

From: [Schmidt, Jon](#)
To: [Timothy Clare](#); [Jack Stark](#); [James Pillen](#); [Elizabeth O'Connor](#); [Robert Schafer](#); [Paul Kenney](#); [Robert Phares](#); [Barbara Weitz](#)
Subject: Resolution to Condemn CRT
Date: Friday, July 9, 2021 4:13:47 PM

Non-NU Email

Good Afternoon,

I was appalled to read the resolution presented by Jim Pillen and supported by Governor Ricketts that would oppose teaching critical race theory. There are so many things wrong with the resolution and its intent that I am encouraging each of you to vote against this resolution.

A few points to make here:

- *Critical race theory* is a theory and in my experience as a professor of education at Loyola University, it is taught as a theory. As with all theoretical propositions, they are presented to students for their consideration to help them think about how to understand the world. Critical race theory is no exception.
- Critical race theorists do not attempt to silence opposing voices. Quite the opposite. They seek to present ideas that open avenues for discussion and consideration. That is what university education is about. I teach CRT in my graduate education classes where we discuss its meaning and application in depth--along with a wide variety of other theories. Neither I nor do academic colleagues present CRT as a doctrine that has to be accepted. We do believe, however, that CRT and its lineage along with other theories about race is important to present to students so that they can reach their own conclusions about the state of race in this country. If we are not strong enough as academic institutions and as a country to face questions about race and racism in the United States, we are really in bad shape.
- In his resolution, Mr. Pillen states that America is the best country in the world, and anyone has a chance to achieve the American dream. Mr. Pillen is stating an opinion. If he is presenting this as a fact, he should provide criteria for what it means to be the "best country in the world" and then data that would support his claim. Of course, criteria presented would likely be analyzed, critiqued, and perhaps countered by other voices with different ideas and perspectives. His next claim that anyone can achieve the American dream is also presented as fact; it is not a fact. It is an opinion. Most any social science scholar can produce voluminous evidence that the American dream (whatever that might mean) is actually not accessible to everyone.

I am confident that you will reject this assault on academic freedom and academic integrity. If we ban the presentation of ideas and theories that help us to better understand our country and its history, we are no longer universities, and we are no longer a democracy.

Jon Schmidt
School of Education
Loyola University Chicago