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Parker Palmer’s search for wholeness has been a complex and continuing quest. His philosophy has been influenced by seemingly diverse forces. Raised a Methodist, his time at Pendle Hill led him to become a Quaker. Though a Quaker, he has been deeply affected by the writings of Thomas Merton. In spite of long battles with depression, his life and work focus on hope and possibility. To read Palmer is to embark upon a journey without maps or charts, not knowing where the journey will lead or when it will end. It may be frightening at times, filled with darkness and shadows before glimmers of light appear. There are mysteries to unravel and paradoxes to be accepted and ultimately embraced. While Palmer does not presume to prescribe the journey’s route, he supports the traveler by sharing his own stories of his own journey toward an undivided life.

Born in 1939, Palmer grew up in a white, upper-middle-class Chicago neighborhood. His father worked for the same company for fifty years, ultimately becoming its owner and Chairman of its Board of Directors. Through example and teaching, Palmer’s father instilled in him the belief that one must live and act with compassion and generosity (Palmer, 2000).

As a young boy, Palmer was fascinated with two things, airplanes and words. He tells of spending hours in his room, drawing pictures of planes, writing about planes and creating his own books. Although he had no real sense of vocation, Palmer responded that he planned to become a naval aviator and then pursue a career in advertising when asked what he intended to be (Palmer, 2000). Ultimately, Palmer entered Carlton College in Minnesota, the first member of his family to attend college, completed a degree in sociology and philosophy, and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa (Palmer, 1998). By the time he graduated, Palmer decided that the ministry was his vocation and he entered Union Theological Seminary in New York City. At the end of his first year there, according to Palmer, “God spoke to me – in the form of mediocre grades and massive misery – and informed me that under no condition was I to become an ordained leader in His or Her church.” (Palmer, 2000, 19-20).

After leaving the seminary, Palmer began graduate study at the University of California at Berkeley, eventually completing masters (1962) and doctoral programs (1970) in sociology. According to Palmer, “Berkeley in the 60s was an astounding mix of shadow and light . . . contrary to the current myth, many of us were less seduced by the shadow than drawn by the light, coming away from that time and place with a lifelong sense of hope, a feeling for community, a passion for social change.” (Palmer, 2000, 20).

In 1969, Palmer went to Washington, D.C. as a community organizer. He explained, “My heart wanted to keep teaching, by my ethics – laced liberally with ego – told me I was supposed to save the city.” (Palmer, 2000, 21). After two years of this work he came to two realizations: he had never stopped being a teacher, he was simply teaching in a classroom without walls, and he was too thin-skinned to be a good community organizer (Palmer, 2000, 22).

In 1974, Palmer decided to take a one-year sabbatical at Pendle Hill, a Quaker retreat center near Philadelphia. That year stretched to eleven years as he became Dean of Studies there. The time at Pendle Hill had a profound impact on Palmer’s life. The daily periods of silence and contemplation were at first unnerving and uncomfortable for him. It was at Pendle Hill where faith ceased to be an intellectual exercise. “In the silence I was able to reconstruct my faith life in a way that just wouldn’t have happened otherwise. It was a much more direct experience of how God was working in my life.” (Faith Alive, 2004). Palmer was diagnosed as suffering from clinical depression at Pendle Hill, a condition that he said “crushed him, and yet, in a way, it was his friend – it kept his feet on the ground” (Palmer, 2000, 66). The years at Pendle Hill enabled Palmer to tell the truth about himself and to write about community, the power of paradox, spirituality and education and the role of Christians in the renewal of public life.

After leaving Pendle Hill in 1975, Palmer lectured and conducted workshops at a number of universities, colleges, schools, foundations, and corporations. He served as a senior associate of the American Association of Higher Education and as senior advisor to the Fetzer Institute where he developed the Courage to Teach Program and published The Courage to Teach in 1998. Overall, he has published a dozen poems, more than 100 essays, and seven books, including A Hidden Wholeness in 2004. He has been awarded 10 honorary doctorates, two Distinguished Achievement Awards from the National Educational Press Association, and grants from the Danforth Foundation, the Lily Endowment, and the Fetzer Institute. Palmer says he is now preparing to lead
a quieter life, bypassing speeches and appearances in order to live a more tranquil life and engage in more solitary work (Intrator, 2005).

I must admit that my first reactions to Palmer’s ideas, based on rather limited knowledge of the man and his work, were skeptical. I thought him to be too “touchy-feely” and just another guru with another quick fix for teachers and education. As a participant in a summer Teacher Formation workshop led by Palmer, my attitudes toward him and his work changed dramatically. I found that Palmer is his work . . . there is no duplicity or arrogance . . . he is, as he claims to be, a teacher at heart. He leads as his father taught him to live, with compassion and generosity.

Palmer’s views of teaching and teachers stand alone in today’s accountability-driven (as measured solely by standardized test scores) culture. He describes the impetus for the Courage to Teach program as coming from his “deep compassion for those folks (teachers) who are doing such critical work in our society with so little outer or inner support” (Palmer, 1999, 1). For Palmer, “good teaching is an act of generosity, a whim of the wanton muse, a craft that may grow with practice and always risky business” (Palmer, 1999, 1). “Good teaching cannot be equated with technique. It comes from the integrity of the teacher, from his or her relation to the subject and students, from the capricious chemistry of it all” (Palmer, 1999, 1).

He has written extensively about the fact that teachers receive significant preparation in curriculum, methodology, and pedagogy, but the self that teaches is given little or no attention. It is Palmer’s contention that we teach who we are, yet little is done to aid preservice or inservice teachers in charting what he refers to as the inner landscape of the teacher’s soul (Palmer, 1998). Perhaps this grows at least in part from the nature of the university itself.

Academics often suffer the pain of dismemberment. On the surface, this is the pain of people who thought they were joining a community of scholars but find themselves in distant, competitive, and uncaring relationships with colleagues and students. Deeper down, this pain is more spiritual that sociological: it comes from being disconnected from our own truth, from the passions that took us into teaching, from the heart that is the source of all good work (Palmer, 1999, 1).

Palmer takes issue with the focus of the university on objectivity and the contention that only objective research and thought are valuable. All that is subjective is to be discounted, indeed rejected. Yet, “objectivism, with its commitment to holding subjectivity at bay, employs a pedagogy that purposely bypasses the learner’s life story. Objectivism regards autobiography as biased and parochial and hopes to replace it with ‘universal truth’ as told through a particular discipline” (Palmer, 1999, p3).

University faculty thus build walls to hide their true selves and their vulnerabilities. Not daring to seem subjective, thus nonintellectual, they keep quiet in meetings where plans or curricula are developed that conflict with their own beliefs. Gradually, the walls they build to hide their true selves from others obscure their own self views. Palmer contends that knowing one’s students and one’s subject rely heavily upon self-knowledge. “When I do not know myself, I cannot know who my students are . . . and when I cannot see them clearly I cannot teach them well. When I do not know myself, I cannot know my subject – not at the deepest levels of embodied, personal meaning. I will only know it abstractly, from a distance . . . .” (infed, 1999, 1). “Good teachers join self, subject, and students in the fabric of life because they teach from an integrated and undivided self, they manifest in their own lives, and invoke in their students, a capacity for connectedness” (infed, 1999,2).

Palmer returns again and again to the notion of identity and integrity. “Identity lies in the intersection of the diverse forces that make up my life and integrity lies in relating to those forces that bring me wholeness and life rather than fragmentation and death” (Palmer, 1999, 5). Through connecting self, subject, and student in an integrated whole, the possibility for creating true community arises. Palmer elaborates on the need for community in A Hidden Wholeness: The Journey Toward an Undivided Life (2004). He warns early on in the text that wholeness does not mean perfection: it means embracing brokenness as an integral part of life.

Palmer attempts to bring balance to our views of teaching learning, holding that both objectivity and subjectivity are necessary, as are intellect and emotion. Yet our disconnection is “driven by our Western commitment to thinking in polarities: a thought from that elevates disconnection into an intellectual virtue” (1998, 61). Even a cursory glance at trends in public education over the past fifty years or so supports this thesis of polarization and pseudointellectualism. Reading instruction must be either phonics-based or whole word focused. Education must be student-centered or subject centered. Schooling is for the transmission of traditional values or it is for social and civic reform.

Expanding on Neils Bohr’s notion that the opposite of a profound truth can be another profound truth,
Palmer suggests that “in certain circumstances, truth is found not by splitting the world into either-ors but by embracing both and” (1998, 63). From Palmer’s perspective, the world of education is characterized by broken paradoxes. “We separate from head to heart. Result: minds that do not know how to feel and hearts that do not know how to think. We separate facts from feelings. Result: bloodless facts that make the world distant and remote and ignorant emotions that reduce truth to how one feels today. We separate theory from practice. Result: theories that have little to do with life and practice that is uninformed by understanding. We separate teaching from learning. Result: teachers who talk but do not listen and students who listen but do not talk” (1998, 66).

While it is easier to think in polarities, Palmer holds that only be engaging in paradoxical thinking, embracing both-and, can we “reclaim the life force in the world, in our students, in ourselves” (1998, 66). The themes of connections and community permeate Palmer’s writings. In The Courage to Teach, he suggests a set of paradoxes to frame pedagogical design.

The space in which teaching and learning take place must be both bounded and open. A focus on the subject and the use of clear and compelling materials and questioning create the boundaries. Yet the space must be open to the variety of paths that learning and discovery may take.

- The space must be both hospitable and charged. It must be safe and trustworthy, but true learning requires some risk taking and some discomfort if students are to move from the known to the unknown.
- The space should provide for the voice of the individual and the voice of the group. While students must have the opportunity to speak their minds, the voice of the group is needed to affirm, question, challenge, and/or correct the voice of the individual. Such interaction between the individual and the group leads to a consensus and a “corporate” voice that reflect all views.
- The space must honor the little stories of the individual as well as the big stories of the discipline and tradition. The little stories, combined with the big, enable us to frame and understand the relationships between our own personal experience and the truths of the discipline.
- The space must support solitude and surround it with the resources of the community. Learning requires solitude for thought and reflection as well as community for dialog, mediation, and expansion of knowledge.
- The space must welcome and encourage both silence and speech. Though we seem to fear and distrust silence, it is needed if our words are truly to be heard and reflected upon.

Through the use of these paradoxes, Palmer describes a model for teaching that honors the subject and the student, the individual and the community, the teacher and the learner. Through these paradoxes, he contends that the possibilities for teaching with integrity and true learning increase.

Palmer’s notions of community are neither romantic nor idealized. He is critical of what he terms the “therapeutic model of community that “makes intimacy the highest value in human relationships, because intimacy is regarded as the best therapy for the pain of disconnection” (1998, 90). Such a model, he contends, “exploits our fear of otherness by reducing community to whatever can take familial or friendly form” (1998, 91).

While Palmer cites the strengths of a civic model of community in mediating inequities and engaging diverse individuals in common work, he cautions that “what is noble in a quest for the common good may be ignoble in a quest for truth: truth is not determined by democratic means” (1998, 92).

The model of community Palmer seeks “is one that can embrace, guide, and refine the core mission of education – the mission of knowing, teaching, and learning (1998, 94). He refers to this model as a community of truth.

The hallmark of the community of truth is not psychological intimacy or political civility or pragmatic accountability, though it does not exclude these virtues. This model of community reaches deeper, into ontology and epistemology – into assumptions about the nature of reality and how we know it – on which all education is built. The hallmark of the community of truth is in its claim that reality is a web of communal relationships, and we can know reality only by being in community with it” (1998, 95).

For Palmer, “truth is an eternal conversation about things that matter, conducted with passion and discipline” (1998, 104). A classroom modeled on a community of truth joins both teacher and students in a focus on what Palmer refers to as “a great thing,” “a classroom in which the best features of teacher-centered and student-centered education are merged and transformed by putting not teacher, not student, but subject at the center of our attention” (1998, 116).

Palmer contends that such a classroom doesn’t ignore students, rather, it “honors one of the most vital needs
Our students have: to be introduced to a world larger than their own experiences and egos, a world that expands their personal boundaries and enlarges their sense of community . . . it also honors one of our most vital needs as teachers: to invigorate those connections between our subjects, our students, and our souls that help make us whole again and again” (1998, 120).
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Overview

This paper draws from a larger project analyzing more than 150 letters women wrote during the American Civil War to explore how women discussed, circulated, and used photographs to create Technologies of the Self and to create “imagined visual communities” during this tumultuous period in United States history (Smith, 1999; Anderson, 1994). Although the haunting battlefield scenes Mathew Brady took endure as memorials to the Civil War period and remain central to its nostalgia, other types of photographs also central to war experiences remain under theorized in the scholarship of what eminent historian James McPherson calls the “most researched event in American history.” In this paper I focus on the function and significance of photographic portraits that single, white, literate correspondents exchanged in the wake of men’s exodus to the front lines. I argue that fashioning, bestowing, withholding, and discussing photographic images became technologies of The Self and the Self-in-community during the Civil War era, with particular gendered implications.

Please send me your picture taken in your uniform (Rosa, 1863)

Enduring sentiment surrounding the Civil this conflict that spanned four bloody years and involved millions of Americans is that it was a Man’s War. It was indeed a Man’s Funeral, given that more than 600,000 men lost their lives in the war’s hospitals, camps, and battlefields—more American men than the combined death totals for all other wars with U.S. involvement (McPherson, 1988). Yet, as women at the time expressed and social historians have echoed since those years, the war had profound social, economic, and political reverberations that shaped women’s lives as well as men’s and left a sobering legacy that American people still struggle to understand nearly one hundred and fifty years after Lee’s surrender. To understand more fully how women shaped and were shaped by Civil War events, much remains to be mined from the social terrain of Civil War history and the letters, diaries, and photographs which literate women left behind (Harper, 2004; Conklin, 2001).

This paper draws from 158 recently-discovered letters women wrote to a Union Lieutenant during the Civil War. The collection is unusual in a number of ways: it contains letters primarily written by young, single women (including childhood chums, love interests, and an admiring cousin); it includes more than 40 letters written by strangers who responded to the soldier’s advertisement for correspondents; it primarily represents women’s efforts to “cheer the soldier” rather than lament hardships at home; it represents consistent dates of production (1862-1867); and it offers glimpses into rural, middle-class women’s lives in Ohio and northern Kentucky. Also unusual is that the collection was, in a sense, edited by the soldier himself. He selected these letters from an unknown number of originals, carried them throughout three years of military service, preserved them throughout his life, and by happenstance or intent, left them to be discovered by his granddaughter, Mrs. Nancy Rhoades, more than a century after the Civil War ended. This soldier left few other material possessions behind. Significantly, fifty-six letters in the collection refer to photographs, likenesses, and shadows and many refer to such images multiple times.

References to photographic portraits throughout Civil War correspondence and the 35,000 photographs New York professional Mathew Brady snapped during the war speak to their increasing cultural importance during this period of national conflict, mourning and loss. “Once the camera appeared” on the Civil War battlefields, Alan Trachtenberg (1989) notes, “our sense of what suffices as a historical account was altered forever.” The camera had equally significant effects for individuals living through the war. As Shawn Michelle Smith argues in *American Archives*, a shift from the earliest form of photography, daguerreotypy, to mechanically-reproducible photographs in the 1850s ushered in new possibilities for imagining identity and relationships in the latter half of the century. For the first time, photographic images could be reproduced and distributed *en masse*, offering opportunities for sustaining allegiances in new and different ways and linking individuals in an “imagined visual community” (Smith, 1999, p. 6; Anderson, 1994). Had the war erupted a mere fifteen years earlier, such images would not have been readily available to provide these tools of comfort and community-building.

Photographs offered a new medium of self-representation that became increasingly prominent during the war. Portraits functioned in an array of ways: as technologies for constructing self and community, as tangible reminders of loved ones, as talismans against loss, as proxies for their embodied subjects, as tools of
flirtation, and as testimonies of connection and patriotism. Although the power of photography to unlock image from referent unsettled some viewers and evoked fear of the occult for others, professional photographers hurried to promote the middle-class respectability of their craft and it soon became a component of the spectacle and experience of war. Gravediggers plucked photograph after photograph of nameless women from the bodies of soldiers; Generals in full regalia followed a series of unspoken guidelines as they posed painstakingly for the camera; Women pleaded with soldiers to send their portraits “in uniform” as if a parlor mantel might offer a modicum of protection to its subject in the field (Bailey with Rhoades, 2007). Photographs, their exchange and the norms of production and reception in which they were embedded, established identity and community at the same time they represented it.

Against the potent backdrop of war and its constituting allegiances and divisions, photography functioned to interrogate its subjects not only as members of the middle-class and individuals of “character” and “virtue” but also as Patriots. As previously-held notions of “nation” and “citizen” fractured in the wake of events at Ft. Sumter, producing and exchanging portraits helped foster the formation of new identities. Soldiers’ portraits invited civilians to imagine their destinies linked with men in far-off battlefields, while women’s images—slipped in envelopes to soldiers—reminded soldiers for whom they were fighting. The “rituals” of “photographic self-representation” became “increasingly standardized” as the practice of photography expanded so that subjects posed and adorned themselves according to established norms (Smith, 1999, p. 6). The familiar features appearing in photographs signaled viewers to imagine connections with those represented and read bodily cues for a sense of interior “depth” and “essence.”

A military uniform and sober expression in the photograph of a soldier could intimate an “honorable,” “patriotic” interior essence, evoke sentimentality in the viewer, and reinforce a sense of shared nationalism—a self-in-community. One stranger examining the soldier’s photograph felt inspired to write him because “[I] considered the face . . . an honest looking one and . . . we were both friends to the same cause.” As civilians and soldiers gazed into photographs, they sometimes imagined fellow Patriots in the images. A photograph’s power to evoke and concretize patriotic sentiment amplified as individuals shared letters and photographs among community members and performed group readings and views of the same. One seventeen-year-old Ohioan captured this sentiment when she wrote fervently in 1863, “The people here at home look on the soldiers as a living wall of human flesh standing between them and destruction. They will ever be honored and respected by all.” Soldiers became objects of salvation in the public imagination and their images became instruments of connection and patriotism.

Photographs also provided comforting and tangible reminders of absent friends and loved ones that held particular promise in the context of war. Just as a letter with familiar handwriting could assure an anxious recipient that the soldier who held the pen remained healthy and whole, photographs gestured to a familiar embodiment and fostered the promise of a soldier’s safe return. As one writer expressed, “I [ . . . ] received your photograph which I am truly happy to see . . . . I shall keep and treasure it as the gift of an absent Brother, hoping to see the original as soon circumstances will permit.” The familiar tilt of a head and the shape of a brow conjured memories of its subject and offered comfort to the viewer. “I was delighted indeed to get your photograph” one writer shared, “as I knew that other one did not look like you with those large eyes.” Another imagined the Lieutenant’s unchanging essence when she gazed at his photo: “[a friend] had your likeness with Her . . . . altho you have changed still I could tell it was Ed.” Photographs evoked memories of their Subjects and a sense of enduring solidity that signaled life.

Indeed, correspondents sometimes imagined photographs as actual physical extensions of their loved ones, standing in as objects to view, touch, and sometimes kiss in their absence. This function as intimate placeholder was sometimes quite explicit. As one young Ohioan reflected on the Lieutenant’s portrait, she expressed, “I think friend Edwin your picture is sweet enough, and so sweet, that I shall be tempted to _____.” Though her writing is illegible here, another letter from the era hints to the sentence’s possible closure: “I pressed to my lips over and over the spot that yours had touched and tried to imagine I could feel your own precious lips & that dear moustache . . . .” (Faust, 1996, p. 117). Other writers personified their photographs as if the images were flesh and bone: “I am going to have my negative taken tomorrow and next time I write look out for me,” one young writer declared, “I often come down that way. Went down to Memphis last week and expect to go that way . . . again.” Another claimed her photograph had no desire for military service: “As to my ‘Photo,’” she wrote in 1864, “I have none at present, presume I could not induce one to go if I had, as they have a great antipathy
Photographs, however inadequate, sometimes functioned as proxies for their embodied subjects who remained miles away. The limited size of the photograph, its portability, its associations with the “private” realm, the traces of a real object it casts onto paper through light and form (Metz 1985) provide a foundation for the playful—and sometimes deeply significant—lacing of images with their referents.

Photographs played a powerful role in fueling the romantic imaginary for correspondents engaged in the tenuous work of building romantic ties through letter writing. Women at times betray starry-eyed visions of heterosexual romance, courtship, and marriage in their letters as they communicate with men outside their social circles or whose familiarity is recast in the rosy glow of patriotism. Romance was no small matter for women in an age in which economic health often depended on a secure marriage. With traditional courtship rituals altered dramatically by war events and increasing numbers of young men dragged to the front lines, women and men alike exchanged letters and photographs to forge bonds. Such epistolary and photographic connections were fundamental to many a romantic union that occurred at war’s end. For unknowns building relationships across the miles, letters and photographs were key Technologies of the Self and could therefore hold great sway. One writer’s animated reaction to the Lieutenant’s photograph captures this potential power. She swoons,

If you could have been an unseen observer of my countenance as I opened your letter and beheld the “Photo” my eyes certainly did sparkle with delight. The frank open countenance, the intellectual forehead, the bright expressive eye—how was I going to say—burned my hand, and if, you will allow me the expression, made a complete conquest. No soldier could have been disappointed with such an enthusiastic reception of his image. Jennie Hall’s romantic imagination springs to life as she ascribes depth, essence, and character to the flat black and white image of a man she has never met and may, in fact, be the image of another soldier altogether: the forehead that is “intellectual,” the countenance that is “open” and “frank,” the eye that is “expressive.” The photograph, as proxy for the imagined man himself, “made a complete conquest.” Jennie’s description of her “sparkling” eyes and her “burning” hand emphasizes aspects of her body and invites the Lieutenant to imagine her corporeal form responding to his representation. The potency of the terms encourage viewer and subject to experience the photograph as a physical extension of the person represented, dissolve miles in their imaginations, and invoke a potent physical exchange between two people in the act of touching a photograph.

This suggestion of corporeality and physical intimacy in the offer, exchange, and possession of photographic portraits was deeply gendered. Requesting and possessing photographs of members of either sex could affirm a viewer’s or subject’s desirability and convey romantic interest. A soldier who received more mail and photographs might garner masculine esteem among his company members whereas a woman might collect soldiers’ photographs to bolster her femininity and patriotism. As one young woman requested flirtatiously of the Lieutenant in 1863, “I have quite a fine lot of pictures and I would be so proud to have yours among them.” To the soldier her collection of photographs is used to convey that she is desirable and socially active and that he competes with others for her interest.

Yet, unlike the sharing of men’s images, the manner in which women’s photographs were exchanged mattered for their reputations. “You will allow,” a twenty-year-old writer explained when she refused the Lieutenant’s request for a picture, “that with gentleman it is different. There will be no impropriety in your sending a photo.” Some women defined portrait exchange as appropriate only among intimates. “I disapprove,” one writer speaks with reproach, “of the practice which many ladies have of giving their photographs to gentlemen, do not think it is proper, and never did give my photo to any gentleman.” As if woman and photograph were the same, women voiced concerns that circulating their image too hastily would threaten their social standing.

Indeed, women sometimes relied on the understanding of photographs as extensions of their characters, souls—even their bodies—to illustrate their “character” and “virtue” and construct their identities against less deserving others. Given the limited number of vehicles available for correspondents to demonstrate virtue across the miles, and the recent technological development of photographic reproduction, slips of paper accrue heavy symbolic weight in this system of signification. One Ohio teacher refused a serviceman’s request for a photo because to comply seemed inappropriate:

I should consider it very imprudent for any lady to give her picture to a person she had never seen although it is no uncommon thing in this fast age. Should we become better acquainted and should we both live to meet here on earth and then if I deemed you worthy of my thoughts your request should be
granted but for the present the matter will have to remain as it is.

Here Mollie emphasizes the word “lady” as if to distance herself from other women whose photographs, and perhaps, morals, flow more freely “in this fast age” than decorum demands. She promotes a dignified, moral Self who offers her attentions only to those who prove themselves worthy. Such fierce enunciations of propriety in exchanging images are understandable given photography’s role in establishing middle-class identities (Smith 1999), women’s inability to represent themselves in the courtship circumstances of war, and their dependence on image and letter for the task.

Ironically, the very vehicle by which comfort and connection became possible—mechanical reproduction—heightened women’s anxiety about circulating their representations. The practice of producing photographs in mass quantity during the 1850s removed photography from the realm of art and embedded it in practices of consumerism and mechanization. However accessible this technological shift allowed photography to become, the practice sparked anxiety about women’s “inability to control the reception of her photographic portrait as it circulate[d] beyond the bounds of intimacy.” One writer expressed, “to be candid with you . . . I don’t think any gentleman would have a very exalted opinion of a Lady who would send a picture to a stranger.” Another asked nervously, “John Hawn wrote home to say to me that he saw my face every day. Did you give that Photo to him?” While women distributed photographs freely among family and friends, sharing a photograph with a soldier was risky business since they became exposed to the gaze of strangers as soon as they entered the masculine arena of military camp. Women were well aware that soldiers circulated and discussed their images and letters just as such items were discussed on the home front.

Some women were therefore reluctant to share photographs too freely and preferred to use them as small steps in the dance of romance orchestrated with soldiers. Photographs became tools of flirtation and tokens of women’s favors. One spunky writer exchanged banter with a serviceman for nearly seven months before acceding to repeated requests for her image. Another promised something “sweet” in exchange for the soldier’s portrait: “I promise you shall have mine by and by. So please send yours in your next letter and then I have something sweet to tell you which is worth knowing—something that will do to dream about. I might forget to tell you unless you send the shadow.” Such teasing seems intended to entice the soldier, encourage his attentions, and maintain his correspondence.

Such epistolary flirtation amplifies the signification of the photograph in the romantic imaginary. It suggests women viewed the bestowing and withholding of photographs as an aspect of power in courtship. A woman’s agency to ponder the merit of requests for her image, discuss her beliefs about photographic exchange, create anticipation of a photograph’s delivery, and then bestow the visage in a time frame she deems suitable and aligned with the vision of Self she most wants to promote offers a modicum of power in the courtship circumstances of the war that must have felt primarily beyond her control. Empty church pews and newspaper reports of battle fatalities reminded women their suitors may never return (indeed, 620,000 men died during the Civil War, including 25% of the South’s men of marriageable age). Photographs of battlefields and soldiers who had died also haunted viewers with the possibility that death could at any time “abduct” the referent into another world (Metz, 1985, p.158) and leave only his photographic traces behind. Though many women may have chosen to “embrace their anticipated spinsterhood” (Faust, 1996, p.139) rather than indulge in fruitless marital aspirations, the letters under study indicate some women’s fierce intent to avoid that role if they could.

Collecting soldiers’ images testified publicly to women’s connections with a given soldier and created a Desired Self in the community’s eyes. Photographs were often shared in community gatherings, described on the pages of personal correspondence, and used as vehicles to signify affection. “A thousand thanks to you for that splendid Photograph!” one young woman expressed enthusiastically after the receipt of a gift, “It is nothing more or less than Edwin-ning. Don’t wonder much that Miss Phrone found a place in her Album for “three” similar ones.” With a witty flourish, the writer affirms the power of Phrone’s three photographs to testify to the community at large of her investment in the soldier, and perhaps, his investment in her. Indeed, recognition of this function meant that requests for photographs sometimes held a competitive and urgent air. Seeing a photograph the Lieutenant sent to his mother, one young woman chastises him, “Ed, I think you might have some photographs printed and send me one in return for the one I am sending you.” Emblem of connection and expressions of etiquette, photographs functioned well beyond preserving reflections of their referents (fetishes, etc.).

Determining acceptable boundaries of flirtation and the timing of offerings in that dynamic was a delicate matter given the social norms women were negotiating.
in epistolary relationships: correspondents who were unknown or newly positioned as soldiers, propriety, concern for reputation, concern for their own economic futures, and the courtship circumstances of the war that bound romantic labor primarily to the pen. Examples I have presented here suggest that withholding, bestowing, and discussing photographic portraits functioned in an array of ways for building identities and forging community in fractured and uncertain times. Although Civil War photographs have become through the years weighty signifiers of an unparalleled and tragic historical period in United States history, and their images imbued with the death and nostalgia of that time, the meanings of photographs for viewers during the war exceeded a photograph’s function as harbingers of death (Metz 1985). In their ability to function as proxies for their writers, as tools of romance, and as vehicles for connection and community, photographic portraits may have offered particularly welcome balm amidst the ravages of war. Indeed, portraits continue to offer welcome contrast to the side of war Mathew Brady’s images still haunt us with today: demolished buildings and battlefields strewn with corpses.
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Introduction

The road to empathy is at best steep and indirect. It is contaminated with constant visual visual, auditory and tactile stimuli, that tug at the mind and subconscious, insisting that we must obtain every product, whether useful or not, comfort, whether realistic or not, and be perfect in order to secure even a modicum of happiness in the twenty first century. There is little time to think or process reality, no matter what reality appears to be for each of us, much less to reflect on life or how we fit into the grand scheme of life. Modernity has set this stage for its own interests and hegemony encourages the game to continue without interruption.

In the game, modernity assumes the role of ‘the expert’ and is the repository of all correct knowledge. It has become the meta-narrative of control and uses the technical language game to advance its goal, by making it more and more efficient to digitize and standardize what counts as knowledge and of course totally control its distribution. The penetrating gaze of modernity continually inspects all discourse, searching for the absolute “certainty,” that legitimates and reinforces modernity’s power over humanity through an ingeniously simple tool, standardization. While on the surface standardization may appear to be benign and even beneficial, it is not, especially in cases concerning knowledge, learning and education. Rather, standardization has morphed into a tool of control. Through the current national trends of Grade Level Expectations (GLE) and Average Yearly Progress (AYP), standardization controls and thus limits what counts as knowledge in America’s public schools. Standardization reaches into university teacher and administrator preparation programs through departments of education and national accreditation agencies. This paper seeks to briefly address the reality of standardization and high stakes testing in America.

Postmodernist Considerations

Postmodern thinkers such as Jean Francois Lyotard, an eminent philosopher and author, advocates such as Karlena Renaldi, American pragmatists, such as John Dewey, and those who seek enlightenment through the ancient practices of yoga embrace the notion that knowledge is without limit, constructed in the individual by the individual and simultaneously connected to all other things in the universe. True knowledge and learning cannot be standardized or controlled. Rather, knowledge opens many doors with endless possibilities.

Knowledge and learning occur in endless opportunities and may be displayed in countless ways. Lyotard describes knowledge in this way:

Knowledge, then is a question of competence that goes beyond a simple determination and application of a criteria of efficiency (technical qualification), of justice and/or happiness (ethical wisdom), of beauty and sound (auditory and visual sensibility).

