

Democratizing Philosophy: School for Life, Life for School

By Charles C. Verharen*

Re-visioning education is critical to developing new ways of thinking and acting in the face of global threats to life from global climate change and weapons of mass destruction. Like philosophy in Quine's words, education is "losing contact with the people." Education suffers this loss in part because education has lost contact with philosophy. The paper first addresses the relations between philosophy and science. Nietzsche is a primary guide on this question. While his elitism must be dismissed, his apocalyptic vision of philosophy may help students become more deeply engaged in all levels of schooling. The paper's second concern is whether philosophy can be infused into all other subjects. The conclusion considers whether it is practical to teach philosophy to all students. Schooling that democratizes philosophy can reveal that many more human beings are gifted than we could have imagined. W.E.B. Du Bois in fact argues that virtually all humans should receive higher education. A compelling reason to democratize philosophy is to further democracy itself.

Keywords: Du Bois, education, historically black colleges and universities, Nietzsche, philosophy.

Introduction

Nietzsche in *Beyond Good and Evil* (1992, p. 402, Nietzsche's emphasis) stresses the origins of morality in danger and the need for collective action in the face of danger: "*Again danger is there, the mother of morals, great danger.*" Four existential crises confront the world: the sixth mass extinction, global climate change, weapons of mass destruction and the immiseration of billions in the Global South (Gardiner, 2011; Kolbert, 2014; Wilson, 2016). For the first time in our ~300,000 year history, humans may acquire the power to alter life globally. This danger calls for a new morality (Verharen et al., 2011). Nietzsche (ibid, p. 406) offers the promise that grave danger may stimulate the creation of a new morality: "The greater the danger is, the greater is the need to reach agreement quickly and easily about what must be done". Re-visioning education is critical to developing new ways of thinking and acting in the face of unprecedented dangers. Like philosophy in Quine's (1972, p. 191) words, education is "losing contact with the people." Education suffers this loss in part because education has lost contact with philosophy.

The paper's first part shows how school may be connected to life and philosophy to school. My primary guide in the paper's second part is Nietzsche. His apocalyptic vision of philosophy may help students become more deeply

*Professor, Howard University, USA.

engaged in all levels of schooling. Nietzsche argues that new creations in philosophy evolve out of grave dangers. A committed elitist, Nietzsche held that only a few select human beings could respond to those crises by creating new commanding values. With more than a century's experience of democracy beyond Nietzsche's, we can argue for a democratization of philosophy. On the verge of being able to disrupt in dramatic ways life on the planet, we need all the help we can get.

The paper's third part shows how philosophy can be infused into all other subjects in an education powerful enough to address our contemporary dangers. The conclusion considers whether it is practical to teach philosophy to all students. Schooling that democratizes philosophy can reveal that many more human beings are gifted than we could have imagined. W.E.B. Du Bois (2001) in fact argues that virtually all humans should receive higher education. A compelling reason to democratize philosophy is to further democracy itself.

Connecting School to Life and Philosophy to School

Nel Noddings' *Philosophy of Education* (2011) claims that education is lost on many students because they feel no deep connection to the material taught. United States drop-out rates, particularly in our inner cities, confirm her wisdom. How can we meet the needs of children who do not respond to contemporary educational practices in satisfactory ways? School for many students is an odious task that can only be endured with great helpings of discipline.

This essay works toward restoring the connotation of the word *school* to its ancient Greek sense of *leisure* by infusing philosophy into the curriculum. Disaffected students think of school as drudgery rather than leisure. Plato to the contrary thought that school is the loftiest of human pursuits. On one reading, Plato's *Republic* is a blueprint enabling the philosopher to spend her entire life in school—save for the twenty years from ages 50-70 she must reluctantly spend as *philosopher-queen*. Aristotle's *Nichomachean Ethics* argues that the lucky man (and Aristotle did mean *man*) will spend the greater part of his life in the *scholē* of thinking (Nussbaum, 1986).

