

Rapoport Center Human Rights Working Paper Series

01/2014

Constitutionalism and the Foundations of the Security State

Aziz Rana



The Bernard and Audre
RAPOPORT CENTER
For Human Rights and Justice
The University of Texas at Austin
School of Law



Creative Commons license Attribution Non-Commercial No Derivatives. This text may be downloaded for personal research purposes only. Any additional reproduction for other purposes, whether in hard copy or electronically, requires the consent of the Rapoport Center Human Rights Working Paper Series and the author. For the full terms of the Creative Commons License, please visit www.creativecommons.org.

The Rapoport Center Human Rights Working Paper Series is dedicated to inter-disciplinary and critical engagement on international human rights law and discourse. We encourage submissions from scholars of all disciplines as well as from activists and advocates that contribute to our mission to build a multidisciplinary community engaged in the study and practice of human rights that promotes the economic and political enfranchisement of marginalized individuals and groups both locally and globally. In order to facilitate interdisciplinary dialogue, each accepted paper is published alongside a brief response from a member of the multidisciplinary editorial committee; this unique WPS format allows for paper topics to be examined in terms of broader currents in contemporary scholarship

ISSN 2158-3161

Published in the United States of America
The Bernard and Audre Rapoport Center for Human Rights and Justice
at The University of Texas School of Law
727 E. Dean Keeton St.
Austin, TX 78705
<http://www.rapoportcenter.org/>

<http://blogs.utexas.edu/rapoportcenterwps/>

ABSTRACT

Scholars often argue that the culture of American constitutionalism provides an important constraint on aggressive national security practices. This article challenges the conventional account by highlighting instead how modern constitutional reverence emerged in tandem with the national security state, functioning critically to reinforce and legitimate government power rather than simply to place limits on it. This unacknowledged security origin of today's constitutional climate speaks to a profound ambiguity in the type of public culture ultimately promoted by the Constitution. Scholars are clearly right to note that constitutional loyalty has created political space for arguments more respectful of civil rights and civil liberties, making the very worst excesses of the past less likely. But at the same time, public discussion around protecting the Constitution – and with it a distinctively American way of life – has also served as a key justification for strengthening the government's security infrastructure over the long run.

I argue that in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, significant popular skepticism actually existed concerning the basic legitimacy of the Constitution. But against the backdrop of World War I and the Russian Revolution, a combination of corporate, legal, and military elites initiated a concerted campaign to establish constitutional support as the paramount prerequisite of loyal citizenship. Crucially, such elites viewed the entrenchment of constitutional commitment as fundamentally a national security imperative; they called for dramatically and permanently extending the reach of the federal government's coercive apparatus. In the process, defenders of the Constitution reproduced many of the practices we most associate with extremism and wartime xenophobia: imposed deference and ideological uniformity, appeals to exceptionalism and cultural particularity, militarism, and political repression. Moreover, the problem with such World War I origins for today's constitutional climate is not simply that of a troubling but distant past. Rather, the foundations developed nearly a century ago continue to intertwine constitutional attachment with the prerogatives of the national security state in ways that often go unnoticed – emphasizing the real difficulties of separating the liberal and illiberal dimensions of American constitutional culture.

Constitutionalism and the Foundations of the Security State

Aziz Rana

Table of Contents

- I. INTRODUCTION: CONSTITUTIONAL ATTACHMENT AND AMERICAN CIVIC CULTURE
- II. TURN OF THE CENTURY AMERICA AND CONSTITUTIONAL DISILLUSIONMENT
 - A. The Civil War, Sectionalism, and the Uncertain Place of the Constitution
 - B. Industrialization and Constitutional Opposition
- III. WORLD WAR I AND THE MODERN ORIGINS OF CONSTITUTIONAL VENERATION
 - A. The Interconnection of Pro-Constitution and Pro-War Activism
 - B. The Constitution as the Positive Principle for a New Security State
 - C. Constitutional Devotion Finds a Popular Base
- IV. NATIONAL SECURITY AND THE FORGING OF A NEW CONSTITUTIONAL CITIZENSHIP
 - A. Patriotic Education and the Deferential Citizen
 - B. American Exceptionalism and Cultural Particularity
 - C. Repression and the Constitution's Friends and Enemies
- V. CONCLUSION: THE TROUBLED LIBERALISM OF AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONAL LIFE

I. INTRODUCTION: CONSTITUTIONAL ATTACHMENT AND AMERICAN CIVIC CULTURE

In contemporary American politics, perhaps no commitment enjoys as much widespread public support as belief in the sanctity of the Federal Constitution. Displays of constitutional loyalty are ubiquitous, ranging from the establishment of Constitution Day as a national holiday¹ to

· Associate Professor of Law, Cornell University Law School; A.B., Harvard College; J.D., Yale Law School; Ph.D., Harvard University. For discussion and incredibly helpful comments, I would like to thank Liz Anker, Asli Bâli, Josh Chafetz, Adrienne Davis, Michael Dorf, Karen Engle, Alex Gourevitch, Nathaniel Green, Jamal Greene, Odette Lienau, Julian Lim, Michael Kammen, Joe Margulies, Bernie Meyler, Fionnuala D. Ní Aoláin, Jedediah Purdy, Nick Salvatore, Steve Shiffrin, and Sidney Tarrow. I also have benefited greatly from the suggestions given to me on earlier drafts by participants in seminars at Washington University Law School, Columbia Law School, the University of Texas School of Law, and Cornell Law School. Special thanks for their excellent research assistance go to Heather Byrne and Sergio Rudin. Finally, Jane Drumheller, Amy Emerson, and Kathleen Hartman at the Cornell Law Library provided invaluable support in helping me to access essential but hard to find sources.

¹ This occurred in 2005 against the backdrop of the Iraq War. The move was spearheaded by Democratic Senator Robert Byrd from West Virginia who pressed through an amendment to an appropriations bill that made September 17th, the date of the text's 1787 Convention signing in Philadelphia, a special day of commemoration. The bill mandated that every educational institution "receiving Federal funds," regardless of whether the institution was private or public, grade school or university level, "shall hold an educational program on the United States Constitution on September 17." Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005, Pub. L. No. 108-447, div.

bipartisan readings from the text to usher in new sessions of Congress² to references to its wisdom during presidential speeches and addresses.³ There are of course dissenting views, especially following the recent financial crisis and government gridlock. A vocal minority of scholars declares that the Constitution has generated a “frozen republic”⁴ or a “republic, lost”⁵ and argues for “constitutional disobedience”⁶ and even a new federal convention.⁷ But as a political matter, these calls to ignore or fundamentally rewrite the Constitution are voices in the wilderness; they reside more or less exclusively in the academy and would be nearly unthinkable if expressed by a major electoral figure in public life.

And even in the academy, constitutional loyalty runs deep, with legal scholars habitually reaffirming their own commitment to the text and arguing that the Constitution and American nationhood are inextricably bound together. In the words of Akhil Amar, the Constitution is “one of the things that . . . we Americans have in common, one the things that *constitute* us as Americans.”⁸ Laurence Tribe takes such sentiment further, contending that the very idea of being

J, tit. I, § 111(b), 118 Stat. 2809, 3344 (codified at 36 U.S.C. §106 (2006)). Although Byrd was a sharp Administration critic and opponent of the war, the Bush White House strongly backed the holiday. In fact, for years, Bush had been issuing executive proclamations declaring the week of September 17th to be “Constitution Week.” For more on political circumstance around the 2005 bill, see Jason Frank, Constitution Day (Sept. 2012) (unpublished manuscript) (on file with author).

² This practice was started in 2011 by Republican members of the House of Representatives, with notable Democrats such as Nancy Pelosi participating. Two years later, according to Bob Goodlatte, the Republican House Judiciary Chair, the desire to participate in the reading was so strong that they “ran out of Constitution before they ran out of readers.” See *66 Minutes to Read the U.S. Constitution*, ABC NEWS (Jan. 15, 2013), <http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/politics/2013/01/66-minutes-to-read-the-constitution>.

³ As just one illustration, the very first words of President Barack Obama’s second inaugural address maintained that the inauguration itself should be viewed as a collective moment in which the country “bear[s] witness to the enduring strength of our Constitution.” See Barack Obama, Second Inaugural Address (Jan. 21, 2013) (transcript available at http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2013-01-21/politics/36473487_1_president-obama-vice-president-biden-free-market).

⁴ See DANIEL LAZARE, *THE FROZEN REPUBLIC: HOW THE CONSTITUTION IS PARALYZING DEMOCRACY* (1996).

⁵ See LAWRENCE LESSIG, *REPUBLIC, LOST: HOW MONEY CORRUPTS CONGRESS—AND A PLAN TO STOP IT* (2012).

⁶ See LOUIS MICHAEL SEIDMAN, *ON CONSTITUTIONAL DISOBEDIENCE* 10 (2012) (arguing that for Americans to fulfill our national principles we must actually “first free ourselves from the yoke of constitutional obligation”).

⁷ See SANDY LEVINSON, *OUR UNDEMOCRATIC CONSTITUTION: WHERE THE CONSTITUTION GOES WRONG (AND HOW WE THE PEOPLE CAN CORRECT IT)* (2006). In republishing his seminal book *Constitutional Faith* in 2011, Levinson pointedly concluded in a new afterword that although he once chose to sign the Constitution as part of an exhibit celebrating the text’s 200th anniversary he would not do so again. He no longer believed in the document’s progressive potential, “unless one reduce[d] ‘constitutional faith’ to a willingness to embrace the Preamble while being harshly critical of much of what follows it.” See SANFORD LEVINSON, *CONSTITUTIONAL FAITH* 245 (2d ed. 2011).

⁸ Akhil Reed Amar, *A Few Thoughts on Constitutionalism, Textualism, and Populism*, 65 *FORDHAM L. REV.* 1657, 1658 (1997) (continuing, “And I think it is a superior form of constituting us as Americans than the fact that we all watch *Seinfeld* and *Friends* on Thursday night”).

“American” only makes sense against the backdrop of the document. Tribe writes that the Constitution forged in 1787 cannot

simply be replaced by a temporary upgrade or substitute when the fire bells sound in the darkest night. Its text and invisible structure are part of the nation’s beating heart – the solar plexus at which the vast diversity of American narratives inevitably converges, and the conversation through which we remain tied to past and future generations. “We the People” cannot simply bracket our Constitution . . . for that very notion presupposes a “we” that exists outside the Constitution’s frame.⁹

Such commentary is in large part driven by the belief that the Constitution as a cultural force has had profound positive effects on American civic life. For Tribe, what makes the text so invaluable is less the specific structural features of the document, let alone the legal opinions reached by judges. Rather, it is how the Constitution – and the discursive traditions that surround it – provide Americans with a continuous practice of “collective interpretation and reinterpretation,”¹⁰ one that promotes not only substantive liberal commitments but also a broader national ethic of critical engagement.

Tribe, Amar, and others are well aware that citizens once viewed the Constitution itself as compatible with various modes of illiberalism and coercion. But according to these authors, the constitutional tradition above all has played the role of forcing Americans to confront their own national demons. As Jack Balkin and Reva Siegel maintain, the Constitution provides a reflective mechanism for addressing the country’s historic sins and for reshaping American identity in terms of rights-protection and civic equality. They write, “All these changes came about because people believed in their Constitution and in the importance of continually examining our practices in light of our principles.”¹¹ For this reason, “each generation must honor the Constitution’s commitments in its own time.”¹² Underlining the point, Cass Sunstein similarly concludes that failing to do so would mean nothing less than abandoning precisely what is “exceptional”¹³ in American character: a constitutional culture that has over time promoted democratic consent, pluralism, and equal rights for all.¹⁴

Such arguments about the salutary effects of constitutional attachment are particularly pronounced in debates about national security. Today, scholars and commentators routinely contend that the Constitution functions as a constraint on an aggressive security mindset, especially by checking government excess and discretionary authority. Once again, scholars readily admit that such constraint does not always (or even primarily) occur through explicit court oversight, given the checkered judicial history when it comes to rights protection. But even when formal constitutional processes fail as a curb, the Constitution, so the story goes, provides a second, far more important type of constraint. It promotes a common public culture committed to self-reflection, respectful of the rule of law, and skeptical of belligerent and xenophobic appeals to

⁹ Laurence Tribe, *America’s Constitutional Narrative*, 141 DAEDALUS 18, 23 (2012).

¹⁰ *Id.* at 19.

¹¹ See Jack Balkin & Reva Siegel, *Introduction* to THE CONSTITUTION IN 2020 1, 3 (2009).

¹² Balkin & Siegel, *supra* note 11, at 3.

¹³ See Cass Sunstein, *The Real Meaning of American Exceptionalism*, BLOOMBERG (Sept. 23, 2013), <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-09-23/the-real-meaning-of-american-exceptionalism.html>.

¹⁴ According to Sunstein, American “exceptionalism is real” and “[i]t began in 1787, with the Constitution’s effort to establish a large, self-governing republic, in which diverse views serve as both a safeguard and a creative force.” *Id.* Quoting Alexander Hamilton’s language in *Federalist No. 1*, Sunstein declares that while European history, marked by monarchical despotism and class conflict, may have been the product of “accident and force” the defining feature of the American experiment – expressed most profoundly by that initial act of constitutional construction – is instead the effort to base politics on “reflection and choice.” *Id.*

exclusion and violence. Geoffrey Stone writes that “the United States has made substantial progress” in the last century in balancing security with liberal values, in large part because of “the development of a national culture” grounded in constitutional attachment and “more attuned to civil liberties.”¹⁵ Richard Pildes too sees a narrative of real progress, because of how the pervasive climate of constitutional loyalty affects presidential decision-making. According to him, the Constitution above all “serve[s] as a crucial focal point for widely shared judgments about presidential credibility.”¹⁶ Thus, even in circumstances where there is little likelihood of an official reprimand, the public sense that the President has violated the Constitution imposes extensive political sanctions.¹⁷ In effect, for scholars like Stone and Pildes, widespread constitutional commitment operates to place serious limitations on the government’s coercive apparatus.

This article challenges the conventional narrative that constitutional loyalty has unproblematically refashioned American civic life around liberal values. It does so by offering an alternative account of the historical relationship between constitutional attachment and national security practices. I argue that in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, significant popular skepticism actually existed concerning the basic legitimacy of the text, voiced at times even by future Presidents and sitting judges. But against the backdrop of World War I and the Russian Revolution, a combination of corporate, legal, and military elites initiated a concerted campaign to establish constitutional support as the paramount prerequisite of loyal citizenship. At a moment of external conflict and real domestic uncertainty about what defined the United States as a single community, these civic and political actors sought to elevate the Constitution above popular dissent. Crucially, such elites viewed the entrenchment of constitutional support as fundamentally a national security imperative; they called for dramatically and permanently extending the reach of the federal government’s security apparatus. In the process, defenders of the Constitution reproduced many of the practices we most associate with extremism and wartime xenophobia: imposed deference and ideological uniformity, appeals to exceptionalism and cultural particularity, militarism, and political repression.

This unacknowledged *national security* origin of today’s climate of constitutional reverence highlights a profound ambiguity in the type of public culture ultimately promoted by the Constitution – in particular, how it fuses liberal and illiberal practices in ways difficult to disentangle. Stone, Pildes, Tribe, and others are clearly right to note that constitutional loyalty has created political space for creedal arguments more respectful of civil rights and civil liberties, making the very worst excesses of the past less likely. But at the same time, public discourses around protecting the Constitution – and with it a distinctively American way of life – have also served as key justifications for strengthening the government’s security infrastructure over the long run. And moreover, the twentieth century historical process by which elites actually generated an affective popular bond to the American Constitution was based just as much on inculcating deference from above as on fostering self-reflective citizen-subjects – what scholars often associate with constitutional culture. In effect, the events around World War I underscore how modern constitutional reverence emerged in tandem with the national security state, functioning critically to reinforce and legitimate government power rather than simply to place limits on it.