Understood this way knowledge is what makes someone capable of forming “good” prescriptive and “good” evaluative utterances . . . It is not competence relative to a particular class of governments to the exclusion of others . . . the principal features of knowledge (are): (first) it coincides with an extensive array of competence-building measures and (second) it is the only form embodied in the subject constituted by the various areas of competence composing it.²

Lyotard describes two types of knowledge: The first is critical, reflective and speculative. It is firmly imbued in values and ethics and expressed in many language games, never standardized. This type of knowledge is a free flowing dialectic, a conversation that expresses the power knowledge relationship between the people and the government. The people and the government are equals, giving and receiving their power from one another. Here knowledge serves humanity not itself. Lyotard writes,

This knowledge determines in a single stroke what one must say in order to be heard, what one must listen to in order to speak; and what role one must play in order to be part of the narrative.³

These narratives of knowledge play a critical role in our daily lives, because, “What is transmitted through these narratives is the set of pragmatic rules that construct the social bond.”⁴ It is the social bond that allows us to form an organic whole, or a society. Ideal speculative knowledge is the very different second type of knowledge that Lyotard describes as positivist knowledge.⁵ This type of knowledge inducts people into a system that directly links man to technology and materials. The government uses positivist knowledge to capture and control its citizenry in the name of progress, and to create standards in education programs. In this process, the ideal narrative of knowledge, which has many possibilities, is changed into a new type of narrative with only two possibilities: either yes or no, in played in a denotative language game. In education, the
government and national accrediting agencies expand and secure their control over what counts as knowledge by defining the ‘yes’ criteria, such as GLE and AYP, and allowing no options. All other discourse is negated. It is viewed as worthless and discarded. Only this specific government stipulated knowledge is allowed. The government even controls who has access to the yearly test results by establishing a limited password system of codes.

This is standardization at its zenith. Everyone learns the same content, everyone thinks alike with no questions asked and everyone is accessed with the same tools. Surely Kant is ecstatic as the ultimate a priori condition is established and nurtured by government and accrediting agencies in the name of progress, in fact I am sure that I recognized his ghostly form floating through Webster Hall last October 31. This was totally appropriate for not only was it the date that the NCATE team arrived for our School of Education’s evaluation visit; it was also all Hallowed Eve. One wonders if Kant were actually an unseen expert witness and team member, hovering and passing judgments.

Despite the idea that progress is ‘good’ for the people, this model has a fatal flaw that keeps it from attaining true success. That is, the numerous contradictions in its own language. At least three distinct language genres have been crisscrossed as modernity has tried to blend them into one uniform standard. Unfortunately for modernity, discourse embedded in one genre can only link to and legitimize discourse in the same genre. For example, the discourse of pedagogy, is justice and all its endless dimensions clearly represented in the prescriptive language game. In schools the discourse is knowledge, and its dimensions are firmly established in the denotative language game. In standardization, the discourse is based in efficiency and all its dimensions are absolutely cemented in the technical language game. Technical measures of efficiency cannot determine what counts as knowledge or express the endless dimensions of pedagogy. The entire notion of determining accountability in education through standardization is as ludicrous as the notion that specified statistical representations can delineate adequate yearly progress for an entire group of children without considering their individuality.

National and international professional organizations such as NCATE, ELCC, CEC and government departments of education have put much thought into the standardization of American public education, seeking to make sure that all teachers and administrators are proficient in the required skills, knowledge, and dispositions and thus will guarantee all children will achieve high test scores and similar excellence in school. Once again, Kant must be so very pleased. All things can be quantified by Kant’s notion of a priori truths. Standards of proficiency have become ‘the ultimate truth’ and as ‘the ultimate truth,’ have quietly morphed into a power structure that is braided into major educational funding streams. The message is clear, “Do our bidding, reach our standards, meet our goals or cease to exist.”

National studies indicate a shortage of qualified applicants for administrative positions. Most reports identify reflective practice and ethics/integrity as integral components in quality educational administrative / leadership preparation. The Institute of Education Leadership published a white paper in September of 2003, on the relationships between university programs, state polices, the needs of schools and qualities of a good school administrator. In this paper two primary areas were delineated in which state policies and university programs strongly influence the outcomes in schools. The first is, licensure, certification and accreditation; the second is, administrative training and professional development.

To achieve higher quality school leadership, and of course higher test scores; the report makes the following recommendations: First: Change policy (at the state department level) and Second: Change programs (at the university level).

While these recommendations appear to be very sound and exquisitely simple, they are almost impossible to attain. If somehow they were to be attained, the result would surely cause a rupture in education policy and practice across the country. Isn’t this what Foucault would label as an “opportunistic rupture?” He would welcome such a radical movement to free thought and knowledge from the chains of standardization that require accreditation games in which universities collect, compile and track specified data until it becomes a clump of factoid mush.

Measuring specific ‘knowledge’ and skills has been routinized from preschool through the university. Yet when it comes to fulfilling the third branch of assessment required by accrediting agencies, dispositions, educational institutions tread very, very carefully. Dispositions are very tricky since they describe attitudes, behaviors, and values of individuals, that is, unseen characteristics. Rating dispositions, not to mention using those ratings as a key assessment or a gatekeeper that can keep a student from continuing in a program, can cause many difficulties including possible lawsuits against the university. It becomes clear that ideals, values and dispositions cannot be assessed or
standardized as accrediting agencies proclaim. Perhaps this would be a good time and place to attempt an entirely different approach, a ruse, not a compromise but an entirely new game between equals.

One approach, which has yet to be tried, is for each individual student and each instructor to voluntarily embark on a continuing journey of self study, or a peregrination, in order to learn about his or her true value system and self awareness and how one is connected all other beliefs and individuals. This self study will be an internal journey examining thoughts, attitudes, and actions, in other words the discourse of the body, mind and spirit. All discourse, both internal and external, thought, speech and action no matter how seemingly insignificant, initiates a vibration, an energy born and carried in the breath of life, that is the \textit{prana yama}. As energy flows throughout the universe it connects everyone to everything, past, present and future.

This belief system of inner-connectedness is vastly different from those systems that encourage purposeful separation by setting up boundaries. These boundaries keep all who are different from us, the stranger, the foreigner and especially the hidden parts of ourselves that we are afraid to acknowledge and face, safely separate from us. These mental, physical and psychological walls serve to keep ‘the they’ from becoming part of us. They can never become ‘the we.’ In this way, ‘the we’ remains dominant.

Today city walls are rare in the North America but modernity has assumed many of the characteristics of walls, though presented in different forms such as: gated communities, special clubs, organizations such as religion, and unions, gangs, sports teams, financial status, political parties, race, special education, and national origins, to name but a few. Hegemony encourages North Americans to consider these organizational walls to be fair, and ethical. But this comfortable customary belief is far from fair or ethical. These are the walls, which Servan described when he wrote:

\begin{quote}
When you have [thus] formed the chain of ideas in the heads of your citizens, you will then be able to pride yourselves on guiding them and being their masters. The stupid despot may constrain his slaves with iron chains, but a true politician binds them even more strongly by the chain of their own ideas; it is at the stable point of reason that he secures the end of the chain; this link is all the stronger in that we do not know of what it is made and we believe it to be our own work; despair and time eat away the bonds of iron and steel, but they are powerless against the habitual union of ideas, they can only tighten it still more, and on the soft fibers of the brain is founded the unshakable base of the soundest Empires.\end{quote}

Mohandas Gandhi writes, “The purpose of life is . . . to know oneself. We cannot do so unless we learn to identify ourselves with all that lives”, \textit{svadh yaya}. This is not an easy path especially in this modern epistemé.

\textit{Svadh yaya} requires much effort and dedication. It begins with slowing down even the slowing of one’s breath while willfully surrendering the ego and entering into a state where one removes one’s self from the distractions of the world. Here one lets go of preconceived ideas. The turbulence of the mind is still. The silence allows one to listen to the voice within to discover what one values and why one holds these particular truths to be sacred. In this way the \textit{svadh yaya} can allow one to begin to know oneself and compels us to have “an awareness of and an allegiance to interconnection to others”.\footnote{Then can one begin to seek integrity and empathy. Integrity enables one to make decisions consistent with one’s values no matter the circumstances or repercussions. If one has integrity then one does the right thing even when no one is looking.\footnote{Empathy allows one to understand the needs of others through active listening. Developing active listening takes time, focus and concentration for it involves the whole self, not just listening enough to construct a response or an argument to counter the speaker’s point of view, or to silence an opponent or to force a consensus. In active listening one enters into the perspective of the other individual; one validates their worth; empowers them; demonstrates respect for their beliefs, and creates a safe environment in which difficult issues can be examined and the possibility of change may be facilitated.\footnote{Among the most important qualities an education candidate, teacher or administrator, can develop are the abilities to have a deep understanding and sensitivity to the feelings and needs of others; a commitment to serve and provide for the specific the needs of each child and the courage and dedication to transform this sensitivity and commitment into action to alleviate the pain and suffering of others. This combination of skills, knowledge and dispositions create a new formula for education, integrity + empathy + compassion = competency. One of the most important things that I can do as a professor is to help my students develop these characteristics. Good teachers and administrators}}
understand that all other individuals are not so different from themselves.

Schools desperately need teachers and administrators with integrity and empathy who will inspire others with their dedication to step across the boundaries of regulation, policy, procedure, practices, standardization and discrimination and withstand the cultural norms in order to create new opportunities for all children. These courageous educators will venture into new spaces of self-awareness and enter into the perspective of others. Awareness is a matter of perception. Judith Lassiter writes:

Truth is a matter of perspective...the way you think things are. When you do, (let go of your preconceived ideas), you get out of your own way and can experience another perspective. All spiritual traditions talk about enlightenment or realization. One way to view enlightenment is as a radical shift in perspective. Nothing outside you has changed: you have changed. And yet, paradoxically, you have not changed, but rather you have become what you already are. You have removed the smoke screen of ignorance so that what was always present has become apparent.11
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A DEMOCRATIC EDUCATION: THREE INTERPRETATIONS

Mike Boone, Texas State University-San Marcos

Introduction

This semester marks my twentieth year at Texas State University-San Marcos. Part of my responsibilities as a faculty member is to teach the first two courses in the sequence for students earning a master’s degree in educational leadership and the principal’s certificate. Typically, these students are elementary and secondary teachers still working in the classroom. The course I am teaching this fall, Understanding Self, is designed to help students gain a better understanding of their own beliefs and values and how these impact leadership. To that end students read and discuss the works of a wide range of educational philosophers. They complete a comprehensive self-assessment instrument and develop a growth plan based on the results of the assessment. Students also complete an auto-ethnography to understand the influence of social, cultural, and political factors on their own identity formation and craft a first attempt at an educational platform. Our goal is that by the end of the course students will have a better understanding of themselves, their beliefs and values and the impact of these with their performance as school leaders.

One of the topics we address in class concerns the role of public education in a democracy, and the characteristics of a democratic school. These are ideas that potential school leaders ought to have at least heard about. Inevitably the question of whether or not students would characterize their own school as a democratic institution arises. I am constantly surprised by how few of the students would label their school as “democratic” using even the most minimal of criteria (participation in decision making) or who have more than a rudimentary idea of the role public education plays in supporting a democratic society.

After more semesters of conducting this discussion than I care to count, I have come to the sad conclusion that public schools are among the least democratic institutions in our society. It would seem that those responsible for educational policy making and for the daily operation of the schools lack an understanding of the crucial contribution democratic education makes to the maintenance and perpetuation of a democratic society.

Democratic Education

What I have tried to do in the next few pages is to explore with the idea of a democratic education as presented in the writing of three American philosophers—John Dewey, Henry Giroux, and Amy Gutmann— and then suggest some ways these ideas might start us down the road to building a more democratic form of education and ultimately a more democratic society.

John Dewey

When John Dewey died in June of 1952, his reputation as America’s best known educator, philosopher, and democrat had reached its nadir. Yet at the height of his influence from 1890 until the beginning of World War II, Dewey was one of this country’s leading intellectuals who also enjoyed a worldwide reputation (Westbrook, 1991). Although Dewey’s name today is associated mainly with education and philosophy, in his own time he was closely identified with the Progressive Movement in American politics, especially with the Progressive’s advocacy of direct democracy and their belief that all levels of government were responsible for solving the social and economic problems of society. Writing in The Age of Reform (1961), Richard Hofstadter places Dewey firmly among the “brain trust of the Progressive movement” (154). For Dewey and his Progressive colleagues the role of democratic government was to release the capabilities of each person regardless of race, gender, class, or social status. In Dewey’s view, education was the instrument through which this goal was to be accomplished.

Dewey conceived of education and democracy as coexisting in a reciprocal relationship. Because a democracy thrives on a social order “. . . in which interests are mutually interpenetrating, and where progress, or readjustment, is an important consideration,” democratic communities should be more concerned with a “deliberate and systematic education” than other types of societies. The simple explanation for the relationship between democracy and education is that “a government resting on popular suffrage cannot be successful unless those who elect and obey their governors are educated.” One method to secure that obedience is through the imposition of external authority. But democracies by their very nature reject this imposition. Thus an alternative has to be found through which to develop in citizens the habits and dispositions required for a democracy to survive. For Dewey, such habits and disposition are created only by education (Dewey, 1916, 87).

The relationship between education and democracy rests on more than the need for an educated citizenry. Dewey points out that a democracy is not just a form of government, “it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communication” in which expanding the number of persons who participate in governing the
society necessitates that each one must “refer his own actions to that of others, and to consider the action of others to give point and direction to his own.” This need of individuals and interests to be aware of the actions of other individuals and interests in society leads, Dewey thought, to the breaking down of artificial barriers of race, gender, and nationality “which kept men from realizing the full impact of their activity” (Dewey, 1916, 87). The widening of the area of shared concerns and the freeing of individual capability in a democratic society also led to the weakening of the impact of social class, which Dewey considered a highly desirable end.

For Dewey education is essentially a social process, through which individuals are taught to live into a particular democratic ideal. The relevant criteria for judging the level of democracy in any society are first “the extent to which the interests of a group are shared by all members” and, second the degree of freedom in which each group in the society interacts with other groups. An “undesirable society” sets up internal and external barriers to the sharing of group experience and group interaction. However, “[A] society which makes provisions for participation in its good of all its members on equal terms and which secures flexible readjustment of its institutions through interaction of the different forms of associated life is in so far democratic” (Dewey, 1916, 99). A democratic society must have an educational system that provides individuals with a personal stake in its social relationships and the habits and dispositions to accomplish needed social change without instigating chaos.

Dewey’s view of the relationship between democracy and education was centered in his conviction that schools are the instruments of social change. In his “pedagogic creed.” Dewey stated forthrightly that “education is the fundamental method of social progress and reform.” Dewey considered any social reforms that rested only on law or civil sanctions to be transitory. True reform depended instead on the use of education as a “regulation of the process of coming to share in the social consciousness, and . . . the adjustment of individual activity on the basis of this social consciousness as the only sure method of social reconstruction” The use of the school as a means of bringing about social change was both “individualistic” and “socialistic.” It was individualistic because it “recognizes the formation of a certain character as the only genuine basis of right living.” It is “socialistic” because it “recognizes that this right character is not to be formed by merely individual precept, example, or exhortation, but rather by the influence of a certain form in institutional or community life upon the individual.”

Because the school is the instrument through which society creates a democratic character in children and achieves its own continuity, community support of the school therefore became a “paramount duty” (quoted in Johnson & Reed, 2000, 109).

The role of the school as an agent of social change imposes certain responsibilities on teachers and others with an interest in education. It becomes “the business of everyone interested in education to insist upon the school as the primary and most effective [instrument] of social progress and reform in order that society may be awakened to realize what the school stands for.” Moreover, “every teacher should realize the dignity of his calling; that he is a social servant set apart for the maintenance of proper social order and the securing of the right social growth” (quoted in Johnson & Reed, 2000, 110). Teachers are critical agents of social change with a heavy responsibility for the perpetuation of a democratic society.

Schools fulfill their role as agents of social change in two ways. First schools should model a democratic social order in classrooms and in the larger school environment and second, schools must teach children how to think critically about their society. Dewey’s exemplar of critical thinking was science. Here Dewey was referring not to the accumulated body of knowledge associated with a particular scientific discipline, but to the method by which this knowledge was produced. For Dewey “science” meant the same as “reason” or “intelligence,” or “reflective thought.” Scientific thinking embodied in the sequential process of the scientific method was thinking itself. There were no alternatives (Westbrook, 1991).

But scientific thinking involves not just a method of thought. It also entails participation in a community that possessed certain intellectual virtues. Dewey identified these virtues as “free inquiry, toleration of diverse opinion, and free communication” and considered them “the necessary if not sufficient attributes of a democratic society and polity.” Dewey believed that science provided both the model for effective thinking but also illustrated the need for a social group in which knowledge was socialized. Because thinking is essentially a social process, Dewey held that schools should organize themselves as small scientific communities where children could participate in “ongoing experimentation, communication, and self-criticism, constituting themselves as a youthful commonwealth of cooperative inquiry” (quoted in Westbrook, 1991, 170).

By the 1930’s Dewey’s confidence in the ability of schools to be effective agents of change had waned. He
came to the reluctant conclusion that schools are more often defenders of the status quo. Deeply embedded in their communities, both schools and teachers are constrained from being agents of change by the limits placed upon them by the social, political, and economic interests that dominate the community. But while the schools could not by any stretch of the imagination be the builders of a new social order, they “will surely, as a matter of fact, not of ideals, share in the building of the new social order as they ally with this or that movement of existing social forces” (quoted in Hoy, 1998, 68-69). How this alliance was to be created and sustained was unclear.

Dewey’s views on philosophy and education came under severe attack after World War II from critics of both the Left and the Right. From the Left, critics assailed him for not being radical enough. Critics from the Right condemned him for all the supposed errors of the Progressive Education, some aspects of which Dewey opposed (Westbrook, 1991; Hoy, 1998; Spring, 2006). But though it is not possible, or perhaps even desirable, to resurrect Dewey’s entire philosophical system, his work on the relationship between democracy and education certainly merits serious—and critical—examination to identify those ideas which are relevant to questions of education in our own time. That is a process that Dewey himself would heartily endorse. Henry Giroux

Giroux shares Dewey’s belief in the close connection between education and democracy. With Dewey, he sees the school as an agency of social change. Giroux insists that public schools be recognized as “democratic public spheres.” By that he means that schools are “democratic sites dedicated to self and social empowerment. Understood in these terms, schools can be public places where students learn the knowledge and skills necessary to create a critical democracy” (Giroux, 1988, 185). But Giroux takes Dewey’s concerns for the impact of industrialization and urbanization on society a step further when he addresses the unequal distribution of power in society as the shaper of both student’s social relationships and their interpretation of the world and their place in it. Consequently Giroux targets equalization of the distribution of power in society as the proper target of the social reforms schools should support.

As a democratic public sphere, the primary purpose of the school is to equip students with the skills and attitudes needed to understand the role of power in society and the social construction of knowledge. For Giroux knowledge is not something that exists outside of the boundaries of language and the persons who use it. The process of obtaining knowledge and making use of it—learning—cannot be disentangled from the learner’s social context and experience. The tool to be used to bring students to a proper understanding of power and the social construction of knowledge is critical pedagogy. Critical pedagogy becomes the means of empowerment of students.

The term critical pedagogy can be understood in a variety of ways. The traditional meaning of the term refers to an educational theory and to teaching and learning practices that are designed to raise students’ consciousness of oppressive social conditions so that they can take action against them, a process that Freire (2000) calls “conscientization.” Critical pedagogy can also be seen as the first step in a larger political agenda aimed at transforming oppressive social conditions and creating a more egalitarian society. Within the school, however, critical pedagogy is concerned with changing the traditional teacher-student relationship in which the teacher is the active agent and students are passive recipients of the teacher’s knowledge. Instead, critical pedagogy converts the classroom into a place where new knowledge, growing from the experience of both teacher and student, is produced using critical dialog. Critical pedagogy gives students “the means to critically appropriate knowledge existing outside their immediate experience in order to broaden their understanding of themselves, the world, and the possibilities for transforming the taken-for-granted assumptions about the way we live” (Giroux, 1988, 189). Critical pedagogy enables students to participate intelligently in democratic dialogic process that addresses issues of social justice and the unequal distribution of power. To Giroux the link between critical pedagogy and democracy is direct.

Giroux, places the responsibility for implementing critical pedagogy squarely on the shoulders of teachers. With critical pedagogy, teachers can move away from the status of a technician teaching a prescribed and packaged curriculum to become a transformative intellectual, who possesses the knowledge and skills to critique and transform society and to engage students in critical dialog. To produce this caliber of teacher, Giroux insists that teacher preparation institutions must themselves conduct critical dialogs with future teachers as a means of getting them ready for the classroom. The role of the teacher is central in the transformation of the classroom, the school and the society.

Dewey and Giroux share the view that the relationship between education and democracy is reciprocal and that the relationship forms the basis for creating unity out of the diversity of interests that is so
important to the maintenance of democracy (Hoy, 1998). Both affirm that education must be directed toward attaining an ideal of democracy as a form of associative living where interest must refer to interest and the barriers of class, race, gender, and inequalities in the distribution of power can be overcome. Both initially conceived of schools as the primary instruments of social change, but came ultimately to believe that schools alone could not accomplish social reform (Westbrook, 1991; Hoy, 1998). Nevertheless, schools could play an important part in social reform by aligning themselves with other movements for social reform.

Amy Gutmann

Gutmann’s work explores the sources of authority in a democratic educational system. Her interest is in determining who decides when society is confronted with significant issues in educational policy making. Her concern is that democratic majorities can and sometimes do make educational decisions that are inimical to their own long-term interests. How, she asks, can education be protected against the whims of the majority, the mendacity of legislators, and the self-serving behaviors of special interest groups?

Gutmann defines a democracy as a situation in which all adult citizens are eligible to participate in the governing of society. All adult citizens are not required to participate in decision-making to make a society democratic; democracy lies in the absence of any social, economic, racial, or educational barriers to prevent participation. To guard against the erection of barriers to participation, Gutmann proposes two foundational principles for a democratic education. These are, non-repression and non-discrimination. Non-repression insures that no one may restrict the free flow of ideas in the school. Non-discrimination means that democratic processes may not be used to exclude any individual or group from access to the school. These two principles stand against the power of both the majority or of any special interest group to use education to dominate others, either by restricting the free exchange of ideas or by excluding any person or group from obtaining an education. The free flow of ideas and equality of access enable a democracy to protect itself from itself.

Gutmann considers three alternative structures in her search for a source of democratic authority in education that will protect non-repression and non-discrimination. These are the family state, the state of families, and the state of the individual. The concept of the family state draws heavily on Plato’s Republic and locates authority over education squarely in the hands of the state, personified by the Philosopher Kings. The state’s purpose in providing an education is to convince all citizens to desire a common version of the good life and to value it over all other possible versions. The problem with this approach is that there are no objective versions of the good life to which all members of a society might adhere. What any citizen might consider “good” grows out of the type of education he receives and the individual choices he or she makes.

The opposite of the family state is the state of families. This structure places educational authority primarily in the hands of parents, permitting them to educate their children to prefer a way of life consistent with family heritage and values (Gutmann, 1987.) Those who support this arrangement believe that parents have the right to determine their children’s future, a right that the state cannot abrogate. Ultimate educational authority belongs to parents “whose freedom includes the right to pass their own way of life on to their children” (Gutmann, 1987, 29.) But the state of families is inconsistent with the democratic ideal because some families may want to pass on very undemocratic values to their children, such as teaching children to discriminate against certain groups of people or to deny freedom of thought. But children are much more than members of a family. They are also—or will be—citizens of a democratic society. As future citizens, society has an interest in the nature of their education. Parents alone cannot be counted on to equip their children with the intellectual skills and moral values necessary for participation in a democratic society or to expose them to the viewpoints of others with whom they must live in that society. In point of fact both parents and the state have an interest in the education of children and, while both share authority over what is taught, neither may exercise exclusive control.

Gutmann’s third structure for educational authority is the state of individuals. Drawing from concepts contained in John Stuart Mill’s On Liberty, this structure rejects any imposition of an approved vision of the good life on children. Neither parents nor the state have the right to bias the choice of children in favor of one conception of the good life over another. Children should be free to make their own choices. Educational experiences should maximize the child’s opportunity for future choice without prejudicing children toward or away from any idea of the good life. Education should provide children with the opportunity for choice while maintaining neutrality among competing conceptions of what constitutes the good life. Children are to be protected from both the biases of parents and the preferences of the state.

But Gutmann maintains that the idea of free choice is itself a version of the good life and therefore not a
neutral concept. Decisions about what children should be taught are laden with values. Within certain limits parents do have the right to pass on their values and religious beliefs to their children without interference from the state or anyone else. But fellow members of a democracy may claim a reciprocal right to insist that children are taught democratic values such as tolerance, non-discrimination, and mutual respect and that they acquire the intellectual capacity to participate fully in the democratic process. No child of a democracy should be taught to be intolerant, discriminatory, self-centered, or left ignorant.

Gutmann proposes her own alternative for exercising democratic authority over education. She writes that a democratic state has the responsibility to consciously reproduce itself. A democratic education therefore “must consciously seek to prepare citizens who will maintain a democratic state. This means preparing children to participate actively in the sharing of power and the shaping of society” (Gutmann, 1987, 39). Gutmann thus rejects majority rule, philosopher-kings, families, and individuals as sources of authority for democratic education. In their place she proposes a structure for democratic education that balances the authority of all parties with an interest in education and blocks the right of democratic authority to exclude the basic principles of non-repression and non-discrimination from the school curriculum. A truly democratic structure for education rests on shared authority “even though such sharing does not guarantee that power will be wedded to knowledge that parents can successfully pass their prejudices on to their children, or that education will be neutral among competing conceptions of the good life” (Gutmann, 1987, 42.) In her view a society in which authority over education is balanced among all interests is best able to prepare all citizens to participate effectively in governing a democracy.

In Gutmann’s view, a society marked by shared authority is the best guarantee of democratic control while at the same time counteracting the authority of the state to suppress freedom of ideas. Gutmann is more concerned with non-repression of ideas than she is with discrimination because that principle is firmly embedded in the constitution and in statute (Spring, 2006). But keeping people from suppressing the freedom of expression is an entirely different matter. Gutmann’s solution to this problem is to rely on the “democratic professionalism” of teachers. Teachers have “[t]he professional responsibility . . . to uphold the principle of non-repression by cultivating the capacity for democratic deliberation” (Gutmann, 1987, 76).

Guarding against the repression of ideas is also the role of teacher’s unions who, in support of the efforts of individual members, assure that all children learn to reflect critically on their society and to master the skills needed to participate in democratic deliberation.

Gutmann’s vision of the best source of authority for democratic education can be criticized on several points. Two are particularly relevant here. First, her advancement of non-repression and non-discrimination as fundamental principles is not the result of any recognized democratic deliberative process. Authority for their selection rests on Gutmann’s own interpretation of democratic theory and a philosophical tradition that reaches back as far as Plato (Spring, 2006). Gutmann’s action places her among the ranks of the “Philosopher Kings.” As valuable as these principles may be, given the absence of any democratic deliberation they cannot yet be authoritative. Gutmann is probably correct in her selection of founding principles, but the choice has been hers, not ours. Second, it is difficult to conceive of any context in which all teachers—or teacher unions—would accept the protection of non-repression as a professional responsibility. But without that agreement the possibility that teachers will act professionally to protect the free flow of ideas collapses. In the end Gutmann fails to suggest a political structure that would effectively counter majority rule and the maneuvering of special interests to dominate education (Spring, 2006).

Drawing the Threads

So, what do these three philosophers have to contribute to our understanding of a democratic education? There are at least three points to be kept in mind in any consideration of how a truly democratic education should be structured. The first point to be considered is the reciprocal connection between education and democracy. To sustain itself, a democracy must have citizens who share certain key values and have specific intellectual skills. The list of values democratic citizens must possess is short. It includes tolerance, the willingness to respect the views and opinions of others, and nondiscrimination. Citizens must also possess the intellectual skills to critically analyze the operation of their own society and to participate meaningfully in the deliberative processes that can bring about social change. Imparting these values and skills validates the school as a necessary institution in a democracy.

Second, the power of democratic decision making in education is not absolute but must necessarily be circumscribed. Gutmann would prohibit democratic
majorities from suppressing the free flow of ideas or restricting access to education for any individual or group in society. She also balances the rights of parents and other citizens in determining what values children are taught in school. Dewey and Giroux would also limit democratic majorities from interfering with the implementation of critical instructional methodologies in the classroom, a stricture that does not apply to the content of the curriculum (Spring, 2006). Since critical methodologies can be adapted to any subject matter, majority determination of curricular content is irrelevant. Any content can serve the ends of democracy as long as critical methodologies are employed to teach it. Besides, Dewey and Giroux insist, once citizens begin to think critically the curriculum will become democratic.

Third, all three philosophers rely primarily on teachers to carry out their ideal of a democratic education. Gutmann appeals to the “democratic professionalism” of teachers and teacher unions to preserve the principle of non-repression. Dewey and Giroux assign teachers the important role of agents of social change who instill in their students habits of critical thought as they examine the social, political, economic, and cultural aspects of the world around them. Unfortunately, this assignment ignores the realities of the political world public school teachers inhabit, especially in this era of high stakes testing, state mandated standards, and corporate influence. Even without these pressures, teachers have never been totally free agents inside their own classrooms. Should an ideal level of democratic control of the schools eventually be realized, teachers may become partners in shaping educational policy, but never its sole determiners. Perhaps the inability of the schools to live up to their idealized role in shaping democratic society led both Dewey and Giroux ultimately to look beyond the schools for the leadership of social reform.

Drawing from Dewey, Giroux, and Gutmann, how might we craft a vision of a democratic school? We might begin with the understanding that the school exists to intentionally inculcate future citizens with the values and intellectual skills to become full participants in a dynamic democratic society. This role can only be accomplished if teachers and students are given open access to ideas and information. Ideas, issues, and policies would be subject to a critical analysis in a democratic school. Democratic schools must also affirm the capacity of people to solve their own problems and provide students and teachers opportunities to experience problem solving in relevant settings. The school must also inculcate students with a reasonable concern for the common good and a commitment to the dignity and basic human rights of all citizens. These values must be intentionally taught and not left to chance or to the whims of parents, who may not share them. Finally, those in a democratic school must come to understand that democracy is never fully realized but is always in the process of creation and refinement (Apple & Beane, 1995). Are these the schools we have now? Unfortunately, the answer is “no.” But these are the schools we can have if we possess the political will to create them. The ideas are there. It is up to us to follow where they might lead.
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WORK OR LOVE?: A CHRISTIAN EVALUATION OF JOHN DEWEY’S VIEWS ON THE PURPOSE OF SCHOOLING

Claudiu Cimpean, Baylor University

Introduction

In this paper I will evaluate John Dewey’s views on the purpose of schooling from a Christian perspective. First, I will provide a Christian understanding with regard to the purpose of schooling. According to a Christian perspective, the purpose of schooling is to form individuals who will serve and love God and his or her fellow human beings. Second, I will present the epistemological means which are employed by humans as they fulfill the Christian purpose of schooling. These are science, philosophy, and faith. Third, I will argue that Christianity is a practical religion and, therefore, Christian living requires more than a theoretical understanding; it demands action. Fourth, I will present a Christian perspective with regard to democracy. An understanding of democracy from a Christian perspective is essential for my evaluation of Dewey’s views on the purpose of schooling. For Dewey, democracy constitutes the highest ethical ideal and implicitly the ultimate purpose of schooling. Finally, I will evaluate Dewey’s views on the purpose of schooling from a Christian perspective.