Although Noddings defines *philosophy* in her opening lines as "love of wisdom," she does not carefully explicate that expression. Jane Heal (2012, p. 39) defines *wisdom* through ethics: "Being wise is a matter of having a good (or the right, or some admirable) stance to the world, such that one apprehends, feels, acts in ways that are good (or right, or somehow admirable). Plato and Aristotle define *wisdom* much more broadly. Philosophers have only a highly generalized knowledge of everything" (*Metaphysics* 982a21-24). Detailed knowledge is left to specialists in other disciplines. For Aristotle, philosophy is more like poetry than history because both poetry and philosophy try to capture universals, while history is content with the particular (*Poetics* 1451b1-11).

W.V.O. Quine follows Aristotle in claiming that knowledge is a spectrum, ranging from the hyper-generalizations of philosophy through the more modest generalizations of science, culminating in the practical arts of engineering (Quine

quoted in Magee 1982, p. 143-44). Because of the highly generalized status of philosophy, philosophers cannot substantiate their theories through empirical investigation. Scientists' theories in their most powerful guise are less general than those of philosophers (Quine, 1951). Nevertheless, philosophy drives science by addressing questions completely beyond the competence of scientists to answer consensually, given the limits of knowledge of their times.

Contemporary cosmology and neuropsychology present clear evidence for this claim. Quantum mechanics has pushed contemporary physicists to propose a variant of Pythagoras' claim that all things are numbers. The research program is called "string theory." Physicists also begin to suggest that there may be billions of universes beyond ours. Most provocatively, they hypothesize that we ourselves may be simulations in the computational systems of species far ahead of us in the evolutionary process (Greene, 2011).

Neuroscientists now explore the mystery of consciousness (Thagard, 2010). They propose research programs showing that our linguistic and ethical capacities are innate—just as Plato suggested, but for radically different reasons (Joyce, 2006; 2001). Such speculation about the origins of the universe and the nature of consciousness must have been counted as utterly "wild guesses" just a few decades ago. However, it is precisely this kind of radical philosophical speculation that spurs current research in cosmology and neuropsychology.

Thousands of years may separate philosophical speculation from scientific application, as in the case of Democritus' atomism or Pythagoras' number-based ontology. The capacity of scientific generalizations like Newton's to predict and control experience may blind us to the limitations of scientific knowledge. Stephen Hawking (2010, p. 5; see Papazoglou, 2012, p. 10) claims—without success—that physics can now answer cosmological questions about our origins and purpose: "philosophy is dead." Confident of our control of experience, we may be reluctant to engage in philosophical speculation that might yield new scientific theories with more massive capacity for connectivity. Rare geniuses like Einstein replace old philosophical assumptions that served perfectly well for the prediction and control of experience for hundreds of years with astonishing new ones.

Focusing students' attention on the wildly imaginative and speculative nature of philosophy can help them understand that they are apprentices in the arts of solving problems. As students, they are immersed in one of the most fundamental of all human problems: what is education and how should it be conducted? Their own dissatisfaction with current answers to those questions can serve as the best stimulus for them to rethink and revise their experience of education. If students come to see themselves as apprentices in the art of solving problems, they may no longer see school as the work of memorizing facts and learning routines that are of little apparent relevance to their lives.

Can we give students a sense that they are partners in the adventure of solving unsolved problems? In my introductory philosophy courses, I tell students that the greatest problem they face in their lives is the perennial philosophical question: How should I live my life? The history of philosophy broadly conceived is a cascading series of answers to that question. Given the magnitude of our global problems, it should be clear to students that our current philosophies are

inadequate for their tasks. I charge my students with the mission of coming up with better ways to ensure our own survival and flourishing in the face of the sixth mass extinction (Kolbert, 2014)—and to pass the joy of life on to future generations.

Every K-16 course should explore the idea that philosophy itself is the essence of *education* in the word's historical sense of a *leading out* from ignorance to knowledge, and from knowledge to wisdom. For Dewey (1916, p. 338; see Kitcher, 2011, p. 249), philosophy *is* education: "If we are willing to conceive education as the process of forming fundamental dispositions, intellectual and emotional, toward nature and fellow men, philosophy may even be defined as the general theory of education." Every classroom should be a place where students participate in humanity's ongoing pursuit of wisdom. A key to *philosophy of education* must be *philosophy in education*.