Part II begins by detailing how today’s mass politics of constitutional veneration actually marks a break from the public culture of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In the

¹⁵ See GEOFFREY STONE, *PERILOUS TIMES: FREE SPEECH IN WARTIME FROM THE SEDITION ACT OF 178 TO THE WAR ON TERRORISM* 533 (2004).

¹⁶ See Richard Pildes, *Law and the President*, 125 HARV. L. REV. 1, 30 (2012).

¹⁷ See *id.* (arguing that citizens and political actors “will often coalesce in broad agreement around the point that public officials should comply with the law. Because the law has this focal-point significance, the allegation that the President has violated the law is often what transforms an event into a scandal.”)

wake of the Civil War and against the backdrop of industrial conflict, the country was consumed by profound social dissensus, including over the continuing political relevance of the existing Constitution. In Part III, I then turn to a close examination of how the mood toward the Constitution began to shift, especially with growing concerns about the internal and external threats facing the country. Drawing from original archival work, I demonstrate how a collection of pro-war organizations, operating in concert with public officials and corporate elites, rallied around the Constitution as the positive principle justifying American militarism abroad and a robust new security framework at home. Part IV then turns to the basic policies civic and government actors pursued to promote both constitutional loyalty and the emerging security state; these policies centered on patriotic education, cultural assimilation, and the suppression of anti-constitutional sentiment. This pro-Constitution campaign had the practical effect of fundamentally reshaping the public debate about the text's legitimacy. Although constitutional skepticism persisted on the labor left and among middle-class reformers throughout the interwar period, constitutional defenders nonetheless succeeded in permanently linking constitutional support with patriotism in the mainstream public imagination. By way of a conclusion, I suggest two long-term legacies of the historic interconnection between modern constitutional reverence and the rise of the national security state. First, I argue that while today's constitutional advocates would certainly reject the regressive brand of politics pursued by earlier defenders, it may not be so easy to disassociate the current – presumably liberal – constitutional climate from its modern genesis a century ago. And second, I delineate how exceptionalist discourses around American constitutionalism have persisted well past World War I in validating national security prerogatives.

II. TURN OF THE CENTURY AMERICA AND CONSTITUTIONAL DISILLUSIONMENT

On first glance, it might be surprising to think of constitutional reverence, which appears inevitable in public life today, as ever being politically suspect. In the words of Laurence Tribe, loyalty to the text can seem for Americans like “the night sky,”¹⁸ a timeless feature of our collective past and the closest political fact we have to a natural one. And indeed, during many periods of American history, most organized constituencies – whatever their disagreements about the text's concrete meaning – have nonetheless taken the document as a given and even celebrated it.¹⁹ But in the late nineteenth century, the experience of the Civil War and growing industrial strife cast a pall over the Constitution. Large swathes of the public worried whether the existing order was adequate to maintain social peace or to address new economic grievances. While most Americans refrained from embracing actual constitutional rupture and overthrow, the general tenor of public discourse was one of profound disappointment rather than fealty and veneration. In this section, I provide a brief overview of the constitutional environment in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries – a time when the country witnessed judges, popular politicians, and even future Presidents explicitly defending systematic textual revisions. Such facts highlight the depth of public skepticism vis-à-vis the Constitution as well as the significant challenges pro-Constitution activists faced in shifting the cultural climate toward greater support.

¹⁸ Tribe, *supra* note 9, at 20.

¹⁹ For more on majority acceptance of constitutional legitimacy, especially during the early republic, see Lance Banning, *Republican Ideology and the Triumph of the Constitution, 1789 to 1793*, 31 WM. & MARY Q. 167-188, 168 (1974) (describing the willingness of most Antifederalist voices to accept the inevitability of the legal and political system as a “quick apotheosis of the American Constitution” and “a phenomenon without parallel in the western world”). See also MICHAEL KAMMEN, *A MACHINE THAT WOULD GO OF ITSELF* 29 (1986) (referring to the majority “pattern of American constitutionalism [as] one of *conflict within consensus*”).

A. *The Civil War, Sectionalism, and the Uncertain Place of the Constitution*

One key reason for the overall climate of constitutional disillusionment had to do with the reverberating effects of the Civil War, whose legacy and meaning continued to stoke bitterness – not to mention white supremacist violence – for decades following the Confederate surrender. The war also raised basic questions about the Constitution’s legitimacy. In particular, how could the text be thought of as a successful institutional experiment, let alone a mechanism that promoted national unity, if it had failed to head off cataclysmic social conflict? Such questions, which circulated across sectional lines, punctured efforts to foster a culture of reverence around the document.

Indeed, when politicians and civic leaders established the privately run Constitutional Centennial Commission to celebrate the text’s one hundredth anniversary they failed to generate much public enthusiasm. Efforts by the Commission to produce countrywide events honoring the document foundered on what one key organizer called, “the entire absence of any interest or general sentiment in favor of the proposed celebration on the part of the public.”²⁰ The organization was unable to convince Congress to provide funding or support, had limited success in attracting an official poet or orator (no poet could be convinced and Associate Justice Samuel Miller served as orator only after numerous other figures turned down the request), and received polite regrets from many of those asked to attend the central celebration at Philadelphia’s Independence Square.²¹ Explaining the collective mood of disinterest, E.L. Godkin, the founder of *The Nation*, wrote in the pages of the magazine that the recent war made it difficult to take seriously the worshipful tone of anniversary celebrations. He commented that for the “original framers” the text’s principal goal had been to address “two great difficulties”: “the union of slave and free states under a common government, and the merging of State allegiance and national allegiance in the mind of the citizens of the several States.”²² When measured against these central purposes, the Constitution could only be viewed as a “failure”²³ – a fact that was not lost on the public.

This sense of constitutional disillusionment, provoked by the war, was particularly pronounced among specific political constituencies during Reconstruction and after. For many white Radical Republicans in the North, constitutional structures – such as the Electoral College and the state-based representational system in the Senate – facilitated Southern intransigence and violence in the face of Reconstruction. These Republicans had long been steeped in an Abolitionist reform movement, in which prominent figures like William Lloyd Garrison denounced the antebellum Constitution’s accommodation with slavery as an “agreement with hell.”²⁴ In the postwar period, confronted first by a resistant Southern President in Andrew Johnson and later by a Supreme Court willing to roll back the most transformative racial accomplishments of the era, Pennsylvania Congressman Thaddeus Stevens and others considered that the constitutional order – with its intricate system of checks and balances – was little more

²⁰ Quoted in *id.* at 128. See generally *id.* at 127–155.

²¹ For an excellent account of the challenges facing the centennial celebration see generally *id.* at 127–155.

²² E.L. Godkin, *Some Things Overlooked at the Centennial*, THE NATION, Sept. 22, 1887, at 226; see also KAMMEN, *supra* note 19, at 141.

²³ *Id.*

²⁴ William Lloyd Garrison introduced a resolution before the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society in 1843 stating: “That the compact which exists between the North and the South is ‘a covenant with death, and an agreement with hell,’—involving both parties in atrocious criminality; and should be immediately annulled.” Quoted in JACK BALKIN, CONSTITUTIONAL REDEMPTION: POLITICAL FAITH IN AN UNJUST WORLD 253 n.7 (2011).

than a sustained infrastructure for protecting white supremacy. As Stevens reportedly told one interlocutor, in his view the document was “a worthless bit of old parchment.”²⁵

As for many white supremacists in the former Confederacy, no matter the utility of federalist structures in constraining Reconstruction, the Constitution nonetheless symbolized their own defeat. In fact, in the South, white bitterness over the war fed a politics of such intense hostility among sectionalists – those whose primary political allegiance remained to the region of the Confederacy – that any national symbol, even the Declaration of Independence, became suspect. Before the Civil War, African Americans often celebrated Independence Day on July 5th as an explicit commentary on black enslavement and exclusion from the body politic.²⁶ But after the war, along with January 1st events honoring the Emancipation Proclamation, July 4th became a day of massive black parades and festivities. At the same time, Southern whites now retreated indoors in silent protest; in the words of one South Carolina diarist, July 4th was a day that African Americans now commemorate while “whites stay at home and work.”²⁷ With even the Declaration a fraught symbol, many die-hard sectionalists associated the Constitution with perceived federal oppression and Northern control.²⁸

²⁵ This quote comes from a meeting between Thaddeus Stevens and Richard Taylor, son of President Zachary Taylor and a Confederate General during the war. Thus, although the sentiment is consistent with Stevens’s basic worldview, one may well question whether Taylor, who saw Stevens as a bitter enemy, captured the latter’s words with absolute accuracy. Quoted in RICHARD TAYLOR, *DESTRUCTION AND RECONSTRUCTION: PERSONAL EXPERIENCES OF THE LATE WAR* 244 (1879).

²⁶ For example, Frederick Douglass’s famous 1852 address to the Antislavery Society of Rochester, “What to the Slave is the Fourth of July,” was delivered on July 5th because according to historian Mason Lowance, Douglass “did not wish to participate in the celebration of hypocrisy and could not join the festivities recalling the Declaration of Independence.” Mason Lowance, *Frederick Douglass, in AGAINST SLAVERY: AN ABOLITIONIST READER* 38 (ed. Mason Lowance, 2000). Also highlighting black anger at white American hypocrisy, Nat Turner’s slave revolt was planned to begin on July 4, 1831. See MATTHEW DENNIS, *RED, WHITE, AND BLUE LETTER DAYS: AN AMERICAN CALENDAR* 287 n.18 (2005).

²⁷ Quoted in ERIC FONER, *RECONSTRUCTION: AMERICA’S UNFINISHED REVOLUTION, 1863–1877* 289 (2d ed. 2002).

²⁸ Although writing in the 1930s, Frank Lawrence Owsley, influential co-author of the “Southern Agrarian” manifesto *I’ll Take My Stand* (1930), captured sectionalist views that had long circulated in the postwar South. Owsley contended that the Civil War was thrust on the South by relentless North economic expansionism, which the constitutional system fostered because it was written by Northern moneyed elites to serve their interests. See Frank L. Owsley, *The Irrepressible Conflict, in I’LL TAKE MY STAND: THE SOUTH AND THE AGRARIAN TRADITION* 61, 91 (1930). He argued that the country was “less a nation than an empire made up of a congeries of regions marked off by geographic, climatic, and racial characteristics.” FRANK L. OWSLEY, *The Pillars of Agrarianism* (1935), in *THE SOUTH: OLD AND NEW FRONTIERS: SELECTED ESSAYS OF FRANK LAWRENCE OWSLEY* 177, 186 (ed. Harriett Chappell Owsley, 1969). Given the reality of Confederate defeat and the fact that separation was no longer a possibility, some sectionalists like Owsley saw abandoning the Constitution – a document supposedly used to maintain domination over the South – as one potential solution. Owsley called for a new mode of government that ensured de facto autonomy to the various regions of the country with only minimal federal intervention. See *id.* at 187 (“The federal government should have supreme control over war and peace, the army and navy, interregional or even interstate commerce, banking, currency, and foreign affairs. On the other hand, the sections should have equal representation in the federal legislative body and in the election of the president and the cabinet. The legislative body should be composed of a senate only and should be elected by the regional congresses. Finally, . . . the

But constitutional skepticism persisted even among Southern racial conservatives who accepted the need for reconciliation and thus defended national over sectional attachment. Future President Woodrow Wilson, the son of a Virginia slave owner and a rising Atlanta lawyer in the 1880s, embodied this “New Southern” desire for meaningful integration with the North.²⁹ Wilson’s central concern was that the South had become an economic backwater. As a consequence, he believed that the region should be remapped in modern industrial terms so that it shared the wealth of commercial growth and served as more than simply a supplier of raw materials to the North. But he worried that, unless the Federal Constitution was dramatically reinterpreted by the courts, structurally altered by amendment, or even rewritten through a new convention, it would be incapable of facilitating the national policies that could place the South on an equal footing. As Wilson wrote in 1885, whatever the wisdom of the initial design, the text was no longer “adapted to serve the purposes for which it was intended.”³⁰ Influenced by Walter Bagehot’s *The English Constitution* (1867), he called for a parliamentary system with a strong prime minister.³¹ For Wilson, national cohesion actually *required* fundamental structural reform of the Constitution.

As with Southern sectionalists, a large part of what motivated Wilson was anger at how Northern elites had supposedly manipulated the text to serve Northern ends – problems that “the rude shock of war”³² and Reconstruction made plain to him. Wilson maintained a strong commitment to black subordination, defending slavery as a wrongly maligned and benevolent, albeit paternalistic, institution. He claimed that the text had been “organized upon the initiative and primarily in the interests of the mercantile . . . classes”³³ in the North. And after the war it promoted a destructive project of racial readjustment, in which Republicans imposed black voting and legal protections on Southern whites, the region’s “real citizens.”³⁴ In overseeing both Reconstruction and the “the sudden and absolute emancipation”³⁵ of slaves, the Constitution, according to Wilson, had been complicit in “a dark chapter of history.”³⁶

several regions should have an equal share in making the tariff, which would be in the form of a treaty or agreement between all the sections, somewhat in the fashion of the late Austro-Hungarian tariff treaties.”).

²⁹ Historian Michael Dennis describes Wilson as personifying the emerging white middle class sensibilities in the urban South, especially the commitment to “regional progress through national reconciliation, industrial growth, agricultural diversification, and racial control.” See Michael Dennis, *Looking Backward: Woodrow Wilson, the New South, and the Question of Race*, 3 AMER. NINETEENTH CENT. HIST. 77, 77 (2002).

³⁰ WOODROW WILSON, CONGRESSIONAL GOVERNMENT: A STUDY IN AMERICAN POLITICS 5 (1885).

³¹ See generally *id.* at 58–129.

³² *Id.* at 5.

³³ WOODROW WILSON, DIVISION AND REUNION, 1829–1889 12 (1894).

³⁴ Dennis, *supra* note 29, at 82 (quoting Woodrow Wilson, *Reconstruction of the Southern States*, 87 ATLANTIC MONTHLY 1, 11 (1901)).

³⁵ Wilson, *supra* note 34, at 6.

³⁶ *Id.* at 11. Wilson decried Reconstruction practices, complete with the new constitutional amendments, for producing

a vast “laboring, landless, homeless class” once slaves, now free; unpracticed in liberty, unschooled in self control; never sobered by the discipline of self-support, never established in any habit of prudence; excited by a freedom they did not understand, exalted by false hopes; bewildered and without leaders, and yet insolent and aggressive, sick of work, covetous of pleasure, a host of dusky children untimely put out of school.

Id. at 6.

In the end, however, perhaps the voice of constitutional disappointment that most powerfully captured the postwar age came from African Americans, the very community men like Wilson viewed as unduly advantaged by the Constitution. It was certainly the case that, with the passage of the Reconstruction Amendments, large numbers of African Americans began to embrace the text alongside the Declaration of Independence as symbols of their own freedom and equality. But the steady move of the black community from bondage to liberty and back again to bondage left many increasingly embittered by the hypocrisy of white America and the hollowness of constitutional protections. For African American journalist T. Thomas Fortune, writing in 1884 against the backdrop of racist violence and the collapse of meaningful black rights, white blindness to black oppression highlighted how government officials in the North and the South had turned the Constitution into a dead letter and had “forgotten the principles for which Sumner contended, and for which Lincoln died.”³⁷ Although Fortune ascribed absolutely to the values embedded in the Reconstruction Amendments, he sadly concluded that African Americans, “the beneficiaries of those amendments,”³⁸ remained “aliens”³⁹ in the United States, denied “in every instance [the opportunity] to enjoy the benefits that were, presumably, intended to be conferred.”⁴⁰ To make matters worse, not only had the Constitution’s new egalitarian language been gutted by courts and politicians, the Constitution as it operated in practice left African Americans to the “lawlessness” and “inhuman mercy of men”⁴¹ that only recently had fought to destroy the republic. For Thomas, echoing the views of many others within the black community, African American loyalty to an aspirational Constitution mingled with extreme disillusionment.