A Christian Perspective on the Purpose of Schooling

The purpose of human existence from a Christian perspective is to enter into a relationship of love with our Creator. St. Augustine argues this point numerous times in his famous autobiography, Confessions (Augustine 1960). Augustine (Outler 1955, 1) also mentions in The Enchiridion on Faith, Hope and Love that serving God is the purpose of human existence. Far from being inconsistent, Augustine understands that service constitutes a way in which humans manifest their love for God. Augustine, who served as the bishop of Hippo, further rhetorically wonders whether he can enter in a relationship with God if he does not know God (Ryan 1960, 43). Indeed, knowledge of God is required prior to our engagement in His service.

For Soren Kierkegaard, another famous Christian author, man’s relationship with God is essential for being happy. Kierkegaard believes that by nature humans are relational beings. The human self is a complex structure. The self has the ability to relate to itself. In other words, the self is the relation of itself to itself (Evans 1990, 13). As C. Stephan Evans, professor of philosophy at Baylor University, put this point “One cannot understand a spiritual being all by itself as a simple entity; its being is constituted by its relations” (Evans 1990, 45-46). Of these relations, Evans believes that one’s relation to God is “the most basic relationship humans have, then it seems that the God-relation cannot be a peripheral, add-on fact about human beings” (Evans 1990, 46).

Kierkegaard believes that through man’s relationship with God, he or she is transformed into the individual that God intended him or her to be. Man has a threefold responsibility in his or her relationship with God. First, man must accept to become what God wants him or her to be. To Kierkegaard, God cannot transform man without his or her consent. Second, man must realize that through his or her own powers he or she cannot reach the ideal set by God for his or her life. Third, man must be transparent to God. Transparency entails knowing oneself and subsequently willfully revealing oneself entirely to God (Evans 1990, 57-59).

To Kierkegaard, knowing oneself is not an easy task. He believes that man has the ability to hide from himself or herself many aspects of his or her existence, usually those aspects that are hurtful, shameful, and sinful. Knowing oneself requires a plunge into man’s unconscious, from where he or she must recover knowledge about himself or herself that was hidden by sin (Evans 1990, 59).

A Christian perspective, thus, recognizes that in addition to knowledge of God, man must acquire knowledge of himself in order to be happy. Our love for God and our love for ourselves are not mutually exclusive. To the contrary, God demands that we love ourselves. As a God of supreme wisdom and as a Being whose love for human beings was ultimately manifested in the sacrifice of His only Son, Jesus Christ, the Christian God would go against the core of His nature were He to demand that we do not love ourselves.

Furthermore, according to a Christian perspective, serving God implies loving and serving one another. Jesus says that whoever loves Him will obey His commands (The Holy Bible, John 14:21). Jesus identifies the greatest commandments as the following: “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. 38 This is the first and great commandment. 39 And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself” (The Holy Bible, Matthew 22: 38, 39). To summarize, serving God entails that man loves God, loves himself, and loves his fellow man as himself. This love entails
knowledge of God, ourselves, and our fellow human beings.

**Christian Epistemology**

Christian epistemology embraces the following truths: scientific truths, logical and mathematical truths, and the truths of faith. Humans reach scientific truths through observation and experiment. The scientific method requires the utilization of both senses and reason; it is practical and reflective. In scientific experimentation, one’s interaction with the physical environment is supplemented by thinking about this interaction. The scientist proposes a hypothesis. He then tests the hypothesis within the physical environment. The scientist then reflects upon the experiment and, if the experiment does not confirm the hypothesis, proposes a new hypothesis. This new hypothesis is then tested in the same manner as the first one. If the hypothesis is confirmed, the scientist will repeat the experiment. If the experiment yields the same results after an adequate number of repetitions, the tested theory becomes scientific truth. A Christian perspective does not reject scientific truths. These are considered useful, indeed essential, for humankind. However, according to a Christian world view, scientific truths are not absolute truths. They are viable truths, meaning truths that can be improved.

In the second category of truths embraced by a Christian perspective are logical and mathematical truths. These truths are developed through abstract reasoning. They cannot be inferred from any source other than reason. In Plato’s Republic, Socrates differentiates between mathematical and dialectical (or purely rational) truths. The former are valid arguments, logically deduced from axioms that were never tested by reason. The latter are sound arguments because they are grounded and tested in their entirety by reason.

According to Socrates, purely rational truths are reached when one finds the first principle. The first principle is proven in itself; it does not need rational justification. Subsequently, one can deduce the whole knowledge from the first principle. For Christians, absolute truth exists. A Christian perspective does not reject this quest for a rationally justified absolute truth. Christianity endorses the rational assertion that it would be irrational to cease the logical human quest for absolute knowledge, truth, and goodness. As long as the logical possibility of finding this rational truth exists, one can legitimately engage in the logical quest for the absolute.

A Christian perspective does not endorse the epistemological either/or between total empiricism and idealism. Philosophy and science serve different aspects of human nature. They are two parts of the same reality. The former, philosophy, satisfies the mind, while the latter, science, satisfies appetite, the senses, the will, and practical action. Humans cannot choose one over the other, but rather must live in both worlds simultaneously. God created human beings to live in both worlds from the beginning.

The truth provided by Divine revelation, the truth of faith is central to a Christian perspective. According to Christianity, one’s knowledge of God is a necessary precondition to one’s happiness. Christianity affirms that the realization of human happiness requires man’s relationship with God. In his work, The Confessions, Augustine (1960) rightly wonders whether he could love God if he does not know Him. Reason alone cannot justify the human knowledge of God. Our knowledge of God is provided to us through Divine revelation. Christianity asserts that God reveals Himself within His creation. In the Epistle to the Romans, for example, Apostle Paul discusses God’s revelation in nature. Paul states,

19 that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath showed it unto them. 20 For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse (The Holy Bible, Romans 1: 19, 20).

Moreover, God reveals His nature in human conscience. Apostle Paul declares,

14 For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: 15 which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another; (The Holy Bible, Romans 2:14-16).

God reveals Himself in the Bible. Apostle Paul proclaims,

16 All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: 17 that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works (The Holy Bible, 2 Timothy 3:16,17).

Finally, the apocaphysis of God’s revelation is in the person of Jesus Christ. The author of the Letter to the Hebrews affirms,

1 God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, 2 hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; 3 who being the brightness
of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high; (The Holy Bible, Hebrews 1:1-3).

According to a Christian perspective, God employs these means (general revelation: human conscience, nature; and special revelation: the Bible and the person of Jesus Christ) to reveal His conceptions regarding the physical world, humanity, and the responsibility we have toward them. To all of God’s revelation we have access only through faith. But, what is faith?

According to Kierkegaard, the message of faith, transmitted by God to humans through the aforementioned channels, has the weight of evidence behind it. This evidence, although not entrenched in pure reason, is sufficient in providing conviction, even certainty beyond any doubt. This is the power of faith. However, human beings are endowed by God with the possibility to reject His message of faith. Kierkegaard, echoing the Apostle Paul, affirms that humans can further pervert, or alter, the message of God and even replace it with a lie to which they can adhere and believe.

C. S. Lewis (1987), in his work *The World’s Last Night*, agrees with Kierkegaard that Christian faith requires evidence. According to Lewis, Christians do not consider it admirable to believe without evidence or even against opposing evidence. However, Lewis affirms that once the belief is formed, Christians believe that it is meritorious to adhere to his or her faith in spite of contrary evidence. Furthermore, Lewis addresses the following questions: *Is it reasonable to form beliefs? And, Is it reasonable to hold on to our beliefs in spite of opposing evidence?*

In the attempt to answer the latter question, Lewis employs the analogies of a dog, whose paw is trapped, and of a boy with a thorn in his finger. To save the dog and alleviate the child’s pain entails an initial increase of the level of their pain. The dog and the child consider that the actions of their benefactor go against their conceptions, supported by evidence, regarding the solution to their situation. However, the child and the dog submit themselves to the decisions of their benefactor and soon their predicament is over. Could anyone blame the victims for their decision to trust in their savior? Could anyone accuse them of lacking intelligence? Certainly not. Lewis expands on this point, *Now to accept the Christian propositions is *ipso facto* to believe that we are to God, always, as that dog or child . . . was to us, only very much more so. From this it is a strictly logical conclusion that the behavior which was appropriate to them will be appropriate to us, only very much more so . . . . If human life is in fact ordered by a beneficent being whose knowledge . . . infinitely exceeds our own, we must expect *a priori* that His operations will often appear to us far from beneficent and far from wise, and that it will be our highest prudence to give Him our confidence in spite of this (Lewis 1987, 24).*

The strength of faith required to overcome contrary evidence is smaller when the contention is between propositions of faith and scientific evidence than in the case where faith battles reason. In the former circumstance, scientific arguments are supplemented by faith because science does not have pretensions of absolute knowledge. In the latter situation, more faith is necessary to prevail over logical contradictions, which are absolute. For example, one’s belief in the triune nature of God constitutes an act of faith that transcends rational understanding. Even in the latter case, it is reasonable to believe in a triune God. To dismiss such belief as unreasonable because reason refutes them is to institute reason as the ultimate authority in establishing what is true. To affirm that reason should have absolute pretensions over truth is conceived and arrogant. A Christian perspective considers arrogance less reasonable than modesty. Therefore, it embraces the mysterious and transcendent aspects of reality.

According to a Christian perspective, the epistemological tools of science, reason, and faith presented above complement each other rather than being antagonistic in man’s quest for the truth. *Christianity: A Practical Religion*

According to a Christian perspective, theoretical knowledge, regardless of its breadth and depth, is insufficient for realizing the purpose of serving God. From a Christian standpoint, knowledge for its own sake is not only useless with regard to physical and social matters, but it is also immoral. To Christians, knowledge must be accompanied by action. Serving and loving God, our fellow human beings, and the community in which we live require action. A Christian perspective recognizes that teachers must show their love for God and other human beings through action. Scientists must do the same as well. Moreover, the Apostle James, Christ’s brother, affirms that a man of faith is necessarily a man of action. James puts this point,

17 Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone. 18 Yea, a man may say, Thou hast faith, and I have works: shew me thy faith without thy works, and I will shew thee my faith by my works. 19 Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well: the
Augustine, in the Confessions, describes in the section on the famous pear tree incident, the role played by his will in the act of sinning (Augustine 1960, 69-75). Augustine affirms that his sin was not a consequence of his lack of adequate knowledge or of his inability to harness his passions. Rather, Augustine sinned because he chose to do evil. Augustine acknowledges that his choice was not influenced by his desire, specifically the desire to enjoy the taste of the pears from a neighbor’s garden. Augustine explains that those pears were not very tasty. Hunger was not an issue either. Augustine even mentions that he had access to better pears. Moreover, he was fully aware of the particular situation he was confronting, specifically that stealing the property of someone else was a sin. Augustine’s decision to steal was triggered by his choice to do evil for its own sake. He realized that his problem resided in his will. His will was corrupt and needed to be transformed. Augustine believed that he inherited his corrupt will from his parents. This generationally transmitted sinful nature was introduced in humankind by Adam’s original sin. Augustine came to the realization that the transformation of his will could be realized only by God through His Divine grace (Augustine 1960, 73).

According to a Christian perspective, the essence of the corruption of the will resides in man’s inability to choose to love God above everything else. Once God intervenes and rehabilitates man’s will, however, man acquires the freedom to choose to love or reject God. For Augustine, man’s love for God is more than a sentiment; it is the product of his will. Our love for God originates in our decision to love Him and subsequently evolves into a feeling of love for Him. C. S. Lewis shares this view. For example, in Mere Christianity (1952) and The Four Loves (1960), Lewis argues that man’s ability to love God is essential to being a good person (Lewis 1952, 132). For instance, a person might possess the highest form of knowledge. Moreover, he or she might also exhibit the noblest of moral habits. Throughout this individual’s existence, he or she could perform the greatest amount of good into the world. However, according to a Christian perspective, if this person’s deeds are not motivated by his or her love for God, that person will inevitably be unhappy.

Christian faith plays an essential role in fostering the ideal of serving God, improving man’s condition, and assisting man as he or she contributes to the betterment of other human beings. According to a Christian perspective, only Christians can truly realize the purpose of serving and loving God. Moreover, only Christians can experience the highest state of happiness. Also, only Christians can truly love others. Christians are able to
fulfill these ideals because they possess knowledge and have a regenerated will. I have already argued in this chapter that love and service entail knowledge; and knowledge requires reason and faith. Christian faith is essential because it provides knowledge with regard to God and man that is not available to man through general revelation (e.g., revelation in nature and human conscience). Moreover, Christian faith has a role in remedying the inaccuracies that we have planted in our conscience. The Apostle Paul describes in the second chapter of his Epistle to the Romans the process employed by humans for perverting their conscience. Paul concludes that the perversion of the human conscience was so severe that its cleansing could have only been realized through God’s special revelation in Christ (Romans 2: 9-28). In addition, I will affirm that Christianity is an exclusivist religion, meaning that Christianity offers the only way to God, salvation, and happiness. Therefore, among all faiths, only the content of Christian faith can assist man in achieving adequate knowledge and subsequently realizing the purpose of serving God and man.

According to a Christian perspective, a person who loves God must also obey Him. If one can express one’s love for a fellow human being by refusing to satisfy the latter’s desires, one cannot love God and simultaneously disobey Him. In the first case, one, as an expression of his or her love, can disregard, or even act contrary to, his or her friend’s desires when these desires are unwise, meaning rationally deficient or even intentionally self-destructive. In the second case, God’s desires are never unwise. God is the possessor and source of all wisdom and love. In Him, there is no hate; neither for Himself nor for another. Therefore, an all knowledgeable God will always know better than us how we should love Him. Moreover, an all loving God will never undermine Himself. Based on these arguments, man is rationally justified to express his love for God through obedience to His commands even when these commandments go against his or her understanding. Moreover, human beings should obey God even when they perceive that God’s demands violate the fundamental principles of reason. According to a Christian world view, man’s obedience to God refers to respecting God’s commandments presented in Scripture. Also, from a Christian perspective, man’s obedience consists in abiding by the demands of his or her conscience.

All of the theological concepts presented above must be apprehended by the person who wants to follow Christ. These ideas are fostered by faith and reason. The act of conversion requires man’s decision to love God above everything else and to obey Him in all aspects of his or her existence. Christian conversion requires man’s free participation.

Therefore, according to a Christian perspective, knowledge regardless of its breadth and depth is necessary but not sufficient for fostering the good life. Moreover, the formation of moral habits is also necessary but not sufficient for generating man’s happiness. According to a Christian world view, only a complete commitment to Christ can produce a good and happy human being, one that will fulfill the purpose established by God for his or her existence.

According to a Christian perspective, the purpose of schooling is to advance the Christian metaphysical ideals of God, man, and the cosmos. Christian schooling should also further the epistemological methods of science, philosophy, and faith. Moreover, schooling should seek to foster Christian moral habits. Finally, schooling should provide an environment in which human beings are provided with the opportunity to experience conversion to the Christian faith. All of these aims of schooling fulfill a greater purpose: loving and serving God.

Christian schooling also must foster excellence. Our service to God, our fellow human beings, and even ourselves must be unblemished. As I mentioned above, loving and serving God entails loving and serving ourselves and our fellow human beings. Therefore, Christian schooling must aim to develop man’s capacities to their fullest potential. Michael L. Peterson, in With All Your Mind: A Christian Philosophy of Education, identifies the following human capacities that Christian schooling must strengthen: “rational, emotional, moral, aesthetic, physical, and practical” (Peterson 2001, 109). All of these human capacities can reach their full potential only when developed within the Christian metaphysical, epistemological, and ethical framework presented above.

**Democracy: A Means of Serving and Loving God**

In this section I argue that democracy can be employed as a means of promoting the ideals of serving and loving God. I model my understanding of democracy on the views presented by Arthur Cushman McGiffert (1919), professor of theology and former president of Union Theological Seminary, in his article entitled “Christianity and Democracy.” McGiffert roots his conception on democracy into the ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity.

McGiffert (1919, 37) argues that democracy is not only a political issue, but a moral issue as well. To McGiffert, the idea of democracy is justified by Christian ethics. In addition, McGiffert argues, non-democratic regimes, specifically autocratic
governments, are immoral because they treat “men as machines instead of persons, as things to be manipulated and controlled instead of free beings gifted with the privilege of choosing for themselves even to their own hurt” (McGiffert 1919, 38). According to McGiffert, the Christian God does not intend to coerce men into submission to His omnipotent will, “but to lead them into the full liberty of sons of God” (1919, 49).

According to Christian thinking, liberty is a fundamental part of man’s nature. In other words, man must be free in order to be fully human. Also, liberty is a Christian ideal because one cannot love God unless he or she is a free being. According to a Christian perspective, love is more than a sentiment; it always entails a choice. Thus, love for God requires freedom of choice.

McGiffert warns that freedom by itself could have disastrous consequences for society; it might lead to selfishness and implicitly to anarchy. He argues that Christianity can strengthen democracy if the ideal of liberty is permeated by the ideal of service. McGiffert warns us that “Democracy may well be worse in its results than autocracy, if it meant only liberty for universal selfishness” (1919, 45).

Fraternity refers to man’s love for his or her fellow human beings. When Christ states this ideal in the golden rule, he clearly establishes that man must first love God and next he or she must love mankind. According to a Christian perspective, one cannot use the love for God as an excuse for not manifesting one’s love for one’s fellow man. These two kinds of love are under no circumstances mutually exclusive. To Christians, serving God in love also entails serving and loving all of society.

According to McGiffert, “an essential element in brotherhood has been commonly overlooked” (1919, 39). This forgotten element is the ideal of equality. The Christian idea of fraternity entails the idea of love between equals. To McGiffert, the ideal of fraternity can only be realized in a democratic state. Citizens in an autocratic society are not equal. They are the subjects of princes, kings, noblemen, tyrants, or dictators. In autocratic states, the welfare of citizens depends upon the benevolence of the rulers. In this case, the ideals of fraternity and equality are replaced (in the best case scenario) by charity. Because a Christian perspective endorses the ideal of fraternity, then it must adhere to the ideal of democracy.

McGiffert warns that the idea of equality is not synonymous to the idea of perfect identity advocated by socialism (1919, 46). Socialist equality attempts to create human beings who have the same political ideology, economic status, and private lives. Socialism repudiates liberty because socialism makes no room for variety. According to McGiffert, equality must not oppose liberty, but rather they must live in harmony. The Apostle Paul endorses a harmonious coexistence of liberty and equality in I Corinthians. Paul mentions that Christians are given different gifts, some greater than others, but all alike are honorable. All of these gifts are useful for the body of Christ. They should be employed for the benefit of others rather than for selfish reasons (I Corinthians 12: 4-11).

However, a Christian perspective acknowledges that absolute political equality is unattainable in a fallen world. However, democracy provides the highest form of political equality that can be achieved by human beings. Indeed, in a representative democracy, some people will have more political power than others, but in no other political system will the citizens of a state have as much political power as they do in a democracy. Also, political equality entails political freedom. In a democracy, one’s political freedom is not absolute, but rather it is limited by the political freedom of the other citizens of the state. Therefore, political equality entails both rights and responsibilities. Political equality is a Christian ideal because it confers citizen freedom. Moreover, political equality restricts this freedom in such a way that it does not harm other human beings. Christianity will endorse democracy to the detriment of the other political systems because political equality is best realized in a democratic state.

Moreover, political freedom and equality inherent in a democratic state lead to the establishment of a fair economic environment. Democracy allows for the highest level of economic prosperity for the largest number of citizens. A Christian world view acknowledges the value of political equality because it generates material prosperity. Christianity believes in material, or physical, goods. Consequently, Christians are called to express their love for their fellow human beings by offering them these kind of goods. Charity is a Christian virtue. Moreover, if we desire that our fellow men partake of these goods, we should support the political regime that best promotes their production. Consequently, a Christian perspective should endorse democracy.

A Christian perspective supports the ideal of political equality and economic prosperity inherent in a democracy for yet another reason. Political equality and economic prosperity reinforce each other. Political equality leads to economic prosperity and vice versa. These human ideals grant political power to the individual and thus allow him or her to exercise freedom of thought, conscience, and religion. Freedom of
thought allows for the developing of the human mind. How can a man expand his or her mental abilities unless he or she is free to pursue and investigate all avenues of thought? The developing of one’s intellect is a Christian ideal. It is an end in itself because man’s happiness depends upon the development of his or her mental capacities. Moreover, mental development is a prerequisite for serving God and one’s fellow man. Economic and political power also allows one to act according to his or her conscience and religious understanding. To summarize, a Christian perspective supports democracy because democracy, more than any other political system, promotes the Christian ideals of individual freedom, political equality, economic prosperity, intellectual development, and moral and religious freedom.

As I have mentioned above, one’s intellectual, spiritual, and religious manifestations are in some measure dependent upon political freedom, equality, and economic freedom. I would also like to underline the fact that the pursuit of wisdom, spirituality, science, and the activity of the mind in the life of a nation will generate economic development and political equality. Religion also plays a significant role in society. Religion can either allow or restrict the life of the mind, economic prosperity, and political equality. Therefore, economic development, political equality, individual freedom, religion, and intellectual development are all interdependent and mutually implicit. Christianity supports democracy along with all of these aforementioned human ideals.

One might argue, with some degree of historical evidence, that a Christian support of democracy, political equality, economic prosperity, and intellectual freedom is a self-defeating endeavor. Coming from a former communist country, I have witnessed a spectacular expansion of the Christian church during times of restriction, oppression, and persecution. After the fall of communism, the period of economic prosperity that followed has witnessed a diminishing enthusiasm for Christianity. A similar situation occurred when Christianity became a religia licita (officially permitted religion) in the Roman Empire. Under these circumstances, the following question presents itself: why should a Christian perspective support democracy? My unstaunched support for democracy derives from my understanding that Christianity does not adhere to the idea that the purpose justifies the means. Rather, I believe that Christianity supports the principle that just means should always be employed when promoting just purposes. Therefore, a Christian perspective will never endorse oppression, persecution, or other evils in order to promote itself. Instead, Christianity will support democratic principles such as individual freedom, political equality, and freedom of religion.

**A Christian Evaluation of John Dewey’s Views on the Purpose of Schooling**

The purpose of schooling is determined by metaphysical, epistemological, and ethical dimensions inherent in any particular world view. Therefore, different metaphysical, epistemological, and ethical views lead to different purposes for schooling. Dewey’s progressivism and a Christian perspective differ with regard to metaphysics, epistemology, and ethics. Consequently, they propose different purposes for schooling. A Christian purpose of schooling is rooted in a metaphysical understanding of God, man, and the cosmos. According to a Christian perspective, these metaphysical views are immutable and absolute. Moreover, God has established an absolute existential purpose for man, which is to serve and love Him. From a Christian perspective, schooling must serve this Divine purpose.

The first point of contention between Dewey’s progressive philosophy and a Christian perspective can be found in the very concept of metaphysics. Dewey rejects the notion of a world that consists of absolute ideals and realities (Fair, 1999). If Dewey rejects the existence of absolute realities, then by logical necessity he must refute the idea of an absolute God. By rejecting the notion of an absolute God, Dewey discards the idea of a Christian God. For Dewey, the idea of serving an all-knowing God is therefore not important. Consequently, to Dewey, the idea of man created with a precise purpose established by God is also unacceptable. Therefore, Dewey rejects the Christian purpose for schooling, which is to serve and love God. When evaluated from a Christian perspective, Dewey’s progressivism falls short due to its refusal to promote the Christian ideal of serving and loving God. Dewey’s purpose for schooling is to promote a democratic state. For Dewey, democracy is the ultimate ethical ideal for man. To Dewey, democracy is the political system in which man’s ethical ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity can best be realized. In Dewey’s view, these ideals are not entrenched in idealist metaphysics. According to Westbrook,

[It] must be said in Dewey’s defense that he never tried as a metaphysician to secure his most cherished values as ‘fixed traits of real Being.’ His attempt to establish that democracy was a reasonable regulative ideal in a hazardous world in which such ideals often came to grief was a far cry from the efforts of others to forge for their ideals a false passport to certainty.
A Christian perspective promotes the ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity. Unlike Dewey, however, Christianity affirms that these principles are absolute and universal. They are offered to man through God’s special revelation, which is accessible only through faith. Moreover, these principles are made available to man in God’s general revelation, the revelation in nature and human conscience. Liberty, equality, and fraternity derive their content from Christian metaphysics. Unlike Dewey, a Christian perspective endorses the idea that these ideals are not ends in themselves, but rather they are means to attaining the highest ideal of serving and loving God. Therefore, a Christian perspective affirms that democracy by itself is an insufficient purpose for schooling. Democracy must be presented to students in addition to knowledge about God and the Christian purpose of serving God in love. Democracy, in other words, must be rooted in the Christian faith.

**Conclusion: Dewey’s Democratic Schooling and the Christian Ideal**

I will conclude by comparing Dewey’s democratic purpose for schooling—specifically the ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity—against the Christian ideal of serving and loving God (Dewey 1976, 441-444; Westbrook 1991, 93). To Dewey, liberty entails two aspects: knowledge and the ability to put one’s ideas into practice (Dewey 1902, 93; 1897, 59-60; 1899, 23). Echoing Jefferson’s view, Dewey does not believe that man can be both ignorant and free. Moreover, Dewey believes that man is a slave as long as he cannot act upon his ideas. In other words, to Dewey, a free man is the master of his private life and has a say in the affairs of the state.

A Christian perspective endorses the idea of liberty. Indeed, according to Christianity, man must be free in order to love God. Love entails liberty. Man cannot be forced to love another, whether this person is God or a fellow human being. Moreover, a Christian perspective supports the idea of political liberty. As I have shown above, McGiffert (1919, 38) argues that Christian ethics demands democratic freedom. McGiffert argues, similar to Dewey, that the very idea of human nature demands that man be able to put his or her ideas into practice. In other words, in order to be happy, man must have personal and political freedom. Since loving oneself is a means of loving God (Augustine 1996, 114), I will conclude that democratic liberty is necessary for fostering the ideal of loving and serving God.

With regard to the ideal of equality, Dewey argues that it can be achieved by implementing the idea of socialism of intelligence (Dewey, 1976, 441-444; Westbrook 1991, 93-94). Socialism of intelligence refers to providing all students, regardless of their social status, with the same quality of education. Dewey, like Horace Mann, believed that education, specifically K-12 schooling, is the great equalizer of the human condition. Dewey agrees with Mann that education can assist students in accomplishing the highest potential of their natures. For Dewey, human beings are unique. Therefore, they realize their natures in different ways. Humans need different resources (both in quality and quantity) in order to fulfill their unique natures. Under these circumstances, Dewey concludes that there is no need for an equal distribution of physical, financial, and economic resources. Thus, Dewey’s conception of equality is at odds with socialist ideology.

Christian morality proposes higher standards than Dewey’s ethics, because Christianity demands service rather than equality. In the Gospels, Jesus affirms that the greatest in the kingdom of God is the one who serves (Luke 22: 24-27). Jesus calls human beings to serve both God and one another.

Finally, for Dewey, the idea of fraternity refers to the social nature of man. Fraternity contributes to the unity of the state. To Dewey, citizens must learn to learn to embrace the ideals of the community and ultimately the state. Dewey does not argue for either a total subordination of individuals to the state or a complete independence of men from the authority of government. Rather, Dewey promotes a balance between individual and public interests. Thus, for Dewey, liberty and fraternity must find a way to coexist in a democratic state. According to a Christian perspective, however, fraternity is formed by love and service, not service to the state. Fraternity is not a means in itself, but rather a means for loving and serving God (Augustine 1996, 114).
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The Problem

This paper is a brief sketch of a serious and complex problem of American democratic life and discourse. At the root of my interest is the variety and nature of public voice and the educational role of public speech. Philosophy of education seems often to be a philosophy of schooling. We know education takes place in many places beyond school (indeed, as reductionism becomes ever more prevalent, one is tempted to ask if anything worthy of the name “education” takes place in school). Right wing politicians, operating intentionally and in a focused manner since the 70’s, have effectively used the political process to educate a generation. The result has been a dramatic shift of political rhetoric moving from concern over public and common good to a discourse focusing on individual good, and at the same time moving matters previously understood as private morality to the center of political debate, especially around matters of sexuality. Care for the poor, the environment, and of our neighbor generally are no longer considered moral problems as framed in public speech.

The first section of this paper will present the idea of public voices. The second section of this paper will briefly sketch the nature and dimensions of the relation between religion and public policy. The third part will consider the historical context of the problem. The final section of the paper will briefly examine the way the political process has been used by the Right to educate a generation; conversely, this is also the story of how progressive advocates have failed to so use the political process.

Public Voices

There are at least three distinct voices of public policy discourse: there is the voice of prudential self-interest, the voice of constitutional-legal requirement, and the voice of moral sensibility and imperative; often but neither inevitably nor always, this voice is rooted in a religious sensibility and tradition. The first two voices speak in different ways to reason, but the third voice calls to the heart of its hearers. The reactionary America right, especially theocratic Christian Conservatives, are fluent in all three voices, while the progressive left has lost the ability to speak fluently in the moral voice, in which it used to excel. This gives a strong advantage to reactionary politics, since the law often follows a sense of moral imperative, such as happened in the civil rights movement of the 50’s and 60’s, and may be happening now with the GLBT civil rights and the anti-abortion movements. It is also, of course, what is undermining women’s right-to-choose and progressive tax policies.

“Moral” is the domain within which differentiations between good and evil are made. To say that a discourse or decision is moral is to say that it takes place in the domain where such differentiations are seen to be relevant, not that the judgments in this domain are correct.

Each of these voices calls us to action in a different way. The Constitutional-legal imperative speaks to us of what we must do (or not do), with the understanding that there are civil consequences for violation. This is a voice that is important and a necessary part of claiming civil rights in our system of government. However, it is not a voice that tugs at the heart strings. It also tends to be a win-lose way of putting the issue; what usually happens is that one side claims a right, for example, to freedom from state establishment of religion, and the other side puts forth a competing rights claims, for example, the right to free speech or the right to religious freedom. With smart lawyers arguing both sides of the case, it is difficult to win or even discern a moral high ground.

The second voice is that of utilitarian self-interest. This is the argument that we should provide good education for the younger generation because it is they who must pay my Social Security benefits when I am retired. Appealing to self interest is an important part of the political process. Human beings do, even if not always, act on their self-interest. More precisely, perhaps, they do not often act against their perceived interests.