As Nel Noddings put it, education has lost contact with the students. Dewey (1938, p. 43) points out a primary reason for this: a failure to emphasize "the importance of the participation of the learner in the formation of the purposes which direct his activities in the learning process." Dewey (*ibid.*) claims that the greatest flaw in traditional education is "its failure to secure the active cooperation of the pupil in construction of the purposes involved in his studying." The introduction has made the claim that philosophy's primary task is the solution of what appear—at first glance—to be intractable problems. Students who do not realize that their primary mission is to prepare themselves to address those problems cannot connect school to life. The next section focuses on Nietzsche's conviction that philosophy's most fundamental problem is how to guarantee that humanity will survive and flourish.

Nietzsche's Metaphilosophy

In *Beyond Good and Evil*, Nietzsche (1992, p. 420) offers a poetic description of the philosopher: "a fatal human being around whom there are constant rumblings and growlings, crevices, and uncanny doings." Nietzsche separated philosophy from science. The distinction between the two subjects lies in their degrees of generalization. At their intersection, philosophy and science are indistinguishable, like color bands on a spectrum. Philosophy's forte is generalization. Science's is specialization. In Nietzsche's (1992, p. 314) eyes, the inauguration of the PhD degree in German universities in the 19th century heralded the separation of the two fields:

"The dangers for a philosopher's development are indeed so manifold today that one may doubt whether this fruit can still ripen at all. The scope and the tower-building of the sciences has [*sic*] grown to be enormous, and with this also the probability that the philosopher grows weary...so he never attains his proper level, the height for a comprehensive look, for looking around, for looking down."

The success of the sciences in predicting and controlling experience forces philosophers into the respective specializations of philosophy so prominent in contemporary philosophy. Imitating scientists, philosophers have become specialists or even handmaidens to science.

Against this tide, Nietzsche (1992, p. 325) advocates a return to the primal essence of philosophy—the creation of new values as an expression of life's force:

"Genuine philosophers...are commanders and legislators: they say, "thus it shall be!" They first determine the Whither and For What of man, and in so doing have at their disposal the preliminary labor of all philosophical laborers, all who have overcome the past. With a creative hand they reach for the future, and all that is and has been becomes a means for them, an instrument, a hammer. Their "knowing" is creating, their creating is a legislation, their will to truth is—will to power."

Philosophy stands outside of science in several ways. It judges the value of science with respect to life: the philosopher "demands of himself a judgment... about life and the value of life" (Nietzsche, 1992, p. 314). And philosophy creates the diverse methodologies or research paths that inspire scientific creativity. Nietzsche identifies the philosopher as a "genius—that is, one who either *begets* or *gives birth*, taking both terms in their most elevated sense..." He contrasts the philosopher with the "scholar, the scientific average man" who "always rather resembles an old maid: like her he is not conversant with the two most valuable functions of man" (Nietzsche, 1992, p. 314, my emphasis). Those two functions are the "begetting" and "giving birth" to the direction of life—and science as a part of life. Philosophical guidelines create new knowledge by creating generalizations that reduce the manifold of experience.

The philosopher is the advance guard on reduction's path. Scientific reductions are limited to specializations like physics, chemistry and biology. Within those fields are even sharper reductions. Newton reduced the difference between motions in the heavens and on the earth to universal laws. Darwin reduced the differences between human and all other life forms to the common process of evolution. Maxwell reduced electricity and magnetism to a common set of fundamental laws. Teams of contemporary physicists reduce nuclear and electromagnetic phenomena to electroweak laws. And string theorists in pursuit of theories of everything or grand unifying theories seek the marriage of gravitational with electromagnetic and nuclear phenomena.

Nietzsche's reduction exhibits a far greater and deeper scope. He would like to reduce all experience to its foundation in value. And like Hume, he finds the source of all value in feeling. The force of life or the will to power is in turn the source of feeling. Philosophy at its maximum performance aims to create new values, new rules for the direction of life under conditions of maximum uncertainty. Down from that almost impossible goal are the lesser tasks of philosophy: to create new ways to solve problems not in the whole of life but in the details of life.