B. Industrialization and Constitutional Opposition

Alongside the fallout over the Civil War, the second key force driving constitutional skepticism was the transformed economic landscape, marked by heightened bureaucracy, corporate concentration, and wild cycles of booms and busts.⁴² Such developments produced a highly inegalitarian society: by 1890, 51 percent of all property was held by the top 1 percent, and 88 percent of the population controlled just 14 percent of the wealth.⁴³ Making matters worse, the industrialization of the economy went hand in hand with the increasing interpenetration of political decision-making by corporate interests. At virtually every level of government during what came to be called the “Gilded Age,” giant corporations wielded influence over politicians from both major parties, with railroad companies and industrial magnates enjoying particular access and privilege.⁴⁴

For many farmers, workers, and middle class reformers, the constitutional system and especially the federal judiciary – the single institution most closely identified with the text – seemed to be a critical obstacle to addressing problems of destitution and social inequality. In fact, in turn of the century America, denunciations of the bench by Populists, Progressives, and labor

³⁷ T. THOMAS FORTUNE, *BLACK AND WHITE: LAND, LABOR, AND POLITICS IN THE SOUTH* 77 (1884).

³⁸ *Id.* at 67.

³⁹ *Id.* at 6.

⁴⁰ *Id.* 67–68.

⁴¹ *Id.* at 59.

⁴² See WALTER LICHT, *INDUSTRIALIZING AMERICA: THE NINETEENTH CENTURY* 183 (1995).

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ See generally ALAN TRACHTENBERG, *THE INCORPORATION OF AMERICA: CULTURE AND SOCIETY IN THE GILDED AGE* (2007); JACK BEATTY, *AGE OF BETRAYAL: THE TRIUMPH OF MONEY IN AMERICA* (2008).

activists were ubiquitous.⁴⁵ Running in 1892 as the People's Party candidate for President, James Weaver referred to John Marshall's decision in *Marbury v. Madison* (1803) as a "gross usurpation" of power, which over time had allowed judges to operate as an "*imperium in imperio*."⁴⁶ Not to be outdone, Populist Governor of Oregon Sylvester Pennoyer, in another article condemning *Marbury*, went so far as to conclude that, "This unconstitutional usurpation of the law-making power by the Federal courts is productive alone of confusion, anarchy and judicial despotism."⁴⁷ Such claims were also commonplace in the labor movement. Samuel Gompers, founder of the American Federation of Labor (AFL) and representative of the more conservative "prudential unionist"⁴⁸ stance, viewed the Supreme Court as little more than a class instrument and judicial review as fundamentally illegitimate. In his words, "in exercising this prerogative the Supreme Court usurped power that did not constitutionally belong to it."⁴⁹

Although the argument about "usurpation" on its face separated between an ideal text and a corrupted practice, the close association between the Supreme Court and the Constitution increasingly generated direct attacks on the system as a whole. Weaver may have believed that judicial review contradicted the framers' intentions, but he nonetheless admitted that the judicial power was of a piece with the generally undemocratic structure of the constitutional process. Noting that only the House of Representatives was directly elected by popular vote in the 1890s, Weaver wrote that "the fact remains beyond dispute that under our present system, three out of the four subdivisions of Government are practically placed beyond the control of the multitude."⁵⁰ For Walter Clark, the Populist Chief Justice of the North Carolina Supreme Court and one of the state's most popular politicians during the era, this meant that although judicial review was not intended by the Constitution's framers, it nonetheless was consistent with the broader drift of the text. Judicial review had been allowed to flourish because the system as a whole was "never democratic."⁵¹ Calling for a new constitutional convention, Clark viewed the Electoral College, the indirect election of Senators, and lifetime appointed tenure for federal judges as all antiquated holdovers from a feudal and monarchical age. These veto points not only undermined the ability of citizens to respond effectively to dramatic economic changes, they also were "anachronism[s] . . . a survival from times when the people's representatives could not legislate without the assent of the monarch expressly given to each act."⁵²

As evidenced by the fact that even sitting judges adopted such views, arguments that the Constitution was inconsistent with democracy reached far beyond agrarian rabble-rousers or labor protestors. They were part of a broad public discourse in which countless muckraking exposés and

⁴⁵ For a comprehensive catalogue especially of popular antipathy to the bench during this period, see WILLIAM G. ROSS, *A MUTED FURY: POPULISTS, PROGRESSIVES, AND LABOR UNIONS CONFRONT THE COURTS, 1890–1937* (1994).

⁴⁶ JAMES B. WEAVER, *A CALL TO ACTION: AN INTERPRETATION OF THE GREAT UPRISING, ITS SOURCES AND CAUSES* 74 (1892).

⁴⁷ Sylvester Pennoyer, *The Case of Marbury v. Madison*, 30 *AMER. L. REV.* 188, 202 (1896).

⁴⁸ Among labor historians, the term refers to union activists who opposed endorsing political parties, emphasized trade over larger class-conscious identities, and believed that unions should focus on immediate economic interests rather than broader social change. See generally BRUCE LAURIE, *ARTISANS INTO WORKERS: LABOR IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY AMERICA* 176–210 (1989).

⁴⁹ Samuel Gompers, Letter to Charles Warren (Apr. 18, 1924) (unpublished material on file with the Library of Congress, Manuscripts Division, Charles Warren Papers).

⁵⁰ WEAVER, *supra* note 46, at 73.

⁵¹ Walter Clark, *The Revision of the Constitution of the United States*, 32 *AMER. L. REV.* 1, 5 (1898).

⁵² *Id.* at 7.

historical works highlighted the democratic weaknesses of the constitutional system.⁵³ Not unlike North Carolina Chief Justice Clark above, these exposés tended to explain the era’s constitutional failures by revisiting the text’s framing and ratification. According to such writing, the Constitution was structurally incapable of addressing mass economic grievances, because it had been constructed to serve propertied interests and to thwart popular will. These books effectively espoused views similar to those ascribed to by some Southern white supremacists, albeit to different ends. Beard’s *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States* (1913) in particular, which depicted the Constitution as a counter-revolutionary document pressed on poor farmer-debtors by wealthy bondholders, became the period’s “generally accepted view of the founding.”⁵⁴ According to Vernon Louis Parrington, summarizing the turn of the century and Progressive era literature in 1930, the Constitution was nothing more than “a deliberate and well considered protective measure designed by able men who represented the aristocracy and wealth of America; a class instrument directed against the democracy.”⁵⁵

Even anti-Populist and more establishment public intellectuals repeated this sentiment. William Allen White, famed newspaper editor and author of the 1896 editorial “What’s the Matter with Kansas?”, described the Constitution in terms that echoed the most radical agrarian or labor activist:

[I]t seems necessary to inquire if this capture of the Constitution by our only aristocracy – that of wealth – was not in truth merely a recapture of what was intended in the beginning by the Fathers to belong to the minority. The checks and balances put in that Constitution to guard against the rule of the majority protected slavery for fifty years, and perhaps they bound the nation to the rule of the privileged classes in the Nineties. Perhaps these same checks and balances were put into the Constitution deliberately – the judiciary which annuls statutes and remakes laws, the rigidity of the fundamental law to amendment, the remoteness of the Senators from popular election and control.⁵⁶

Similarly, Herbert Croly, the Progressive co-founder of the *New Republic* and a key intellectual figure behind Theodore Roosevelt’s 1912 presidential campaign, accepted that the Constitution was undemocratic in original design and ill-suited for contemporary needs.⁵⁷ Most telling, Croly

⁵³ A quick list of some of the better-known titles gives a flavor of the argument: SYDNEY GEORGE FISHER, *TRUE HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION* (1902), J. ALLEN SMITH, *THE SPIRIT OF AMERICAN GOVERNMENT* (1907) and *THE GROWTH AND DECADENCE OF CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT* (1930), ALLEN BENSON, *THE USURPED POWER OF THE COURTS* (1911) and *OUR DISHONEST CONSTITUTION* (1914), GUSTAVUS MYERS, *HISTORY OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES* (1912), GILBERT ROE, *OUR JUDICIAL OLIGARCHY* (1912), CHARLES BEARD, *AN ECONOMIC INTERPRETATION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES* (1913), and LOUIS BOUDIN, *GOVERNMENT BY JUDICIARY* (1932).

⁵⁴ See Forrest McDonald, *A New Introduction, in AN ECONOMIC INTERPRETATION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES* xxi (1986).

⁵⁵ VERNON LOUIS PARRINGTON, *3 MAIN CURRENTS IN AMERICAN THOUGHT: THE BEGINNINGS OF CRITICAL REALISM IN AMERICA* xxv (1930).

⁵⁶ WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE, *THE OLD ORDER CHANGETH: A VIEW OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY* 22 (1910). For more on muckraking and the Constitution, see Jason Maloy’s excellent analysis of Progressive era journalism, “The Muck of Politics and the Rake of Realism” (unpublished manuscript on file with author).

⁵⁷ See HERBERT CROLY, *PROGRESSIVE DEMOCRACY* 29–45 (1914). In the chapter, “The People and the Law,” Croly referred to the Constitution as “inaccessible” to popular power: “in practice the people have never had much say about it.” *Id.* at 43. Like White, he too argued that the amendment process needed to be revised, so that the Constitution could be changed “at the demand and according to the dictates of a preponderant public opinion.” *Id.* at 231. Otherwise,

concluded that the greatest inhibition to change was not the judiciary or a specific institutional structure, but any lingering loyalty Americans still had for the text as it was. In his view, such loyalty had to be fundamentally repudiated, because by “consecrat[ing] one particular machinery of possible righteous expression” constitutional veneration transformed “reverence for order” into a destructive “reverence for an established order.”⁵⁸

At a time when Croly championed the need for a “New Nationalism,” a term Roosevelt adopted in 1912 and credited to him, he presented constitutional loyalty as *compromising* rather than promoting shared national identity and purpose. Thus, the 1912 campaign saw the top two vote getters in the presidential election either explicitly defending alternative constitutional models or closely aligned with voices deeply skeptical of the text as it was. If anything, Wilson’s ultimate election to the Presidency – despite having authored multiple books suggesting the incompatibility between national strength and the existing constitutional structure – speaks to a very different politics of national identity and patriotism at the time. To make the point more sharply, Wilson apparently strongly considered nominating constitutional opponent and fellow Southerner Walter Clark for the Supreme Court.⁵⁹ Thus, not only was it conceivable for a President to question the text, but a potential Supreme Court Justice could even argue for its outright rejection.

In effect, as the twentieth century began, discontent with the Constitution came from a remarkably diverse array of social groups, running the gamut from labor and agrarian activists to newly freed African Americans to middle-class reformers and public intellectuals to Southern white supremacists. Although each group may have been disaffected for competing reasons, such widespread concerns raised real questions about whether the document could cohere a polity wracked by class, racial, and regional divisions. Ultimately, it would take a new war for the Constitution’s defenders to begin to reshape this public debate. As the following sections explore, for various government and civic leaders, the Constitution became a rallying cry to justify both American involvement in World War I and the Red Scare that followed it. Against the backdrop of external intervention and internal labor conflict, such figures argued that constitutional loyalty was a central precondition of patriotic citizenship and called on an expanded national security infrastructure to ensure widespread public commitment to the text and its basic values.

III. WORLD WAR I AND THE MODERN ORIGINS OF CONSTITUTIONAL VENERATION

In April 1917, the same month as the United States’s entry into World War I, a recently formed group, the National Association for Constitutional Government (NACG) published the first issue of *Constitutional Review*. In the issue, the group included a manifesto of principles explaining the reasons for its creation. According to the editorial, whatever may have been the appropriateness of criticizing the Constitution in the years before the war, that appropriateness had now disappeared. Faced with profound threat, citizens needed to recognize the real differences between the United States and its foreign enemies, which ranged from the German Empire to revolutionary extremists. For those in the NACG, the Constitution, more than anything else in U.S. history, safeguarded the nation’s essential institutions and separated a free American republic from monarchical tyranny or even worse “the chaotic rule of an irresponsible and absolutistic democracy.”⁶⁰ However, as the editorial continued, at a moment when these “institutions [were] gravely menaced,”⁶¹ “several millions of Americans” seemed indifferent to the Constitution’s fate

“the political destinies of the American people will have to rest to an unnecessary and unwholesome extent upon the dicta of a board of judicial trustees.” *Id.*

⁵⁸ *Id.* at 45.

⁵⁹ See ROSS, *supra* note 45, at 91.

⁶⁰ *The National Association for Constitutional Government*, 1 CONST. REV. 35, 36 (1917).

⁶¹ *Id.*

or even “advocated what the Association deprecate[d].”⁶² In the words of the NACG, “The Constitution [was] in danger of assassination in the house of its friends.”⁶³ The only solution was a concerted effort by “all right-minded men” to revive “the real patriotism of the great mass of the American people” and to defend both the Constitution and the government it had established from assault.⁶⁴

The NACG was only one of a plethora of political associations that gained prominence in the context of the war and that intertwined loyalty to the text with an aggressive national security politics. In this section, I examine the deep interconnections between calls for a more robust security infrastructure and those for a public culture of constitutional respect during the 1910s and 1920s. I highlight the overlapping membership of pro-Constitution and pro-war activism, as well as how constitutional discourses helped infuse security practices with a higher normative purpose. At the same time, I also show how the context of war reframed the perceived stakes of debates over the Constitution’s legitimacy. In particular, concerns about external threat and internal social disorder led many Americans to see the Constitution, whatever its flaws, as an unassailable foundation for shared national identity. Security rhetoric thus played a critical role in generating a new mass base for constitutional veneration.

A. The Interconnection of Pro-Constitution and Pro-War Activism

Although we often think of constitutional commitment as an important check on national security excess, such commitment took root in modern American society precisely through wartime efforts to expand the national security framework. Constitutionalists at the time overwhelmingly saw devotion to the document as of a piece with calls for the heightened militarization of collective life. Indeed, most of the key figures behind war mobilization efforts were the very same ones pressing for greater popular constitutional reverence. The National Association for Constitutional Government provides just one telling example. Its founder and head, David Jayne Hill, was a former ambassador to Germany and President of the University of Rochester but also served as an honorary Vice President of the American Defense Society⁶⁵ and spoke routinely on behalf of the National Security League (NSL).⁶⁶ The Defense Society and the League were two of the most prominent military preparedness organizations. Early champions of a permanent civilian defense infrastructure, these groups advocated dramatically expanded military funding, the creation of executive branch institutions overseen by military experts to coordinate defense policy, and compulsory peacetime military service and training for all able-bodied male citizens.⁶⁷

Hill’s movement between the NACG, the Defense Society, and the NSL was hardly novel, and indeed common membership and leadership were widespread across the various groups and between pro-Constitution and pro-security activism more generally. Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia University for the first four decades of the twentieth century, was both a

⁶² *Id.*

⁶³ *Id.*

⁶⁴ *Id.*

⁶⁵ See *Calls for Strict Ban on German Language: American Defense Society Also Urges Vigorous Steps to Put an End to Plots*, N.Y. TIMES, Feb. 25, 1918, at 4 [hereinafter *Calls for Strict Ban on German Language*].

⁶⁶ See *Assails Navy Plan as Far Too Slow: Security League’s President also Denounces it as Weak and Insufficient*, N.Y. TIMES, Jan. 21, 1916, at 5 [hereinafter *Assails Navy Plan*].