Neither of these voices demands much from us; the law normally defines minimally acceptable standards of conduct, not any supererogatory virtue or performance. It delineates what we might call the ordinary virtues of social life—what is required of its members for society to function. The voice of prudential self-interest, even more so, does not provide a standard that inspires. It merely tells us to do those things that would benefit us personally, not a difficult sell.

The third voice, however, the voice of moral imperative, calls us to be good, or at least better. For all intents and purposes, it today belongs to the far right in their advocacy of theocracy. It is, for example, the voice used by the religious right in opposing abortion rights and civil rights for GLBT people. Both these causes are framed in the language of moral imperative, in which morality (specifically the religious doctrines of some Christian sects) is said to be threatened in some vague but evocative manner.
Now there is something important to note here: both the language of the law and the language of morality speak to us in the imperative voice. That is, we do not experience the dictates of either the political or the moral law as optional. The moral law tells us, this is what we are obliged to do, while the political law tells us, this is what we are required to do, where “obligation” calls on an internal voice that tells us of duty, and “requirement” suggests the existence of some external coercion, either from the law or some sort of group sanction. In either case, we have choice to the extent that we always might refuse to comply with the demand. In either case, also, we recognize that there is a price to refusal. With the political law, the penalty can be fines or imprisonment; in the case of the moral law, the penalty is a troubled conscience, whose power is not to be underestimated.

Education involves the heart as much as the head, and that the reactionary right has been significantly more effective than the progressive left in putting a morally imperative face on their policies. They have also been more effective in using the electoral political process as a means to educate a generation of voters to see their program and their party as morally superior to their opponents.

The significance of this understanding of public languages is this: when the languages work convincingly and in unison, policies so framed receive wide and deep support. The reverse is also true: when the languages do not work convincingly together, policies have at best nominal public support. Specifically, policies supported in the legal-constitutional language of rights and obligations but not supported by the language of moral imperative are policies that are tenuous at best. It may be the lack of moral-imperative voice defending a woman’s right to choose, the defense being almost entirely presented in legal-constitutional language, that helps explain the steady erosion of that right over the past fifteen years (beginning with Planned Parenthood v Casey).

Religion and Politics

One of the most surprising events of my lifetime is that Jesus has somehow become a registered Republican. That accomplishment is made even more impressive when one realizes that, according to the Bible, Jesus favored the poor and opposed war, rather than the other way around. Conservative Christians see Republican candidates as representing their interests—that is, their moral interests. Or more precisely, that the reactionary right, speaking through the Republican Party, makes elections about matters like abortion, prayer in school, and denying civil rights to GLBT people rather than about health care, war and peace, environmental policy, or social justice in general helps explain the dominance of the Republican Party in national elections.

Moral language has been pre-empted by a religious right that, in conjunction with hard-right corporatist funding and infrastructure support, has shaped political discourse for the past thirty years. Using biblical language and the language of moral imperative, this alliance has done a great deal to undo social progress made during the period from the New Deal to the Reagan Revolution.

That the last thirty years have seen a revolution is no understatement. Within one generation, from 1961 to 1980, the signature political epigram went from “And so, my fellow citizens, ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country,” to “Are you better off than you were four years ago?” That shift, from a consideration of what we can do together for the common good to a focus on my own individual well-being, and the hell with everyone else, is the result of the use of the political process as an educational institution and elections as teachable moments.

Commentary typically concentrates on the degree to which religion has recently become a centerpiece of political rhetoric. This is an error; religion and its cognate, morality, have always been part of political discourse in this country, from the earliest days of European occupation. The Massachusetts Bay colony was established by what we call the Pilgrims, whose name for themselves was Puritans, and what they intended to purify was Christianity—to create a more austere and more demanding version based on their reading of the Bible. These people were a Christian version of the Taliban: they did not hesitate to punish, even with death, those whose version of Christianity varied from their own.

What is currently anomalous is not that religious morality shapes the public conversation; that has always been true. What is different is that only one political party now speaks that language of moral imperative. This is a radical departure from the past, when much political rhetoric on all sides of the political spectrum was rooted in religious-moral reasoning. While Roman Catholic Joseph Cardinal Spellman of New York never encountered a bomb or warship he did not want to bless, Fathers Daniel and Joseph Berrigan drew on the same Roman Catholic tradition to oppose the Vietnam War in prophetic language. Northern and Southern conferences of a variety of Christian churches stood on both sides of the desegregation debate. As Lincoln put it with his
typical eloquence: “Both read the same Bible, and pray to the same God; and each invokes His aid against the other.” He was speaking of the Civil War, but he might have been speaking of just about any public discussion of the past two hundred years; that there was a moral position to be taken on public policy questions was taken for granted. And that was probably correct; it is often said that we can not legislate morality. That opinion is surely wrong; it is more likely that we do not legislate anything but morality.

For virtually all of our history the religious-moral voice has been used and heard from across the political spectrum; only recently—roughly since the Dukakis-Reagan presidential contest of 1988, has the religious-moral voice become exclusive to the Republican Party. Since that time, the Democratic Party has focused on legal-constitutional arguments for some policies (such as civil rights for members of the GLBT community) and utilitarian self-interest for others (such as, we ought to provide children a good education so that they can pay my Social Security taxes). It is difficult to think of an example of a Democratic candidate or national figure, except for Mario Cuomo, using the language of moral imperative.

The Background

Nancy Northrup, the President for the Center for Reproductive Rights, recently argued that Plan B contraception should be made available to teens as well as to women over 18, saying, “There is no medical basis for restricting teenagers’ access to emergency contraception. This is not about morality, it’s about public health and cutting America’s alarmingly high teenage pregnancy rates” (italics added).

As an example of public speech, this is quite remarkable. First, it misses that choices about how one uses one’s sexuality are paradigmatically what many people mean by “moral”; such choices involve our relationship with others, which is the domain of morality even for those who do not construe the sexual domain per se as inherently moral. Second, social policies that affect public health and teen pregnancy rates are certainly moral and have tremendous implications for the morality of our public life; no moral society denies proper care and necessary information to those who need it. And finally, to be so incredibly tone deaf as to how arguments are heard in the public sphere is to virtually guarantee the continued defeat of progressive policies. To restrict public speech to appeals to what amounts to self-interest is to misjudge seriously the psychology of human motivation.

Public policy issues are moral at the root; to think otherwise is to misunderstand either the nature of the issue, the nature of morality, or both. Further, to insist that we discuss serious issues of public policy while pretending that they are not connected inextricably to people’s moral commitments is to yield unnecessarily to the right wing a powerful and effective public voice.

In the not too distant past, the language of morality in the public square belonged to progressives, or “liberals” as they were known in those days. Their vision of the public space was rooted in a social contract underwritten by what was known as the Social Gospel, and it was, to put it in current vernacular, rooted in the question, “What Would Jesus Do” with respect to the poor and the marginalized in society. This is not to pretend that moral language was not also used by conservatives; indeed slavery, segregation, miscegenation laws, as well as all of America’s imperial expansion (among many other examples) were all defended in moral language. What is different today, however, is that both progressive and regressive policies were defended in part as the moral thing to do. Progressive and liberatory policies are today mostly defended in the language of constitutional rights or utility, not moral Right; there is little moral counterclaim to the moral language of reactionary policies.

A strange thing happened in the late 60’s and early 70’s, signaled by the creation of the so-called Moral Majority. The political agenda of the radical Christian Right, largely funded and supported by right-wing ideologues connected to the Republican Party and presented in moral terms to the public, repelled progressives. Rather than contending for the votes of religiously motivated and morally concerned citizens, the progressives all but abandoned defense of progressive policies with reference to moral obligations. The language of moral imperative was ceded to the reactionary right; Jesus supposedly registered as a Republican at some point in the 1980’s; and political questions became theological ones, at least in part.

There have been exceptions. Jonathon Kozol has been consistent in his call for middle class Americans to recognize the social policies of the past thirty years as shameful and morally repugnant. Marion Wright Edelman has rightly reminded us that our obligations to our children are moral obligations.

However, beyond constitutional arguments, progressive policies have been defended in utilitarian terms of self-interest: we ought to provide educational opportunity to poor children because when the baby boomers are ready to retire we will need every available worker to pay our benefits. The most egregious example of this I can recall is contained in a PBS video based on
Kozol’s *Savage Inequalities*, called *Children in America’s Schools*.

In this video, Paul Houston, one of the participants in a panel discussion, defending school breakfast and lunch programs, points out that there is much research to show feeding school children helps improve academic performance. It may indeed be the case that children who have been fed will do better on academic tasks, but that can not be the reason to feed them. Decent people do not let hungry children remain hungry; it is just not what decent people do. The apparent inability to make that simple case in the public square seems to me paradigmatic of how progressives have lost the ability to speak in the public square with moral authority.

The preceding is an impressionistic history, not a detailed one. I offer it only to point out that something has changed, and what has changed is that we now have a religious party funded by a fairly secretive oligarchy as one of the two national parties. This is bad for our national debate about policies, and it is worse for policies that would increase social justice.

Unnecessary, is what it also is.

The question in all this is: How did “morality” come to be about sex, when what the Biblical God is constantly concerned with is “justice?” I think at least part of the answer is that right-wing politicians learned to make their policies look like they are in accord with biblical morality. But the more important part of the answer, I think, is that the Democratic Party has decided to leave a vacuum in that regard by deciding not only not to speak in religious-moral language, but to actively condemn such language rather than challenge the content on its own terms of moral discourse.

**Politics as Education**

The root question in discussions about both politics and religion is the question of what makes or is a good life. Such issues are not easily resolved. Perhaps the progressive left has abandoned talk of the good life because different views on this question are thought to be incommensurable, which is likely. Since there are several defensible but incommensurable versions of The Good Life, public discourse winds up devolving to notions of rights, not notions of the good. Progressives feel that it is not right to force their version of the Good on others, and therefore they typically frame arguments in the language of constitutional legality or utility, not morality. Nevertheless, it is important for political agendas to be advanced with the coherence of some vision of a good life. That is, while progressives might rightly shy away from imposing their view of a good life on others, they may still need to defend that vision in the public square.  

There is a serious problem with the state of public discourse, and it is one of a very practical nature. When practices of freedom are defended in the public square only in the technical and denatured language of legal rights and constitutional protections or the utilitarian language of self-interest, they walk into the public square inadequately defended. This is not to say that the claims to legal rights or utilitarian value are inaccurate or irrelevant, but they are insufficient in ways becoming increasingly obvious and dangerous.

By “dangerous,” I mean from a particular point of view, that of a Deweyan liberal. The practice of democracy requires the consistent and general practice of certain civic virtues among its citizens, and those virtues include the capacity to see and respond to the needs of the whole—to understand that the point of the Abrahamic traditions (and others, of course) is that we each are responsible for all. As John McCain put it in explaining why he is less rabid than other Republican contenders on the question of immigration penalties, “They are all God’s children.” This is also the core of the Progressive project, whether regarding fair wages, rights to organize, just international relations, civil rights for all, universal health care, immigration policy, equitable school funding, etc. On each of these policies, it is the progressives who argue for policies that are in accord with traditional religious morality of the Abrahamic religions, all of which have as their core a responsibility for the less fortunate among us and the need for social justice.

There are two ways the right wing ideologues have distorted moral language. One is purely and uninterestingly rhetorical manipulation: the federal law that seriously threatens public education and particularly diminishes the schooling of the poor is titled No Child Left Behind; the law that allows polluters a free hand to destroy the environment is called the Clear Skies Act. This is simple dishonesty, and not very interesting, though why it is so effective is an interesting question, perhaps for another paper.

The other sort of co-option, however, is a bit more subtle, a lot more dangerous, and in an ugly sort of way more interesting. Consider as paradigm the campaign against taxes and government. This is an example of the way the Right wing has used politics as an instrument of education, teaching people in general that government is an evil:

In this present crisis, government is not the solution to our problem; government is the problem. From time to time we’ve been tempted to believe that society has become too complex to be managed by self-rule, that government by an elite group is
superior to government for, by, and of the people. Well, if no one among us is capable of governing himself, then who among us has the capacity to govern someone else? All of us together, in and out of government, must bear the burden. The solutions we seek must be equitable, with no one group singled out to pay a higher price.\(^1\)

Much of the Republican civic curriculum is in this excerpt. In particular, note two the theme that government is a bad thing; it is the problem. From this also follows the principled opposition to taxes:

Some say we need more of your money to expand the size and scope of government, or, they would argue, more of your money to balance the budget. Then there are those like me in Washington who say, there's ample money in Washington to meet priorities, and the more money you have in your pocket, the better off the economy is. In other words, let me put it bluntly: I think you can spend your money better than the federal government can spend your money.\(^12\)

Thus the curriculum is laid out: government is bad, taxation is taking your money, which you should have, and giving it to the government, which is bad. Further, the rich should not be taxed more than others ("... no one group should be singled out to pay a higher price."). Government should, according to the curriculum, be reduced to the size where it can be dragged off and drowned in the bathtub,\(^13\) and protecting people from the government is a noble act.

It is worth noting that in the opening remarks of the address quoted above, the President says, “My job is the Commander-in-Chief and my job is the Educator-in-Chief, and part of being the Educator-in-Chief is to help our fellow citizens understand why I’ve made some of the decisions I’ve made that have affected your lives”; the people who write his speeches get it.

The consistent message is government is bad; taxes support government; taxes are bad; look out for yourself; government should not help the poor. There is, of course, a different case to be made, but few are making it—certainly none of the leading presidential candidates from either party. The public can mindfully make decisions only when they are fully informed on the issues, and the moral stakes involved in abandoning the poor have not been made clear.

This right wing curriculum has been effective. Its way of framing issues is now the default position of those who would lead us. Even when our bridges collapse, our cities are ravaged, our highways deteriorating, and our social programs (meager as they are) are faced with imminent and predictable, but still avoidable, bankruptcy, politicians are afraid to talk honestly about the importance of just tax policies for a decent society. And that is the key new feature of our political-educational discourse: there is no opposing curriculum. Even those mildly progressive politicians who want to provide, for example, health care for all who need it must do so pretending this can be done with no new tax burden. That is not true, but political discourse is so corrupted that the truth cannot be spoken. There is no longer any significant balance in the curriculum. This is bad for democracy which requires the public to be well- and accurately-informed, not just given a lot of information.

For political discourse to be more honestly educational, progressives interested in social justice must think of politics as an educational institution and do the sorts of things described in deMarrais’s paper: we must thoughtfully and deliberately educate the public to think of itself as a public.\(^14\)
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EUGENICS EDUCATION IN OKLAHOMA: EXPLORING THE CONTEXT FOR THE STATE’S PROGRAM OF INVOLUNTARY STERILIZATION

Nance Cunningham, University of Oklahoma

Introduction

In 1935, the Oklahoma legislature passed a bill authorizing the sterilization of habitual criminals, defined as those who committed three felonies involving “moral turpitude” (The Oklahoman, 14 Apr 1936:10). Although a seven-year fight by inmates resulted in no actual sterilizations of criminals and the striking down of the law by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1942 (The Oklahoman, 02 Jun 1942:7), the law allowing involuntary sterilizations of inmates at state hospitals for the mentally diseased, the feeble-minded, and the epileptic remained in effect. In 1933, the Oklahoma Supreme Court upheld the right of the state to sterilize patients before they were released (The Oklahoman, 15 Feb 1933). Subsequently, upon the recommendations from each of the five Oklahoma state mental hospitals, inmates’ names were regularly submitted to the state board of affairs (The Oklahoman, 25 May 1934; The Oklahoman, 05 Sep 1934; The Oklahoman, 15 Sep 1934; The Oklahoman, 15 Nov 1938) prior to the surgeries. In all, 556 sterilizations were carried out in Oklahoma for eugenic reasons (Robitscher, 1973; Reilly, 1991). Eugenics education in the United States between 1910 and 1940 included as learners the adult lay citizen public, as well as students in public schools and universities. Although studies of the eugenics education project have been completed on the national level (Rosen, 2004; Engs, 2005; Currell and Cogdell, 2006; Winfield, 2007), a specific study of the history of eugenics education in Oklahoma that provided the context for its own programs (actual and attempted) of sterilizations has not been done. This paper will be a beginning look at the culture of Oklahoma, which supported sterilization as part of a larger acceptance of the ideas of eugenics.

Eugenics

A significant part of the culture, of course, includes the public schools and universities. According to Randy Moore, one of the common high school science textbooks used in the 1920’s in the United States was George William Hunter’s A Civic Biology: Presented in Problems, copyrighted in 1914 (Moore, 2001; Hunter, 1914). This book included a chapter entitled, “Heredity, Variation, Plant and Animal Breeding” which included a section on eugenics. It reads,

When people marry there are certain things that the individual as well as the race should demand. The most important of these is freedom from germ diseases which might be handed down to the offspring. Tuberculosis, that dread white plague which is still responsible for almost one seventh of all death, epilepsy, and feeble-mindedness are handicaps which it is not only unfair but criminal to hand down to posterity. The science of being well born is called eugenics (261).

Next Hunter describes the Jukes family, which included one feebleminded son. Out of 480 descendants of this family, Hunter says, “. . . 33 were sexually immoral, 24 confirmed drunks, 3 epileptics, and 143 feeble-minded” (263). Finally, Hunter includes sections on “Parasitism and its Cost to Society” and “The Remedy.” He says,

Just as certain animals or plants become parasitic on other plants or animals, these families have become parasitic on society. They not only do harm to others by corrupting, stealing, or spreading disease, but they are actually protected and cared for by the state out of public money. Largely for them the poorhouse and the asylum exist. They take from society, but they give nothing in return. They are true parasites. . . If such people were lower animals, we would probably kill them off to prevent them from spreading. Humanity will not allow this, but we do have the remedy of separating the sexes in asylums or other places and in various ways preventing intermarriage and the possibilities of perpetuating such a low and degenerate race. Remedies of this sort have been tried successfully in Europe and are now meeting with success in this country” (263).

According to Moore, this book was the state-approved text used by John Scopes in Tennessee in 1925. He was brought to trial because of the chapter on evolution. Because of the bad publicity, the publisher gave the book a new title and Hunter deleted the section on evolution. However, New Civic Biology: Presented in Problems, published in 1926, has the nearly the same sections on eugenics and parasitism, with an expanded description of the Jukes family. The copies of both versions of the book held by the Oklahoma University Bizzell Library have stamped on one of the first pages “Univ. H. Sch.” Although the Oklahoma State Department of Education does not have records of the science curricula for schools in the early part of the twentieth century, further research might determine what other schools in Oklahoma used the books.

Another textbook stamped “Univ. H. Sch.” at the OU Library is called Biology: The Story of Living Things. When Hunter and two others published this in 1937, the
view described was that perhaps the influences of heredity and environment might be a little more complicated than earlier thought; however, eugenic control was still praised. The chapter ends with “. . . the eugenic golden rule,” that is, “DO UNTO YOUR DESCENDANTS AS YOU WOULD HAVE HAD YOUR ANCESTORS DO UNTO YOU” (642). John Johnson’s text for high school and college biology teachers advocates the “best possible teaching . . . in order to develop latent traits in the children” in addition to “the spreading of the known facts of heredity wisely to those qualified to understand [so that] the teacher can indirectly aid in the improvement of the next generation” (1930:301). In a check of the online library catalogs at OSU, SWOSU, and UCO, I found that they all had books by Hunter or Hunter and others, teaching science to students and teaching biology and science to teachers-in-training. Readers of The Oklahoman in January of 1932 would learn that “Dr. Forrest E. Clements, head of the University of Oklahoma anthropology department, is assisting in the preparation of a book on eugenics . . . “ (31). The book was to be edited by Frederick Osborn of the Eugenics Research Foundation, who had argued early on “. . . that the myriad topics covered under eugenic education could most easily be introduced in connection with established courses in biology, sociology, history, and economics” (Rembis, 2006:95).

Not only was eugenics part of the public school curriculum, it was part of civic education in Oklahoma. Eugenics education was presented in a wide variety lay public forums, including churches, ladies clubs, state fairs, and newspapers in Oklahoma from 1910-1940. According to Andres Reggiani,

On September 6, 1935, Time featured on its cover the Nobel laureate and best-selling author Alexis Carrel (1873-1944). The week before, Carrel had published Man, The Unknown, a book in which he endorsed an unorthodox brand of scientific holism, mysticism, and eugenics to overcome the decline of Western civilization (Reggiani, 2006:71). For at least 14 weeks during 1936 and 1937, Man, The Unknown was on the bestseller list in Oklahoma City. As Reggiani points out, Carrel’s book includes this idea: Those who have murdered, robbed while armed with automatic pistol or machine gun, kidnapped children, despoiled the poor of their savings, misled the public in important matters, should be humanely and economically disposed of in small euthanasic institutions supplied with proper gases. A similar treatment could be advantageously applied to the insane, guilty of criminal acts (318-319).

This is not surprising because the general public had begun its education in eugenics as early as 1913 with a “Better Babies Contest” held at the state fair (The Oklahoman, 15 Jun 1913). The newspaper article notes, The better babies’ contest will be along the lines of eugenics. Baby culture will go hand in hand with sheep standards, cattle raising, hog husbandry, mule raising and kindred subjects (7).

Contributors to the prize money included the “Woman’s Home Companion, the federation of women’s clubs and the federated kindergarten mothers’ club of Oklahoma City” (7). Later on that year, the paper published a long article about a contest in England entitled, “Why Scientists are Eager to Breed a Eugenic Baby” (The Oklahoman; 09 Nov 1913). Carrel’s concern about “drilling” eugenics into people’s minds as a social necessity” (Reggiani, 2006:79) was well on its way.

As early as 1913, as wide variety of ladies’ and civic clubs included eugenics in the educational part of their meetings. That year the Motherhood Culture Club planned a fall program that included the titles “Modern Improvements in Child Education, The Child in Literature, and Eugenics and Eugenics” (The Oklahoman, 28 Sep 1913:25). In 1914, the Clinton Literary Club devoted an afternoon to education about eugenics and state policy. “Mrs. W.W. Church and Mrs. C.H. McBurney . . . presented a paper on the subject of state legislation, affecting eugenics and marriage laws” (The Oklahoman, 07 Jun 1914:28). Their entire paper was contained in the article. Supporting the necessity of race improvement, these ladies decreed the small majority in the Oklahoma legislature that had defeated a marriage law that would require health examinations before marriage licenses could be obtained. After all, they noted, the demand for health certificates had been “. . . endorsed by over 50 ministerial associations from Maine to California, including approximately 3,500 clergymen” (28). In 1916, the Lions Club hosted Dr. Alexander Johnson, who described the burden on the country of the 400,000 criminals and 280,000 feebleminded people, all of whom should be isolated and prevented from procreating (The Oklahoman, 15 Dec 1916). Later hosts for eugenics lecturers included the Oklahoma City Chapter of the D.A.R. (The Oklahoman, 16 Dec 1928), the Sororis Club (The Oklahoman, 04 Dec 1931), the Swastika Study Club (The Oklahoman, 08 Dec 1935), and Oklahoma City University (The Oklahoman, 19 Nov 1932; The Oklahoman, 24 Mar 1937). The ordinariness of these speakers appears clear when the other part of the evening’s or afternoon’s program is the Christmas Cantata or the Men’s Glee Club.
One of the speakers at OCU was Dr. Paul Popenoe, Director of the Institute of Family Relations in Los Angeles. He favored both negative and positive eugenics; as a member of the Human Betterment Foundation, he advocated forced sterilization of inferiors. In 1931, he published with E.S. Grosner Sterilization for Human Betterment: A Summary of Results of 6,000 Operations in California, 1909-1929. On the other hand, Popenoe also advocated teaching eugenics to public school students of good stock so that they would see the importance early on of choosing mates wisely and seeing their moral duty to the hygiene of the state by having as many children as possible (Popenoe, 1935). According to Christine Rosen in her 2004 book Preaching Eugenics (Rosen, 2004), Popenoe and others like him appealed to ministers in the Social Gospel movement of the time. She says, [The] Social Gospel succeeded in creating space for Protestant ministers to participate in secular reform movements to usher in the kingdom . . . Salvation for Social Gospelers was a social matter . . . . In a similar vein, eugenists argued that heredity should be a social matter, and they too supported intervention and reform to guarantee the preservation of the race. Both groups appealed to society’s social conscience in the interest of reform (Rosen, 2004:16). Oklahoma citizens would read in The Oklahoman in May 1932 that the general assembly of the Presbyterian Church USA, meeting in Denver, would approve “an entirely new section [of the directory of worship, giving] tacit approval of physical examinations for parties to the marriage contract and a limited supervised practice of eugenics.” The section recites, in part, ‘Children have a God-given right to be well-born.’”(The Oklahoman, 31 May 1932:13). When the Presbyterians began their consideration the year before, The Oklahoman had editorialized, “What with crime and insanity and mental deficiencies increasing, the economic burden upon society is becoming unbearable. Why should not the churches take a hand?” (The Oklahoman, 09 Mar 1931:8). The editorial stated further that all ministers should counsel certain couples not to have children. From time to time [a real pastor] would do well to preach a sermon indicating that the Master came that we might have more abundant life, not that there should be nervous disorders, chronic illnesses, insanity, delinquency, drunkenness, idiocy and crime. For all the preaching and religious teaching in the world cannot prevent the unspeakable miseries following in the train of physical and mental abnormalities (8).

In 1932, according to the paper, Rev. Homer Lewis Sheffer of the Oklahoma City Unitarian Church gave just such a sermon (The Oklahoman, 03 Jun 1932). Throughout the 1930’s, the editorial page of The Oklahoman discussed eugenics positively at least nine times, with titles such as “Teach Heredity in School,” (24 Aug 1932) “Parents Should Teach Eugenics,” (16 Jun 1934) “Is ‘Roman Ruin’ Just Ahead?” (07 Jun 1935) “The Burden We Bear,” (13 Jun 1933) “Fruit of the Family Tree,” (11 Dec 1933) “Is Sterilization Degrading?” (28 May 1932) and “Shall the Poor Pay This Penalty?” (08 Dec 1934). No, the editorial writers did not think involuntary sterilization was inhumane, partly because it “does not interfere with the patient’s sexual life” (The Oklahoman, 28 May 1932:6), but mostly because of the extreme burden of caring for inferiors and because “. . . there is nothing humane about bringing into this world a child unfit mentally or physically to fight [society’s] battle” (6). No, the writers did not think that the poor should have to choose between being sterilized or forfeiting all government help, but they did think that all feeble-minded should be sterilized (The Oklahoman, 08 Dec 1934:8). The Oklahoman’s much beloved ladies columnist Edith Johnson participated in this conversation, too. For example, in 1937 (15 Jan), Johnson wrote, If there is any one thing we, as a people, are sissy about it is in our failure to sterilize the unfit. With the burden of unfit men and women growing every year, we continue to procrastinate out of fear of a few morons who rise up and shout ‘I am not going to have my sacred right to have children and as many of them as I like, taken from me’ . . . Hospitals for the mentally sick are full to over-flowing and the demand for new buildings and greater facilities is heard every time a legislature is about to meet. Prisons are so crowded that the corridors often have to be filled with cots. There is a steady increase in the number of feeble-minded . . . Weaklings and mollycoddles that we are, we submit to a social and economic condition that is positively alarming” (10).

Johnson advocated for positive eugenics, as well as negative eugenics. For example, in 1932 (12 Jun), she wrote an entire column entitled, “Romance and Eugenics Hand in Hand” (40). In it she argues that “eugenics in the friend of romance, not its enemy” because “there is nothing romantic about getting married to an irresponsible man or a neurotic woman. There is nothing romantic about having weak, inferior or incorrigible children. When such tragedy occurs,
romance vanishes like a mist and grim endurance must take its place” (40). In an article called “Liberals in Oklahoma,” C.L. Leathwood and Ernest R. Chamberlain describe Johnson as “a champion of Liberal doctrines” and “an advocate of the new feminism, the new religion. She applauds heretical gestures and scorns the old-fashioned emotions” (241). In a section of her autobiography Johnson describes her “deep feeling for poverty-stricken and underprivileged men, women and children” and her “desire to make whatever contribution [she] can to the relief of the dispossessed.” (Johnson, 1940) There is an editor’s note at the bottom of the page saying that Johnson was one of the organizers and incorporators of the Goodwill Industries of Oklahoma City.

Agreement with eugenics by physicians was part of the culture at this time, too. The Oklahoma University School of Medicine’s copy of the New England Journal of Medicine in 1930 includes an article entitled “Preventive Medicine and Mental Deficiency” (Barr and Witney, 1930). In it the authors describe heredity as the most common cause of mental deficiency and conclude, “We feel that it can be approached in three ways, namely: sequestration and segregation, more stringent laws relative to marriage, and sterilization” (874). A 1937 issue of American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology includes a long article about the “Eugenic Sterilization Laws in Europe,” as a kind of factual recounting of the situation there, with little comment about its appropriateness (Kopp, 1937:499). Closer to home here, Dr. O.L. Norsworthy of San Antonio published in the Texas State Journal of Medicine (1931) a piece entitled “Eugenic Sterilization,” in which he says,

The human race has developed through countless ages under the laws of heredity by the survival of the fittest . . . . Modern civilization, human sympathy, and charity have intervened in Nature’s plan (438). Later in the article, he states,

Persons should be sterilized if it is to the interests of the commonwealth (or more broadly, of the human race) that they bear no children, or no further children; and if it appears that sterilization is the most effective and satisfactory means of preventing such reproduction (440).

Dr. Carl Steen writes in 1935 in the Journal of the Oklahoma State Medical Association “Apparently the state does not feel called upon to decide the question of sterilization until the citizen has been taken into actual custody. There is a much larger number of potential carriers of mental defect outside of hospitals than have been committed. It seems pertinent to ask what of these?” (450). He notes that the German sterilization that went into effect January 1, 1934 is such that “its provisions are about the same as ours” (451). Finally, he explains that the three main reasons for the sterilization law in Oklahoma include “the prevention of suffering to progeny,” the prevention of “suffering or anguish of the family deprived of this member of the circle,” and “probably the most urgent reason as seen by the average citizen or taxpayer is that of the economy” (451). As Paul Lombardo and Gregory Dorr (2006) have written, “For the first forty years of the twentieth century, the highest officials in the U.S. Public Health Service and other public health leaders were among the most enthusiastic supporters of the claim that every social ill—from crime, poverty, and syphilis to mental disorder—could be cured by ‘genetic’ interventions . . . . Physicians who were active participants in and vigorous advocates of the eugenics movement filled the Public Health service ranks” (306-7).