The German invention of the PhD degree maps—albeit unconsciously—this function of philosophy forcefully. Think of the irony of receiving a degree in chemistry or business that is nevertheless a degree in philosophy. What have engineering or neuroanatomy to do with philosophy? Our careful separation of philosophy from the sciences and engineering is a creation of 20th century separation of intellectual powers. As Descartes strove for a distinctive philosophical method that would yield the objectivity of the mathematics and sciences of his day, 20th century philosophers like Quine (1972) saw philosophy as a handmaiden to science.

Analytic philosophy, philosophies of language, mathematics, logic and science became the staples of philosophy departments in elite universities in English-speaking nations. In France, Jacques Derrida (1985; 1997; 2001) inaugurated the deconstruction of meanings as a primary method of philosophy. Philosophy's old mission, creating values and rules for the direction of life, was left to modest redoubts in those departments or more robust fortresses in European universities.

Why regress to Nietzsche's vision for philosophy now? If danger is morality's source, then new dangers call for new philosophies. In the *Gay Science*, Nietzsche (2001, p. 6, Nietzsche's emphasis) affirmed the primary role of philosophy:

"I am still waiting for a philosophical physician, in the exceptional sense of the word—one who has to pursue the problem of the total health of a people, time, race or of humanity—to master the courage to push my suspicion to its limits and to risk the proposition: what was at stake in all philosophizing hitherto was not at all 'truth' but something else—let us say health, growth, future, power, life."

The *Gay Science* (2001, p. 27) presents Nietzsche's rationale for his philosophical deliberations on value: Humans dedicate themselves to a

"single task, each and every one of them: to do what benefits the preservation of the human race. Not from a feeling of love for the race, but simply because within them nothing is older, stronger, more inexorable and invincible than this instinct – because this instinct constitutes *the essence* of our species and herd."

Nietzsche's flaw is to reserve the practice of philosophy only for the elite. The *Gay Science* (2001, p. 330) claims that a philosopher's virtues "must have been acquired, nurtured, inherited, and digested" to prepare him for "great responsibilities, the loftiness of glances that dominate and look down, feeling separated from the crowd and its duties...." Nietzsche despised the socialism emerging in his times. Confronting Darwin's theory of evolution, especially as promulgated through Herbert Spencer's emphasis on "survival of the fittest," Nietzsche (1999) in *Thus Spake Zarathustra* fantasized that a "new man" shaped by the will to power would supplant humanity just as humans supplanted the other

higher primates (see Johnson, 2010 for Nietzsche's anti-Darwinism and Richardson, 2004 for his pro-Darwinism).

Philosophy's resurgence depends on educators' recognition that philosophy can never be finished. The philosopher's mistake is to imagine that her particular choice of a foundational value may capture an eternal truth. In *Human, All Too Human* (1992, p. 157), Nietzsche highlights the philosophers' temptation to imagine that their work may be a final solution to a heretofore intractable problem:

"Philosophers' error. The philosopher supposes that the value of his philosophy lies in the whole, in the structure; but posterity finds its value in the stone which he used for building, and which is used many more times after that for building better. Thus it finds the value in the fact that the structure can be destroyed and *nevertheless* retains value as building material."

The world's most renowned philosophers have seized upon important aspects of the nature of life and how we should live, but a new value is always waiting in the wings. Nietzsche's wisdom is to insist that philosophy can never be finished. If Nietzsche is right that new philosophies emerge from new dangers, then we must impatiently await the next great philosophers. Unlike Nietzsche, however, we should believe that philosophers are made rather than born. As *Beyond Good and Evil* (Nietzsche, 1992, p. 330) has it, "For every high world one must be born; or to speak more clearly, one must be *cultivated* for it: a right to philosophy—taking that word in its great sense—one has only by virtue of one's origins; one's ancestors, one's 'blood' decide here, too." Against Nietzsche, the more minds working on the problem, the better the chances of a solution emerging.

Philosophy as the evolving quest for the meaning and direction of life has barely begun its task. While our human heritage runs back millions of years, we as *Homo sapiens* have only been on the planet for perhaps 300,000 years. We must see ourselves as utterly naïve, jejune, callow—featherless for the flights of fancy that the future will bring should we be wise enough to control the powers that science, technology, mathematics and engineering (STEM) unleash. Oppenheimer's purported recitation of Vishnu's line in the *Bhagavad-Gita* is still apropos: "Now I am become death, the destroyer of worlds." Ironically, as we will see in the essay's conclusion, recent philosophers claim that new technologies may serve to guarantee the future of life on earth (Verdoux, 2011).

