whenever three respectable negroes, heads of families, shall desire to settle on land...the Inspector of Settlements and Plantations will himself, *give them a license to settle such island or district* and afford them such assistance as he can to enable them to establish a peaceable agricultural settlement...*so that each family shall have a plot of not more than forty acres of tillable ground*.

In order to carry out this system of settlement, a general officer will be detailed as Inspector of Settlements and plantations whose duty it shall be to visit the settlements...and who will furnish personally to each head of a family, subject to the approval of the President of the United States, *a possessory title in writing*, giving as near as possible the description of the boundaries; and who shall adjust all claims or conflicts that may arise under the same, subject to the like approval, *treating such titles altogether as possessory*.³²

Amazingly for Smith, “the historical record” in no way indicates that any promise of land was ever extended! His article reminds us of how the repressed memory of “Forty Acres and a Mule” is a product not only of naked majoritarian power relations but of a deeply racialized pattern of collective amnesia that is often rooted in a strong passion to ignore.³³

In thinking through the many interpretive questions “Forty Acres and a Mule” brings to the fore, I cannot help but mention, in conclusion, that a colleague of mine, an African American woman, told me that within her family there was a rich lore attached to the phrase. Its very presence defined the trajectory of the two arms of her family: she learned that one side acquired land and did well for themselves; the other side, however, “struggled,” by which she clearly took to mean that her family did not obtain their forty acres.³⁴ Interestingly enough, she also told me that when her father returned from World War II, he used the G.I. Bill to earn a degree in pharmacy. In this way, the G.I. Bill functioned as a kind of moral equivalent of “Forty Acres and a Mule.” In 1964, King had already linked the underlying rationale of the G.I. Bill to the moral legitimacy of reparations for black citizens:

In this way, the nation was compensating the veteran for his time lost, in school or in his career or in business...Certainly the Negro has been deprived. Few people consider the fact that, in addition to

being enslaved for two centuries, the Negro was, during all these years, robbed of the wages of his toil.³⁵

Because of its ability to spotlight social contradictions and generate civic questions that ramify in many controversial directions, I believe “Forty Acres and a Mule” matters. A critical appropriation of the phrase not only provides unique points of entry for better understanding the meaning of freedom and debates about reparations, but it can also illuminate how the “politics of memory” functions in the knowledge industry to reproduce revoltingly high levels of officially sponsored collective ignorance. “Forty Acres and a Mule” can thus be *made* pedagogical to the extent our investigations of the phrase, in the words of Freire, “unfolds into other themes,” “evokes action,” and “calls for new tasks to be fulfilled.”³⁶

NOTES

1. Eric Foner, *Forever Free: The Story of Emancipation and Reconstruction* (New York: Vintage, 2005), 5.
2. W.E.B. DuBois, *Black Reconstruction in America* (New York: Atheneum, 1935), 602.
3. Martin Luther King, Jr., “The Days to Come,” in *Why We Can’t Wait* (New York: Mentor, 1964), 137.
4. Although the term “Forty Acres” found expression in congressional legislation, the land and mule association grew out of Special Field Order 15, “Forty Acres and a Mule,” issued by General W.T. Sherman (1865), <http://teachingamericanhistory.org/library/index.asp?documentprint=545>.
5. See Claude F. Oubre, *Forty Acres and a Mule: The Freedmen’s Bureau and Black Land Ownership* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1978); Eric Foner, *Reconstruction: America’s Unfinished Revolution 1863–1877* (New York: Harper and Row, 1988); and Willie Lee Rose, *Rehearsal for Reconstruction: The Port Royal Experiment* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1964).
6. Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: Continuum, 2000), 102–3.
7. *Ibid.*, 35 and 81.
8. I am indebted to Kathy Hytten for this phrase, describing her similar Freirean approach: “A pedagogy of questions is a pedagogy that affirms students as agents in the world and that heightens their engagement with ideas...it is grounded in a vision of curiosity...essential to humanization.” See Hytten, “Critical Thinking, Social Justice, and the Role of Philosophy,” in *Unsettling Beliefs: Teaching Theory To Teachers*, eds. Josh Diem and Robert J. Helfenbein (Charlotte, N.C.: Information Age, 2008), 185–200.

-
9. Consider, for example, the joint house resolution introduced by Jesse Jackson, Jr.: “Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the right of all citizens of the United States to a public education of equal high quality.” (H.J. Resolution 29, Feb. 13, 2007). Using Jackson’s proposal as a starting point for further investigation, then, represents a subtheme for inquiry that derives from the phrase’s civic generativity.
 10. John David Smith, “The Enduring Myth of Forty Acres and a Mule,” *Chronicle of Higher Education* 49, no. 24 (2007), B11.
 11. Without the military campaign against the civilian population, Sherman’s army would not have been in South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida, and therefore no Special Field Order 15 would have been issued.
 12. Oubre, *Forty Acres and a Mule*, 181. The addition of a “mule” with the forty acres came about when Sherman offered some of the livestock he had been using for military purposes to those obtaining land in the “Sherman reservation.”
 13. *Ibid.*, 182. Oubre cites several newspaper accounts as evidence of such a hope and expectation.
 14. Foner, *Forever Free*, 5□8.
 15. DuBois, *Black Reconstruction in America*, 602.
 16. Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 90.
 17. Charles Sumner, “Further Guaranties in Reconstruction: Loyalty, Education, and a Homestead for Freedmen; Measures of Reconstruction: Not a Burden or Penalty,” in *Collected Works XI* (Boston: Roberts Bros., 1883), 127.
 18. Thaddeus Stevens, “Damages to Loyal Men,” in *The Selected Papers of Thaddeus Stevens 2: April 1865□August 1868*, ed. B.W. Palmer (Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 1998) 276□95.
 19. *Ibid.*, 284.
 20. *Ibid.*, 283.
 21. King, “Days to Come,” 134□41.
 22. See “The Negro’s Hour,” in Benjamin Quarles, *Frederick Douglass* (Washington, D.C.: Associated, 1948), 243.
 23. See, “Thoughts About Restitution,” in Randall Robinson, *The Debt: What America Owes to Blacks* (New York: Dutton, 2000), 199□234.
 24. Commission to Study Reparation Proposals for African-American Act, H.R. 40, January 4, 2007.
 25. Robinson, “Thoughts About Restitution,” 219□20 (emphasis added).
-

26. John Dewey, “Nationalizing Education” (1916), in *The Essential Dewey, Vol. 1: Pragmatism, Education, Democracy*, eds. Larry A. Hickman and Thomas M. Alexander (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998), 267–73.
 27. King, “Days to Come,” 138.
 28. Ibid, 137–38.
 29. DuBois, *Black Reconstruction in America*, 727.
 30. Smith, “Enduring Myth” (emphasis added).
 31. Sumner, “Further Guarantees in Reconstruction,” 128–9.
 32. Foner, *Forever Free*.
 33. See David W. Blight, “The Riddle of Collective Memory and the American Civil War,” in *Beyond the Battlefield: Race, Memory and the American Civil War* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002), 278–80.
 34. I want to thank Andrea Evans of Northern Illinois University’s College of Education for providing me with this piece of oral history.
 35. King, “Days to Come,” 137.
 36. Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 101–4.
-