According to a comprehensive 1937 study entitled State Mental Hospitals in Oklahoma published by the Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board, patients with mental illness came into the four hospitals for the insane through physicians, as well as judges. “On the other hand, certification by county officials is not a prerequisite of admittance to the hospital for mental defectives and epileptics except in cases of destitution and ‘feeble-minded’ women between the ages of 16 and 45” (3). Family could just drop them off. In the statement of purpose of the five hospitals, the study includes these two statements: “Institutional care also has social value in that it terminates the propagation of offspring” and “Segregation as well as sterilization of these persons is also valuable in that it arrests their reproduction” (2). In 1937 there were 8,238 patients in the mental hospitals and 994 mental defectives and epileptics (18). A 1945 book about Western State Hospital in Fort Supply says that there were four physicians who were resident staff and five who were consulting staff, including three surgeons.

This paper has been a beginning effort at what Ann Gibson Winfield (2007) has called “excavating memory” (149). She has written a fascinating book entitled Eugenics and Education in America: Institutionalized Racism and the Implications of History, Ideology, and Memory. She describes how the eugenics movement was an educational movement, and how the eugenics ideas influenced and continue to influence school curriculum and student evaluation. “The ubiquity of the past in our present national conversation about schools and race, test scores and national strength, or immigration and cultural decay underscores a serious
need for ideological excavation” (151). After all, Winfield says, “... the eugenics movement was part of the Progressive movement ... carried out by people who sincerely believed they were working to make society and the world a better place” (150).
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I started working in direct care at Enid State School twenty-six years ago today. I was twenty-two and in need of a job. I had graduated cum laude from Wittenberg University in my hometown of Springfield, Ohio. Yet, my hopes for graduate school then were not to be, due to a family tragedy compounded by a less than stellar performance on the Quantitative Section of the Graduate Record Exam. So there I was at The Enid State School in early September 1981 applying for a direct care job in a suit. I was hired. Some of you may have heard of Enid State School. It still exists today, although its name has been changed to the North Oklahoma Resource Center at Enid – which of course is in Enid, OK. Today this facility is a mere shadow of its former self – with perhaps only 150 residents. In 1981, it was home to more than 700 and, at one time, housed upwards of 1500 people. The Enid State School began in the early teens of the 20th Century as the North Oklahoma Hospital for the Feebleminded. When I started, there were many more shadows to testify, many more stories and rumors about what had gone on before. When I arrived, I was assigned to Linden Hall I, a dormitory for 60 boys and men ranging from late teens up to about the age of 50. The building where I worked had been a dormitory for staff, so residents who lived at Linden Hall did have their own bathrooms but this was not the case everywhere. In fact direct care residents were frequently reassigned to other buildings where most bathrooms were communal, with toilets without lids attached to ceramic block walls. No, there were no partitions. I remember vividly walking into a ‘cottage’ at bath time to find a long line of naked male residents waiting their turn for bathing. This was quite a shock for me. I need to mention that all cottages, except Linden Hall, were named for flowers and trees with names like Canna, Begonia, Pansy, Rose or Oak. Oak housed the “bad boys.” Canna housed the “low grades.”

In 1981 I had had no idea that The Enid State School was a crossroads of competing thoughts on what should be done with the mentally retarded. I should add the designation of mental retardation included an array of individuals declared IN NEED OF TREATMENT. It was obvious there was intention to isolate the residents from society. After all, what was around in Western Oklahoma in 1914? The battlegrounds for eugenics, isolation, protection, and later habilitation were fought not only in the newspapers and the colleges, but also in the institutions where neither the staff nor the residents could read the newspapers or go to college. I have to wonder if any of the residents I knew had families who participated in State Fairs celebrating the fortune of their good stock. What I do know is that the residents I knew had families, some still very involved, very caring, and never liable to be suspected as somehow deficient considered on their own. Some had families who were not involved, and appeared to be uncaring, but you must consider that families were told up into the late 1970s to forget about their loved one, for it was best for them and it was best for everyone concerned. Now that I have learned about the true extent and pervasiveness of eugenics education, it is likely I knew individuals who had been sterilized. For example, I did know individuals whose teeth were pulled because they had been labeled, BITERS. I do not know whether they may have become so before or after sterilization.

The precise value of persons with disabilities was conveyed by the location of an oil refinery across the road from the facility in the mid-40s. When I arrived in 1981, the smell of sulfur was thick in the air, lending an eerie poignancy to the tall smokestack next to the facility’s heating plant. I remember asking the question once, “My God do I work at Auschwitz?” All of the newspapers articles describing the homelike environment and pastoral setting of Enid State School, were belied by the tall towers of flame and smoke across the road. (Cunningham)

We have heard much about how these “feebleminded” take and give nothing in return, and I ask just what did they take, and what do we allow them to give? Much of what I know, as a prospective philosopher of education, of moral deliberation and the ethics of care, I know as a result of my experience with them. Much of how I use philosophy owes an inestimable debt to my friends, friends whose may have spoken with difficulty, but conveyed the depths of life in few words, a look, a hug, or in silence. Eugenics means a net loss in the opportunities to care. I am not, however, suggesting we need to keep large institutions to multiply our opportunities to care, but I am suggesting that ‘care’ that sought the closure of large institutions should not end when the doors are closed. For many years, the residents of the Enid State School supported the institutions through a full array of resident skills, vocations, and talents. I ask how this community is any different from any community we take for granted. What do any of us accomplish without the help of others?

I know thus far, I have portrayed Enid State School in largely unflattering light – after all we have made so...
much progress in our attitudes towards others different from ourselves, haven’t we? There were caring people who worked there, and I did witness changes in attitudes that were followed by changes in the physiognomy of the facility. Partitions appeared between toilets, for example. But, I have to remember, at the end of my shift, I left, the residents did not. To this day, when I see people I knew, former residents, I greet them as friends, and frequently this is mutual. But when I talk about the good times we had together at Enid State School, they have to remind me, it was not all good times for them.
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SEX AND BRIBERY FOR BETTER GRADES: ACADEMIC DISHONESTY IN LIBERIA

Kadiker Dahn, University of Oklahoma

Introduction

Sex and bribery in the Liberian school system is a norm. Teachers demand bribes from male and a small proportion of female students for better grades while a large percentage of girls have sexual encounters with their teachers and sometimes educational administrators in exchange for better grades. Male teachers in most instances threaten to fail a female student if she refuses to give him sex (FIDH 2004; Doe-Anderson 2005). Some male students also suffer at the hands of male teachers if the teachers notice that a male student is in love with a fellow female student in whom the teacher is also interested. The practice of “revenge” is a silent weapon employed against male students in the educational system in Liberia. The teachers’ prurient propensities to have sex with schoolgirls are widespread, yet to date, no drastic disciplinary action has been taken to correct such abuses.

The government of Liberia passed a law in the early 1970s during the presidency of the late William Tolbert that “lowered the age of consent to twelve” (Perkins 2006). Even with the election of a woman president, President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, violence against girls in the school system has not abated. Violence against students, especially girls in Liberia, is a customary practice that has little or no scholarly chronicle. The purpose of this paper is an attempt to begin to create a scholarly chronicle on the violence in the school system in Liberia.

The cultural setting of violence in Liberia

In villages and towns in Liberia, patriarchy is the rule (Doe-Anderson 2005). For example when elders of a village or town meet to deliberate issues relevant to the town or village, the responsibility falls on the men. These elders make laws to govern all, including women, yet women are not represented in the deliberations. Mahatma Gandhi, a nonviolent activist, observed that “ancients’ laws were made by seers who were men. The women’s experience, therefore, is not represented in them” (Iyer 1986:394). In other words, women are required to live laws which they have had no part in formulating. It is alleged that in Liberia, whenever a position of prominence has been given to a woman by a male superior, there are sexual negotiations attached to the appointment. This is not to extrapolate that Liberian women are inferior and incompetent, and therefore have to obtain positions with sex. Absolutely not! Rather, it is because the context this study is addressing is a patriarchal society. According to Liberian cultural beliefs, the responsibility of a woman is to have children while a man’s responsibility is to provide for his family.

To borrow a phrase from Jane Roland Martin, philosopher of education, male and female relationships in Liberia could be summed up thus, “women are relegated to reproduction while males take on the production” (Martin 1985:6).

The distortion, devaluation, and denial or deliberate neglect by patriarchal cultures that invalidates women’s education, on the grounds of women’s subservience in knowledge to men while also claiming equality for all, amount to what Martin calls an epistemological inequality. An epistemological inequality, she argues, is destructive. Martin observes:

We may never know enough about the curriculum of Plato’s guardians to determine all the respects in which males and females are represented differentially in its subject matter. But one thing is clear. In so far as the subjects studied and the literature learned do validate males while invalidating females, one would expect to find differences in the way members of the two sexes perceive themselves and one another. If stories portray women as irrational and immoral, will not students of both sexes come to believe that males are superior and females inferior human beings? If abstract disciplines employ masculine imagery and set masculine norms, will not students of both sexes come to believe that females are abnormal human beings? Epistemological inequality surely has destructive effects on the students of a field. How difficult it is for any group to be seen as equals of others, or even to see themselves as such, when they are not accorded equality in knowledge? (Martin 1985:26)

This “epistemological inequality,” gives birth to discrimination. Liberian women as this study will demonstrate, suffer discrimination mostly from male parents in the realm of education.

Recent works on Liberia (Moran 1990) and the continent of Africa (Zewde 2003, Steeves 1997) validate the claim that Liberia and Africa in general are countries dominated by patriarchal hegemony. Anthropologist Mary Moran, in her book, Civilized Women, specifically examined the roles of men and women in a particular tribe (Grebo) in Liberia. In her studies, she tried to answer the question of what it means to be a civilized and native woman in the Grebo culture. Before addressing her study question, she presents a picture of the education of men and women in the Grebo culture and Liberia. The study finds that concerning schooling,
the education of boys takes precedence over that of women. Moran observes:

Men have the advantage on the whole of higher levels of education because parents are usually more willing to invest in the schooling of sons than daughters. A common rationale offered for preference for educating boys is that they cannot "spoil themselves" with early pregnancies. (Moran 1990:3-4)

Moran’s assessment presents the propensities for males’ parents to approbate the schooling of sons over that of daughters in Liberia. A common assumption, among male parents as to why the schooling of boys usually takes precedence over that of girls, is that they believe that a daughter will eventually become married. Therefore, the schooling of such a girl should largely depend on the husband since she will be living in his household. In other words, it would be an extravagant use of resources to educate another man’s wife. One of the difficulties with such philosophy is what if the girl chooses to remain unmarried? The obvious answer is that for financial reasons, such girls, eventually will attach themselves to men. Men on other hand, for prestige, recognition, and power, would pursue relationships with these girls, thus initiating polygamy. Jestina Doe-Anderson, a Liberian educator in the U.S. observes:

During our years of civil unrest, with the progression of anarchy and wanton abandon, respect for women and womanhood became severely diminished. Sexual exploitation became commonplace, and there was no longer need for negotiations in that regard. Very young girls, in dire need of a livelihood, took their most valued property—their bodies—to the market. This became a virtual field day for the average middle-aged, pot belied, and soon-to-suffer-a-stroke Liberian man for a few dollars to spare.

Doe-Anderson (2006)

Older men in Liberia entice young girls with money. Because these girls are seeking merely to survive, they are forced to succumb to monetary temptation and give their bodies in exchange. Doe-Anderson also observed that “in Liberia, it is known that men who have a penchant for pre adolescent girls are not an anomaly to our society. This is a legacy that has been shared from time immemorial by our Westernized or civilized and traditional or country people alike, and continues to this day” (Doe-Anderson 2006). Older men’s prurient desires for young girls for sex have been part of the cultural practices since statehood. Parents’ choice for boys is not just a Liberian problem but an endemic African cultural practice.

That greater respect and concern are given to boys in Liberia is also true of other countries in Africa. The problem of boys’ schooling taking precedence over that of girls is not just a Liberian problem. Such practices have been documented to have occurred in other parts of Africa. For example, Lily Mafela in her essay, Gender Education in African Setting: Bechuanaland Protectorate in Pre-colonial and Colonial Periods, recounts similar experiences to have occurred in Botswana as a prelude to women’s subordination as well as increased discrepancies between mothers and fathers. Mafela states:

While mothers sometimes favored the education of their daughters, the fathers could easily override their wishes. This happens mainly in situations where the woman was a Christian and the husband was not as it seems that Christian men appreciated better education of their wives. The concern of fathers related to the fact that they were unlikely to get anything in return on their investment in girls’ education. Unlike boys, girls were not likely to offer their parents financial support upon marriage as they are required by custom to work for and contribute to the welfare of their in-laws. It is interesting to note the problems that the fathers had with their daughters having to travel long distances to school, while the same situation did not apply to boys. This concern pertained to the greater need to control the sexuality of daughters than that of sons. Nor were girls’ problems completely solved once they entered school, because of their persistent engagement in household chores. (Quoted in Zewde 2003:6)

Boys’ issues take the center stage more often than girls’ issues because investments in girls are perceived as a waste of resources. In the Liberian context, apart from the election of Madame Ellen Johnson Sirleaf as President and her efforts to address the sexual violence, Liberian women have been silenced from detailing the violence and abuses they suffer at the hands of men. The official setting of violence in Liberia

Most Liberian men, especially those who have served or are serving in the government in Liberia, are partners in inflicting violence against women. Jestina Doe-Anderson states “the truth is that rape is a practice so deeply entrenched in our history that it has become a natural part of our patriarchal culture” (Doe-Anderson 2006). Government officials in Liberia, whether clandestinely or publicly manipulate young girls to be their mistresses. Government officials with farms would then take these victims to their farms and repeatedly violate them. One such leader is the late President William Tolbert. According to Edward Perkins, former
Ambassador of United States to Liberia, when Tolbert became president, he had a law passed in an effort to lower the age of consent for sex. Perkins states:

When he [Tolbert] became president, he had a law passed to lower the age of consent to twelve, and he was known to have chosen many young girls as consorts. He required his wife [Victoria Tolbert] to walk two paces behind in deference to his status as head of state. When I met her, she was recovering from the effects of a beating he had given her. (Perkins 2006:197)

If a president would engage in blatant abuse and violation of women like William Tolbert it is, directly or indirectly, an invitation for his cabinet ministers, directors of government agencies and those in government with a few dollars to also participate in such abuse. Ironically, parents of these young girls gladly welcome these violent men in expressing their support for such relationship. These men entice the young girls and their parents in many ways. They often offer money to the girls or their parents, rent a room or house for them, build them a house, or provide a vehicle if a particular victim is lucky. Also, they provide food for these girls and their immediate relatives. The parents of these girls take pride in the fact that their daughters are in relationships with government officials. The International Federation for Human Rights (FIDH) states that “in Liberia, parents use their girl children a bread winners for the families to upkeep their homes” (FIDH 2004). The FIDH also notes that “the state, security apparatus, families and the communities” are the perpetrators of the violence against women and girls in (FIDH 2004). Doe-Anderson observes:

Not only our government officials, but also the average “Joe” could publicly flaunt teenage sexual partners or exploits knowing that they were above the law. Who could dare accuse any of them of rape, even with the disclosure of the new rape law and President Johnson-Sirleaf’s vow to ensure the rape is fully enforced? Perhaps this is why, in the recent past, some Liberian and foreign nationals alike have been consistently blatant in their disregard for the rape law. Why not, when we have the [activity] of Senator Joseph Nagbe of Sinoe County who would exercise political power to avert the prosecution of five Russian men alleged to have gang-raped two young Liberian girls. (Doe-Anderson 2006)

The Liberian media has not been thorough in documenting such practices as they do with other perpetrators. However, to their credit, local and international media sometimes expose male teachers’ habitual sexual exploitation of female students. Male teachers’ threats and the demand for sex with female students in the school system in Liberia are a norm.

Pedagogical setting of violence in Liberia

In the same way government officials have sexual encounters with young girls, so also do teachers and administrators in the school system in Liberia. Sex between students and teachers and, at times, educational leaders, is a norm. These acts occur in most instances in exchange for better grades. Make-up, a practice originally designed for students who for some reasons are not able to meet their academic requirements, is being corrupted in Liberia. Make-up is now understood in the academic practice in Liberia to consist of two things, sex and bribery. Male students and a small proportion of female students bribe teachers and administrators for better grades, while a large portion of female girls and teachers, and at times, administrators have sexual encounters for better grades. Male teachers, in many instances threaten to fail a female student if she refuses to give him sex. The International Federation of Human Rights observes “other human rights violations against women in Liberia are found in the Liberian education system where girl children trade off their bodies to the teachers in replacement of scoring grade marks” (FIDH 2004). Doe-Anderson’s assessment of violence against women in Liberia, especially in the realm of education, is instructive for our purposes here:

Our society has almost always promoted cultural beliefs, social norms, and a legal environment that legitimizes and perpetuates the subordination of women. Young Liberian women and girls are being enticed or constrained to engage in transactional sex to obtain funds for family survival, school fees, food, or material enticements or perhaps just to compete with their friends or the wife of their “godpa.” And let us not discount the reality that many girls in Liberian schools, colleges and universities must succumb to the sexual advances of their male teachers in order to make the grades required to pass a course or receive a diploma or degree. While it spans all income groups, the greatest common denominator in transactional sex arrangements seems to be older and younger women and girls. Sadly, the girls are being recruited at younger and younger ages as the men become older and older, and the younger women and girls who engage in transactional sex (and their families) are held responsible for the absence of, or noncompliance with, a good, moral upbringing (Doe-Anderson 2005).

Some male students also suffer at the hands of male teachers if the teacher notices that a male student is in
love with a female classmate whom the teacher is also interested in. The practice of “revenge” against male students by male teachers and administrators is endemic in the Liberian culture. Teachers’ and administrators’ prurient propensity to have sex with school girls is widespread. In addition to sex with students, another practice in the educational system in Liberia that has received little or no attention apart from efforts in this study is bribery. Institutions of higher learning in Liberia also engage in bribery.

The institutional setting of violence in Liberia

At some of the institutions of higher learning in Liberia, male students and a large proportion of female students suffer at the hands of educators. Consider this example: the admission process to a university in Liberia is extremely difficult. The point of contention is, while the entrance exams are difficult for those who take them, there those who, because they have money or their parents are of status, easily obtain admission. The rest who are not admitted are forced to return the following year, at least this time with an undisclosed amount of money with which to bribe school officials. Students in question are very smart, but their “crime” for not obtaining admission in most instances is poverty. They cannot compete against those who have the financial means. What is ironic is that on the surface it seems that some of these higher institutions of learning care about education, but their actions are not congruent with what they preach. Consider this example. In some of these very institutions that administer difficult exams, undergraduate students serve as course instructors. One wonders, if these institutions are really so concerned about academic excellence while undergraduate students teach other undergraduate students classes? One must ask if these are supervised, what does such supervision promote—academic excellence or academic dishonesty? Some local and international media such as the BBC, have reported a wide range of bribery occurring for graduation purposes. It seems compelling that promotion on the basis of bribery is a sign of cultural practice of dishonesty in Liberia.

As noted above, quite a number of educational leaders and teachers in Liberia corrupt young minds and prey on school girls for sexual gratification. Corruption in the Liberian schools undermines the development of honest leaders for tomorrow. The Analyst, an independent newspaper in Monrovia, quoting one teacher, observed, “the merit system in school is dead and is being replaced by nepotism and/or incentive or benefit systems. Most students get grades because they get the favor of the instructors through bribery using cash and unprofessional and illegal relationships” (The Analyst 2007). Academic dishonesty is ingrained in the school system in Liberia. The Analyst again observed “more than 2,000 12th-grade candidates were recently disqualified for outright cheating in two of Liberia’s 15 counties and many have no doubt that is the proof of the backwardness of the system” (The Analyst 2007). Cheating and certain forms of dishonesty are learned in Liberian schools, perhaps this is why when someone schooled in the Liberian manner gets into leadership they become dishonest and corrupt.

Conclusion

In the four conditions mentioned above, namely, the cultural setting, the official hierarchy, the teachers’ behavior, and institutional settings, we noticed that many men in Liberia have engaged in violence of unimaginable proportion. These older men, whether in school or in the government, prey on young women and girls for sexual gratification. A cultural practice of male parents’ reluctance to send daughters to school as they do with sons speaks of Liberia’s patriarchal nature. Academic institutions, in their actions of advocating and accepting monetary and sexual exploitation, have become the accomplices in the violence in Liberia. Seeing Liberian school schools in these contexts, it seems compelling to argue that Liberian education does not need a “tune-up, it needs and overhaul” to use an American educator, Molefi Asante’s phrase (quoted in Stevens et al. 2000). John Dewey, an American educational theorist, provided an injunction on the role of school in weeding out miseducation, and this too, is instructive for Liberian schools:

It is the business of the school environment to eliminate, as far as possible, the unworthy features of the existing environment from influence upon mental habits. It establishes a purified medium of action. Selection aims not only at simplifying but at weeding out what is undesirable. Every society gets encumbered with what is trivial, with dead wood from the past, and with what is positively perverse. The school has the duty of omitting such things from the environment which it supplies, and thereby doing what it can do to counteract their influence in the ordinary social environment. By selecting the best for its exclusive use, it strives to reinforce the power of the best. As a society becomes more enlightened, it realizes that it is responsible not to transmit and conserve the whole of its existing achievements, but only such as make for a better future society. The school is its chief agency for the accomplishment of this end. (Dewey 1944:20)

If young Liberians are to take over future leadership, it is imperative to overhaul the educational system with
the hope of producing honest leaders who will not be entangled in a web of deception, dishonesty, and corruption like previous leaders whose miseducative practices laid a foundation for the schism and anarchy experienced in Liberia over the years. There is a moratorium on the violence in Liberia. Until dishonesty is properly addressed and eschewed from the culture, school system, among teachers and educational leaders, and from the higher learning institutions, violence will, I am sorry to say, resurface. As Liberians, we must do all we can for ourselves, our children, and their generation, to address these issues. If we fail to do this, our children and their posterity will hold this present generation culpable for the transmission of violence.
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Abstract

This paper chronicles the experiences of four Liberian women from rival ethnic groups exiled to the United States as a result of the Liberian civil war, and the state of education in post-conflict Liberia. Given the violent nature of the Liberian civil war, I interviewed these women to tell me their experiences in Liberia before, during, and after the civil war as they remember it. The purpose of this paper is to document the experiences of four Liberian women from rival ethnic groups exiled to the United States in their own words, the experiences of parents and students, the status of schooling and education post-conflict Liberia, and the changes in the government of Liberia.

Introduction

Liberia is composed of four socioethnic groups, the Dan, Krahn, Repatriate Liberian, and Mandingo, which were involved in armed competition for control of the nation, a civil war. Men from these four social groups, in their roles as civil war combatants, demonstrated their desires to obliterate each other, thus, substantiating their claims of hatred. Initially, when the war began, the Krahn and Mandingo allied against the Dans and Repatriate Liberians, but this alliance was short-lived as both social groups began to butcher one another, for example, the murder of General Albert Karpeh, a Krahn and former Minister of Defense, Republic of Liberia by Alahaji Kromah, a Mandingo, and his loyalists (Ellis 1999; Alao et al. 2000) accompanied by subsequent violence demonstrated hatred between these groups. Alahaji Kromah, for example, again allied with Charles Taylor to eliminate Roosevelt Johnson, a Krahn, and his forces in what is known in Liberia as “The April 6 War” (Ellis 1999). The schism between these groups led to the formation of ULIMO-K, an armed faction named in honor of and led by Alahaji Kromah. Roosevelt Johnson, a Krahn became the leader of ULIMO-J, an armed faction and that faction was named in honor of him. General Prince Johnson, a Dan from Nimba was at odds with Charles Taylor, a representative of the Repatriate Liberian group.

Prince Johnson, because of internal conflict, defected from Charles Taylor and his NPFL. He organized an armed faction and named it INPFL. Forces loyal to Prince Johnson and those of Charles Taylor mercilessly massacred one another. The Dan and Mano forces under the commander of Charles Taylor massacred members of their own ethnic group. For example the death of Jackson Doe, a Dan politician, has been placed at the feet of Taylor’s NPFL (Ellis 1999; Alao et al. 2000). From 1979, after the Rice Riot, the assassination of William Tolbert, and the civil war, fear and terror became the order of the day. Consequently, many fled into exile including the four women from rival ethnic groups chosen for this study.

Study participants

While Liberian men from rival ethnic groups were butchering one another for control of Liberia, four Liberian women from the same rival ethnic groups exiled to the United States were offering their perspectives about the violence in Liberia. I interviewed these four women under the auspices of the University of Oklahoma to know and understand their experiences before, during, and after the Civil War in Liberia. Though from rival ethnic groups, experiences of violence in Liberia of three of the four women participants are almost congruent with each other. The fourth was spared some of the horrific experiences. Repeatedly, the women talked about death, the presence of corpses, destruction, and fear. Categorically, there were two different experiences for these women. Marie, a Krahn participant in my study, did not experience violence such as death in her family or starvation. Esther, the Dan participant, Sarah Mitchell, the Repatriate Liberian participant and Bandu Kromah, the Mandingo participant all experienced death and starvation in their respective families. There was a setback during the study because participants were afraid of immigration authorities.

When I flew into Baltimore, the Mandingo participant declined to participate. She refused believing that I was an “FBI cover agent trying to seek my deportation to Liberia.” My student identification and recruitment letter, along with a letter from the Institutional Review Board from the University of Oklahoma were not substantial enough to convince her. Consistent with allowing a participant to withdraw from the study, I concurred with her request. My experience with the Mandingo participant from Baltimore was also repeated with Mandingo participants in Minnesota and Dallas. Both women from Minnesota and Dallas refused to participate on the grounds I was an agent working for the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization. In accordance with the informed consent to allow a
participant to withdraw, I concurred with their demands. Finally, in Oklahoma, I was able to meet a woman of Mandingo ethnicity who expressed her willingness to participate and therefore was recruited for this study. My experiences with the Mandingo women who declined to participate in this study were not the same as that of the Dan, Krahn, and Repatriate Liberian women.

Women from the Dan, Krahn, and Repatriate Liberian social groups were eager to tell me their stories. They wanted to have records of their experiences in Liberia. They wanted to pass a written record to their children and grandchildren. For example, Marie, a Krahn participant observed:

Well, I am just happy that you know people are taking the time to talk to people about these things because I think it is part of the healing process for the country that you can take on a project like this and will be available for generations. Even when we pass on, people will read about these things to know what happened. So, I think this is really good and I hope that a lot of other people will commit to writing these things down.... I am so really happy about what you are doing and if there is anything I can do, I will be willing to do it. I hope I can have a copy of this so when I read it, I can pass it to my children.

In my research I found that no research chronicles exist on Liberia that document the abuses and violence against women. This study, therefore, is an attempt to begin that documentation and establish its need. This study enables readers to hear the voices of a few Liberian women in patriarchal Liberia; of their experiences, and therefore, would enable Liberian women to have a written record of their experiences, past, struggles, and successes; and enable readers to know the state of education in post-conflict Liberia. Thus, participants like Marie were glad to have a written document of her experiences in Liberia. With this in mind, we turn our attention to Esther, the Dan participant.

The fourteen themes in Figure 1 illustrate how these women’s experiences answer the research question: Given the violence nature of Liberia, what were the experiences of four Liberian women exiled to the United States as they remember it?

The Dan Participant’s Experience

Esther is a Dan born in Nimba County, Liberia. Her father was a chief. In the Liberian context being a chief like Esther’s father, carries the potential of being a polygamist. Esther’s father was a polygamist. Her father had a stroke during the Liberian civil war in Nimba County and subsequently died of complications. Esther told me, “My father, being a chief had many wives. I have about forty siblings.” One of her elder siblings took her to live with her in Monrovia. This elder sibling’s husband once was a cabinet member in President Charles Taylor’s administration. He defected from Taylor and joined a coalition, the Central Revolutionary Council. He subsequently served as a deputy speaker in the Liberia National Transitional Government. Esther’s sister and husband along with two members of the husband’s family were arrested and subsequently murdered by the order of Charles Taylor. She fled into exile for fear of being the next target.

Esther states,

I was brought up by my late sister who was murdered along with her husband by the order of Charles Taylor. She brought me to Monrovia for schooling, and later, my father took me to live with some family in Brewerville, and there where I lived half of my life doing schooling. I rejoined my sister after the military coup of 1980. The family I was living with brought me back to my sister because they were leaving for the United States as a result of the military coup. While living with my sister, I was able to complete high school. I attended City Commercial, a commercial school in Monrovia. When the Civil War started, we all went into the interior. We did business to survive. My sister and husband bought a home in Ghana and I managed to join them there for a period of time. My sister’s husband left from Ghana to work in the interim government in Liberia, but he and Charles Taylor could not get along anymore. He defected from Charles Taylor and joined the coalition. He and Charles Taylor were no longer friends. During the 1997 general elections in Liberia, my brother-in-law and I were members of the Unity Party of the current President, President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, but we lost the elections in 1997 to Charles Taylor. I ran as a congresswoman from my district in Nimba County. We accepted the results and we all decided to live in Liberia and look to the future.