Philosophy's Place in K-16 Curricula

Tim Crane cites Wilfrid Sellars' sense of philosophy: "The aim of philosophy, abstractly formulated, is to understand how things in the broadest possible sense of the term hang together in the broadest possible sense of the term" (Sellars cited in Crane, 2012, p. 21). Sellars' description is incomplete. Philosophy also aims to understand how "things fall apart," in Yeats' immortal words (Staub, 1989). However, Sellars' sentiment captures the generality of philosophy. The expression

hang together is perhaps the simplest formulation of thinking as an agent of connectivity.

Sellars seizes upon Nietzsche's conviction that philosophical vision must be from a great height so that it may encompass all experience. Examining the principles whereby everything hangs together captures Nietzsche's sense that philosophy must be the driving force of life. Ever seeking to expand the range of one's vision, searching for hidden principles beneath obvious principles, viewing the history of those principles with an eye toward replacing them—all these express Nietzsche's definition of philosophy. Nietzsche has made no new discovery in defining philosophy's roles, as both Plato and Aristotle saw philosophy as synoptic, foundational and self-correcting.

Introducing philosophy into education means exposing students to the deepest controversies in every subject they study (Graff, 1992). In my introductory philosophy classes I ask students to explain why my pen falls when I drop it. They of course answer that it falls because of the force of gravity. Paraphrasing the title of a wonderful book (Loewen, 2007), I say that this answer is one of the lies your teachers told you.

A better answer to the question is that no one knows why objects with mass behave in gravitational ways. Theories abound. Physicists used to speculate that gravity was a force carried by particles called *gravitons*. Recent experiments detected gravitational waves. However, waves require a medium whose nature must be a matter for speculation. Einstein claims that mass warps the shape of space to cause gravitational phenomena. But why does mass warp space? Descartes explained gravitational movement through vortices in a hypothetical ether, the plenum of space. Newton saw gravitational force as acting at a distance through the vacuum of space, but he famously said he had no idea how that could happen: "*hypotheses non fingo*."

Introducing philosophy into the curriculum in this example would mean simply confessing our ignorance and asking students for help: "We don't know why the pen falls, but we can describe its behavior very precisely. We would very much like to discover why it falls. Would you please help us out with our research?" Posing such a question and making such a request, even to very young students, can give them an avenue to turn school away from the drudgery of fact-gathering into the joy of exploration and discovery (Matthews, 1996; 1982).

This proposal is hardly new. Philosophers of education like Rousseau, Dewey and Montessori have capitalized on the model of education as discovery. What is new in this essay's proposal is that philosophy be introduced systematically into every subject at every level of education. Matthew Lipman's Philosophy for Children Program (2012) at Montclair State University offers a K-12 philosophy curriculum. However, the program offers course modules in philosophy rather than saturation of the curriculum with philosophy.

Introducing philosophy into the K-12 curriculum will show students that some problems simply never go away. Scientific problems begin as philosophical problems and then vanish. The conviction that the earth is the center of the universe was virtually universal until Aristarchus proposed a sun-centered world more than 2,000 years ago. Only in 1836 did his conviction receive empirical

confirmation through advanced technologies for confirming celestial parallax. The deepest scientific problems can never escape philosophy. The ultimate cosmological question—"where did it all come from?"—is unanswered for both ancient Greek and contemporary cosmologists.

Dewey remarks on philosophical problems, "We do not solve them: we get over them" (Dewey, 1910, p. 19; see Kitcher, 2011, p. 252). From Nietzsche's point of view, Dewey could not be more wrong. We "try on" solutions, sometimes for the moment, sometimes for the millennia. For Nietzsche, "real" philosophy creates new solutions to old problems. That very process creates new problems. The generality of philosophical problems and answers renders them more unfit for verification than scientific generalizations.

A seductive test of both philosophical and scientific generalizations is Dewey's (1938), however: pragmatic application. This process requires varying time spans across the two disciplines. Aristotle has commanded numerous followers for over 2,000 years (Collins, 2000). Newton's science of mechanics had a much briefer lifespan, although his generalizations still have practical uses for predicting and controlling lesser masses and velocities. Quine and his fellow naturalists are right to say that all philosophical claims are "vulnerable to revision in the face of empirical evidence" (Lewens, 2012, p. 47). Philosophy is indeed an experimental discipline, though its experiments may run for thousands of years (Appiah, 2008).