⁶⁷ For more on the history of both groups, especially the larger and more influential National Security League, see Mark Shulman, *The Progressive Era Origins of the National Security Act*, 104 DICK. L. REV. 289 (2000); David Ward, *The Origins and Activities of the National Security League, 1914-1919*, 47 MISS. VALLEY HIST. REV. 51 (1960); and JOHN CARVER EDWARDS, *PATRIOTS IN PINSTripES: THE MEN OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY LEAGUE* (1982).

frequent author for the NACG's *Constitutional Review* and an executive committee member of the National Security League.⁶⁸ James Beck, Solicitor General between 1921 and 1925 and author of countless books and articles praising the wisdom of the Constitution, was also heavily involved with the League. He participated in its "patriotic education" campaigns during the war, writing the preface to one of the group's speaker handbooks.⁶⁹ And after the war, the NSL independently distributed his reflections on the Constitution, for instance by sending out 10,000 free copies of his 1922 collected volume, *The Constitution of the United States*.⁷⁰ The League had a similar relationship with Charles Warren, Wilson's former Assistant Attorney General, editorial board member of *Constitutional Review*, and Pulitzer Prize winning constitutional scholar.⁷¹ Given this overlap of membership and ideological goals, it is hardly surprising that pro-Constitution and pro-security organizations often worked together on joint initiatives and even formed umbrella groups to coordinate their efforts, like the 1922 establishment of the Sentinels of the Republic (which brought under one tent the American Defense Society with other groups like the National Association for Constitutional Government, the Constitutional Liberty League, and the powerful veterans group, the American Legion, itself formed in 1919).⁷²

At an organizational level, a primary reason for this overlap had to do with the source of both funding and energy behind drives for military preparedness and greater constitutional loyalty. For most of these civic associations, the primary financing came from the business community in New York City. For instance, the NSL's main donors consisted of corporate tycoons such as George H. Putnam, Cornelius Vanderbilt, Henry C. Frick, and Simon Guggenheim, among others.⁷³ This concentration of influence was hardly uncommon during the age. As historian Sven Beckert writes, at the turn of the century the city's "mercantile elite" in particular "dominated the nation's trade, production, and finance" and enjoyed an outsized political power that "reverberated . . . from City Hall to the White House."⁷⁴ Underscoring the point, when Robert Lee Bullard, U.S. Army General during World War I and President of the NSL in the 1920s, retired from the military following the war, he relied not on the federal government but on private capital for his financial security. New York City businessmen including Vanderbilt raised \$20,000 for his wellbeing and then facilitated his presidency of the League.⁷⁵ In effect, the influence and goals of the New York City mercantile elite, concerned especially with protecting private property and maintaining social

⁶⁸ See EDWARDS, *supra* note 67, at 53.

⁶⁹ See James Beck, *Preface*, in AMERICA AT WAR: A HANDBOOK OF PATRIOTIC EDUCATION REFERENCES iv (ed. Albert Bushnell Hart, 1918) (arguing that such books produced by the National Security League "render[] a special service . . . in again bringing to the attention of the American people the continuing importance of preparedness").

⁷⁰ See KAMMEN, *supra* note 19, at 252.

⁷¹ Referring to one of Warren's pamphlets on the virtues of the Supreme Court, the executive secretary of the NSL wrote to him in 1924 that they had printed 15,000 copies and sent them "into practically every State in the Union." E.L. Harvey, Letter to Charles Warren, (Feb. 16, 1924) (unpublished material on file with the Library of Congress, Manuscripts Division, Charles Warren Papers).

⁷² Michael Kammen writes that, "Its organizers hoped to persuade one million people 'to pledge themselves to guard the Constitution and wage war on socialism.' Their Battle-cry became: 'Every citizen a sentinel, every home a sentry box.'" KAMMEN, *supra* note 19, at 225.

⁷³ See Ward, *supra* note 67, at 52, 54.

⁷⁴ See SVEN BECKERT, THE MONIED METROPOLIS: NEW YORK CITY AND THE CONSOLIDATION OF THE AMERICAN BOURGEOISIE, 1850-1896 4 (2001).

⁷⁵ Robert Lee Bullard, Personal Diary (June 29, 1928) (unpublished list of benefactors on file with the Library of Congress, Manuscripts Division, Robert Lee Bullard Papers). In the note, Bullard lists all the "men who upon my retirement raised (among themselves) and gave me twenty thousand dollars." All twenty individuals were New York City residents.

order, helped cement the connection throughout the 1910s and 1920s between advocacy of a strengthened national security state and efforts to popularize the Constitution.

B. The Constitution as the Positive Principle for a New Security State

Besides a shared business sponsorship, the profound symbiotic relationship between the two projects also revolved around their deeper ideological continuities. Critically, the linkage of the Constitution with national security enhanced the popular legitimacy of arguments both for an entrenched security infrastructure and for greater constitutional loyalty. To begin with, the most common criticism leveled at advocates of military preparedness and American entrance into World War I (as well as global power politics generally) was that American interventionism abroad and the creation of a permanent war footing at home were inconsistent with national principles. In particular, such policies went against two popular assumptions: 1) skepticism of a standing army and belief in transparent decision-making through civilian control; and 2) wariness of entanglement with European rivalries.

Indeed, during the early republic, widespread hostility existed toward professional standing armies; they were famously described by Virginia Congressman John Randolph as “mercenaries” and “ragamuffins.”⁷⁶ Even a century later, the broad view remained that standing armies only served to promote the rise of military despotism. At the same time, a classic tenet of American foreign policy had long been that isolation from Europe and its internecine conflicts sustained domestic tranquility. In *Federalist No. 8*, Alexander Hamilton famously argued that the barrier of the Atlantic Ocean meant that as long as the republic did not fracture internally, its external position would be one of calm. As he concluded, “Europe is at a great distance from us. Her colonies in our vicinity will be likely to continue too much disproportioned in strength to be able to give us any dangerous annoyance. Extensive military establishments cannot, in this position, be necessary to our security.”⁷⁷ Such anti-interventionism and anti-militarism counselled against the push by pro-war activists toward both far greater global authority and its related domestic security requirements.

These longstanding views raised significant doubts about the American-ness of preparedness efforts, let alone the broader militarization of civilian life. In response, members of the Defense Society and the NSL developed a series of related arguments that bound national security vigilance and American interventionism with the protection and promotion of the Constitution. First and foremost, proponents of preparedness argued that the Constitution was ultimately what defined the national ethos; thus defending “Americanism” was nothing more than supporting the governmental system and public culture generated by the text. This constitutionally grounded vision of national identity had two effects: it placed the Constitution at the center of American exceptionalism and provided an implicit justification for greater militarism and global authority.

According to pro-war activists, the feature that distinguished the American political project from Old World Europe was the Constitution, more so than anything else. Whereas European communities were the product of feudalism as well as political and religious absolutism, the Constitution highlighted the extent to which the American experiment had been built from its founding on an effort to fulfill Enlightenment principles. As David Jayne Hill, founder of the NACG, wrote in his 1916 book, *Americanism: What It Is*, the Federal Constitution above all “developed here in America a new estimate of human values, and this had led to a new understanding of life.”⁷⁸ Contrasting European monarchical despotism with American commitments to liberty and self-government, Hill – in words virtually identical to Cass Sunstein

⁷⁶ Quoted in LANCE BANNING, *THE JEFFERSONIAN PERSUASION: EVOLUTION OF A PARTY IDEOLOGY* 262 (1978).

⁷⁷ *Id.*

⁷⁸ DAVID JAYNE HILL, *AMERICANISM: WHAT IT IS* viii (1916).

more recently – declared that the “original and distinctive contribution of the American mind to political theory” was the focus on eliminating “forever the recurrence of absolutism in *every* form, whether official or popular, whether of dominant individuals or of popular majorities.”⁷⁹ The Constitution was the living embodiment of these goals and had produced a phenomenon unique in global history: it transformed a set of distinct North American colonies into a single, unified, and powerful nation bound to notions of universality and republican freedom. In effect, Hill and other World War I era defenders of the Constitution mapped out an early twentieth century variation of what scholar Nikhil Pal Singh has called “American universalism”⁸⁰ – namely the idea that what marks out the United States as exceptional is its status as the place where Enlightenment commitments truly took historical root.

At stake in such claims was more than the belief that the Constitution safeguarded liberties at home. It also upheld the view that the Constitution spoke to a special mission abroad. According to Hill, European powers sought to divide the world according to a principle of “imperialism”⁸¹ and thus treated other communities as little more than material spoils. Given these facts, a peaceful and stable international order required a strong American presence. This was because the culture of American constitutionalism was “antithetical to Imperialism, whose watchword is unlimited power”⁸² and thus offered a necessary counterbalance on the global stage. In opposition to empire, the constitutional principle meant that American authority was centrally about creating the conditions in foreign, oftentimes non-European, societies for peaceful self-government. Distinguishing U.S. colonial control over the Philippines following the Spanish-American War from European practices, Hill argued that American conduct on the island had been a step in the advancement of both civilization and international peace. Glossing over the brutal American suppression of local independence efforts, he declared, “we have taken a population in its political childhood and conscientiously striven to lay the foundations for its future self-government.”⁸³ And similarly, with the world now consumed in global conflict, the United States had a responsibility to ensure that the principle of constitutionalism rather than that of imperialism dominated the international order.⁸⁴

Furthermore, according to Hill and other pro-war activists, the United States had no choice but to enter the war and to claim a greater interventionist presence. Especially with the global after-effects of the Russian Revolution, European disorder had increasingly reached American shores. This fact not only counselled for participation in the war effort abroad but also underscored the centrality of domestic security measures to safeguard the constitutional order. As the NSL’s Executive Committee declared, American identity sprang “only from the protection of personal liberty and the right to property – the right of individual possession of property as guaranteed by the Constitution. He who does not believe in this cannot be an American.”⁸⁵ Arguing that, in the wake of the Russian Revolution, socialists and anarchists of all stripes were

⁷⁹ *Id.* at 27.

⁸⁰ See NIKHIL PAL SINGH, *BLACK IS A COUNTRY: RACE AND THE UNFINISHED STRUGGLE FOR DEMOCRACY* 17–18 (2004) (“‘American universalism,’ historian John Higham summarizes, is ‘our egalitarian ideology . . . molded by the Enlightenment and forged in the revolution . . . simultaneously a civic credo, a social vision and a definition of nationhood.’”).

⁸¹ HILL, *supra* note 78, at 134.

⁸² *Id.*

⁸³ *Id.* at 177.

⁸⁴ *Id.* at 222 (arguing that “[w]hen the American people have had time to realize the character and extent of the emergency our age is called upon to meet – and the moment for action admits of no delay – their decision cannot be doubtful. The call to duty may require sacrifices, but we shall be a nobler people for making them.”).

⁸⁵ *Says We Face Revolution: National Security League Calls on Public to Awake*, N.Y. TIMES, Oct. 17, 1919, at 7.

massing in the United States to “overthrow . . . American institutions and ideals just as surely as if a Bolshevist army were marching on Washington,”⁸⁶ the NSL maintained that preparedness and greater security vigilance were at heart about ensuring the basic survival of the Constitution. In essence, while such associations accepted public arguments that heightened militarism and global interventionism were historically novel, they argued that a new national security infrastructure had become essential to preserve a distinctively American way of life. The country not only had a global responsibility to protect constitutional values at home and abroad, but international events left it with no other alternative.

C. *Constitutional Devotion Finds a Popular Base*

Crucially, if the discourse of American constitutionalism provided a positive principle to justify military preparedness and global interventionism, security discourses helped transform the popular mood around the Constitution. The war and fears of revolutionary extremism invigorated pro-Constitution groups and allowed the politics of constitutional loyalty to tap into a broad public base. As the foregoing comments by the NSL imply, by the lead-up to World War I the Constitution had become most associated with corporate privilege – its defenders were overwhelmingly seen as legal and business elites (not surprising given the centrality of New York mercantile sponsorship), groups wary of any reform to property relations. Panegyrics to the Constitution came from familiar sources: the American Bar Association, the National Civic Federation, chambers of commerce, and Rotary and Kiwanis clubs. Progressive journalist Norman Hapgood derisively referred to these champions of the Constitution as those “Professional Patriots” committed to “defending the existing property and political system without change.”⁸⁷ Indeed, while criticism of the Constitution seemingly resounded from all quarters (industrial workers, rural farmers, African Americans, Southern sectionalists, the urban middle class), by contrast only a comparatively narrow demographic wholeheartedly defended the text as it existed or asserted the Constitution’s fundamental importance to nationhood. But war and its aftermath generated a much broader audience willing to embrace a culture of constitutional reverence.

In large measure, this was because the conflict in Europe highlighted for many white Americans, especially Protestants, the sense both that the country they once knew appeared to be coming apart at the seams and that foreign danger required rallying around existing symbols of social order. In the half-century leading up to World War I, virtually all the basic elements that had long defined American identity faced extreme pressure. In particular, the United States had begun as a specifically Anglo settler project, combining explicit racial hierarchies and territorial conquest with republican commitments to internal equality and producerist ethics.⁸⁸ However by the early decades of the twentieth century, the closing of the American frontier raised basic questions concerning land access and whether the republican promise of broad individual proprietorship could ever be achieved. At the same time, industrialization left growing numbers of white Protestants, long considered privileged insiders, subject to the vagaries of a wage economy. Even worse, they found themselves competing over menial jobs with an influx of ethnically distinct new immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe, many of whom were Catholic. And

⁸⁶ *Id.*

⁸⁷ See NORMAN HAPGOOD, *PROFESSIONAL PATRIOTS* 8 (1927).

⁸⁸ For a general account of American constitutional life as an experiment in settler colonialism see AZIZ RANA, *THE TWO FACES OF AMERICAN FREEDOM* 8–14 (2010). I argue that early colonists, along with their nineteenth century descendants, viewed society as grounded in an ideal of republican freedom that emphasized continuous popular mobilization and direct economic decision-making, especially through land ownership, artisanal production, and homesteading. However, like other settler societies in Asia and Africa, many white Americans believed that this ideal required native dispossession and the coercive use of dependent groups, most prominently slaves, in order to ensure that they themselves had access to property and did not have to engage in menial but essential forms of work.

while the end of Reconstruction ensured the preservation of white supremacy, it nonetheless left a history of black emancipation and legal equality that challenged the racial basis of the republic.⁸⁹

With the social fabric seeming to unravel at home and the country facing war abroad, a significant number of white Americans reassessed their relationship to the Constitution. Whatever may have been its weaknesses, the text nonetheless connected them, in the twentieth century, to what they viewed as the golden age of the republic. Although the Constitution's principal backers had been mainly business elites, they were nonetheless able to strike a nerve with a growing public sentiment. In effect, they conveyed the message that, as much as the country may have changed in terms of size, economic structure, or ethnic composition, what remained constant was the Constitution. And in a time of war, this document – the country's lodestar – needed to be embraced as a sacred text.

Against this backdrop, the idea that “100% Americanism” required fealty to the Constitution emerged for the first time as a defining mass political commitment. According to legal scholar Mark Shulman, despite its New York corporate sponsorship, “By mid-1916 the NSL had some 50,000 members nationally, organized into 155 branches in 42 states. By the end of the year, membership had doubled, with 250 chapters and 100,000 members.”⁹⁰ In large numbers, returning soldiers joined veterans groups like the American Legion, which took constitutional loyalty as a guiding principle along with the need to protect the Constitution absolutely from all perceived threats.⁹¹ The Second Ku Klux Klan, born in 1915, had four million members by the mid-1920s and combined white Protestant supremacy with an extreme commitment to the Constitution. Underlining their belief in the tie between nation and text, during Klan initiation or “naturalization” ceremonies, new members were questioned about the seven sacred symbols of Klankraft and what they represented: one of these symbols was the flag and it was meant to denote the Constitution.⁹²

But even if World War I witnessed a profound shift in constitutional mood, defenders of the document still faced significant popular discontent with and even outright opposition to the constitutional system. Disillusionment had not disappeared; changes in public discourse simply meant that it now existed alongside an organized and mass politics of textual loyalty. As the following section discusses, pro-Constitution groups responded to this reality of divided popular opinion by pursuing a series of strategies to produce widespread affective attachment to the text. In the process, they sought to form a new type of American citizen, one that psychologically identified with the constitutional state and was willing to defend it against external and internal foes, by force if necessary.

IV. NATIONAL SECURITY AND THE FORGING OF A NEW CONSTITUTIONAL CITIZENSHIP

Especially in the context of war and the U.S.'s growing global presence, certain civic and government actors saw constitutional commitment as above all a national security objective; they viewed support for the document as establishing the shared parameters within which all other disagreements about social policy or textual interpretation must occur. But defenders of the Constitution faced a significant problem: how do you foster a public culture of devotion to the text – and with it devotion to a set of institutions associated with the federal government – against the backdrop of extensive disenchantment? Ultimately, American constitutionalists in the 1910s and 1920s responded by employing methods familiar from the history of modern state-building, but

⁸⁹ See generally *id.* at 176–235.