Esther continues:

Prior to the death of my sister and some family members which I traveled with from Monrovia to attend a wedding in Sanniquellie, Nimba County, were arrested at one of the main check points in Liberia which, is Gbarnga that was controlled by the then government of Charles Taylor’s and put in jail. While in jail, a number of security officers entered and said that Charles Taylor wanted Paye and his family in Monrovia for questioning which we didn’t
know, but as God could have it, the security officers were not fully informed of what was going on, though they were given instruction. You know, Paye was like a father to me. So he said to the officers if they could please release and allow me to carry the wedding stuffs ahead to Nimba. The worst mistake the security officers made was to allow me to leave for Nimba County while my sister and her husband along with two family members remained in jail. When they realized to come after me, I had already left and it was too late for them. The next morning, we realized that all of the people that I left back at the police station to be going to Monrovia to see President Charles Taylor was murdered. My sister was raped repeatedly repeatedly. She was then executed. The other female relative was also raped and then murdered. My brother-in-law along with the last family member was beheaded. They were all burned and half-way buried in Gbarnga. That was what we discovered when the family kind of get some information from the press about their whereabouts. Based on that, the civilians in Monrovia wanted me to go out and give information about what had happened during our arrest, and who made the arrest and what occurred in jail. Because I have to tell the story, the then government of Charles Taylor, didn’t want the story to be told. The human rights organization helped to safeguard me in Liberia while I was there. They also gave me an idea to go to the American Embassy to get a visa to leave the country. I was practically smuggled out of Liberia. That is why I am here in the United States. Thank God that I am here. Coming to the United States was an opportunity but, on the other hand, it was tough because of the situation. I did not see any family members of mine and I had to come here [United States] before communicating with the rest of my family again. I am glad to even tell the story again. National Chronicle, a local newspaper in Monrovia writes of the incident Esther narrated. I use pseudo names to protect identity:

According to our reporter who visited the horrible scene, Mr. Paye and four others including Esther Mensahn left Monrovia on Friday, November 28 to attend his sister’s wedding in Sanniquelie, Nimba County. Upon their arrival in Gbarnga, Bong County, at about 7:30 P.M., they were reportedly arrested at the Iron Gate by members of the joint security forces in Gbarnga for what they reportedly turned as “traveling late night.” But Mr. Paye according to eyewitnesses told the security officers that he was traveling late because he had other pertinent things to do, for which they were late. Traveling in a green car with foreign license plate, Mr. Paye and family were reportedly escorted to the Gbarnga police station where they were said to have gone through long investigation ... a group of security officers who reported themselves as SSS officers and were acting upon the orders of the SSS Director, Col. Benjamin Yeaten [actual name] to arrest Mr. Paye and family, reportedly stormed the police station that Friday night in a red Mitsubishi jeep and demanded that Mr. Paye and family go with them. But the police deputy commander was said to have refused on grounds that it was too late. The same red jeep again, according to the reports, appeared on Saturday morning and took Mr. Paye and family in separate vehicles and to separate destinations. Mr. Paye and his wife, Mary Paye were said to have ridden in their car ahead of the security officers, while his sister, Teresa Paye and his nephew, John Guanu rode in different jeep. Thereafter, Mr. and Mrs. Paye were reportedly taken to Kokoya road where Mrs. Paye was violently raped by four men until her (repeatedly) and killed her in the fore view of her husband. Paye was later beheaded and body burnt while his car was set ablaze. Theresa Paye and John Guanu were according to reports taken to Geneive Town where Theresa was also reportedly raped before flogging both of them to death. (National Chronicle 1997)

The news story as well as Esther’s narration speaks of the violence many women in Liberia experienced at the hands of their government and those that came to “liberate” them. Rape was common during the Liberian civil war. The use of force by armed militias against “enemies” was widespread. Killings were rampant and human skeletons were found in villages, towns, and cities. During the height of the civil war, at some of the major immigration checkpoints in Liberia, human skulls were placed by militias to indicate that they had power to do as they wish. Charles Taylor and his forces were part of that violence as well as Alhaji Kromah and ULIMO-K, the LURD armed faction of Sekou Conneh, and the MODEL armed faction. These men and their forces massacred Liberians as a means of forcing their way to power. Just as Esther’s experience of the civil war was a bloodbath so also is Sarah, the Repatriate Liberian participant. We turn our attention to her narratives.

The Repatriate Liberian Participant’s Experience

Sarah Mitchell was born in Millsburg, Liberia. She grew up in Montserrado County. When she was two or three years old, her biological mother gave her to
another family not for adoption but to rear her. She was brought up in a Christian home and was reared by this family until they passed away. Sarah could not remember her biological father because she was too young, probably between the ages of two or three years when he passed away. She is a high school drop out. Sarah worked as an elementary school teacher and later, was promoted to the principalship. Sarah got married and she and her husband had eleven children. Her husband later passed away and she was left with all the responsibilities. She became sole provider and shouldered all the responsibilities of her children’s education. Two of the children passed away during the Civil War in Liberia. Sarah’s experience of the Civil War was of suffering and pain. Here is Sarah’s description when asked to tell me her experience during the Civil War in Liberia:

My experience during the Civil War, first of all, I was a widow with ten children and their children. It was very, very hard on me. At that time, men could not walk; it was the women. I had to leave my children to various areas when it got hot [fighting became tense]. When it is hot on this side, I will go on that side. Things were hard. Food was hard to find. We were leaving from one place to another. The check points, oh yes, so many check points. They will be checking in your clothes for money or whatever things they can get. Putting people one side and saying that you were an old soldier or you were in the government eating government’s money, but all those things with the grace of God, the only problem that I faced that hurt me was that I had to leave all of my sons behind they were all young men and therefore, it was risky for them to travel because they could be murdered either by the rebels or the government’s soldiers. I had to leave them behind because they couldn’t travel. I traveled with the girls and their children. It was not an easy thing for me but I trusted the Lord and he carried me through.

When we got to a certain place, I really thought that some of us would have been murdered. When they were searching me and the girls, the only thing that they took from me at that check point were batteries I had to keep the flashlight on while going through the bushes. The young rebel was so wicked; he took the batteries. One little child said to me “Old mom, the man is taking your batteries.” I put my finger to my mouth so that he can know that I want him to keep quiet. I did that because they would have forcibly kept him, or did something to some of us for saying that. And we traveled.

Sarah continues:

I had a son who was suffering from sickness and there were no medicines—nothing for me to treat him with. If you ever heard that human beings got killed, I saw it at that time. We traveled. We had no money. We had no food and for days, imagine someone being sick. One place we were hiding, he passed away. We couldn’t get food and we couldn’t find medicines. He passed away and was buried in one of our bed sheets we were traveling with. No casket—where will you find it? Then I decided to go back to Millsburg. It was a one day walk from 6a.m. to 7p.m. but we made it. When we got home, I felt so good but then for someone to ask me about this particular child, because he was too friendly, it just made me I was nobody to myself again to remember that he had died and we had to leave him behind. Anyway, we went through that; we went back home. The girls were having problems with their children. There was no food no medications. We walked from Millsburg three days to get to Bong Mines.

Sarah continues her narrative:

When we got to Bong Mines, to my sister’s house, everybody broke up in tears because they were happy. They were crying for joy; we were crying for joy and what we passed through. And so, we had a big cry in the house and we consoled one another. After Bong Mines, to go back to Monrovia, it was not easy. My sister had to walk through the bushes three days and three nights. They just had to sleep in the name of Jesus. It wasn’t easy. People were being killed left and right. Any way, we got through. One little child could not walk; so I had to stay to take care. I stay in one family home. I had to take the heat and the abuses. On the road again, we got to a certain place, then I said I will die right here. The driver of the car we were riding pulled over and said “If anybody here knows God, that person must pray because we are going to the ‘God bless you gate’ now.” Oh! Yes Jesus! I said God you know I put this problem in your hands ever since. I am in your hands. Please carry us over this gate. Luckily, for us, the wicked guy who should have been there had gone to the bush to toilet. One rebel boy was sitting at the gate. When got to the gate there, he let us past. By the time we passed, we saw the wicked guy coming out of the bush and everybody said “God, thank you.”

Sarah continues:

When we left from there, we went back to Monrovia
again. It got rough there again. The fighting between rebels and government soldiers went on and on. My oldest daughter, they took her husband and two sons to Kakata. They were murdered. She just worried over it. Whenever she hears guns sounds, neighbors say, she will run. One day, she ran and up to date, we have not seen her. My two children died. For us to really know that she was dead, a friend of hers who was a minister and his wife, they used to be together working for the native people to survive. They told us the story. They give us her slipper, her New Testament Bible with my daughter name in it. They told us that she died from cholera. “Your daughter died. There was no medicine” her minister friend and wife said. So, my two children died.

Again, Sarah continues her narratives:

So this war, when I said by the grace of God, this is it. You know for those things to happen and for you to go through and still be on your two feet, it is not your own strength but that of God. My sons that I left that could not travel with us, they suffered a lot. Some of the students that I taught and some of the citizens of the town said they did not know my children when rebels entered the village. One of the boys from the village said, “If I have to die with the children, I will die with them. How some of you say you don’t know these boys when their mother was a teacher in this town?” That was what saved my boys. During this period in Liberia, when people of a town say they do not know you, the rebels will call you on the side and take you to the river and they will not see you no more. The town people denied that they knew my boys but God saved them. So, this is how my sons are living. Other than that, they would have been dead… I lost a nephew, my sister’s son. He was beheaded. Another nephew of mine was beheaded. I have so many relatives that died apart from my own two children. In Bomi Hills, one of my nephews was beheaded and his head put in the tree. Another one was beheaded in the city of Monrovia. He was the only child of my sister. They cut his throat and put it on the street. My sister suffered from that loss until she died. There are so many that I cannot think of now.

In the African culture especially in Liberia, wisdom teaches that children are to bury their parents but the not other way around. It is tragedy for parents to bury their children. Sarah’s son died an untimely death and she was forced by the circumstances in Liberia to bury her son without the least respect of providing a casket. Sarah’s daughter died and she did not know where the daughter was buried. The civil war was marked by a high proportion of violence and intolerance and many had experiences like that of Sarah. In fact, Sarah was blessed others will argue in that she was able to bury her son because there were others, during the worst of the slaughter, who lost their son, daughter, husband or wife, or father, or mother, and were not able to bury the deceased. Just as Esther and Sarah’s narratives are about blood bath and starvation, so also is Bandu’s, the Mandingo participant. Her father was murdered. Four siblings, two sisters and two brothers were also murdered, and starvation was incremental. Here is Bandu’s description of her experience during the Civil War.

The Mandingo Participant’s Experience.

Bandu was born in Monrovia, Liberia. Her father was an accountant and her mother a registered nurse. Bandu’s experience of the civil brutality in Liberia was similar to those of Esther and Sarah. The similarities are death and starvation. Her father was beaten and subsequently murdered by rebel militias. Four siblings, two bothers, and sisters were also murdered by rebel militias. Bandu escaped death and experienced severe starvation during the Civil War. Here is Bandu’s description of her experience during the war.

Too many people lost their lives during the Civil War. I experienced injustice and violence. I experienced grief and pain. Quite a number of my relatives and friends lost their lives. Food shortage was another problem during the war because of the war, there was no food to eat. Many people died from starvation. Mothers cried for the death of their children. I did not have sufficient food to eat and water to drink. There was no money to buy food; even if you had money, you cannot go looking for food because of terrorists’ attacks, fighting, shooting, and bombings. Too many people suffered from hunger and died. What a life? My family and I suffered so much during the war in Liberia. They beat and killed my father. Two of my brothers and two sisters were also killed. That day, my whole life changed. My family quiet routine changed into a nightmare, fear, and anger. I know I will live with this pain for the rest of my life.

Bandu continues:

Some time I tell myself life doesn’t like me. I say this because the people I love very, very much, life has taken them away from me. Yes indeed I experienced the war, food shortage, poverty, pestilences, and lawlessness. My country ruined itself. Some tribe loves themselves, money, no affection for other tribes, and religion. My family comes from a tribe (Mandingo) that most people
hated. They were looking around in Liberia to find my family and kill them. Luckily some of my family survived. Now, I call myself the survivor. I tell the Almighty God thanks for keeping me alive today … 

the pain of my father’s death as well as four siblings is still with me, and I must admit I will live with it as long as I live. No one would like to be in my shoes. The Almighty has been my strength. I am angry with those who killed my family and friends. My country was destroyed by the Civil War. Students and teachers shot in schools, rebels sexually exploited young people followed by the waves of assaults from the warring factions, seen the dead, the wounded, lack of medication resulted in flu killing people, moral break down, lost of faith, destruction of homes, food shortages, among other things make me sad. How will children survive? How will they take care of themselves in this world of unequal opportunities? Because of these things, children are practicing prostitution, abusing drugs, being sexually abuse for money, and engage in pornography just to make a living. What a life? It is all because of the Civil War.

People of the Mandingo ethnic tribe of which Bandu is a member were massacred by the rebel militias of Charles Taylor during the war. The Mandingo social group was an ally of Samuel Doe and the violence and hatred towards Samuel Doe and his Krahn loyalists were equally displayed against the Mandingos. Mandingos in Liberia are exclusivists. Mandingo men intermarry with other social groups, but they prohibit their women from marrying Liberian men from other social groups. The children of Mandingo men by women from other social groups were targeted during the war and many of these children were murdered. There is a strong dislike of the Mandingos in Liberia.

Experiences of the Krahn participant

Unlike Esther, Sarah, and Bandu who experienced violence in their respective families, Marie, the Krahn participant’s experience of the civil war, though alarming, was not as visceral as the Dan, Repatriate Liberian, and Mandingo participants’ experiences. We turn our attention to Marie, the Krahn’s participant.

Marie was born in Grand Gekew County, Liberia. Marie’s mother gave her to her younger sister to be her daughter. “My mother had, I think, five sisters and two of them didn’t have any kids, so she took me and gave me to her younger sister to be her daughter” Marie said. This “othermother” educated Marie from elementary until she graduated from high school. Upon her graduation, Marie went to Monrovia for further education. She was graduated from the University of Liberia in 1982. Marie further pursued higher education in the United States where she obtained a Masters in Elementary education. She came to the United States as a refugee because of the Civil War in Liberia. Marie observes:

I am in the United States as a refugee. I came here because of the war. I have no intention of living outside of Liberia. In fact, before the war started, we were building our house and were planning to move in the house by Christmas of 1990. So, we were doing everything possible and move in the house by December of 1990 and then we had to flee. So, I am here because of the war.

During the Liberian civil war, Marie did not experienced direct violence but on many occasions, she and her family were on the floor to guard against bullets. She did not witness any execution but did see corpses, and people tied and beaten. Marie observes:

To be frank with you, I did not see anyone being physically killed, even though I did see a lot of bodies. I saw people been tied “tabied” but I didn’t actually see people been shot physically in my presence but I did see a lot of bodies … actually, my experience during the civil war, I mean apart from the fact during the civil war, a lots of time we have to be like laying on the floor to dodge the bullets, and stuff like that; but my experience during the war, I saw the best and worst in a lot of people including myself because I saw people who put their lives on the line for their fellow Liberians and I saw people who felt justified letting their fellow Liberians get killed for whatever reason. I think I saw the best and worst in a lot of us. That was my experience.

While Marie claimed that she did not experience physical violence much like her fellow participants, Marie conceded that she, and some of her relatives were victims of the political violence in Liberia. The people of Nimba, from rival ethnic group, Dan and Mano, on the one hand and the Krahn ethnic group of which Marie is a member, are foes. The Krahn and Mandingo are also foes. As noted, each of these groups wanted to obliterate the other. In fear for her life, Marie was forced to flee along with her family. Marie observes,

I have to flee. All of us have to leave Liberia one point in time. My mom, they have to walk in the bushes for days to get to the Ivory Coast. My husband people, everybody have to flee Liberia. So yes, we were all victims.

Brutality of such a high proportion as described in these narratives may prompt one to ask: What did the
women say was their assessment of why violence erupted in Liberia, and who was responsible? These two questions were contained in the questionnaire posed to the participants. On the question of their assessment why violence erupted in Liberia, the women’s responses could be summarized into two categories: capacity, on the one hand, historical and personal reasons on the other. For example, Marie, the Krahn participant, observed:

Well, I think the violence that erupted in Liberia can be attributed to historical as well as personal factor. If you look at the history of Liberia, from the Rice Riot in 1979 up to the time the war started, you know that something was cooking. You know that something eventually was going to explode because of the distrust, because of the inequities of the distribution of resources, of the way Liberians look at each other. You know, we were not really trusting of each other. Some group felt that they were at a higher level than other groups and even those of us the indigenous people who have some education, felt that we were better than those who didn’t have as much education. So, there are lots of disparities in the country and so, we were not really working as a country. One other thing I noticed is that because Liberia was not colonized, we don’t have that patriotism because we didn’t fight for our freedom so to speak and everybody is just carefree.

Marie’s assessment of the violence in Liberia speaks to some of the core issues that have divided the Liberian society for generations: disparities between the haves and the have-nots, the educated and uneducated, Repatriate Liberians and the indigenous, and one tribe against another. Other participants see the violence in Liberia from different perspective.

Esther, the Dan participant, on the question of why violence erupted in Liberia asserted:

Violence came to Liberia; I want to believe because of greed. Everybody wants to be in power and when they are in power, they don’t want anyone to speak against them. No democracy. No freedom of expression. If you have a family who is part of the government or does not go along with the government, and you kind of connected, it is like guilt by affiliation. Violence is in Liberia, I will say it is because of greed. Liberian leaders do not want to see people in their way.

Esther’s observation above also addresses other core inequities that are used by those in leadership as a means to continuously hold on to power. Some of the hallmarks of the violence in Liberia are intolerance to opposition, the muzzling of expression of free speech, and greed where those in power embezzle the country’s resources for their own gain while the rest of the people starve and go without health care. When issues of this nature persist for long, it encourages others to rebel thus, the Civil War in Liberia.

On the question of culpability of the violence in Liberia, the responses fall into three categories: 1. human nature, 2. Charles Taylor, and 3. previous presidents of the Republic. Bandu, the Mandingo participant and Sarah, the Repatriate Liberian participant argued that Charles Taylor as an individual was responsible for the violence in Liberia. Esther, the Dan participant, argued that Charles Taylor and every previous president of Liberia was responsible for the violence. Esther observed: “Liberian presidents are responsible for the violence in the country. If they did not agree to any form of violence, it would not have happened. Liberian presidents want people to always agree with them. If you don’t, they think you are against them, and they will try to get rid of you. So, Liberian presidents are responsible for the violence.”

Esther’s remark addresses the issue of leadership involvement in violence to silent opponents. In the case of Liberia, government agents with close ties to the President engage in the act of violence. Because these agents are doing the will of the President, the judicial branch of the Liberian government is afraid and impotent to pronounce judgment in accordance with the law. No major crime committed in Liberia without a president’s knowledge has resulted in the perpetrators’ conviction. In fact, whether with a president’s knowledge or not, the judicial system in Liberia has been one of the co-conspirators in the violence in Liberia. There are no convictions for violence or crimes against other citizens in which the government may be an accomplice, but there are convictions when an alleged crime is against a president or an incumbent government. Thus, Esther’s contention that presidents in Liberia are responsible for in the country seems compelling.

Marie, the Krahn participant attributed the violence in Liberia to human nature—one that seeks to denigrate and devalues others. Marie’s assessment while generic seems to hold freed blacks from the United States culpable for the violence. Marie asserts:

You, know, I don’t think I can hold a particular person responsible. I think it is human nature that is responsible because I feel like the freed slaves that left to go to Africa, to establish Liberia as their home, if they had gone to Liberia to actually establish a free nation, and make everybody free, I think things would have been different; but I think
when they went to Liberia, they became kind of slave masters and the indigenous became like the slaves. And so, I think it is human nature because they fought the system here [United States] and they left and went is the same system they created. But again, I don’t think they knew better because it is the same system they knew. I think it is human nature, you know, for me to feel important, someone has to feel less important.

It seems the human nature in question is that of freed slaves that returned in the 1800s to establish the Republic indirectly exonerating the leadership of Samuel Doe and Charles Taylor, whose struggle for political power exiled Marie and thousand other Liberians. In the quote above, Marie appears a bit indigenistic, favoring the indigenous over the emigre. By this, I mean, while history points to the shortcoming of Americans of African descent in Liberia, indigenous Liberians are as well culpable for the violence. Nevertheless, Marie omitted this assertion and put the blame for the violence in Liberia solely on Repatriate Liberians. The Repatriate Liberian rule came to an end in 1980 with the assassination of Tolbert. It was not a Repatriate Liberian who executed General Thomas Weh-Syen and his colleagues for a bogus coup plot. It was not Repatriate Liberians who massacred defenseless women and children at the Lutheran church in Monrovia during the civil war. It was not Repatriate Liberian who burned cities, towns, and villages in Nimba and buried alive an estimated 200 hundred children in a well in Nimba County. All these were done with the participation and approbation of President Samuel Doe, a Krahn and an indigenous Liberian. Marie, though the most educated among my participants camouflaged the errors of indigenous Liberians.

Marie holds a Master in Elementary education from an American University while in exile. Thus, Marie is the most educated of my participants in this study. If Marie returns to Liberia as she envisioned, being an elementary education teacher, she might like to return to the classroom. This misconception on her part of the violence in Liberia might be taught to young Liberians. Marie’s action equates to what I called indigenistic dishonesty. By this, I mean, concealing the destructive roles of native Liberians in leadership and putting the blame on Repatriate Liberians. Until Liberians can take responsibility for their roles in the civil brutalities in Liberia, total peace is far from over.

Another point that stems out from the four women’s narration of their experiences in Liberia was the emphasis on family bonds. This family attachment leads to, for example, a mother’s sister, female relatives, or friend becoming “othermothers.” Sociologist and author Patricia Hill Collins uses the concept of othermothers to denote collective caring relationship in the African and African-American communities where a female relative or friend becomes a “mother” to help a “bloodmother” in caring for a child. Collins asserts:

In many African-American communities, fluid and changing boundaries often distinguish biological mothers from other women who care for children. Biological mothers, or bloodmother, are expected to care for their children. But African and African-American communities have also recognized that vesting one person with full responsibility for mothering a child may not be wise or possible. As a result, othermothers—women who assist bloodmothers by sharing mothering responsibilities—traditionally have been central to the institution of black motherhood. Othermothers can be key not only in supporting children but also in helping bloodmothers who, for whatever reason, lack the preparation or desire for motherhood (178-180).

In their narratives, three of the women, Marie, Esther, and Sarah respectively, talked about a sister being a mother, an aunt being a mother, and a mother’s female friend being a mother. In all three instances, biological parents turned over their child to a relative or friend who would bear the responsibility of rearing the child. This is not an adoption in the Western context with legal approbation, but a display of community loving care in shouldering the responsibility of rearing another member. This community loving care was demonstrated in each of the three narratives. For example, Sarah, the Repatriate Liberian participant observed, “When I became three, my mother left me with another family, and they became my parents. The woman was my ‘mother’ and the man was my ‘father.’ I was reared by them until they passed away.” Esther, the Dan participant asserts, “My sister was a ‘mother’ to me and her husband a ‘father’ to me.” Marie, the Krahn participant laments, “I was born in Grand Gedeh County and my mother, had, I think, five sisters, and two of them didn’t have kids; so she took me and gave me to her to be her daughter. My aunt became my ‘mother’. Though Bandu did not say much about her mother, her sister, who petitioned on her behalf to come as a refugee, also became a mother. All four participants intend to return to Liberia and help in any way possible. Just as the “othermothers” and “otherfathers” rendered assistance to Marie, Esther, Sarah, and Bandu, so do they want to reciprocate to their fellow
countrymen and women who were victims of the civil brutalities in Liberia. Bandu, the Mandingo participant wants to be a lawyer to return home and perhaps help in prosecuting crimes against women. Sarah, the Repatriate Liberian participant prays to return to the classroom to educate young Liberians. Esther, the Dan participant would like to advance herself and return home to participate in the reconstruction of Liberia. She desires to mold the minds of boys and girls in Liberia assuring them of self-respect and dignity. Esther considers “transactional sex,” to use Jestina Doe-Anderson’s phrase between young girls and older men in Liberia as a form of violence. Therefore, Esther envisions educating girls against sexual relationships with older men. Esther asserts that:

My dream for the future is how I can advance myself that if I were to go home one day to help rebuild my country and molds the minds of my brothers and sisters back home. I want to carry the culture back home and I pray that our sisters and brothers will listen to us; that they can live their lives differently and not sleep with older men to survive, and that they can do things in their own way to make a living.

Marie, the Krahn participant’s plans for the future are to promote a nonviolent approach. She hopes for all Liberians to return home to help rebuild Liberia, and believes that Liberians should learn to resolve their differences through peaceful means. She argues that there maybe differences but it is extremely important that Liberians learn to work together to resolve differences rather than resorting to violence. She asserts that violence begets violence creating a vicious circle. Marie observed:

My hope and plan for the future is that Liberians can return home and build. We can build our country the way we want. We can all work together and we may have differences but learn to resolve our differences in a peaceful way rather than resorting to violence because as we can see, everybody lost during the war. Everybody was affected one way or the other. Then look at the country, the country has been destroyed. We are even afraid to go back there because there is no running water, no good hospital, and no good school for our children. And so my hope is that Liberians can realize that violence just begets violence and it is a vicious circle … so my hope is that Liberians will never again resort to violence; that whatever problems we are facing, that we will sit down across the table, with our coffee on the table and resolve our differences because I mean, Liberia is the only place we can call home. Even if you are a citizen of another country, you are still a Liberian, you know. Like here [U.S.] we eat Liberian food every day. We are Liberians and when we open our mouths, people know we are Liberians. You, know, we are a kind of special, unique people in the world.

Marie, like the rest of the women in this study, desires for Liberians to discontinue the violence. There shall be misunderstanding and disputes, Marie conceded, but the proper recourse is not violence. While I concur with Marie for the discontinuation of violence, she missed an important ingredient, honesty, which in my opinion is essential to ending violence. It is one thing to sit on the table with someone for photo opportunities and is quite another to be honest in resolving differences. Like in the case of President Doe, there were repeated peace conferences yet peace did not materialize because the action of Doe forced Liberian dissidents to into exile. This statement is also true of President Taylor (Alao et al. 1999, Ellis 1999). For example those who made peace with him like Samuel Duokie, were murdered by militias loyal to Taylor. Ending violence demands mutual trust and the government with its secret agents to enforce decisions must take the lead. While the women all agreed on ending violence there were discrepancies in their responses especially between Esther, the Dan participant, and Marie, the Krahn participant, on the role of women and education in Liberia.

Esther and Marie see the preferential treatment of boys in Liberia with opposing perspectives. Esther argues against the preferential treatment of boys and the notion that men are superior to women; she longs for closing the gap. Marie acknowledged the preferential treatment of boys but agreed to the different roles society has placed on man and woman. On the question of gender equality in the Krahn tribal group, Marie observed:

They teach that a woman is to be in the backgrounds, the man is the head, the woman has no, (actually, it is not that the woman has no value because all the strong men have strong women behind them) but the women are expected to be in the background and not in the forefront. You know, before, they never sent girls to school. Girls are just expected to be house wives, take care of children, take care of their husbands, and it was very lately, especially I mean I don’t know about other tribes, but in our tribe, they didn’t really send girls to school. They sent boys to school, but the girls, no. The boys were valuable; like back home [In Liberia], if a man has all daughters and didn’t have a son, it was nothing; he will have to have a son …
like I said before, I think I am a Christian so I believe that there is a place for the woman and there is place for the man and I think they can both do the same things it is just that we have different roles not that one is better than the other, but I think we all have different capabilities because like in my house, there are certain things that, I mean, I don’t feel comfortable doing and my husband can do it comfortably and there are certain things that he doesn’t feel comfortable doing that I can do comfortably.

Marie continues:

So, we have our roles not that one is better than the other but we have different roles … the roles for men for instant, the man is the hunter. You will not see a woman go hunting. They might go fishing or something, but you will not see a woman carry gun to say that they are going to hunt. The women are expected to cook. A man who is a cook in our culture is considered, or is regarded as useless or worthless. You know men can’t cook. Men are not supposed to watch clothes. Men are not supposed to cry. You know there are different roles that society ascribed to men and women. So, they have distinct roles in our culture. Even making farms, the man brushes the farm, fells the trees and stuff. Women are expected to plant the rice. You don’t see men in our culture planting rice. Men can help to harvest, but women do most of the harvesting.

Marie’s statement speaks for most Liberian women, especially those of the Christian, Muslim, and Traditional religion. A man has his place in the home, likewise the woman. Christian doctrine and that of Islam, where a man is the head of home, is honored and respected in Liberia. But it is also a distortion to say that men do not cry, men do not wash clothes, and cook. Men do cry. Men do wash clothes, and men do cook. I am one of those Liberian men. I cried when my father died and definitely will cry my mother passes on. I cried when I left my step mother at the Lutheran Church in Monrovia where she was murdered by the forces of President Samuel Doe. Also, I cried when three of my brothers were killed during the Civil War in Liberia.

When my wife comes from work exhausted, I do not expect her to do laundry. I help to do the laundry. I also can help to cook. A man must learn to do these things in an event, the wife is not around, and he would be able to do it himself. I equally support my daughter and her two brothers. I try to be fair in my treatment of them because they are my blood and will not let culture dictate how I treat my children. It is a sin to discriminate. The pages above, demonstrate how Liberians have been miseducated in Liberia. One must ask, what then is state of schooling and education in post-conflict Liberia?

Status of Education in Liberia

Education was not a priority during these turbulent years in Liberia. Children were forced to take up arms and fight. A number of girls of school age and women under duress by rebel commanders participated also in the violence. According to most analysts, unemployment rates in Liberia are at about 80 percent and therefore, most parents find it difficult to send their children to school. Most children, rather than joining gangs sell on the streets to help their parents pay bills, but the efforts of teens selling has been turned by the government of Liberia as a child labor. In an effort to curb children selling in the streets, a new education policy has been adopted by the Liberian government according to an Integrated Regional Information Networks, information service of the United Nations. IRIN states:

Under a new education policy, parents or guardians of children will soon face fines or even be arrested for allowing their children to sell in the streets during school hours. President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf in early September announced the measure, which is said to be aimed at increasing school enrolment and curbing child labour.

Closely examining the government efforts to increase school enrolment and curb child labor seems to contain some flawed elements. Those in the government including the President have their children and grandchildren in Western countries going to school. Though the civil war just ended, government officials are living better lives, enjoying all the luxuries of being officials of government. Most parents in Liberia do not have those luxuries like the government officials. According to past educational news, from Liberia, most parents want to send their children to school but do not have the financial means. (IRIN 2007) Therefore to threaten parents with fines or arrest without the government of Liberia providing equal opportunities to all Liberians is to add pain to injury. Parents and their children have suffered long enough in Liberia. The government of President Sirleaf has a mandate given to her by the Liberian people when they elected her to correct wrongs and not to repeat them. If the government’s policy on education stands as it is, a dangerous path and all Liberians should reject it in accordance with the law.
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"All I can say is that we are mistaken to gouge such a deep rift in history that the things old men and old women know have become so useless as to be not worth passing on to grandchildren" (Charles Frazier, 2006, 412)

Introduction

Contemporary Continental philosophy is turning in a most unexpected, but perhaps inevitable course. Who would have thought that Continental philosophy, following and expanding on the work of such celebrated atheists as Nietzsche, Heidegger, Foucault, and Derrida, would take a theological/philosophical turn at the beginning of the 21st century? Yet, a vigorous school of post-secular Continental philosophy has embraced religious texts as legitimate and worthy arenas of philosophical discourse within the postmodern philosophical tradition. Of interest to me, however, is that much of this work is relevant to education. So relevant that educational philosophers who usually distance themselves from anything “theological” seem to be missing one of the main currents of contemporary philosophy with profound ethical and teleological possibilities for educational dialogue. Post-secular philosophy offers intriguing opportunities for meaning and purpose in education. While the relevance of post-secular theology to education is indirect and multilayered, one key theme, presented and discussed in this paper, is the active discussion of social transformation, the possibility of the impossible. This paper examines the hermeneutical philosophy of Richard Kearney with a focus on ethics, social justice, and the meaning of the “Other.” I argue that Kearney’s ethical philosophy, while theological in context, nonetheless provides an appropriate and unique perspective for thinking about education.