Philosophy's problems are compelling and urgent. While with Socrates we can be certain our solutions must be passing fancies, we must commit ourselves to those fancies in order to get on with life. We can wait millennia for consensual answers to purely scientific problems. But we must have instant solutions to the deepest philosophical problems in order to know how to live. Contemporary philosophers question the power of philosophy to solve problems: "Many contemporary philosophers see themselves as problem solvers—like natural scientists. This seems to be mistaking the characteristic philosophical vocation. To philosophize is to engage in a reflective activity, but it is hardly a domain where one expects to solve problems" (Hedley, 2012, p. 115). Against this sentiment, philosophical problems must be solved in order know how to live. They may only be solved for the nonce—or perhaps for millennia in the case of long-lived philosophies like those of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle.

Introducing philosophy into education means exposure to controversy at multiple levels of generality. Certainly this is true for the grand problems of life such as Kant's "what can I know," "how should I live" and "what may I hope for." But it's also true for problems of fine-grained detail. Every intellectual discipline's mission is to solve problems within a specific area of experience. The philosophies of those disciplines dictate their unsolved problems and the controversial methods for research into their solutions. Such controversy is the life-blood of every discipline, from fine arts and practical arts through history, science and particularly philosophy itself. Controversy in the fields of mathematics, logic and grammar is more difficult to glimpse for the uninitiated. However, non-Euclidean geometries, Gödel's discoveries of inconsistency and incompleteness in formal systems, Chomsky's postulation of a universal grammar and the failure of Russell to derive

mathematics from logic disclose the deeply contentious nature of these fields. The Bourbaki group inverted Russell's hypothesis to claim that logic is simply a part of mathematics following from set theory.

Grounded in uncertainty and controversy, emboldened by its synoptic and foundational vision, critical of all its predecessors, saturating all intellectual disciplines (including itself—hence the journal *Metaphilosophy*), philosophy has the power to turn every discipline into a "blood sport." Philosophy on Nietzsche's definition is like life itself, red in tooth and claw: "I love only what a person hath written with his blood" (Nietzsche, 1999, p. 23).

Educators will have good reasons to resist this model of philosophical education. Students must learn the basics of a discipline before they can be competent to criticize well-established disciplinary practices. Teachers must retain autonomy in the classroom to ward off chaos. However, apprenticeship in the basics of a subject must be conducted with student focus on the problem to be solved—with *philosophical* awareness that alternative solutions may exist. Students should be sensitized to search for those alternatives as soon as they are grounded in the field's basic methods of research.

Conclusion: Democratizing Philosophy: Whose School? Whose Life?

To summarize once again the results of this research in Dewey's (1916) words above, philosophy is education and education is philosophy. If this premise is true, the consequences for education are provocative. If Nietzsche is right that danger is the source of morality and that grave danger demands a global response, then the survival of life as we know it commands a global infusion of philosophy into education. The Senegalese historian, Cheikh Anta Diop (1990), puts it this way. Evolution drives us to survive. And creativity is our means of survival. As the *leisure* that makes creativity possible, school is the instrument of survival. We cannot have life without school. Conversely we cannot have school without life. What is more important—survival or creativity? Life or school? All are inseparable and philosophical reflection is their driving force.

The final questions are: Whose school? Whose life? A proper school aims at our *schooled* capacity to solve life's problems. If we now face the gravest self-caused dangers to our survival, should not all humans have access to an education grounded in philosophy and aimed at the survival of life on earth? Preposterous! However, Nietzsche would insist that *philosophical* commands *be* outrageous to their first hearers. Think of Thomas Jefferson's (2011) absurd—for the times—proposal that rich men should pay for the grammar school education of poor men's sons. W.E.B. Du Bois (2001) uttered his own command about proper schooling in the context of African American experience. He said that the point of a black university is not to train professional problem-solvers to go into their supporting communities to get high paid jobs. Rather university students should go into those communities in order to teach community members how to solve their own problems. Service learning with *éclat*!