⁹⁰ Shulman, *supra* note 67, at 305.

⁹¹ See THOMAS PEGRAM, ONE HUNDRED PERCENT AMERICAN: THE REBIRTH AND DECLINE OF THE KU KLUX KLAN IN THE 1920S 96 (2011).

⁹² See KATHLEEN BLEE, WOMEN OF THE KLAN: RACISM AND GENDER IN THE 1920S 38 (1991).

hardly consistent with what one associates with a liberal civic culture. Pro-war champions of the Constitution emphasized three related approaches: 1) the use of educational campaigns to generate deference toward government institutions; 2) enforcing cultural assimilation and homogeneity; and 3) applying a new security apparatus to root out those individuals and groups deemed enemies of the Constitution. In the process, they spearheaded a wide-ranging loyalty campaign unlike any in previous American history and, in doing so, fundamentally transformed assumptions about both the relationship between the Constitution and patriotism as well as the legitimacy of coercive federal authority.

A. Patriotic Education and the Deferential Citizen

Even if constitutional veneration increasingly tapped into a mass base during the war, civic associations and public officials still faced real constitutional distrust and a divided rather than an ideological uniform public. The first method that officials and activists employed to transform collective sentiment was a vigorous education campaign to “Populariz[e] the Federal Constitution.”⁹³ As the Editors of *Constitutional Review* asserted, although dangerous revolutionary groups were “impervious alike to logic and to fact,” most citizens would come to identify with the Constitution if properly taught about its essential features. Calling for “a campaign of counter-education,”⁹⁴ the *Review* stated that “the great mass of intelligent American citizens, who are in danger of being misled and corrupted by . . . insidious propaganda, should be thoroughly instructed in the fundamental principles of the American system of government and the contents and meaning of the great charter of their liberties.”⁹⁵ The core ambition of these efforts to popularize the text was to foster within citizens a sense of respect for government institutions – to groom the type of political subject who would be obedient to the existing legal structure and committed to the state’s security objectives. As the motto for one widely read pamphlet, *The United States Constitution Simplified*, read: “Don’t Quarrel with Your Government; Read Your Constitution.”⁹⁶

For today’s defenders of constitutional loyalty, like Tribe or Stone, such a brand of citizenship is clearly the very opposite of what they associate with a public culture of constitutional commitment. Tribe’s Constitution, understood above all as a “verb” or a “practice,” provides a shared public tradition of self-critique and progressive improvement.⁹⁷ Indeed, he and others imagine this tradition as fundamentally open-ended and flexible, able to adapt to shifting social values and, most importantly, to provide a powerful language of dissent from prevailing but unjust laws. Thus, it might be easy to dismiss these early constitutionalists as essentially mistaking constitutional education for propagandizing a conservative and hawkish political agenda. As hinted above, pro-Constitution forces in the 1910s and 1920s certainly circulated especially (although not exclusively) on the political right, and often subscribed to a formalistic theory of constitutional interpretation, one bound to framers’ intent, respect for property rights, defense of limited federal government, and skepticism of both “class legislation” and democratic excess.⁹⁸

⁹³ *Popularizing the Federal Constitution*, 4 CONST. REV. 235, 235 (1920).

⁹⁴ *Id.*

⁹⁵ *Id.*

⁹⁶ *Popularizing the Federal Constitution*, *supra* note 86, at 235 (quoting FRANK WESLEY PHELPS, *THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION SIMPLIFIED* (1920)).

⁹⁷ See Tribe, *supra* note 9, at 18.

⁹⁸ For more on how such constitutionalists in the early twentieth century helped to generate a tradition of modern American conservatism, with echoes today in everything from the Federalist Society to the Tea Party, see Johnathan O’Neill, *The First Conservatives: The Constitutional Challenge to Progressivism*, 39 FIRST PRINCIPLES SERIES: THE HERITAGE FOUNDATION (2011). For more on conservative constitutional interpretation in the nineteenth century, especially its formalist and originalist sensibilities, see Howard Gillman, *The Collapse of Constitutional*

But educational programs were not principally about winning battles over constitutional interpretation. Indeed, this is why mass celebrations of the Constitution or school-mandated textual instruction were able to generate extensive support, well outside the political right. Rather constitutionalists at the time were responding to a more profound dilemma: the fact that many turn of the century Americans, given the fallout of the Civil War and realities of industrial inequality, questioned whether the structure of the Constitution itself – those essentially fixed elements of the text like the Senate, the Supreme Court, or the President – had failed as processes for political decision-making. Pro-Constitution activists saw disappointment with the Constitution as creating a real legitimacy problem for the federal government and thus its security goals, and therefore aimed to silence first-order disagreements in society about whether to retain existing institutions at all. Educational campaigns were at root about creating and cementing the boundaries of dissent, promoting universal loyalty to a background set of processes that would be placed beyond dispute. In other words, World War I era constitutionalists recognized the contingency, even precariousness, of the prevailing political system and sought to tame dissent and thereby make it safe.

In order to establish this deeper foundational agreement, such groups developed a multi-pronged educational campaign aimed not at promoting rational and autonomous citizen-agents – in the mold of Tribe’s or Stone’s civic vision – but instead at instilling an unreflective and deferential identification with the constitutional state. The National Security League pressed for September 17th to be designated as a national holiday, “Constitution Day,” with the goal of using commemorative events to teach “the people in true Americanism and sound and intelligent patriotism” and thus dispel the seductiveness of “bolshevism and other alien cults which are attacking the foundations of our institutions.”⁹⁹ Although it would take eight decades for Congress to eventually establish the holiday, the NSL, working in concert with other like-minded groups, such as the Constitution Anniversary Association, generated widespread observance during the postwar period. 1919 saw governors of twenty states issue official proclamations declaring the 17th to be Constitution Day, with Alfred Smith in New York announcing, “I know that the citizens of this state will welcome the opportunity of demonstrating their love of country by participating in the nation-wide celebration of the signing of the Federal Constitution.”¹⁰⁰ That year across the country some twenty thousand meetings were held in celebration of the text.¹⁰¹ As *Constitutional Review* breathlessly told its readers, “If the average attendance was no more than five hundred persons, that would mean that, on that day, ten millions of our people renewed their allegiance to our Constitution, were instructed as to its transcendent merits, and recorded their purpose to uphold its [sic] against all assaults.”¹⁰² By 1923, observance had grown to such an extent that the American Bar Association and the National Education Association labeled the whole week “Constitution Week” and strongly encouraged schools to use part of each day for constitutional instruction. The War Department even ordered all military bases to engage in commemorative exercises.¹⁰³

The educational campaign also included broad distribution of constitutional material – comprising countless pamphlets praising the document (such as those already mentioned by James Beck and Charles Warren) and copies of the text itself. The NACG published what it called a *Pocket Edition of the Constitution of the United States* and distributed 50,000 in 1920.¹⁰⁴

Originalism and the Rise of the Notion of the ‘Living Constitution’ in the Course of American State-Building, 11 STUDIES IN AMER. POL. DEV. 191 (1997).

⁹⁹ *Constitution Day, September Seventeenth*, 3 CONST. REV. 181, 181 (1919).

¹⁰⁰ *The Observance of Constitution Day*, 4 CONST. REV. 46, 47 (1920).

¹⁰¹ *Id.* at 48.

¹⁰² *Id.*

¹⁰³ See KAMMEN, *supra* note 19, at 222.

¹⁰⁴ See JILL LEPORE, *THE STORY OF AMERICA: ESSAYS ON ORIGINS* 81 (2012).

According to historian Kathleen Blee, the Women's Klan similarly produced "a detailed guide to the proper display of the American flag and a pocket-sized version of the U.S. Constitution," each booklet emblazoned with the Women's Ku Klux Klan logo.¹⁰⁵ The National Security League provided summer correspondence courses on the Constitution for adults.¹⁰⁶ And beginning in 1919, chambers of commerce, Rotary clubs, the ABA, and over 1,100 newspapers worked together on the National Oratorical Contest in which private and public high school students competed by giving speeches on the virtues of the Constitution.¹⁰⁷ According to the ABA's Committee on American Citizenship, by the mid-1920s "more than a million and a half young people" took part annually, in the process becoming "thoroughly educated in the Constitution."¹⁰⁸ Of the 1924 competition, scholar Michael Kammen writes that the "seven finalists spoke for twelve minutes . . . at the DAR [Daughters of the American Revolution] auditorium in Washington before an audience that included Calvin Coolidge and the president of the American Bar Association. Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes and four associate justices of the Supreme Court served as judges."¹⁰⁹

But perhaps the most central educational initiative to implant constitutional loyalty focused on compelling all schools, from grade school to university, to impose constitutional instruction as a requirement of graduation. Combining forces with the ABA's Citizenship Committee, the American Political Science Association in the early 1920s put together a model statute for state adoption. Samuel Weaver of the Washington State Bar Association described the basic elements of the proposal:

- 1) Below the eighth grade the teaching of patriotism and citizenship; 2) beginning with the eighth grade, regular but elementary instruction in the principles of government; 3) no student to be admitted to a high school or a normal school without having met these requirements; 4) in all high schools, colleges, and universities regular courses of study of not less than three full periods per week throughout the school year; 5) no person to be granted a certificate to teach until he shall have passed a satisfactory examination upon the provisions and principles of our constitutional system. This law would require not only that the Constitution be taught in the school, but that the students should be required to study it and to pass a satisfactory examination upon its principles.¹¹⁰

These calls paid immediate dividends; historian Jill Lepore tells us that over the course of the 1920s the number of states mandating constitutional instruction rose from twenty-three in 1923 to forty-three by 1931.¹¹¹

Taken together, these educational initiatives, motivated by the need to make dissent safe for the government, highlighted three aspects of deferential citizenship: ideological uniformity, a sense of constitutional duty or obligation, and reverence for founders. The vision for school instruction best captures the first aspect. For backers of the bills, which ranged from professional bodies and

¹⁰⁵ BLEE, *supra* note 92, at 39.

¹⁰⁶ See KAMMEN, *supra* note 19, at 235.

¹⁰⁷ See *American Lawyers Support the Constitution*, 10 CONST. REV. 185, 186 (1926).

¹⁰⁸ *Id.*

¹⁰⁹ KAMMEN, *supra* note 19, at 233. To give a flavor of the speeches, that year's winning oration, after describing the Constitution as "the most finished, polished, and balanced relation between a people and their government that the human mind has ever conceived", concluded by proclaiming that, "Our Constitution has brought into being a new sun. It is the sun of individual freedom, and as long as there are Americans, God willing, it shall never sink into the sea of forgotten destinies." Don Tyler, Address for the National Oratorical Contest (June 6, 1924), in *The National Oratorical Contest*, 8 CONST. REV. 245, 247, 248 (1924).

¹¹⁰ Samuel Weaver, *The Constitution in Our Public Schools*, 11 CONST. REV. 105, 107 (1926).

¹¹¹ LEPORE, *supra* note 104, at 81.

veterans groups like the American Legion and the Grand Army of the Republic to pro-Constitution organizations and even the KKK,¹¹² the goal was not just *any* mode of constitutional education but what Weaver called a “uniformity of instruction.”¹¹³ According to civic associations, no law would be successful unless schools across the country employed the same nationalized teaching material. Only then could “universal loyalty” to the Constitution be “secured” “regardless of state lines.”¹¹⁴

To this end, the National Security League and other associations generated a plethora of manuals and booklets meant to ensure the right type of instruction.¹¹⁵ Such classroom material was often framed as an exercise in ritual and memorization rather than in open-ended inquiry. For instance, one commonly used text, *Our Constitution in My Town and My Life* (1924), written for twelve- to eighteen-year-olds by Etta Leighton (the Civic Secretary of the National Security League), consisted of over a hundred mechanical questions and answers:

84. What has our Supreme Court . . . been called? “The balance wheel of the Constitution. The high guardian of the Constitution itself.” . . . 91. What distinguishes our Government and makes it a safer guardian of the people’s rights than the governments of Great Britain or France? The Supreme Court, because it protects the people even from tyranny of the Government itself.¹¹⁶

Underscoring the connection between constitutional instruction and the creation of ideological consensus, Federal District Judge Martin Wade declared that anyone who questioned the viability of the Constitution should not be allowed to teach it: “I would not have in an American college a teacher or professor who . . . even harbors a dream that some day this government will fail. . . . I would not tolerate a teacher . . . who cannot find in discussing problems of American government more to glorify than to condemn.”¹¹⁷ Similarly, according to one 1923 ABA report, “The schools of America should no more consider graduating a student who lacks faith in our government than a school of theology should consider graduating a minister who lacks faith in God.”¹¹⁸

Alongside uniformity, constitutional education was also meant to create a particular theory of political membership. A common refrain of constitutionalists at the time was the importance of developing within Americans a far greater awareness of the duties and obligations of citizenship, and thus enhancing their devotional capacity and willingness to sacrifice personal ends for the nation. According to the same ABA report quoted above, “The gravest danger is the gross indifference of our people to the duties of citizenship.”¹¹⁹ Expanding on the point, Robert Lee Bullard, NSL President, often gave a stump speech called “The Meaning of Citizenship.” In it, he would argue that the Constitution established a system of government that could not last without the willingness to fight on its behalf – politically and if need be militarily: “We hear all together too much about ‘rights’ . . . and too little about duty, obligation and responsibility. . . . The

¹¹² See PEGRAM, *supra* note 91, at 96. In fact, according to historian Thomas Pegram, of the Indiana Klan’s state legislative agenda, what it called the “Americanization and Education” program, the only element that was actually enacted into law was a requirement for Indiana students to study the Constitution. *Id.* at 202.

¹¹³ Weaver, *supra* note 110, at 107.

¹¹⁴ *Id.*

¹¹⁵ See, e.g., ETTA V. LEIGHTON, *OUR CONSTITUTION IN MY TOWN AND MY LIFE: WITH 115 QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS* (1924).

¹¹⁶ *Id.* at 21–22.

¹¹⁷ *Education and “The Faith of the Fathers”*, 5 CONST. REV. 181, 182–183 (1921).

¹¹⁸ *American Bar Association to Promote American Ideals*, 7 CONST. REV. 55, 58 (1923) [hereinafter *American Bar*].