Post Secularism

It is important, as I begin what is a philosophical/theological conversation, that I clarify the meaning of post-secularism and why it is both an appropriate and relevant arena for secular conversations on public education. First, I want to be clear that I am not advocating a form of publicly-supported religious education promoting someone or some group’s religious dogma or ideology. Post-secular philosophy is unabashedly postmodern. There is a clear and consistent distinction between modern onto-theology and postmodern post-secular philosophy. The key to the distinction between modern onto-theology and postmodern theology is the meaning of secular. While time prevents a full discussion of this claim, the abbreviated version is that onto-theology (also known philosophically as Christia apologetics) is an epistemological metaphysics of the sacred that embraces the modern objective metaphysics of the natural. Thus, onto-theology posits two realms of Being/being, Divine and natural, heaven and earth, sacred and secular. This common distinction, almost religiously held-to by educational philosophers, between secular and non-secular, or philosophy and theology, is historically a product of the Enlightenment and modernism. Secularism is a modern movement. Nonetheless, the dichotomies between philosophy and theology, secular and non-secular, are seemingly reinforced by the postmodern deconstruction of metaphysics. The emerging post-secular philosophical conversation, however, challenges and rejects the metaphysical truth claims of Christian apologetics and onto-theology while simultaneously examining and deconstructing sacred texts and teaching for meaning and knowing. A result of this is the emergence of a flourishing post-secular philosophical tradition that refuses to reject spiritual texts, spiritual “knowing,” and meaning-making as anti-philosophical.

There is a key theme of the broad and loosely defined post-secular body of work that is central to this paper. Post-secular philosophy vehemently rejects and counters criticisms that postmodern thinking is hopelessly relativistic and nihilistic. In fact, Kearney’s entire body of work is an empowering, optimistic, and positive voice for social justice and meaningful transformation of human society. Kearney locates grounding and purpose in sacred texts (albeit, he admits this assumes a certain act of faith but it is nonetheless a counter to relativism). Before modernism and the advent of objective epistemology knowledge was textual and expressed through narrative. This had severe limitations because the narratives of ancient texts are bound to the mythical world-views of pre-modern cultures. The epistemological project of the Enlightenment was essentially an effort, a method, to get passed narrative to the real, natural world beyond subjective culturally-bound interpretation. A problem arises, the onto-theological problem if you will, when objective
epistemology is used to interpret ancient texts. There is a tendency towards misinterpretation.

For the post-secular, the central issues of our time are problems of knowledge and interpretation, particularly knowing and interpreting the “other.” As a result, a primary post-secular project is to seek right interpretation. Eschewing metaphysics and any foundational epistemological project, post-secular philosophy is hermeneutical and phenomenological. The problem, of course, is the attempt to get at the “right” without any metaphysical/epistemological foundation. This, however, in a nut shell, is hermeneutics—meaningful interpretation without foundational truth claims—tricky business. Hermeneutics breaks down the dichotomy between secular truth and religious dogma by positing the world as text (Ricoeur, 1981). This is not a form of nihilistic solipsism (there is text, and nothing but the text); rather, it is the idea that there is no objective knowing outside of the bounds of textual interpretation. Text always mediates between the world and human thought. We think in language and language is interpretive. Thus, the question becomes, how does one interpret (in the right way)? In response, Westphal (2001) cites Schleiermacher’s (1998) hermeneutic circle. For Schleiermacher, (right) interpretation is a twofold task. Interpretation of the whole requires a priori interpretation of the parts, and interpretation of a part requires a priori interpretation of the whole.

Westphal explains: “But in order rightly to read any part we must know the whole, but how can we know the whole, since we have yet interpreted the parts from which alone such knowledge can arise?” (112).

Overcoming this paradox is partially possible, Westphal believes, by developing a provisional sketch of the whole. Anticipation of the whole, although incomplete, nonetheless allows and interpretation of the parts. This is an exceptionally brief summary of Westphal’s presentation of Schleiermacher’s hermeneutic circle and, space permitting, I would certainly add discussion of the role of levels of interpretation and the relationship between levels of interpretation. The key point is that hermeneutic interpretation is what we are left with in the face of the death of epistemology. Westphal is blunt but leaves open an epistemological possibility:

As the attempt to provide human knowledge with solid foundations, to prove that it (knowledge) can transcend the limitations of its perspectives and be adequate to the reality it intends, it is widely perceived to have failed … the notion that epistemology is a bad habit that needs to be broken has increasingly carried the day. Bust as an investigation into the nature and limits of human knowledge (with special emphasis on limits), epistemology lives on, frequently under the name of hermeneutics, signifying both the interpretative character of pre-philosophical human understanding and, correspondingly, interpretation as the central theme of a certain mode of epistemological reflection. (128)

Westphal does not condemn human knowing to ever increasing relativism wallowing in the rubble of modern knowledge. Wallow in narrative and text we must and Westphal’s key point is that hermeneutics is inescapable.

Richard Kearney

Richard Kearney is a philosopher in the hermeneutical tradition and he is of particular interest to me as an educator. Kearney is a published novelist and poet, a well-known public intellectual in Ireland, and a philosopher whose work and influence are broad and growing. He has previously served as Visiting Professor at the University of Paris (Sorbonne) and the University of Nice. Kearney received his Ph.D. from the University of Paris (Nanterre) where he studied with Paul Ricoeur. Currently he is the Charles B. Seelig Chair of Philosophy at Boston College and Visiting Professor at University College Dublin. He has served on the Arts Council of Ireland, the Higher Education Authority of Ireland, and as chairman of the Irish School of Film at University College Dublin. Kearney participated in drafting several proposals for a Northern Irish peace agreement and served as a speech writer for Irish President, Mary Robinson. In addition, Kearney has presented five series on culture and philosophy for Irish and British television. Recently, he published a philosophical trilogy entitled ‘Philosophy at the Limit’: On Stories (2002), The God Who May Be (2001), and Strangers, Gods, and Monsters (2003).

Kearney’s work is call for social justice, impassioned, but philosophically-grounded, supported, and reasoned. Kearney does not, however, avoid the theological language of his self-acknowledged faith as he laments:

How ironic it is to observe so many monotheistic followers still failing to recognize the message: that God speaks not through monuments of power and pomp but in stories and acts of justice, the giving to the least creatures, the caring for orphans, widows, and strangers; stories and acts which bear testimony—as transfiguring gestures do—to that God of little things that comes and goes, like the thin small voice, like the burning bush, like the voice
Kearney’s connection of ethics and poetic imagination: Gedney explains the profound meaning of image and reality, it must recognize ethical limits. The goal of our group is to better prepare school leaders to be agents of social justice in both the manner in which they run schools and the development of schools as learning institutions that will serve to promote a more socially-just and democratic society. While I applaud and support the work of my colleagues in this group and find them to be talented and committed scholars, there is something missing that offends my postmodern sensibilities. Simply, social justice is frequently essentialized and viewed as a defined goal. This seems a positivist perspective that assumes there is some quantifiable and objective meaning of justice and injustice that may be measured, modified and corrected in a certain way. The resulting moral imperative for those who prepare educational leaders is to increase “the capacity for social justice” within the practice of school management. In addition, this project necessitates an “other” in need of social justice that is defined, typically as a member of a group, or a subject of a specific “identity,” that has suffered injustice (I want to be clear that I am not minimizing the terrible historical and ongoing reality of injustice suffered by human beings based on their cultural, gender, and ethnic identity; rather, my purpose is a limited deconstruction of the term “other”). Thus, injustice is a collective act perpetrated by one group against another. The solution to injustice becomes something to be realized through an identification of the other that allows for identity politics to systematically, through policy and defined praxis, promote justice. My concern is that justice is itself then left dependent on the social construction of subjective group identity. Injustice, in the modern lens, is the essentialization (objectification) of the other; and the modern response is to essentialize (objectify) justice.

Kearney’s response is a call for poetic imagination. In an early work, The Wake of Imagination, Kearney (1988) calls for a restoration of human imagination in the wake of deconstruction as an ethical responsibility: “If the deconstruction of imagination admits no epistemological limits (in so far as it undermines every effort to establish a decidable relationship between image and reality), it must recognize ethical limits” (361). Gedney explains the profound meaning of Kearney’s connection of ethics and poetic imagination: (Kearney’s) rather existential account can be developed in a more concrete fashion if we focus on the power of the imagination to reconfigure our current reality in order both to recognize new possibilities inherent in our self-conception and to make possible new relations to others whose voices had heretofore remained unheard. Along these lines, Kearney speaks of the ethical power of the possible as an alternative to the traditional preference for the actual in both metaphysics and theology. (92)

The problem Kearney addresses, Gedney points out, is that poetic imagination expressed through art (“storytelling, painting, singing, sculpting, etc.” 90) relies on an imagination that is a likeness but nonetheless other than the reality that is depicted. In other words, there is clear distinction between art and knowing.

Kearney was a student and mentee of the hermeneutical philosopher Paul Ricoeur and Gedney suggests, based on Kerney’s 2001 conversation with Ricoeur (Kearney, 2004a), that Ricoeur’s influence is pronounced in The God Who May Be (2001). Specifically, Ricoeur’s view of the fragmented and incomplete understanding of “accounts of ourselves, and the world around us” (Gedney, 2006) is discernible. Gedney continues that Kearney and Ricoeur both have a hermeneutical passion to for encountering the other as a source of new opportunities for critical reflection. Gedney explains:

In that book (The God Who May Be), Kearney developed an alternative account of theism that defends a notion of God’s power grounded in the notion of possibility rather than in traditional categories of actuality and omnipotence. Such a God, who appears, for example, to Moses in the desert and who, rather than simply snatch out His people with a display of mighty power, prompts the timid Moses to act in His name, encourages cooperation in the building of the Kingdom. (98, 99) For Kearney, injustice is a problem of recognition of the “other” and he hermeneutically interprets Biblical texts for the meaning of justice.

In The God Who May Be, Kearney engages in what he calls a phenomenology of the persona. Persona is defined as “this capacity of each of us to receive and respond to the divine invitation” (2). The invitation is to transfiguration and Kearney addresses what he calls the “crucial contemporary debates on the notion of an eschatological God who transfigures and desires” (9). Biblical transfiguration is a symbolic language of knowing that describes the possibility of the transfiguration of the other as the “otherness of the other.” Persona is there but cannot be grasped; it escapes...
our gaze. There is an enigma of presence-absence. Thus, the future possibility of the other is impossible for me to know: “The persona is always already there and always still to come” (12). Regardless, there is a desire to fuse or to appropriate the other’s persona that is related to the desire to fuse with God. This requires, however, a present God. But the presence of God requires transfiguration, a God, who according to Kearney, may be yet to come. In contrast, Kearney suggests that: “To this fusionary sameness of the One I would oppose the eschatological universality of the Other” (15). Thus, one’s capacity to lead for justice through defining and knowing the other is shown to be impossible and attention is turned toward an ethical call for transfiguration of the self: “The fact that universal justice is an eschatological possible-still-to-come creates a sense of urgency and exigency, inviting each person to strive for instantiation, however partial and particular, in each given situation” (15). Kearney is saying that universal justice is a possibility to come but justice resides in every individual act in every moment.

Kearney provides examples of the meaning of transfiguration and the other. In his biblical interpretation, the human role is the acceptance of the gift of universal justice (the Kingdom of heaven on earth) or transfiguration. As an example, Kearney interprets Moses and the epiphany of the burning bush. Recounting the story and describing Moses as a man who longed for a God of justice and liberty, Kearney deconstructs common interpretations from the Biblical text of the meaning of God’s name. He suggests that a more meaningful (true) translation might be “I am who may be” rather than “I who am” or “I who am not.” Kearney contrasts his view of the signature of a God of the possible with the onto-theological reading of the story which views that “the proper name of God revealed in Exodus 3:14 is none other than the absolute identity of divine being and essence” (23). In this onto-theological view, God is conceptualized as a categorical being with substance (definable yet remaining transcendentally undefinable). The divergent eschatological interpretation emphasizes “the ethical and dynamic character of God” (25). The focus is placed on the I/Thou relationship whereby the promise of the Kingdom from God is realized through human ethical living. Kearney explains: Here God commits Himself to a kingdom of justice if his faithful commit themselves to it too; the promise of Sinai calls forth a corresponding decision on behalf of the people. To phrase this otherwise: the I puts it to the Thou that the promise can be realized only if those who receive it do not betray its potential for the future. Not that this is a matter of conditional exchange—turning the Exodus revelation into an economy of give-and-take. No, the promise is granted unconditionally, as a pure gift. But God is reminding his people that they are free to accept or refuse this gift. A gift cannot be imposed; it can only be offered. A gift neither is nor is not; it gives. (29)

Because of this, Kearney calls for a new hermeneutic of God as May-Be, an onto-eschatological hermeneutics, or a “poetics of the possible” (37).

Kearney further explores the Biblical meaning of transfiguration through the narratives telling of Mount Thabor and the four paschal apparitions. At Mount Thabor, according to Kearney, the person of Jesus is “metamorphosed” into the persona of Christ. Among the many meanings of the transfiguration, Kearney emphasizes the call to avoid making Christ an idol: The disciples’ effort to fix Christ as a fetish of presence, imposing their own designs on him, make it necessary for God to intercede from the cloud and bid them attend to Christ’s otherness: “Listen to him!” In this manner, the voice of transcendence speaks through Christ as divine persona, thereby arresting the idolatrous impulse of Peter, James, and John to fuse with his person or possess him as a cult object. (42)

This allows for a messianic persona of Christ beyond the finite person Jesus of Nazareth providing a preview of the kingdom to come, a call to/from God. Again, however, “this eschatological promise requires not only grace but ethical action on our part” (45). Kearney supports this by recounting the four accounts of the narrative paschal testimonies of the resurrected Christ. In these accounts, Christ was not recognized at first by those who knew him even though there was a common sharing of food. But, most importantly, Kearney reminds us: The post-paschal stories of the transfiguring persona remind us that the Kingdom is given to the hapless fishermen and spurned women, to those lost and wondering on the road from Jerusalem to nowhere, to the wounded and weak and hungry, to those who lack and do not despair of their lack, to little people “poor in spirit.” (51)

May those of us working for peace and justice be known by our fruits, our “fruits of love and justice, care and gift” (49). But if my reading of Kearney is fair, my work for justice begins with me, in each moment, and in each interaction; not as an essentialized prescription to
transform/transfigure “others.”
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Introduction

Humankind’s need to divide a whole picture into separate manageable pieces as a practical way of thinking leads to the inevitable belief in a world constituted of separately existent fragments. To overcome this consequence, educators must develop the capacity to journey beyond a fragmented understanding of seemingly unrelated facts toward a succinct recognizable whole picture and travel back into the chaos with an awareness of the existing simple patterns that create the whole picture.

This paper considers the juxtaposition between the creation story told in Genesis and the theoretical literature on civilizational development as an exercise in exploring complex relationships. Such an analysis develops an understanding of the “observed consequences” which made for the adaptation or adjustment of civilization as represented in Genesis. Our purpose is not to propose a new model, or support one argument over another, but to look at the non-linear aspect that sheds light on the complexity associated with societal transformation. This study looks at the larger societal system and explores patterns of development and dynamics on a broad scale over a long time frame. By exploring stories to identify patterns and test insights, we further develop our capacity to think and act more effectively. This study is based on the idea that the evolutionary development of any civilization occurs for specific purposes and that the development of institutions fulfill specific developmental needs. By emphasizing evolutionary universals this study introduces the stages of the journey through Genesis that document humankind’s earliest attempt to record patterns of civilizational development that transcend geography, religion, government or any other unique feature.

Genesis and Universals

Whether Genesis is viewed as a prototype or template of evolving civilization, the story provides clear examples of what Talcott Parsons (1966) claimed were social evolutionary universals. An evolutionary universal is any stage of organizational development so essential to further evolution that it emerges in different civilizations and under different conditions. The theory of social evolution is based on the idea that societies follow predictable patterns of development toward advanced civilization. Subtheories within social evolution vary in the extent to which societies include all steps and elements. Unilinear theory claims that all societies follow the same prescribed steps and incorporate the same elements. Multilinear theorists recognize dispositions common to most rising societies such as the progression from smaller to larger, simpler to more complex, rural to urban, and low-technology to high-technology. However, multilinear theorists argue that societies vary greatly in both content and patterns of development.

To many scholars the Book of Genesis maintains a multifaceted identity. From one perspective it represents humankind’s early beliefs about the origins and development of life, and is the introduction to the religious and historical relationship between God and man. On another level, the Book of Genesis details the evolution of human civilization as it grew from a solitary man and woman to a handful of nations with distinct languages, separate cultural identities, bureaucratic authority, and an understanding of property rights and money markets. Any interpretation must be undertaken with an understanding that the intent of Genesis was to write an early history of humanity.

Bruce Vawter’s (1997) analysis of Genesis concluded that much of early Genesis is based on myth; however, he concluded that it was “only mildly mythical.” The chronicling of civilizational development is an example of the fusion of fact and myth that Vawter referred to.

Primitive Technology

Among the purposes of Genesis were to chronicle the evolution of human civilization as well as the growth and increasing sophistication of institutions. Civilizational development in the primitive technological stage involved the development of conceptual structures that provided the foundations on which more advanced technological development took place at later times. Primitive technological development was necessary to provide the support on which later technological development rested. Developments during this preliminary stage included the development of language, property rights, normative laws and efforts to adapt natural resources to meet human needs.

Genesis reveals two different profiles of existence during the biblical account of creation. The first profile revealed a world devoid of order or structure without any boundaries between light and darkness and differentiation between matter (Genesis 1:2-8). The process of creation appeared to intend to bring organization to the world and to introduce a conceptual essentialness to understanding existence. The creation of humankind was intended to help bring further order into the world.
Earth was represented as uncultivated and unkept until humans were assigned to bring it into order (Genesis 1:26, 2:15). Humankind lacked the ability to grasp a world without order or structure; to grasp the whole, human beings divided the whole based on differences, identified unique features, and categorized objects based on similarities. Adam, Eve and their children continued their charge to bring order to the earth through farming and herding even after their expulsion from the Garden of Eden (Genesis 3:23, 4:2). Such adaptation included the collection of foods, the killing of small game and occasional killing of large game. Little planning for the future occurred and it is unlikely that food production was sufficient to provide for a stored surplus for the fallow season. Further civilizational development occurred in the account of Cain’s demarcation land for agricultural use. The first city became inevitable when Cain put up the first fence and established the idea of personal property and landed development. Cain’s choice to pursue an agricultural life influenced the role he and his descendants played in civilizational development. One of the earliest forms of social organization is the development of boundaries, both physical and political. This tendency to establish property rights grew, leading to Cain eventually being credited for the creation of the first city (Genesis 4:17).

Genesis introduces the earliest emergence of a leader in the form of Cain. Societal development requires some form of centralized authority to coordinate the actions and energy of others. Though his methods were admittedly questionable, Cain’s removal of his brother isolated Cain from the rest of existent humanity and set the stage for him to emerge as a power figure. It would have been more difficult for Cain to found a city with his brother. Founding a city requires a leader; however, there exists a natural sense of equality between brothers. The killing of Abel was a political as well as criminal act in the respect that it led to Cain’s emergence as a central authority figure.

Further organizational development occurred following the great flood with the first codified law. The destruction of humanity in the flood was necessitated by humankind’s behavior (Genesis 7:5-6). Not only was humankind’s creation as source of regret, but they were found to be guilty of repeated failures (Genesis 7:5-6). The giving of the law following the flood was intended to correct a lack of normative expectation that humanity did not have in the pre-flood existence. Law regulated humankind’s existence with others, with the environment, and helped humanity develop in a regulated manner. The Hebrew acceptance of divine law is an example of cultural legitimation in the context of religion. Its reciprocal relationship with God assured a sense of order in which the Hebrews agreed to adhere to divine law and God adhered to certain conditions.

Communication must exist to make the sharing of culture and norms possible. Parsons (1966) identifies language as a common evolutionary universal. Initially Genesis documents that all humanity spoke a single language (Genesis 11:1). The period after the flood accounts for the diversification of language. The diversification of language parallels the spread of humans across the globe and the distinction of national identities (Genesis 11:7-8, 9:5 and 10:31). A variety of cities develop shortly after the end of the flood, including the origins of Egypt (Genesis 10:11-13). In addition to cities, Genesis also documents the development of distinct cultural identities such as Jebusites, Amorites, Girgasites (Genesis 10:16), Hivites, Arkites, Sinites (Genesis 10:17), Ar vadites, Zemarites and the Hamathites (Genesis 10:18).

**Subsistence Technology**

Michael Rosenberg (1998) suggests sedentism is an essential transitional stage if society is to evolve. However, he argues that the transition is a process of increasing pressure toward land use that functions in attendant conditions of defense cost versus intensified exploitation. He also maintains that theories explaining the shift from hunter-gatherer to sedentary lifestyle as the result of energy efficient means of producing adequate amounts of food do not address key factors such as drought, or human predators. He describes the growing specialization in a society as first necessary to the defense, and second, the catalyst for conflict in an agrarian societies that necessitated differentiation.

The third chapter of Genesis indicated that while in the Garden of Eden Adam and Eve’s needs were met by gathering food from the trees in the garden. Once they were forced to work the ground for food, diversification soon followed, “Now Abel kept flock, and Cain worked the soil” (Genesis 4:2). Parson’s describes stratification and differentiation as social evolutionary universals. Andrew Schmookler (1995) claims that environmental factors and influences weigh so heavily upon a hunter-gather society that the possibilities for advancement become limited. Schmookler suggests that after diversification, supply and demand form the catalyst for stratification.

Differentiation in a society leads to clear values assigned to specific roles or functions. Ranks develop into stratified classes from role values. Parsons (1966) also suggests that as the complexity of a society increases so do the problems of maintaining order. The murder of Abel in Genesis 4:8 was a clear example of
such internal conflict resulting from differentiation and territorial jurisdiction. The Bible did not provide an explanation for why God rejected Cain’s offering, but clearly diversification is evident (Genesis 4:2). Different values were assigned to products, “In the course of time Cain brought some of the fruits of the soil as an offering to the Lord. But, Abel brought fat portions from some of the firstborn of his flock. The Lord looked with favor on Abel and his offering, but on Cain and his offering he did not look with favor” (Genesis 4:3). Parsons (1966)'s theory of societal evolution also provides insight into the societal transformation evident in Genesis as related to differentiated roles in a diversified society. Able became a shepherd, Cain a farmer (4:8), and Jabal was the father of those who live in tents and raised livestock (Genesis 4:20).

Differentiation may be beneficial in some respects, however; it poses new problems in terms of integration. Society must therefore develop an authority system in order to offset any potential fragmentation that may result from increased differentiation. Theoretical perspectives on societal development inform us that as societal population increasingly expands a vertical hierarchy becomes necessary in order to maintain internal order and stability. Differentiation must also increase adaptive capacity so that individuals can fulfill their roles in society and enable the development of a more balanced and involved system.

One of the evolutionary universals of social organization is the tendency to develop vertically along ascribed kinship as a society prospers from the gathering of economic and political power. This partly results as families with distant or non-existent connections to political and economic elites are moved to less prosperous residential locations and engage in less productive occupations. Individuals who are physically and economically marginalized lack the political power to challenge their disadvantaged circumstances. Specialization and centralization of political and religious responsibility further the development of social stratification. Such stratification typically develops along lines of kinship where status and benefits are conferred by birth.

Increasing size and diversity represent further challenges to maintaining a cohesive society. The development of a hierarchical status system makes it easier for a civilization to establish and maintain a system of values, beliefs and traditions in order to develop a common cultural identity which overrides smaller group identities. Parsons (1966) concludes this is administratively accomplished by the centralization of religious and political responsibility. Genesis 3:16 “and he shall rule over you” referred to one of the first efforts at civilizational development and organization along hierarchical lines. There was a need for leadership to coordinate survival activities, because life outside the garden was presumably more difficult than life inside. The idea of the rise of a ruling body occurred again in Genesis 4:7 when God told Cain that “unto thee (Cain) shall be his (Abel’s) desire, and thou shalt rule over him.”

Languages continued to diversify through the period of subsistence technology. The diversification of languages and development of distinct cultural identities challenges the cohesiveness of a group or nation. Cultural legitimation was another evolutionary universal identified by Parsons (1966) and was also evident in Genesis. Cultural legitimation refers to the development of characteristics, values, and traditions that identify and set apart a group of people from others. Such identifiable characteristics must also include religion and relations to the sacred, gods and holy places. Underlying cultural legitimation is an individual’s desire to obtain a meaning and purpose for their life. According to Richard Rorty (1991) there are two opposing means used by human beings to provide meaning, purpose and explanation to their lives. In the first manner groups tell their stories in the context of a bigger picture; however, the community is used as the larger context. The second manner uses a higher power as the background for the story. Individuals strive to explain the legitimate value of their existence. Certain groups in a larger society are used to define a person’s place and purpose in the world. These groups are formed as an attempt to gain cohesiveness as well as to define meaning and value among and between groups of individuals. Both stratification and cultural legitimation address the problems that arise as a society becomes more highly specialized. Specialization most successfully occurs when a culture is sufficiently stable and defined that common loyalties are not threatened by specialization. Role differentiation and role assignment begins with differentiation by age and gender with later differentiation based on physical and learning capacities. As society becomes more complex individual work roles become increasingly specialized. Specialization that is allowed to randomly occur ultimately creates a state of disorder. Specialization must be coordinated by some type of authority in order for society to develop in an orderly manner.

As society becomes more complex there is an increased possibility that conflicting interests may develop and create conflict. The root of these conflicts can be quite complex in nature. Policy implications of
systematic reform require an understanding of the dynamics of complex relationships. Jay Forrester (1975) describes the benefits of system dynamics as a way to help the learner develop “more effective way(s) of interpreting the complexities of the world around them.” Possessing the ability to interpret and understand the interpersonal relationship dynamics deepens and expands awareness of the complexity of multiple interests in a way that can bring clarity to the relationships that exist within a society. Interdependence requires the development of rules that govern interpersonal interactions and hold society together with a core set of commonalities. Such commonalities ensure that the population adhered to collective values that “approved, permitted, and prohibited forms of interpersonal and more complex transactions.”

Conquering Technology

The idea of civilizational conquest is doubtless likely to generate more controversy than anything in this paper; however, history records numerous examples of civilizations that sought to conquer others and leave their own lasting imprint on the world. The development of technology is central to conquest as technological development has been vital to civilizational evolution. There are diverse reasons for why a civilization seeks to conquer another. Some reach a stage of advancement superior to those that surrounded it and decide to take advantage of an opportune situation; some view other civilizations as intellectually, culturally or racially inferior and feel no moral conflict about imposing their own ways on others; some seek expansion for economic gains whether the gains be in the form of increased trade or acquisition of fertile land, for example.

Societal expansion and conquest bring with them certain specific difficulties that must be overcome if expansion is to be successful after the period of conquest had ended. It becomes important to develop a system that will maintain internal order as a society or population expands and becomes increasingly diverse due to increased technology and role specialization. Furthermore, the diversification of language and specialization of labor risk the fragmentation of cultural identity that gives society cohesiveness. Emile Durkheim (1983) was highly aware of the problems a society faces when becoming increasingly specialized. He was particularly interested in the problem of maintaining internal social cohesion as a society became increasingly differentiated and its population expanded.

The period after the flood reflects an emphasis on a heightened sense of order and structure. The first attempt to bring order to the world is evident in God’s legal structure which humanity is commanded to obey. The first example of post-flood order is God’s mandate that humans shall be allowed to eat the flesh of animals as food, but not allowed to consume their blood (Genesis 9:4-6). The second example consists of a covenant between God and humans in which God agrees that there will be no further flooding or attempts to extinguish human existence in the world (Genesis 9:9-17). The law and covenant given to Noah mark the politicization of life for humanity. Humanity is at this point given a code of behavior and the responsibility for behaving in a lawful manner.

Conclusions and Analysis

A comparison of the Book of Genesis and theoretical literature on civilizational development reveals a series of parallels chronicling the story of the development of human civilization. Civilizational development in the primitive technological stage involved the development of conceptual structures that provided the foundations on which technological development took place at later times. Primitive technological development was necessary to provide the support on which later technological development rested. Advances during this preliminary stage included the evolution of language, property rights and normative laws. Primitive technology also included the earliest efforts to adapt natural resources to meet human needs.

The idea of social efficiency is one of the core purposes of education. Social efficiency is grounded in the idea that natural development alone cannot guarantee that an individual will be capable of adequately functioning in society. “It is not surprising to find that the value in the idea of social efficiency resides largely in its protest against the points at which the doctrine of natural development went astray . . .” Social efficiency rejects nature as sufficient to educate humanity. The same distinction is made in Genesis with the first Covenant and handing of law to humanity by God. Prior to the flood humans had a natural kinship with animals. Following the flood that sense of kinship was discontinued. Humanity adopted a political bond that accompanied the acceptance of law, and the relationship with animals was recast as man looked to them as a source of food.

In terms of understanding societal evolution it is important to understand the role that social institutions play in the enhancement of adaptive capacity. We must be concerned with the evolutionary development of societies, both as wholes in their principal structural parts and as unique in the content of that structure. According to Parsons (1966) the primary organizational patterns of modern societies share commonalities. One philosophy of societal evolution regards the
development of institutions as natural rather than artificial. Moore reminds us that social institutions are not the result of random innovation, but are the direct result of deliberate human problem solving and are intended to solve human problems. Such perspectives recognize that societal development progresses through a series of predictable stages toward an absolute goal. G. W. F. Hegel’s philosophy (2007) reflected the idea of evolutionary stages as he listed institutions on a linear time frame while reflecting his advocacy of the idea that the human mind is rational in nature. Each successive institution must be reached in order to progress toward the next step.

Explanations for societal development must maintain an explicit connection between development and human needs. For example, one of the criticisms of functionalist theory is that it has not given adequate attention to the mediating factor of human need. Functionalist theory has tended to explain societal change and adaptation in terms of abstract, societal need rather than direct benefit to the individual. An understanding of civilizational change in this study is examined from the perspective that its impact on individuals as social systems unlike organisms do not have any need or interest in their own survival. Evolutionary universals must be understood in terms of the contribution they make to the operation of the social system and the direct benefit conferred to the individual. Individuals can express a desire for institutions or practices to develop or survive; however, institutions or practices cannot express such human sentiments.
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Introduction

In common usage, to judge is to form an opinion. Opinions can be based on either objective or subjective criteria. When based on objective criteria or substantive an opinion is transformed into a fact, a transcendent “truth” of nature. When based on subjective criteria, or no criteria at all, an opinion never rises above its nascent state, a feeling. The distinction between objective and subjective opinions as forms of judgment is fundamentally important in a democratic society.

The following is a Critical Enquiry into the role of American public education in light of its historical purpose to prepare children to make democratically appropriate ethical political judgments when they assume the office of citizen. The brief essay begins with a consideration of the meaning of judgment in Western thought from Plato to Immanuel Kant then locates within Plato’s philosophical discourse—and mirrored by Kant—the notion of objective opinion that effectively negates the possibility of judgment within modern democratic political discourse.