Going even further, Du Bois said that African American colleges and universities (HBCUs) should create models whereby virtually every human being would have a university education. His inspiration for this proposal was the African American civil war troops in Missouri who took the idea of universal public education back to the South. In Du Bois' eyes, those troops inspired an ideal for HBCUs to follow—universal public education not simply at the elementary and high school levels for African Americans, but also universal higher education (Verharen, 2001).

Alain Locke (1989), the first African American Harvard PhD in philosophy, Rhodes scholar and founder of Howard University's philosophy department, echoed Du Bois in advocating university-level education for adults who had missed that privilege. Anna Julia Cooper (1988), the first African American woman to receive her PhD in philosophy from the Sorbonne, used her house near the Howard University campus as a night school for adult university-level education. Howard University's founding mission was to offer a first-rate education in problem-solving to students who would not otherwise have the opportunity. Civil War general Oliver Otis Howard thought that freed African Americans were most in need of higher education to solve their problems autonomously (Logan, 2004). Du Bois capitalized on General Howard's wisdom to insist that *all* humans be invested with a university-level education. In his vision, universities must no longer be instruments for the production of an elite corps of professional problem-solvers. Rather they must become instruments for empowering those populations most in need.

Distribution of university education to a global audience requires its de-institutionalization. Visiting Africa for the first time, Du Bois reveled in the West African integration of education with life: "[children] sat in council with their elders and learned the history and science and art of the tribe, and practiced all in their daily life. There could not be uneducated people. There could be no education that was not at once for use in earning a living and for use in living a life" (Du Bois, 2001, p. 84).

Can new technology help turn Du Bois' dream into reality? Harvard and MIT's collaboration on the edX project distributes STEM courses around the globe through Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs). Stanford's Sebastian Thrun offered an online course on introductory artificial intelligence to 160,000 from 190 countries (Auleta, 2012, p. 47). Udacity and Coursera augment leading research universities' efforts to distribute university-level education throughout the world through for-profit credit certification. The world's leading research universities like Oxford and Cambridge join Harvard and MIT in offering MOOCs. While MOOCs have severe student-retention problems, new adaptations of socially relevant computing, wireless broadband access to global networks and distance learning grounded in expert tutorial computer programs can make it possible for the university to come to the community rather than vice versa (Bowen, 2013).

On a final note, a compelling reason to democratize philosophy is to further democracy itself. In its present guise, what passes for democracy relies on the "wisdom of the crowd" for its justification. In Du Bois' vision of the future, a true

democracy would guarantee that every member of that "crowd" be educated in schools infused with philosophy. Educated like Nietzsche in one of Germany's finest PhD programs, Du Bois had to overcome his former elitist view that only the "talented tenth" could profit from higher education. If his ideal is preposterous, then Du Bois salutes Nietzsche's (1992, p. 737) command that philosophy be provocative: "How I understand the philosopher—as a terrible explosive, endangering everything...." The latest biography of Nietzsche (2018) is simply titled, *I Am Dynamite*.