¹¹⁹ *Id.* at 56.

outstanding obligation is by force of arms to defend our government and maintain the Constitution of the United States.”¹²⁰

This notion that citizens should feel a sense of duty to sacrifice on behalf of the Constitution highlights why constitutional champions, like Bullard himself, also defended universal and mandatory military training, even during peacetime. Indeed, support for such training was yet another point of contact between pro-Constitution and pro-security advocacy. As Henry Litchfield West, the Executive Secretary of the NSL and former Commissioner of the District of Columbia,¹²¹ warned, “Citizenship means everything or nothing.”¹²² That is, if Americans had neither the capacity nor the willingness to bear arms for the republic, citizenship itself was rendered an empty concept. Thus, for David Jayne Hill, constitutional instruction and armed instruction went hand in hand, because military training produced another key method for citizens to learn the importance of respect for the constitutional state. Arguing for the basic interconnection between the two forms of education, he told one audience, “every able-bodied young man in our country should first be well instructed in the meaning and value of our free institutions, and taught a wholesome respect for civil authority, and then be impressed with the privilege and obligation of a full preparation of mind and body to defend them.”¹²³

Finally, in addition to ideological uniformity and a sense of duty, constitutionalists saw their educational campaign as seeking to elevate the status of the text’s framers. To the extent that Americans embraced the genius of the Constitution’s founders and saw them as uniquely skilled in political creation, citizens would be willing to identify emotionally with the document itself. Thus the pamphlets, speeches, and teaching material generated during the period focused overwhelmingly on the virtue and wisdom of the founders. For Leslie Shaw, former Governor of Iowa and Treasury Secretary under Teddy Roosevelt, “the Constitutional Fathers” were “[t]hat picked body of men . . . recognized as surpassing any equal number ever gathered for any purpose.”¹²⁴ George Washington, in particular, enjoyed an exalted space in constitutionalist discourse; he was described time and again as the framer most central to the decision to hold a convention and later to the text’s ratification. According to Charles Warren, “without [his] ardent advocacy . . . and the confidence inspired in the people by his support . . . , the Constitution would never have been adopted.”¹²⁵ Similarly, for James Beck, it was Washington who convinced Americans that a new constitution was needed: “Turning his back upon the sweet retirement of Mount Vernon,” “[o]nce again the father of his people came to their rescue.”¹²⁶ For lawyers today, this focus on Washington may come as a surprise, since the present-day legal community most associates the text with James Madison or perhaps Alexander Hamilton – and indeed both received their fair share of plaudits as well. But by emphasizing Washington, Warren, Beck, and others were able to respond to a nagging criticism from constitutional skeptics – namely the idea that the revolutionary experience (complete with the Declaration of Independence) was fundamentally distinct from the more suspect constitutional founding a decade later. Washington’s status as both wartime commander-in-chief of the Continental Army and presiding “father” of the Convention allowed constitutionalists to refashion the text as the ultimate fulfillment of the revolutionary project. As such, it supported their efforts to confront directly the Populist and Progressive

¹²⁰ Robert Lee Bullard, *The Meaning of Citizen* 2–3 (undated) (unpublished speech on file with the Library of Congress, Manuscripts Division, Robert Lee Bullard Papers).

¹²¹ See Henry Litchfield West, *Universal Military Training*, 3 NATIONAL SERVICE 305, 305 (1918).

¹²² HENRY LITCHFIELD WEST, *UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING: AS A PERMANENT PRINCIPLE OF NATIONAL DEFENSE* 1 (1918).

¹²³ *Assails Navy Plan*, *supra* note 66.

¹²⁴ Leslie M. Shaw, *A Republic, Not a Democracy*, 9 CONST. REV. 140, 141 (1925).

¹²⁵ CHARLES WARREN, *THE TRUMPETERS OF THE CONSTITUTION* 20 (1927).

¹²⁶ James Beck, *A Rising or a Setting Sun?*, 8 CONST. REV. 3, 5 (1924).

argument that the constitutional founding was a counter-revolutionary act. Glorifying Washington as a transcendent figure recast the meaning of the Constitution and quelled suspicion of its revolutionary credentials.

Such glorification – of all the framers – also served an additional and equally central purpose. It responded to a public discourse shaped by intellectuals such as Charles Beard that, according to Warren, explained constitutional motivations in terms of petty rivalries and material interests and in the process demeaned the heroism of the nation’s “fathers.” Giving one of the many university lectures established to honor the text, the Cutler Lecture at Rochester University, Warren declared, “To describe the Constitution as simply the product of class interests or of propertied selfishness, is to assert that such motives as patriotism, pride in country, unselfish devotion to the public welfare and belief in fundamental principles of right and government, did not exist or control.”¹²⁷ These views besmirched true statesmen, and, even worse, made Americans in the twentieth century believe that they could do better. Reminding citizens of the gulf between the incorruptible framers on the one hand and contemporary politicians and agitators on the other hand, he remarked, “They were great men, employed upon a great task, and moved by high impulses . . . [w]hen you are asked hereafter to consider amendments to that instrument, it would be well to consider carefully whether the men who urged such changes are equally great and whether their motives and ideals are equally high.”¹²⁸

Taken as a whole, the educational campaign, with its focus on producing deference through ideological uniformity, duty, and reverence for the founders, spoke to a particularly hierarchical relationship between the citizen and constitutional government. More than anything else, proponents of the text sought to transform the ordinary American’s encounter with the document and its institutions. The Constitution was to be understood not as one historical path out of many, but rather as a sacred inheritance from mythic founders – fundamentally outside the bounds of legitimate opposition and to be preserved at all costs.

Pro-Constitution activism’s greatest and most lasting aesthetic creation during the era, the Supreme Court building completed in 1935, powerfully dramatized this account of the relationship between citizens and their governing text. The building was designed by Cass Gilbert, a well-known architect with close ties to the American Legion, the American Defense Society, and the National Security League, who during the war played a central role in government propaganda as the Associate Chairman of the Committee on Public Information’s Division of Pictorial Publicity.¹²⁹ Gilbert sought to make the building an imposing historic monument to the Constitution, one that would both inspire awe in citizens and melt away suspicion of the Court. But as biographers Barbara Christen and Steve Flanders write, for architectural critics at the time, “The authority it meant to convey was easily confused with authoritarianism.”¹³⁰ In part, this was because Gilbert was deeply influenced by Benito Mussolini and especially by the revival of

¹²⁷ WARREN, *supra* note 125, at 65.

¹²⁸ *Id.* at 69.

¹²⁹ See Cass Gilbert, *Division of Pictorial Publicity*, in U.S. COMM. ON PUB. INFO., DIV. OF PICTORIAL PUBLICITY, VICTORY DINNER AND DANCE OF THE DIVISION OF PICTORIAL PUBLICITY (1919). His unpublished correspondences are filled with letters to and from these above organizations as well as influential pro-war constitutionalists like Nicholas Murray Butler and James Beck among others. See, e.g., Letter from Cass Gilbert to Nicholas Murray Butler (Dec. 7, 1933); Letter from Elon H. Hooker, Chairman of the American Defense Society, to Cass Gilbert (February 16, 1931); Letter from Cass Gilbert to Robert Lee Bullard (Mar. 26, 1931) (on file with the Library of Congress, Manuscripts Division, Cass Gilbert Papers).

¹³⁰ CASS GILBERT, LIFE AND WORK: ARCHITECT OF THE PUBLIC DOMAIN 285 (Eds. Barbara Christen & Steve Flanders, 2001).

classical Roman iconography and design in 1920s Italy.¹³¹ He chose an idealized and grand variation on ancient Roman architecture as the basis for the new building, sent Mussolini photographs of his Supreme Court drawings,¹³² and even went to Siena to handpick the Italian marble.¹³³

While clearly not all defenders of the Constitution during the period were sympathetic to Il Duce,¹³⁴ Gilbert's design vision and intentions for the building were of a piece with the broader civic culture promoted by such groups. The building spoke to a pro-Constitution sensibility that saw deference to institutions and to heroic leaders as foundational for constructing a constitutionally loyal citizen, one supportive of broader national security goals. Although today's discussions of constitutional commitment tend to link textual loyalty to self-examination instead of political compliance, such subservience nonetheless played an essential role at a moment when first-order disagreement about the document was a powerful force in public life. Under such conditions, constitutional education, through speeches, mass celebrations, textbooks, and even architectural monuments, tied affective attachment to the text to hierarchical forms of allegiance.

B. American Exceptionalism and Cultural Particularity

This politics of deference went hand in hand with an ethnicized discourse of collective identity, one that again asserted the importance of an aggressive national security posture. Rather than avoiding the pitfalls of locating community in blood and land, pro-Constitution narratives of American exceptionalism played fundamentally on tropes about cultural particularity and fitness. On first glance, this might be surprising given how, as discussed previously, such discourses invoked universalistic Enlightenment values. And indeed, important figures during and after World War I very consciously maintained that "Americanism" was not reducible to ethnic criteria. David Jayne Hill himself declared:

It cannot be maintained that Americanism . . . is a matter of race. Our country from the beginning has been populated by people of widely different ethnic origins. Some of their qualities are perpetuated with practically little effacement, others are obscured by the syncretism of races; but there is no definable ethnic type that is exclusively entitled to be called American.¹³⁵

¹³¹ After a personal audience with Mussolini, while in Italy to choose the stone for the Supreme Court, he gushed:

He is making Italy proud of itself. He is restoring her ancient glory. . . . He is not forgetting the army and navy, they are both ready, well equipped, up to date, well disciplined, well armed. They are forces to be reckoned with, especially now, since Italy is so well worth fighting for. Patriotism is taught to the children and to grown people alike, and when a whole people is convinced of the greatness of their country and the wisdom and greatness of their leader that country is to be respected.

Cass Gilbert, Mussolini 15 (June 6, 1933) (unpublished manuscript) (on file with the Library of Congress, Manuscripts Division, Cass Gilbert Papers); *see also* KAMMEN, *supra* note 19, at 268.

¹³² Letter from Cass Gilbert to Letter to Nobile Giacomo de Martino, Italian Ambassador to the U.S. (Oct. 11, 1932) (on file with the Library of Congress, Manuscripts Division, Cass Gilbert Papers).

¹³³ Letter from J. Alfred Pisani to Guilio C. Pisani, Jr. (Apr. 26, 1933)(on file with the Library of Congress, Manuscripts Division, Cass Gilbert Papers). For more on Gilbert's trip to Italy as part of the construction of the Supreme Court Building, *see* KAMMEN, *supra* note 24, at 266–269.

¹³⁴ For an excellent introduction to the complicated reception of Mussolini and fascism in the United States during the 1920s, *see* JOHN DIGGINS, *MUSSOLINI AND FASCISM: THE VIEW FROM AMERICA* (1972).

¹³⁵ HILL, *supra* note 78, at vii (1916).

For many defenders of the Constitution during the period, the idea that collective identity was bound to affective attachment to a document – one moreover that consisted of abstract republican principles – spoke to an inclusive brand of belonging. As Hill suggested, anyone – as long as he or she was willing to ascribe to these tenets – could become “American.”

However, ideas of cultural particularity steadily regained prominence as pro-war constitutionalists responded to yet another challenge emerging at the time: Why should one view the text as the best expression of a broader Enlightenment heritage that was not necessarily specific to the United States? Especially with growing numbers of new European immigrants, why not learn from these communities’ alternative methods for adapting the republican values of self-government, rights-protection, and economic independence to changed modern circumstances? Indeed, immigrant groups played a powerful role during the era in revitalizing political activism and speaking out against American involvement in World War I, especially within the labor movement and growing socialist parties. As anti-war and pro-immigrant voices like Randolph Bourne argued, the United States had the opportunity to become “the first international nation.”¹³⁶ This meant incorporating new concepts from abroad and even fundamentally shifting existing institutions rather than simply holding firm to a “homogeneous Americanism,”¹³⁷ especially when such ideologies went hand in hand with militarism and coercive government practices.

In order for defenders of the Constitution to link textual loyalty to national security, and then to the war effort, they would first have to explain why the constitutional structure should remain immune from fundamental revision. Hill and others responded to this challenge by focusing again on American exceptionalism. The historical uniqueness of the American experience not only suggested that the Constitution was a sacred document and could not simply be replaced, but also that there was something culturally distinctive about the North American colonies which allowed such creedal values to flourish in the first place. The reason why the framers were able to devise the Constitution was because they had been raised in a political community culturally attuned to practices of self-rule and principles of liberty. According to Hill, the earliest colonists left monarchical England because of a “protest against mere power,”¹³⁸ and indeed the first truly American charter of liberty was not the Constitution but the November 11, 1620 Mayflower Compact. Long before England’s 1647 “Agreement of the People” or the later writings of Locke and Rousseau, initial settlers – “a company of plain men, sailing over wintry seas to an unknown land with the purpose of escaping the too heavy hand of an absolute government”¹³⁹ – “forged the beginning of real self-government.”¹⁴⁰

Thus, the Constitution, a century and a half later, was just the culmination of a specifically American cultural commitment to the “voluntary renunciation of arbitrary power.”¹⁴¹ This commitment, once more, highlighted why the United States enjoyed a special and redemptive global project, embodied by the war effort, and emphasized the domestic importance of preserving the country’s distinctive constitutional heritage. Such facts were a reminder to U.S. citizens to be wary of new, destructive concepts – threats to American security and identity – brought to the country by immigrants that did not have the same long-standing education in self-rule. As Burton Alva Konkle, a Swarthmore College history professor and frequent contributor to *Constitutional Review* in the 1920s, wrote of these recent arrivals, “instead of coming in a profound thoughtfulness for the blessings of free institution, some place their raw Utopian theories on their

¹³⁶ RANDOLPH BOURNE, *Trans-national America*, in *THE RADICAL WILL: SELECTED WRITINGS 1911–1918* 248, 258 (ed. Olaf Hansen, 1977).

¹³⁷ *Id.* at 252.

¹³⁸ HILL, *supra* note 78, at 14.

¹³⁹ *Id.*

¹⁴⁰ *Id.* at 15.

¹⁴¹ *Id.* at 29.

banners and ask us to adopt them.”¹⁴² In order for the Constitution – a national inheritance with roots extending back to the Pilgrims themselves – to be sustained, Hill similarly concluded that immigrants would have to shed their old world and “un-American”¹⁴³ “ideas and sentiments.”¹⁴⁴ A process of “Americanization”¹⁴⁵ was required to make sure that a culture of constitutional commitment spread successfully, “‘assimilating’ the new elements that enter into our population.”¹⁴⁶

These voices saw the centerpiece of assimilation efforts as the stamping out of foreign languages in American educational and political life, with the expectation that an exclusive focus on English would help to standardize national identity and promote the capacities for self-rule among new communities. Calls for English-only measures expanded dramatically during the war as national security enmity focused especially on the German language, associated with both the Kaiser and revolutionary socialism. Hill’s American Defense Society demanded that state and local governments eliminate the use of German in schools and fight to make “the German language . . . a dead language.”¹⁴⁷ At the same time, the NSL began a national campaign “with the object of destroying the German-language press,”¹⁴⁸ through mass popular rallies and pressure on advertisers and news dealers.¹⁴⁹

When the war ended, English-only proposals did not recede but actually grew beyond the focus on German identity. By 1923, the number of states that required English-only instruction stood at thirty-five, up from just nine at the end of the nineteenth century.¹⁵⁰ Capturing the “Americanization” sentiment in 1919, Albert Bushnell Hart, Harvard historian and NSL Education Director of the Committee on Patriotism through Education, remarked that, “Any adult immigrant who comes to this country and is found three years thereafter unable to use English for the ordinary communications of life should be repatriated.”¹⁵¹ In his view, “No public or private schools ought to be allowed to educate in any racial language except English” and suffrage should be limited solely to “those who can read and write English, not merely a few stock phrases and sign their name, but can actually communicate with people in the ordinary daily life.”¹⁵²

This slippage between the text’s universalism and the culturally particular nature of American greatness promoted a xenophobic politics that intertwined national security and constitutional loyalty. Figures like David Jayne Hill or Albert Bushnell Hart, the latter of whom had been one of W.E.B. Du Bois’s professors at Harvard and served as trustee of Howard University,¹⁵³ may have believed in the theoretical fitness of all ethnic and racial groups for full American membership. But transforming this theoretical fitness into a reality entailed eliminating cultural multiplicity and employing government power to impose a standard “American” identity on all groups. It meant pursuing at home the same brand of “tutelage” for racial and ethnic

¹⁴² Burton Alva Konkle, *Americanizing Americans*, 8 CONST. REV. 97, 97 (1924).

¹⁴³ HILL, *supra* note 78, at viii.

¹⁴⁴ *Id.*

¹⁴⁵ *Id.*

¹⁴⁶ *Id.*

¹⁴⁷ *Calls for Strict Ban on German Language*, *supra* note 70.

¹⁴⁸ *League Starts War on German Press: National Campaign Organized to Limit Papers to English Language*, N.Y. TIMES, June 3, 1918, at 5.

¹⁴⁹ *Id.* According to its Committee on Foreign Language and Foreign Press: “The animosity, clannishness, and the propaganda of undemocratic ideas are sources of injury to the community, and the substitution of other languages for our own clearly fosters them.” *Aim to Make America a Land of One Tongue*, N.Y. TIMES, July 22, 1918, at 7.

¹⁵⁰ PEGRAM, *supra* note 91, at 96.

¹⁵¹ Shulman, *supra* note 67, at 319 (quoting Letter from Albert Bushnell Hart to Charles D. Orth (Oct. 11, 1919) (unpublished material on file with Harvard University Library, Albert Bushnell Hart Papers)).

¹⁵² *Id.*

¹⁵³ *Id.* at 306.

communities in their “political childhood” as that employed abroad to quell insurrection in the Philippines and elsewhere.

Even more troubling, as threatened communities contested these policies, the Constitution’s defenders often fell back on explicitly racialized explanations for internal resistance and for why security requirements justified the exclusion in practice of some groups. Although Hill’s discussion of the Pilgrims left the point essentially implicit, Iowa Governor Shaw reminded Americans that the social environment that produced the Constitution was above all an Anglo-Protestant one. In his view the reason why “Americanization” projects, and indeed the Constitution itself, faced such opposition was that by the early twentieth century the Anglo-Protestant identity was disintegrating under the pressure of racial and ethnic heterogeneity. From African Americans to Roman Catholics, the United States found itself attempting to integrate increasingly diverse communities; “many of them,” Shaw argued, were “biologically unable to think in terms of Anglican [sic] liberty.”¹⁵⁴ For the editors of *The American Standard*, the Klan’s widely circulated journal,¹⁵⁵ the Constitution “put into written form the immortal principles of liberty, popular government, and equal justice, which were the fruitage of Anglo-Saxon character.”¹⁵⁶ In language that echoed Hill’s more secularized account, the constitutional text was a fundamentally Protestant document that fulfilled the ambitions of the earlier Mayflower Compact, and which “made us a Body Politic, in the name of God.”¹⁵⁷ For the editors, the country had to remain true to these racial and religious origins or it was liable to perish.¹⁵⁸

In the end, the manner in which constitutionalists during the period moved between universalistic principles and culturally particular historical arguments highlights a significant danger with the connection between constitutional loyalty and national security. If anything, the link in the 1910s and 1920s between the Constitution and American exceptionalism meant that the document operated in collective life as a powerful rhetorical tool reimagining ethno-cultural homogeneity and control as national security requirements. Pro-war and pro-Constitution forces were able to combine seemingly conflicting political ideas about universalism and cultural superiority precisely through a constitutional reverence that promoted a discourse of American chosen-ness. This combination allowed civic and government actors to assert universalistic and inclusive commitments in theory, while in practice arguing that national security and basic order required the imposition of coercive policies grounded in ethnic and racial difference. Indeed, one seemingly paradoxical but lasting legacy of pro-Constitution activism in the period was the construction of a sophisticated language of racial domination that could draw on security concerns for validation while still speaking in universalistic terms.

C. *Repression and the Constitution’s Friends and Enemies*

Still, among the most troubling features of how civic and government actors reframed the American debate over the Constitution involved their tying together deferential citizenship and American exceptionalism with a muscular commitment to government repression. Pro-Constitution forces often repeated that the vast majority of citizens and new immigrants were “well-meaning people”¹⁵⁹ who could be made patriotic through popular education about the text.

¹⁵⁴ Shaw, *supra* note 124, at 141.

¹⁵⁵ Emphasizing the Klan’s commitment to the Constitution, the journal was itself named after Benjamin Franklin’s words at the start of the Federal Constitutional Convention: “Let us raise a standard to which the wise and the honest can repair; the event is in the hands of God.” These words appeared on the cover of every issue of the *Standard*. See *Constitution Day*, 2 AMER. STAND. 420, 420 (1925).

¹⁵⁶ *Id.*

¹⁵⁷ *God and the Constitution*, 2 AMER. STAND. 420, 421 (1925).

¹⁵⁸ See *Constitution Day*, *supra* note 155, at 420.

¹⁵⁹ *The Constitution Anniversary Association*, 7 CONST. REV. 191, 192 (1923).

However, at the same time there existed a small group of enemies to the Constitution who could never be persuaded. According to one wartime National Security League pamphlet, these enemies were often “Secret Americans,” individuals that might not have explicitly admitted their support for the German cause or for Russian revolutionaries but who quietly stood behind arguments about pacifism or the evils of militarism to undermine the constitutional system.¹⁶⁰ The pamphlet continues, “The only safe rule is to regard all of these as unconditional traitors.”¹⁶¹ As the pages of *Constitutional Review* maintained, such individuals underscored how “the enemy [was] within our gates,”¹⁶² “covertly at work to undermine the Constitution.”¹⁶³ Indeed, this internal threat, spearheaded by foreign agitators or revolutionary extremists, had “made great headway”¹⁶⁴ and had “become[] a focus of infection for others.”¹⁶⁵

As a result, education and Americanization efforts alone were not enough; groups also appealed directly to all friends of the Constitution to defend the political community by actively suppressing dissent. These groups argued not only for a dramatically expanded domestic security apparatus, but even for citizens to take matters into their own hands as part of a broader surveillance climate. The American Defense Society demanded “increased vigor of the interning of aggressive pro-German sympathizers, whether German citizens or not.”¹⁶⁶ Arguing for the country to follow the lead of England’s mass German internment, the Society noted that after the arrests “malicious plots and propaganda ceased.”¹⁶⁷ It further called for the exclusion of the Socialist Party of America from politics – a position that met with some success as Wisconsin socialist Victor Berger was twice elected to Congress in 1918 and 1919 but denied his seat by the House.¹⁶⁸ Similarly, in 1920 the New York State Assembly suspended and then expelled on ideological grounds five socialists who had been elected to the body.¹⁶⁹

In fact, strong constitutionalists frequently claimed that the Wilson Administration, notorious during the period for its harsh crackdown on dissent,¹⁷⁰ was actually doing too little to stamp out internal threats. George Sutherland, former Utah Senator, future Supreme Court Justice, and himself a contributor to *Constitutional Review*, declared in 1918 that Administration actions “did not go far enough.”¹⁷¹ In his view, during wartime there was no place for “scurrilous and abusive criticisms of our form of government, our Constitution and our institutions” because “an unbridled tongue may be as dangerous as a wicked hand.”¹⁷²

One famous voice of criticism came from within the Administration itself. Charles Warren, in many ways the most respected intellectual face of pro-Constitution activism in the 1920s – as well as a powerful presence in the Democratic Party and a friend to Presidents and

¹⁶⁰ See generally ALFRED BROOKS, CONVERTED AND SECRET AMERICANS (1918).

¹⁶¹ *Id.*

¹⁶² James A. Van Osdol, *Future Organization and Defense of the Constitution*, 13 CONST. REV. 121, 122 (1929).

¹⁶³ *The Constitution Anniversary Association*, supra note 159, at 191.

¹⁶⁴ *Id.*

¹⁶⁵ *Teaching Constitutional Government*, 5 CONST. REV. 120, 121 (1921).

¹⁶⁶ *Calls for Strict Ban on German Language*, supra note 65.

¹⁶⁷ *Id.*

¹⁶⁸ See SALLY MILLER, VICTOR BERGER AND THE PROMISE OF CONSTRUCTIVE SOCIALISM 191–226 (1973).

¹⁶⁹ See LOUIS WALDMAN, ALBANY: THE CRISIS IN GOVERNMENT: THE HISTORY OF THE SUSPENSION, TRIAL AND EXPULSION FROM THE NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATURE IN 1920 OF THE FIVE SOCIALIST ASSEMBLYMEN BY THEIR POLITICAL OPPONENTS 2–7 (1920).

¹⁷⁰ See generally STONE, supra note 15, at 135–233.

¹⁷¹ GEORGE SUTHERLAND, CONSTITUTIONAL POWER AND WORLD AFFAIRS 102 (1918).

¹⁷² *Id.*

Supreme Court Justices¹⁷³ – played an especially aggressive role in debates within the Justice Department. While Assistant Attorney General, Warren was the principal drafter of Wilson’s two 1917 Proclamations regulating the conduct of “alien enemies” not to mention the Espionage Act (1917),¹⁷⁴ the Trading with the Enemy Act (1917),¹⁷⁵ and the Sedition Act (1918).¹⁷⁶ These laws provided the legal infrastructure for a massive and historically unparalleled federal assault on speech, dissent, and immigrant rights. Among other things, they led to the first government censorship boards,¹⁷⁷ the outlaw, according to historian Robert Goldstein, of “virtually all criticism of the war or the government”¹⁷⁸ and the summary arrest of “alien enemies”¹⁷⁹ (alongside other measures to control enemy nationals such as their mass registration and a complete ban on their entering Washington, D.C.).¹⁸⁰ To give a sense of the coerciveness of national security practices during the war, some 2,000 people were prosecuted under the Espionage and Sedition Acts, mostly for speech crimes (well-known politicians included socialists Eugene V. Debs and Victor Berger),¹⁸¹ and over 6,000 “alien enemies” were detained under presidential warrants issued by the Attorney General – the vast majority interned in army detention camps.¹⁸²

Warren saw the writing of these bills as his greatest achievement while in office.¹⁸³ But he was nonetheless angered by what he viewed as the weakness of the Justice Department in combating seditious speech. In particular, he believed that existing treason laws should be more “vigorously enforced,”¹⁸⁴ ensuring that all U.S. civilians who gave “aid or comfort”¹⁸⁵ to the enemy – such as through nonviolent political advocacy of anti-war positions – were fully prosecuted. As for noncitizen civilians, they should face court martial for analogous crimes.¹⁸⁶ When these views met with some internal resistance and it became clear that the Justice Department was skeptical of mass treason trials, he reached out to extreme pro-war Senators like

¹⁷³ Warren was close personal friends and a political advisor to fellow constitutionalist John W. Davis, U.S. Solicitor General and conservative Democratic nominee for President in 1924. *See e.g.*, Western Union Telegram from John W. Davis to Charles Warren (Aug. 6, 1924) (on file with the Library of Congress, Manuscripts Division, Charles Warren Papers) (asking Warren to prepare a critical “survey” of the “Republican record” for use during the presidential campaign). His collected papers on file with the Library of Congress also include glowing correspondence from everyone from Louis Brandeis and Franklin Delano Roosevelt to Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, and countless others.

¹⁷⁴ Espionage Act of 1917, Pub. L. No. 65-24, 40 Stat. 217; Pub. L. No. 65-24, 40 Stat. 217.

¹⁷⁵ Trading with the Enemy Act of 1917, Pub. L. No. 65-91, 40 Stat. 411

¹⁷⁶ Sedition Act of 1918, Pub. L. No. 65-150, 40 Stat. 553. On Warren’s role as primary author, see Letter from Charles Warren to “Gard” (Apr. 22, 1918) (on file with the Library of Congress, Manuscripts Division, Charles Warren Papers).

¹⁷⁷ *See* MILLER, *supra* note 163, at 193.

¹⁷⁸ ROBERT GOLDSTEIN, *POLITICAL REPRESSION IN MODERN AMERICA* 108 (1978).

¹⁷⁹ *See id.*; *see also* Charles Warren, “Arrest and Internment of Alien Enemies” 535, 544 (undated) (unpublished “War Notes” on file with the Library of Congress, Manuscripts Division, Charles Warren Papers).

¹⁸⁰ *See* Charles Warren, “Arrest and Internment of Alien Enemies,” *supra* note 179, at 544.

¹⁸¹ STONE ET. AL., *THE FIRST AMENDMENT* 20 (2d. ed. 2003).

¹⁸² *See* Charles Warren, “Arrest and Internment of Alien Enemies,” *supra* note 179, at 544.

¹⁸³ *See* Letter from Charles Warren to “Gard”, *supra* note 176, at 2 (as he told one friend, “It has been an arduous but exciting and eventful four years, and I feel I have given my very best efforts to the United States. I leave on the books at least four permanent records of my work.”).

¹⁸⁴ *Id.*

¹⁸⁵ *See* Charles Warren, *What is Giving Aid and Comfort to the Enemy*, 27 *YALE L.J.* 331, 331 (1917).

¹⁸⁶ *See* Letter from Charles Warren to “Gard”, *supra* note 169, at 2.

Lee Slater Overman from North Carolina and George Earle Chamberlain from Oregon. Warren drafted a new bill providing for the military trial of civilian citizens and noncitizens alike of all speech crimes,¹⁸⁷ with punishment by death at the discretion of the military judges.¹⁸⁸ As Warren told Overman, in his view the lack of vigilance in the Justice Department had made clear that military involvement was the only solution: “for nearly a year I have been convinced that the only effective way of dealing with enemy activities in this country was by the military . . . I do not believe that war can be effectively carried on by the criminal courts.”¹⁸⁹ After Chamberlain introduced the bill in the Senate, Thomas Gregory, the Attorney General, was furious at Warren’s insubordination and forced him to resign. Warren’s actions, however, made him a *cause célèbre* in Washington among national security hawks and helped to burnish further the patriotic credentials of pro-Constitution forces.¹⁹⁰

Such activists did not stop with calls for new, more coercive security measures, however; they also pursued separate non-governmental actions against constitutional enemies. As one famous wartime manifesto, widely circulated by the National Security League, declared:

We ask that good Americans . . . uphold the hand of the Government at every point. . . . Furthermore we ask that where government action cannot be taken, they arouse an effective and indignant public opinion against the enemies of our country, whether those enemies masquerade as pacifists, or proclaim themselves the enemies of our Allies, or act through organizations such as the I.W.W. and the Socialist party machine, or appear nakedly as the champions of Germany.¹⁹¹

This militant constitutionalism,¹⁹² in which defenses of the text required popular campaigns of social censure, civic participation in government crackdowns, and if need be even independent

¹⁸⁷ The proposed bill would have established military commissions for such speech crimes as “causing or attempting to cause insubordination or refusal of duty by any member” of the armed forces, “delivering or transmitting, or causing to be delivered or transmitted” to any member of the military “any written or printed matter which shall support or favor the cause of the enemy country or of its allies in the war, or which shall oppose the cause of the United States,” and “printing or publishing any such printed matter.” See S. 4364, 65 Cong. (1918).

¹⁸⁸ *Id.*

¹⁸⁹ Letter from Charles Warren to Lee Slater Overman (April 8, 1918) (on file with the Library of Congress, Manuscripts Division, Charles Warren Papers).

¹⁹⁰ Warren received dozens of letters of support for his position. See, e.g., Letter from W.E.D. Stokes to Charles Warren (Apr. 20, 1918) (on file with the Library of Congress, Manuscripts Division, Charles Warren Papers) (stating “Don’t, for Heaven’s Sake, resign. I have, for 6 months written to the President and told him that the War cannot be run by the Criminal Courts,—that we got to try these cases by Court Martial; you know how I have worked over this question”).

¹⁹¹ *The Children of the Crucible*, in AMERICA AT WAR, *supra* note 69, at 314, 316. The ironic feature of this document is that it was written by intense pro-war advocate Teddy Roosevelt, who for many pro-Constitution activists in groups like the NSL and the American Defense Society still represented the prewar failure of Progressives to embrace fully the Constitution as it was.