References

- Appiah, K. (2008). *Experiments in Ethics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Aristotle. (1941). *The Basic Works of Aristotle*. R. McKeon, ed. New York: Random House.
- Auleta, K. (2012, April 30). Annals of higher education: Get rich U. *New Yorker*, 38-47.
- Bowen, W. (2013). *Higher Education in the Digital Age*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Collins, R. (2000). *The Sociology of Philosophies: A Global Theory of Intellectual Change*. Cambridge: Belknap.
- Cooper, A. (1988). *A Voice from the South*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Derrida, J. (1985). *The Margins of Philosophy*. (A. Bass, Trans). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Derrida, J. (1997). *Le Droit à la Philosophie du Point de Vue Cosmopolitique*. Paris: UNESCO/Verdie.
- Derrida, J. (2001). *L'Université sans Condition*. Paris: Éditions Galilée.
- Dewey, J. (1910). *The Influence of Darwin on Philosophy and Other Essays in Contemporary Thought*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education*. Ed. J. Boydston. (S. Hook. Trans.) Series: *Collected Works of John Dewey*. (Middle Works: Volume 9). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and Education*. J. Boydston (Ed.). (S. Cahn. intro.). Series: *Collected Works of John Dewey*. (Later Works: Volume 13). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Diop, C. (1990). *The Cultural Unity of Black Africa*. No trans. cited. Chicago: Third World Press.
- Du Bois, W. (2001). *The Education of Black People: Ten Critiques, 1906-1960*. Herbert Aptheker (Ed.). New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.
- Gardiner, S. (2011). *A Perfect Moral Storm: The Ethical Tragedy of Climate Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Graff, G. (1992). *Beyond the Culture Wars: How Teaching the Conflicts Can Revitalize American Education*. New York: Norton.
- Greene, B. (2011). *The Hidden Universe*. New York, NY: Vintage.
- Hawking, S., & Mlodinow, L. (2010). *The Grand Design*. New York: Bantam Press
- Heal, J. (2012). Philosophy and its Pitfalls. *Metaphilosophy*, 43(1-2), 39-45.
- Hedley, D. (2012). Forms of Reflection, Imagination, and the Love of Wisdom. *Metaphilosophy*, 43(1-2), 112-124.
- Jefferson, T. (2011). *Notes on the State of Virginia*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

- Johnson, D. (2010). *Nietzsche's Anti-Darwinism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Joyce, R. (2006). *The Evolution of Morality*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Joyce, R. (2001). *The Myth of Morality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kitcher, P. (2011). Philosophy Inside Out. *Metaphilosophy*, 43(3), 248-260.
- Kolbert, E. (2014). *The Sixth Extinction: An Unnatural History*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Lewens, T. (2012). A Surfeit of Naturalism. *Metaphilosophy*, 43(1-2), 46-57.
- Locke, A. (1989). *The Philosophy of Alain Locke: Harlem Renaissance and Beyond*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Loewen, J. (2007). *Lies My Teacher Told Me: Everything Your American History Textbook Got Wrong*. New York: Touchstone.
- Logan, R. (2004). *Howard University: The First Hundred Years 1867-1967*. New York: New York University Press.
- Magee, B. (ed.) (1982). *Men of Ideas: Some Creators of Contemporary Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Matthews, G. (1996). *The Philosophy of Childhood*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press
- Matthews, G. (1982). *Philosophy and the Young Child*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Nietzsche, F. (1992). *Basic Writings of Nietzsche*. Trans. Walter Kaufman. New York: The Modern Library.
- Nietzsche, F. (1999). *Thus Spake Zarathustra*. (Thomas Common, Trans.) New York: Dover.
- Nietzsche, F. (2002). *Beyond Good and Evil*. R.-P. Horstmann, J. Norman, (Eds.) (J. Norman Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nietzsche, F. (2001). *The Gay Science*. B. Williams (Ed.), (J. Nauckhoff Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Noddings, N. (2011). *Philosophy of Education*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Nussbaum, M. (1986). *The Fragility of Goodness: Luck and Ethics in Greek Tragedy and Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Papazoglou, A. (2012). Philosophy, its Pitfalls, Some Rescue Plans, and Their Complications. *Metaphilosophy*, 43(1-2), 2-19.
- Philosophy for Children. (2012). Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2FbkIJ4>.
- Quine, W. (1972). *Theories and Things*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Quine, W. (1951). Main Trends in Recent Philosophy: Two Dogmas of Empiricism. *Philosophical Review*, 60(1), 20-43.
- Richardson, J. (2004). *Nietzsche's New Darwinism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Staub, E. (1989). *The Roots of Evil: The Origins of Genocide and Other Group Violence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thagard, P. (2011). *The Brain and the Meaning of Life*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press
- Verdoux, P. (2011). Emerging Technologies and the Future of Philosophy. *Metaphilosophy*, 42(5), 682-707.
- Verharen, C., Tharakan, J., Middendorf, G., Castro-Sitiriche, M., & Kadoda, G. (2011). Introducing Survival Ethics into Engineering Education. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 19(2), 599-623.
- Verharen, C. (2001). "What They Lose on Earth by Being Black": Du Bois and the Future of African American Education. *C.L.R. James Journal*, 8(2), 121-151.
- Wilson, E. O. (2016). *Half Earth: Our Planet's Fight for Life*. New York: Liveright.