¹⁹² I adapt the term *constitutional militancy* from 1930s German Political Scientist Karl Loewenstein’s phrase “militant democracy.” Particularly influential in post-World War II West Germany, his idea of a “disciplined” democracy, which fought “fire . . . with fire,” justified a German efforts to protect the state and its institutions at all costs. Jan-Werner Müller, *On the Origins of Constitutional Patriotism*, 5 CONTEMP. POL. THEORY 278, 284 (2006) (quoting Karl Loewenstein, *Militant democracy and fundamental rights II*, 31 AM. POL. SCI. REV. 638, 656–57 (1937)). According to Jan-Werner Müller, in the postwar period nationalists argued that a “free democratic basic order” would only persist if that state crushed both Nazi and Communist extremism. *Id.* at 285.

political violence, became part of the public culture of the era. Bar associations routinely imposed “punitive professional sanctions”¹⁹³ like disbarment for those lawyers who defended or associated with dissidents; constitutional loyalty meant “cleansing the bar” as historian Jerold Auerbach notes.¹⁹⁴ And at universities, professors who took anti-war stances or who were viewed as otherwise ideologically suspect found themselves without employment. At Columbia, Nicholas Murray Butler, an outspoken pro-Constitution voice, stated that there would be “no place” at the university for those who countenanced “treason” and oversaw the firing of numerous academics – eventually leading Charles Beard to resign in protest.¹⁹⁵

Patriotic speaking tours, such as those of Robert McNutt McElroy, Princeton professor and NSL Educational Director, also embodied this militant spirit. As McElroy told the *New York Tribune* after a preparedness trip to Wisconsin, the whole state was effectively committing treason, given its large German population and “100,000 disloyal votes”¹⁹⁶ for socialist candidates. Stating the need for government investigations and, failing that, action from loyal Americans, he declared, “I was out there when the news of the German advance was coming through, and from the reception it got you would scarcely have gained the impression that it was a blow to America. You would have been far more likely to suppose that it was somehow a cause for congratulation in this country.”¹⁹⁷ These cries of treason and calls for action stirred various groups to respond, the most notorious being the American Protective League, which during the war enjoyed a quasi-official status, engaging in raids and surveillance of suspected German sympathizers with the backing of state and federal authorities. And following the war, the American Legion, again with government complicity,¹⁹⁸ similarly initiated violent attacks on those it deemed constitutional enemies and thus national security threats – especially socialists and radical unions like the International Workers of the World (I.W.W.). As Progressive journalist Norman Hapgood reported at the time, by the end of 1920 the American Civil Liberties Union had verified over fifty coordinated acts of violence nationwide by Legionnaires.¹⁹⁹

In effect, pro-Constitution advocacy became closely intertwined with a remarkably authoritarian statecraft. Precisely because constitutional enemies could not be educated or reasoned with, government officials and civic associations argued for legal and political responses that made use of the emerging national security infrastructure. Defending everything from bans on political parties to speech restrictions, arrests, and deportations, such voices maintained that anti-Constitution sentiment had to be eliminated once and for all. Again, most tellingly, this militancy was justified precisely in terms of the Constitution; security vigilance ensured the survival of the

¹⁹³ See JEROLD AUERBACH, *UNEQUAL JUSTICE: LAW AND SOCIAL CHANGE IN MODERN AMERICA* 104 (1976).

¹⁹⁴ *See id.* at 102.

¹⁹⁵ ELLEN NORE, *CHARLES A. BEARD: AN INTELLECTUAL BIOGRAPHY* 80 (1983) (quoting Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia University, Commencement Address (June 6, 1917)).

¹⁹⁶ *West is Crowded with Pro-Germans, Dr. McElroy Says: Government Should Investigate University of Wisconsin, He Declares*, N.Y. TRIBUNE, Apr. 17, 1918, in JOHN BRADLEY WINSLOW ET. AL., *REPORT UPON THE STATEMENTS OF PROFESSOR ROBERT MCNUTT MCELROY AND THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY LEAGUE RELATING TO THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN* 16, 18 (1919).

¹⁹⁷ *Id.*

¹⁹⁸ As one F.B.I. Special Agent explained government support for the organization, “The Legion as a body are watching during the day and night so that nothing may start and no trouble may occur.” REGIN SCHMIDT, *RED SCARE: THE FBI AND THE ORIGINS OF ANTICOMMUNISM IN THE UNITED STATES, 1919–1943* 109 (2000) (quoting Report, M.J. Fraser, Special Agent (March 4, 1920)).

¹⁹⁹ *See HAPGOOD, supra* note 87, at 57.

constitutional state and with it a liberal republican political order. Thus, organized groups defended constitutional reverence on national security grounds, and saw the exercise of repressive power as a method of fostering popular identification with the text.

Ultimately, this period of militant constitutionalism had profound and reverberating effects on American public culture. In particular, the concerted civic and government campaign succeeded in placing anti-constitutional sentiment on the permanent political defensive. In the years that followed the war, an accusation of constitutional opposition was often tantamount to a charge of disloyalty. This did not mean that constitutional skepticism disappeared wholesale from the public realm. Indeed, it remained especially strong among Progressive-influenced intellectuals²⁰⁰ as well as radical voices on the political left.²⁰¹ Both groups, against the backdrop of the Great Depression and judicial opposition to the New Deal, expressed with renewed vigor longstanding structural concerns about the anti-democratic characteristics of the Constitution. But such views had far less mass resonance, even prior to judicial acceptance of the New Deal, than they had twenty years previously. In the interim, public perceptions had changed as to the relationship between Americanism, constitutional devotion, and national loyalty. As one telling indication of the transformed landscape, by the 1930s even the Communist Party hoped to burnish its patriotic credentials by embracing a politics of constitutional reverence. During the 1936 elections, Earl Browder, Executive Secretary of the Communist Party, went out of his way to convince constituencies of the ideological continuities between communism and American constitutionalism. The key framer of the Party's 1936 platform, which famously stated "Communism is Twentieth-century Americanism,"²⁰² he stumped across the country carrying a copy of the Constitution in his pocket, a document meant to symbolize his "rights as a citizen."²⁰³ Given the new mainstream public imagination, for a group concerned with being viewed as foreign or un-American, there was now no better way to prove one's local authenticity than to engage in Constitution worship.

In many ways, Americans today live on the other side of a long historical process of constitutional elevation initiated during World War I. The implications of such national security origins for our contemporary climate of constitutional commitment are hardly reassuring. They

²⁰⁰ In the New Deal era, Charles Beard, who decades earlier had played such a central role in establishing the conventional academic wisdom that the Constitution was an anti-democratic document inconsistent with the spirit of the American Revolution, again powerfully captured the persistent climate of scholarly skepticism. See Charles Beard, *The Living Constitution*, 185 ANNALS AMER. ACAD. POL. & SOC. SCI. 29-34, 29 (May 1936) (rejecting the view that the Constitution should be deified as "a 'sheet anchor,' a lighthouse,' an 'ark of the covenant,' a 'beacon,' and a 'fundamental law,'" and arguing instead that it was simply a collection of good and bad legal and political practices. "These symbols are supposed to represent some reality, something tangible, a substance which all good and wise men can see and agree upon. Yet in truth they are mere poetic images that correspond to no reality at all, and the employment of them is sheer animism.").

²⁰¹ For the entire life of the Socialist Party as a meaningful electoral force in American politics – and therefore well into the 1930s – its national platform and main politicians continued to call for fundamental constitutional revision to create a governing order that curbed judicial power and mirrored European parliamentarism. As just one example of these call for basic reform and even a second convention, see the following article by Norman Thomas, six-time presidential candidate of the Socialist Party: *A Socialist Looks at the Constitution*, 185 ANNALS AMER. ACAD. POL. & SOC. SCI. 92–101 (May 1936).

²⁰² *Campaign of 1936: The Election Platform of the Communist Party*, 1 NATIONAL PARTY PLATFORMS: 1840–1956 1 356-360, 360 (ed. Donald Bruce Johnson, 1978).

²⁰³ *Checks, Constitution Browder's Claim against Vagrancy Charge*, CORNELL DAILY SUN, Oct. 20, 1936, at 1.

highlight how the modern genesis of widespread attachment to the document was shaped fundamentally by markedly illiberal wartime and postwar practices. Such practices leaned heavily on ideological deference, forced assimilation, militarism, and repression, and sought to reimagine an aggressive security infrastructure as essential to the protection of American values. Moreover, these practices not only helped to quell first-order disagreements about constitutional legitimacy. They also established many of the central arguments that have dominated more recent American political thinking about the interconnections between the Constitution, global responsibility, and domestic security. Thus, in the following conclusion, I suggest that the problem with these World War I origins is not simply that of a dark past that offers little to say about today's constitutional climate. Rather, the scripts developed nearly a century ago continue to intertwine constitutional attachment with the prerogatives of the national security state in ways that often go unnoticed, emphasizing the real difficulties of separating the liberal and illiberal dimensions of American constitutional culture.

V. CONCLUSION: THE TROUBLED LIBERALISM OF AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONAL LIFE

In this article, I have challenged the prevailing conventional wisdom that American constitutionalism has operated over the long run to refashion political and civic life straightforwardly around liberal values of pluralism, self-reflection, and rights-protection – in particular by curbing coercive national security frameworks. Through a close examination of the mass politics of constitutional veneration during and after World War I, I highlight instead how discourses of security and constitutional commitment actually developed together, critically reinforcing one another at a moment of shared genesis. Present-day constitutionalists, particularly within left-leaning legal academic circles, probably would be at pains to distinguish their own inclusive and civil libertarian goals – not to mention the current constitutional culture – from this earlier era of militant constitutionalism. But as I indicate, there is a profound symbiotic relationship between today's 'good' liberal constitutionalists and the 'bad' illiberal constitutionalists of the early twentieth century.

Laurence Tribe, Geoffrey Stone, and others may well see very little in common between the pro-security constitutional discourses of World War I and their own vision of the text as the focal point for a public culture of dissent and self-critique. Yet, in a deep sense, such scholars valorize a public culture that exists against a backdrop of remarkable political consensus around the legitimacy of the basic institutions of the federal government. Unlike a century ago, no relevant organized political constituencies today question the essential structure of the constitutional state – if we should have a presidential system, or two houses of Congress, or a Supreme Court – let alone whether there should be a broad civilian defense infrastructure housed in the executive branch and operative even during peacetime. By contrast, none of these elements of today's constitutional state were taken for granted in the lead up to American participation in World War I; organized citizens contested everything from the tripartite division of federal power to the appropriateness of a standing army. This widespread first-order disagreement raised profound anxieties among central political and economic elites about whether the country was in fact unravelling under the strain of industrial conflict, heightened immigration, and Europe's increasingly destructive power rivalries. Through an organized campaign of constitutional veneration, such elites in effect buttressed an economic and political status quo in real peril.

Indeed, one might well argue that the relative openness of the prevailing constitutional discourse today is tied closely to the fact that these first-order questions of legitimacy have been settled. All politically relevant groups – from Tea Party activists on the right to Occupy Wall Street protestors on the left – essentially assume the permanence of American legal and political structures. In essence, Tribe and Stone are able now to focus on the self-reflective nature of constitutional discourse, and its embedded spaces for dissent, precisely because the parameters of acceptable popular disagreement have already been established – the *meaning* and *extent* of dissent

have been fundamentally tamed. This does not imply that current defenders of the Constitution are simply wrong when they highlight how the governing constitutional culture facilitates reform efforts or presses against the very worst excesses of government violence. But it does underscore how the basic historical condition for today's presumptively liberal constitutional politics was the practical elimination – oftentimes through force – of more revolutionary alternatives. This fact alone makes it very difficult to keep the constitutional culture embraced by left-leaning academics uncontaminated by and distinct from its illiberal foundations.

Moreover, the national security origins of today's constitutional climate also speak to lasting – if oftentimes under-acknowledged – ideological continuities between the liberal egalitarian and the repressive dimensions in American constitutional experience. This is perhaps most apparent in the dual uses to which the exceptionalist rhetoric of our constitutional culture has been put in the years since World War I. For instance, during the Civil Rights era, such exceptionalism played a central ideological role in justifying policies of desegregation and racial inclusion. But at the same time it also intertwined those reform aims with a set of Cold War foreign policy objectives grounded in an expanded domestic security infrastructure. One sees this linkage quite clearly in sociologist Gunnar Myrdal's seminal study on race relations in the United States, *American Dilemma* (1944), a formative text for mid-twentieth century political elites. There, Myrdal contended that the Constitution embodied what he called “the American creed”²⁰⁴ and through the text “the nation early laid down as the moral basis for its existence the principles of liberty and equality.”²⁰⁵ Myrdal's invocation of America's universalist national identity accepted the practical reality of injustice, particularly the sinfulness of slavery, but essentially viewed the United States as an incomplete liberal society. For Myrdal, although the United States had only partially achieved its ideals, “the main trend” in American “history” was “the gradual realization of the American creed.”²⁰⁶ In his view, the effort to end segregation in the South was ultimately about fulfilling civic goals embedded in the Constitution – a position that many white liberals and middle-class African Americans came to embrace in the 1950s and 1960s. In fact, Martin Luther King famously invoked the abstract principles of the Constitution to describe the American project in terms of universal equality and the country in 1964 as “essentially a dream, a dream yet unfulfilled.”²⁰⁷

But, as powerful as this exceptionalist discourse was for liberalizing reform, it also leveraged such reform for clear national security ends. Myrdal, along with many Cold War political elites influenced by *American Dilemma*, contended that since the country was where the Enlightenment took historical root – as embodied by the Constitution – at its core the United States was nothing less than “humanity in miniature.”²⁰⁸ Just as the United States was a nation open to all, a fact highlighted yet again by racial reform, American power internationally stood “warmheartedly against oppression in all the world.”²⁰⁹ In essence, given that the country's constitutional values expressed the global community's ideals, American interventionism – and the

²⁰⁴ See generally GUNNER MYRDAL, 1 AN AMERICAN DILEMMA: THE NEGRO PROBLEM AND MODERN DEMOCRACY (1944). Myrdal contended that “American civilization early acquired a flavor of enlightenment which affected the ordinary American's whole personality” and generated a creedal commitment to “liberty, equality, justice, and fair opportunity for everybody.” *Id.* at lxviii, lxx.

²⁰⁵ GUNNER MYRDAL, 2 AN AMERICAN DILEMMA: THE NEGRO PROBLEM AND MODERN DEMOCRACY 1021 (1944).

²⁰⁶ *Id.*

²⁰⁷ See Martin Luther King, Jr., The American Dream (Feb. 5, 1964), in A TESTAMENT OF HOPE: THE ESSENTIAL WRITINGS AND SPEECHES OF MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. 208, 208 (James M. Washington ed., 1990).

²⁰⁸ MYRDAL, 2 AN AMERICAN DILEMMA, *supra* note 205, at 1021.

²⁰⁹ *Id.*

massive peacetime civilian defense framework that maintained it – necessarily involved a defense of liberal goals against illiberal threats. In this way, invocations of the United States’s exceptional constitutional culture served, as scholar Nikhil Pal Singh remarks, to “uph[o]ld the prerogatives of the American national security state,”²¹⁰ including domestic efforts to root out constitutional enemies during the Cold War.

One may well argue that the same leveraging of exceptionalist discourse and constitutional attachment for national security frameworks has been a staple of the post-September 11, 2001 “War on Terror.” In effect, political elites at key moments over the last century have repeatedly – and at times unwittingly – reproduced precisely the constitutional vision articulated by pro-security voices in the 1910s and 1920s, especially that of David Jayne Hill and Albert Bushnell Hart. Recall that, for Hill and Hart, American belonging was grounded in universal Enlightenment values, as defined by constitutional commitment alone rather than racial or ethnic criteria. But as a corollary, they maintained that such exceptionalism, symbolized by the Constitution, necessitated an aggressive security approach capable of projecting American power and of safeguarding the constitutional state from all perceived threats.

The lasting influence of World War I era constitutional discourses underscores both the strengths and significant pitfalls of the type of constitutional culture generated during that period. It highlights the deep ideological interconnections between those rights-inclusive elements of the constitutional culture that scholars valorize and the potentially repressive strains that they deemphasize in public conversation. In particular, these ties bring home the fact that one cannot write off the repressive strains as simply aberrational features of an essentially liberal modern constitutional tradition. As this article has explored, the Constitution – and especially the climate of veneration that surrounds it – has perhaps more than anything else provided twentieth century Americans with the ideological parameters for political debate. Although these parameters have no doubt provided a basis for important and truly radical changes, they have also left the country with a much more troubled cultural inheritance than many scholars and citizens appreciate or desire. In the long run, reckoning with this inheritance will require an understanding of the tangled relationship in American constitutional discourse between liberalism and illiberalism, and of the coercive outcomes that have been facilitated by presumptively liberal and inclusive constitutional values.

²¹⁰ See Nikhil Pal Singh, *The Black Panthers and the “Undeveloped Country” of the Left*, in *THE BLACK PANTHER PARTY RECONSIDERED* 57, 73 (ed. Charles Jones, 1998).