Judgment

An exhaustive history of the notion of judgment is not necessary for this enquiry given the dominance of Western thought beginning with the early Greeks then more firmly institutionalized by Immanuel Kant at the dawn of the Modern epistemé. A sufficient beginning would be the historical moment when the Sophist were being vilified by Socrates and his followers, in particular Plato. Essentially, the sophists project was a concern for Man himself, not in locating a transcendent Truth outside of human subjectivity. The sophist, Protagoras, who believed that there was no such thing as objective, real knowledge, perhaps best expressed the sophist belief in his famous utterance, “Man is the measure of all things.” In short, for the sophists to judge was to express an opinion regardless of its claimed objective or subjective character. Plato would not fully disagree. The difference was that while Protagoras located the validity of an opinion entirely within the mind of the person making the judgment, Plato would hold valid only those opinions that located the validity within a domain of ideas that transcended human subjectivity. For Plato, these ideas were natural, universal, and invariable. They were objective.

Consistent with the notion that to judge is to form an opinion, Plato defines judgment as the conclusion of thinking and thinking as a “dialogue of the mind itself” (Soph 264b). That is, the act of thinking must reside between a thought and a corollary valuing action relative to the thought — making a judgment. For Plato, thought relative to judgment does not include all thought, in particular those emanating from sense experiences. For example, in Plato’s Theaetetus dialogue, Socrates, Theaetetus, and a stranger set out to discuss what knowledge is, but, instead, conclude as to what it is not. Socrates tells Theaetetus that “we must not look for knowledge in mere sense perceptions, but in what goes on when the mind is occupied with things by itself, whatever name you might give it [emphasis added].” Theaetetus replies, “Well, Socrates, the name for that, I imagine, is judgment” (Theaetetus 187b). Socrates emphatically agrees.

Fast forward to Kant. In the first two of his famous critiques of the three ultimate modes of consciousness—knowledge, desire, and feeling---Kant undertook the task of establishing a priori principles of understanding as the basis of the faculty of knowledge in his Critique of Pure Reason and reason the faculty of desire Critique of Practical Reason. Relative to feelings, Kant concluded in his Critique of Judgment, that “[I]n the family of supreme cognitive faculties there is a middle term between the understanding and reason. This is judgment [emphasis added], of which we have cause supposing according to analogy that it may contain itself, if not a special legislation, yet a special principle of its own to be sought according to laws [emphasis added], though merely subjective a priori.” Consistent with Plato, Kant effectively eliminates all subjective criteria, the essence of pure opinion, from the domain of judgment.

As with both understanding and reason, Kant believed that there are a priori principles at the core of judgment. According to the Kantian scholar J. H. Bernard, for Kant, “... the fundamental principle underlying the procedure of judgment is seen to be that of purposiveness of nature; nature is everywhere adapted to ends and purposes, and thus constitutes a cosmos, a well-ordered whole.” In Kant’s words:

Judgment in general is the faculty of thinking the particular as contained under the universal. If the universal (the rule, the principle, the law) be given, the judgment which subsumes the particular under it (even if, as transcendental judgment, it furnishes, a
priori, the conditions in conformity with which subsumption under the universal is alone possible) is determinant. But if only the particular be given for which the universal has to be found, the judgment is merely reflective [emphases in the original].

The above brief history of judgment in Western societies, at least, reveals that judgment as it is understood in the Modern epistemé is not to be mere subjective opinion as the sophist would argue, but opinion based on some a priori criteria that transcends human subjectivity, which is not opinion at all, but a logical conclusion from an objective “truth.” If not opinion, then can it be judgment? For Galileo it was not his mere opinion that the earth revolved around the sun as the Church had opined. Galileo used incontrovertible empirical objective evidence to prove his point; thus, he negated any semblance of judgment from his conclusion.

Judgment and Politics

Democracy as a form of politics, which can be succinctly defined as “the struggle over the allocation of social values and resources,” was born out of a need for social, economic, and legal stability in societies encompassing culturally diverse opinions on many aspects of life and after life. Consequently, subjective opinion is the essence of politics in a democratic society. If so, then relative to judgment what ought to be the ethical obligation of a citizen in a democratic society in light of the relationship of the individual to the commonweal? This question is particularly important for American citizens given The Constitution of the United States that embodies the legal principles that serve as the foundation for governance and establishes citizen as the primary political office.

Unique for its time, this open, qua public, loosely connected, and multilayered structure of government is not simply an accident of history, but was deliberately constructed by the Founders. The most radical aspect of the structure was that the people would govern themselves in a delicate balance between their own best individual interests and the best interests of all other citizens as well. Consequently, the collective “We” that opens the Constitution and the singular “I” which is at the center of the Bill of Rights together constitute the locus of ethical tensions that condition the character of a citizen’s political judgments. In homogeneous societies a citizen’s ethical political obligations to others would not be an issue; thus, judgment would not be necessary because laws and/or cultural norms would rule. For example, in the extreme, Aldous Huxley addressed this issue in his classic novel, Brave New World. Here society simply “manufactures” compliant like minded citizens as illustrated in the following.

“Consider the matter dispassionately, Mr. Foster, and you will see that no offence is so heinous as unorthodoxy of behaviour. Murder kills only the individual—and after all, what is an individual?” With a sweeping gesture he indicated the rows of microscopes, the test-tubes, and incubators. “We can make a new one with the greatest of ease—as many as we like. Unorthodoxy threatens more than the life of an individual; it strikes at society itself. Yes, at Society itself,” he repeated. Plato addresses the problem of unorthodoxy somewhat differently. He does so by effectively negating judgment from all discourse. The noted Plato scholar Edith Hamilton summarized that in Book VII of his Republic dialogue Plato presents the argument that “to order a state rightly men’s souls must be raised to behold a universal light. There is truth beyond this shifting changing world and men can seek to find it.”

This “universal light” is the ultimate domain of objective truth, which negates the possibility of subjective opinion, which is judgment itself. Plato goes further and declares that, “When judgment takes the form of a public decision it has the name of law (Laws I: 644d).”

The Negation of Judgment in Education

If the purpose of American public education is in fact to prepare citizens to make political judgments consistent with the Constitution, then what should be the character of the curriculum and schooling practices? If citizens are to make judgments, then they should have at least two opinion options for every political judgment required. Given the current emphasis on standardized achievement tests of knowledge, this is impossible. These tests are designed to elicit only one “right” answer for each question; thus eliminating any possibility for different opinions to be expressed, or even considered. Foucault recognized the power of the examination to control.

The examination combines the techniques of an observing hierarchy and those of a normalizing judgement. It is a normalizing gaze, a surveillance that makes it possible to qualify, to classify and to punish. It establishes over individuals a visibility through which one differentiates them and judges them. This is why, in all the mechanisms of discipline, the examination is highly ritualized. In it are combined the ceremony of power and the form of the experiment, the deployment of force and the establishment of truth. At the heart of the procedures of discipline, it manifests the subjection of those who are perceived as objects and the objectification
of those who are subjected. The superimposition of the power relations and knowledge relations assumes in the examination all of its visible brilliance.\textsuperscript{11}

Foucault locates political power in discourse broadly defined, especially institutionally sanctioned discourse and discourse communicated through institutional practices. He expressed this belief in the following::

\textsuperscript{12} [I]n every society the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organized and redistributed according to a certain number of procedures, whose role is to avert its power and its dangers, to cope with chance events, to evade its ponderous, awesome materiality.

Particularly important for democratic societies is Foucault’s warning of the power of educational institutions to control discourse. Education may well be, as of right, the instrument whereby every individual, in a society like our own, can gain access to any kind of discourse. But we well know that in its distribution, in what it permits and what it prevents, it follows the well-trodden battle-lines of social conflict. Every educational system is a political means of maintaining or modifying the appropriation of discourse, with the knowledge and power it carries with it.\textsuperscript{13}

ENDNOTES

1. Critical Enquiry signifies an ongoing project of the author and his students. The purpose of the project is to develop approaches to American public education policy enquiry that emphasize the analysis and interpretation of discourses that create, maintain, and justify the structures and technologies of institutions functioning within particular social, political, economic, and legal contexts. The notion of discourse relative to the Critical Enquiry (CE) project includes meanings consciously expressed through narratives, including not only phonetic and graphic texts, signs, and symbols, but individual and group behaviors and institutional practices. The capital “C” in Critical emphasizes social criticism at the most fundamental level of what ought to constitute ideal, just, democratic social structures. The capital “E” in Enquiry recognizes that the more traditional spelling is best used when engaged in “asking about” at a fundamental philosophical level. In this regard, the Critical Enquiry project challenges the assumptions of traditional quantitative and qualitative approaches to policy “research.”


4. Kant, xvi.

5. Kant, 15.


13. Ibid.
Beijing to Broadway: A Conversation of the Possible Relationships at Work Among Cultural Transmission, Language Acquisition, and the Arts

Clydia Forehand, Tulsa Public Schools

Introduction

This presentation intends to begin a conversation encircling the ways that the arts inform, guide, and explore the educational processes at work in language learning. It also reports on current research into the criticality of Chinese language learning in American classrooms (U.S. Dept. of Education, 2006) and the value of aligning non-primary language acquisition with deeper understandings of culturally-informed meaning, focusing on the arts as ways of crafting such alignment and of creating nexus between language and meaning. Questions of how language is acquired, how understandings of culture may be guided by non-heritage learners, and how the arts may facilitate these processes are explored with a special concentration on potential ways that barriers to acquiring Chinese language and cultural understanding may be transcended through understandings of and experiences with the arts.

This project is informed by literature advocating the value of creativity, artistic expression, and the cultural belonging that music, dance, theater, and visual arts grant to individuals, whether those individuals are inside or outside of a specific cultural identity. Additionally, classroom research (conducted at an American elementary-level Chinese exchange school), and recent trips to China, (one a research project conducted through the U.S. Department of Education; the other, a cultural project funded by the Freeman Foundation), grant additional understandings to this presentation. Grown from these experiences, this project wonders if the arts are contributors not only to a sense of “other-culture” belonging in certain ways, but to a growing understanding of (or in a sense “mirroring”) American culture, as well.

Thoughts on Ways that the Arts May Transcend Cultural Barriers

Project Overview

The Great Wall of China, historically a deterrent to Mongol invasions, in the current time is also considered as a philosophical, artistic, and architectural symbol of cultural bounding, especially by Westerners. Grown from this notion, the Wall evokes questions of how boundaries of culture often keep “outsiders” out while, at the same time identifying and drawing together those that are “inside,” essentially and effectively isolating each from the other. The arts have been determined by various authors as, alternately, ways of creating cultural separateness and also as ways of transcending cultural barriers (Bateson, 1972; Heidegger, 1971, Nietzsche, 1966)

In the summer of 2007, in the city of Hangzhou, Zhejiang Province (China), several American arts educators questioned this dualism, operating as part of a larger U.S. Department of Education grant-funded project that was conducted under the direction of Valparaiso University’s Asian Studies Department. I was one of those educators. Although not all of us were teaching artists, those of us who were collaboratively explored China’s arts through our various disciplines (music, dance, theater, architecture, and other visual arts) as potential pathways toward transcending barriers to cultural awareness and Chinese language learning in our American classrooms. (There were several other projects approved through this grant; I only discuss here the one for which I prepared a report.)

Exploratory Question and Methods of Inquiry

Our explorations addressed the question, “How might China’s arts become for our students windows into Chinese culture, rather than walls separating that culture from our own American experience?” Guided by the practices of both education and the arts, we organized our discussions, experiences and discoveries into a system that was intended to grow new questions. This system was constructed to include several factors that coordinated to craft a sense of process or flow (Csikszentmihalyi, 1998). Included in this system—as processes—were the identification of cultural barriers, of art forms specific to Chinese cultural understanding, of teaching strategies appropriate to acknowledging these barriers and addressing these understandings, of experiences and resources that we gathered while in China, and considered next steps that we projected forward for our work with students in our American classrooms. We met as a group on several occasions to share our growing insights and new questions as part of this system, eventually creating a graphic organizer which we have included in the Data gathering processes section. Prior to our departure from Hangzhou, we met one last time and created a reflective narrative intended to outline potential next steps for how our work might be continued. That narrative is included in this report under a Findings and next steps heading. This process, for me, had a “pre-beginning” of sorts, growing out of
an earlier trip to China, funded through the Freeman Foundation, and an earlier article submitted to this journal. This paper, then, is a continuation of that earlier one that questioned the arts as “Walls, Windows, or Bridges Across Culture.”

Creating conditions for questioning structure

Questions about how culturally-biased—and educated—are our perceptions about structure emerged out of a discussion that took place in my elementary music classroom in the fall of 2006. As I showed a photograph of the Great Wall, one of my students asked, “Are you sure that’s a wall?” When I assured him I was quite sure, he responded, “Well, look at it. From up high like that, it looks more like a bridge” (Ridley, in classroom discussion, September, 2006).

That this question sprang from this child evidences a sense of irony. When our school originally committed to integrating Chinese studies throughout the grades and disciplines, this child and his family had been resistant. In the three years since that time, this student had undergone a rather dramatic change from stating (the first time he heard Chinese music), “I can’t listen to that crap. It hurts!” (April, 2004) to “You’re going to China this summer? Could you bring back some real Peking Opera stuff?” (April, 2007)

This paper, then, considers the dual possibilities of the arts, questioning, “How might walls (separating insiders from outsiders) be changed into bridges over which outsiders might be carried in?” and, alternately, “How might windows (through which one group might merely peek inside) become mirrors in which each culture might discover itself anew, as it finds reflection in the other?”

Data gathering processes

Our processes for gathering data were drawn from our understandings about the arts, as well as our experiences with the arts and with each other while in China. As such, process and outcome have a great deal of overlap: conversations about the cultural barriers we believe exist and how arts might alleviate them revealed a diverse array of perceptions about and experiences with culture, arts, teaching and learning. The exercise of conversation, itself, revealed a great deal about the fundamental impact of collaborative processing (an intrinsic element of the arts) on the development of questioning, developing plans of action, scope and sequence, and thinking beyond “the one right answer” and into “next steps.” Table 1 is intended to show how the process emerged.

Findings and next steps

This conversational data-generating process granted several findings in response to the question, “How might China’s arts become for our students windows into Chinese culture, rather than walls separating that culture from our own American experience?” We considered the various boundaries to learning to include an American confusion between the various periods of Chinese history: the ancient, the Cultural Revolution, and the present. We wondered at ways that the arts could distinguish among the three eras. Crafting a list of artforms that are specifically Chinese, we carefully extended this list as far as possible to include gardening, cooking, and others that might not usually be included as arts. Our reasons for doing so grew from our own philosophies that arts are not just those “things” that are relegated to museums but are, in actuality, activities that are present in and fundamental to everyday living (Dewey, 1934, 9). The holistic, unbounded nature of the arts (much more evident in the East than in the West) granted us a fresh understanding of how the arts may transcend cultural barriers, not only between East and West but among individual members of Western cultures, as they exist and interact within those cultures. We began to wonder if differing perceptions of the arts might, indeed, create some of these barriers. The following includes thoughts about the arts, alternately considered as barriers and as vehicles to transcending barriers. These thoughts grew out of conversations among these teaching artists on two occasions. They are identified by speaker (I attempt to introduce each briefly), and by date. Each quote was transcribed in real time—as the conversations unfolded—and verified by all participants. All of these conversations took place in Hangzhou, Zhejiang Province, China.

Point one

Like walls and windows, the arts may be both boundaries and vehicles; ones through which passage is possible—after evidence is offered that a rite of passage has been observed.

Chinese music is different from anything in an American child’s general experience. If you’re American you don’t just automatically like all of it. There’s a process involved. Discovering folk music that expresses a feeling they can really feel is important. Getting them involved in it, too. Outside of folk music? Opera? It’s taken my students four years to really get it (Clydia, elementary music teacher at a Chinese exchange/arts school, in Oklahoma, July 10, 2007)

I get my students into it by letting them ‘hear’ Peking Opera with the sound off. Once they’re hooked [with the props, movements, pageantry, acrobatics] I go back and
explain it to them. Then we listen to it (Bonnie, dance instructor at a California high school, July 6, 2007) Point two
In ways similar to walls and windows, the arts offer multiple and changing perspectives—a sense of dynamism, newness, meaning and understanding, as new discoveries invite new questions: How important are arts learning, arts experience, and arts exploration to the study of Chinese culture? How can the arts engage students in the study of Chinese language and culture? And, is there a potential for misunderstanding “otherness?”

I bought some Chinese hip-hop music and, aside from not being able to understand all of the words, my students in America would totally get it. I think that means that globalization removes cultural barriers? (Wynne, an American-born Chinese teacher of Mandarin at a New York City high school, June 30, 2007).
So where is the line between transcending cultural barriers and homogeneity? What role do the arts play in the celebration of cultural diversity? (Clydia, June 30, 2007)
There’s always a danger of the arts being accepted as overall representations of ‘culture’ but that’s a mistake. They’re like the tip of an iceberg. They represent just a small part of what the culture is all about. Rather than asking, ‘What are the arts of a culture trying to tell us?’ What we need to be asking is, ‘How do a culture’s arts express their worldview?’ (Alice, arts coordinator at a private elementary school in Boston, July 20, 2007)
Point three
The arts offer new ways of thinking about structures: they offer metaphorical ways to think about, interpret, and be involved with a culture that is not ours.
We could think of it this way: The arts are boats that carry us from one iceberg to another. They allow us to recognize similarities and to also celebrate differences (Bonnie, July 6, 2007)
Point four
Adapting new ways of thinking (bridges, boats, mirrors) we realize that the arts offer ways to transcend cultural difference through the ways that they communicate process.
To integrate arts and culture within a curriculum is to see beyond cultural arts as ‘products’ and to rejoice in the connections that grow between people within artistic processes. It’s a way of seeing the arts—as arts. Chinese/American—from any culture—as they negotiate the processes of creating music together, they truly do transcend culture and language barriers. The music (or dance, art, theater) invites ‘others’ from another culture—inside—to see in a new way (Clydia, July 10, 2007)
Point five
The idea of transcending cultural barriers invites a two-directional approach to teaching and learning, one that is conditioned through the expressive qualities of the arts.
If I were to teach in China, I would be surrounded by Chinese arts but I would also bring American things with me. They would teach to and learn from each other (Bonnie, July 10, 2007)
Point six
Our experiences with the arts in China have shown us the holistic nature of “living as part of the Chinese culture.” The lines are blurred between “arts” and “life”; there is an acceptance—or even an expectation—to participate freely with various arts in public spaces.
People sing. They dance. Together and by themselves, in public parks, as part of a class or group—or not. They don’t inhibit each other’s expression. It’s not performance. It’s just something they do (Wynne, email correspondence, September 4, 2007)
Point seven
Ultimately, however, the arts gift us with new ways of thinking about living beyond ourselves and in a global community with “others.”
What I know is: By introducing arts into my classroom, my students move outside of their egocentric lifestyles and see things from other peoples’ perspectives—the perspectives of other people, living their lives somewhere else (Helen, a Korean-American teacher of Spanish and French in a California high school, July 20, 2007)
As I bring these questions and concerns into my classes, I join with my students in questioning how the arts may grant us the ability to “see in a new way” through the eyes “of other people, living their lives somewhere else,” realizing as I do that,
Imagination is as important in the lives of teachers as it is in the lives of students, in part because teachers who are incapable of thinking imaginatively or of releasing students to encounter works of literature and other forms of art are probably also unable to communicate to the young what the use of imagination signifies. If it is the case that imagination feeds one’s capacity to feel one’s way into another’s vantage point, these teachers may also be lacking in empathy. Cynthia Ozick writes of a metaphorical concentration by means of which ‘those [doctors] who have no pain can imagine those who suffer. Those at the center can imagine what
it is to be outside. The strong can imagine the weak. Illuminated lives can imagine the dark. Poets in their twilight can imagine the borders of stellar fire. We strangers can imagine the familiar heart of strangers. Is it not imagination that allows us to encounter the other as disclosed through the image of that other’s face? And is this face not only that of the hurricane survivor or the Somalian child or the homeless woman sitting on the corner but also of the silent or the fidgety or the hopeless child in the classroom, be that child girl or boy? (Greene, 1995, 37)

**Next steps with my students**

While I was in China, I had the good fortune to be introduced to Jiang Si Rong, a member of the Dai minority who is also a musician. He plays (and constructs) the hulusi, a traditional Dai instrument made entirely of organic materials (a Chinese calabash gourd and bamboo). He graciously worked to teach me to play this instrument, offering me as many lessons as was possible in the month I was there. He was pleased that I wanted to buy six more of his instruments to bring back to my classroom and now five children, another teacher and I are working toward playing our first piece of hulusi music. “It’s different”

The written music I brought back from my teacher is very different from what my students and I are accustomed to reading. We are actively involved in working to discover multiple ways of decoding the written symbols and turning them into sounds. Alternately, we notate fingerings, solfège, and other notions of pitch and rhythm, realizing that neither pitch nor rhythm, in this context, is altogether “exact.” I brought several recordings as well as scores—from my own learning sessions and from professionally-recorded playings of this instrument (luckily, some of these also have video). To play, my students and I realize we must be fully engaged in watching, listening, and playing—together. We are more dependent on each other than would normally be observable in this particular group of students, and we are much more fluid (bordering on improvisational) as we play along with the video.

**Response and responsiveness**

So to the questions, “How might China’s arts become for our students windows into Chinese culture, rather than walls separating that culture from our own American experience?” and more specifically, “How might this and other arts experiences elevate the learning of Chinese language and culture in an American K-12 classroom?” how does this paper respond?

Thinking beyond a definition of barrier as wall or separation, there is a dawning awareness that barrier in this sense is a hiding—a hiddenness—and that is important if the work of the arts-as-arts is to open up and reveal what is hidden or possibly even deceptive. These two cultures—China and the U.S.—are both masters of putting on the brave face, playing the cards close to the vest and of growing to believe our own deceptions. Arts studies—as arts, cultural arts, and especially engaging or performance arts—have the very great potential to open and reveal. They also offer a sense of resonance (in an aural sense) or of reflection (in a visual one). They guide and grant awareness—of otherness, of self, of the rare, and the mundane—and of how each cooperates with the others. We begin to question (and to realize that these are questions needing to be asked), “What is Chinese and/or American music?” realizing, as we do so, that the questions “What is music?” and “What is art?” might inform us more. In a similar way, we might ask, “What does it mean to be American or Chinese?” with the realization that we are really asking, “What place does this ‘being’ have in a global future?”

This study, sponsored and funded by the U.S. Department of Education, wonders at viable approaches for teaching Chinese as a critical language (it rests in the fifth and highest category of difficulty in the C.I.A.’s language list) (Holt, 2003) to American students in American classrooms, and wonders at the importance of connecting cultural learning and language learning. It is concerned about the competition that potentially exists for Chinese and American students when many Chinese students have a background of K-12 English language learning where American students have limited (or no) Chinese language skills. What might the arts offer toward responding to the question, “Is there a way for our students to live in harmony together (rather than in competition)?”

The use of the word “harmony” raises an interesting point: In Western music, harmony is a term that means multiple voices, playing different sounds together. In Eastern music, however, harmony is synonymous with balance; to be in harmony, each voice is still when another is singing/playing, after which the other voice
Table 1: Conversation as a data-generating tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps in sequence</th>
<th>Actions taken (data gathering process)</th>
<th>Group conclusion</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify art forms</td>
<td>Discuss with artists (Chinese and American)</td>
<td>Chinese art forms include: Folk songs, minority dances, masks, puppets, brush painting, calligraphy, finger painting styles, stone carvings, regional opera</td>
<td>What is art?</td>
<td>Inform and educate American students about historical and cultural nuances of Chinese artforms—how cultural understandings are embedded in the arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experience Chinese art forms</td>
<td></td>
<td>Why is it culturally important?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gather Chinese resources pertaining to arts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Why is it humanly important?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify cultural barriers</td>
<td>Discussing ideas w/ colleagues Transcribed and remembered Conversing with Americans about Chinese culture Gather resources Share experiences</td>
<td>Possible barriers include confusion, especially among young Americans, about China’s historical timeline</td>
<td>Who is China? Is China an ancient culture? A war-torn one? A modern one? What is the place of ideology in the present time? Is it a barrier to American understanding? What is the place of religion and religious freedom (or absence)? Is this a barrier to American understanding?</td>
<td>Gather information to identify ways of guiding students in making distinctions among periods in Chinese history: Pre-modern times Cultural Revolution times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify teaching strategies</td>
<td>Discussion among informed American teaching artists/language teachers, and elementary (core curriculum) teachers (within workshop groups like ours) Invite conversation with American colleagues outside these groups</td>
<td>Possible strategies: Create thematic units to integrate Chinese language, cultural studies, and cultural arts processes (exposure, guided appreciation, experience, and outcome)</td>
<td>How do the arts inform and educate American students about China? What approaches might be useful?</td>
<td>Collaborate with other American teachers (at our sites and in our districts) Develop units of study in cooperation with other teachers and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish networking process</td>
<td>These might include the creation of inter-arts networks (arts teachers who are interested in developing Chinese cultural arts skills such as dance, brush painting, calligraphy, etc.), the creation of inter-disciplinary networks, inter-school networks, and inter-national networks (shared cultures) Needs identified include the gathering of arts resources that may be available in various areas of the U.S. shared among the network.</td>
<td>What other questions are out there? Those of our colleagues, students, communities and districts?</td>
<td>Work toward the creation of other programs (both in-school, among teachers and out-of-school, as community involvement or teacher professional development opportunities).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Opening Caveat

“Nor do we do much better than strive for some reciprocity among incommensurable ideas and points of view.” Maxine Greene

Introduction

Let the reader beware and also, be aware that the American system of education is filled with paradoxes and ambiguities. Like human nature, our educational system contains both the good and the bad in terms of reality - what is - and in terms of possibility - what could be. It is certainly legitimate to write about the positives that make formal education in the United States an ennobling, empowering, transforming, and liberating process. The thoughts here expressed, however, reflect upon less-than-positive trends that the writer believes should be critically interrogated and intensely challenged in the marketplace of ideas, particularly in schools of education where teachers are being prepared for America’s politically-impacted classrooms.

This interpretive reflection is both a philosophical and a political process. It is also an existential exercise. And, in considering the ideas expressed, there is recognition that, in the words of Montaigne: “To every opinion an opinion of equal weight is opposed (Norton, 31).” There are many who will rise up in opposition to the ideas expressed below, and to the interpretations presented. And, those counterpoint ideas may well have equal intellectual weight. But, without asking hard questions, and considering challenges to the educational status quo, we negate the democratic process. Our teachers-to-be must be educated to understand that “educational decisions must be constructed out of dialogues that emerge through the consideration of tough questions (Solloway, 54).” Let the dialogue begin.

Wondering Why?

“I will give my left hand to the rebel and my right hand to the heretic: forward!” Martin Buber.

Public education in the United States is infused today with the same neoliberal and rightist-conservative ideologies that are so powerfully evident in the broader social, economic, cultural, and political spheres. The politically inspired, and misnamed, No Child Left Behind Act, gives an additional voice to an educational orthodoxy that is powered by the force of inflexible political agendas. In many ways, teachers are disempowered, curricula are standardized, procedures are regimented, creativity is bureaucratically stifled, and – in obeisance to a market mentality – students are redefined as products and parents as consumers. A “teach to the test” mantra sounds throughout the land. John Dewey’s concept of democratic education finds diminishing “room at the inn”; except where there are risk-takers willing to challenge the prevailing educational establishment. One may interpret that there is a renewed political effort to reconceptualize, and then to finalize, the Reagan era “conservative restoration.” Here is an ideological vision in which schools are seen as effective resources in which to socialize/indoctrinate students into passive acceptance of the inflexible demands of a powerful ideology. There is an alliance of cultural fundamentalists, “free-marketeers, and nationalistic neocon ideologues” (Willett, 94) that seeps relentlessly into American education.

Donaldo Macedo has written of the miseducation in which “teachers . . . by virtue of the domesticating education they receive in an assembly line of ideas . . . seldom reach the critical capacity to develop a coherent comprehension of the world” (found in Chomsky, p. 10). It is a thesis here presented that Schools of Education in the nation’s universities and colleges have a moral obligation to resist the totalizing effect of the ideologically impregnated instrumentalist trend that is steadily and pervasively infiltrating the academic preparation of teachers. Teachers should be educated to be more than highly trained, licensed technicians; more than standardized conformists to a pattern developed and enforced by a power structure that controls the professional accrediting process.

Teachers should be educated to understand, and to accept, the responsibility of being critical intellectuals who have the courage, the power, and the right to challenge the educational, and political/social, status quo. In our schools of education we need to “create an educational process encouraging critical attitudes . . . to redirect our educational practice toward the goal of authentic democracy” (Freire, 33, 35). Future teachers, in their academic preparation, should be challenged to be restorers of democracy to the individual classroom and also to the nationwide public educational system that makes democratic freedom a possible reality. “We are in need of resistance education that moves in the
direction of cultural criticism and that includes moments of resistance and critical pedagogy” (O’Sullivan, p. 5).

If this radical transformation of the educational system is to happen, it will require a rejuvenation of “foundations of education” classrooms in the nation’s universities. Here is where “faculty have a responsibility to empower students to critique the positions for which they are being prepared . . . and to analyze the social and economic structures into which they will graduate” (Hasseler, 23). Such courses have been marginalized – many eliminated -- in universities all over the country. These are the courses that question, and challenge – and, yes, defy – regimented, standardized, overly simplistic, measurable solutions to complex educational/social problems. When such courses are “eased” – or “pushed” – out of the door of teacher education programs (or minimized), then we lose “the opportunity for future teachers to be exposed to and to grapple with counterintuitive and counternormative ways of thinking about and engaging with our educational system” (Butin, p. 214). It is such intellectual engagement that stimulates and intensifies “who” and “why” questions: Who am I? Who am I becoming as a teacher, and as a person? Why do I want to be a teacher? Why do we educate? Why should questions of political and social power and powerlessness matter to the classroom teacher? Why should time be spent on political, historical, and philosophical dialectics, when it is “what” and “how” of teaching that are the measurable components of educational accountability? Perhaps an answer lies in the fact that

epistemology is political . . . The conditions for the production of epistemologies are political in the sense that these conditions reflect social hierarchies of power and privilege to determine who can participate in epistemological discussions and whose views or epistemology have the potential to gain influence . . . It could be argued that epistemologies have political effects insofar as they are discursive interventions in specific discursive and political spaces (Gottlieb and Schmitt, p. 65-66).

Future teachers should be encouraged to reflect upon the political motivations which drive knowledge transmission and acquisition in America’s schools. They should be educated to use their future classrooms not just to dispense official and testable knowledge, not just to conform to standardized, preestablished expectations; but also to question the very basis of the expectations. To do so is to “transform self, schools, and society.”

This, of course, presupposes being willing to ask hard questions, and to give a hearing to radical answers to complex questions regarding why do teachers, schools, and society need to be transformed? It requires listening to the voices of diverse others. It requires open-ended dialogue, and open-mindedness. It requires taking risks, educating teachers to challenge the “what is” of educational reality, and to conscientiously, willingly, and actively work toward the “what should be.” We need to prepare teachers who

nourish a social imagination, the capacity to look at the world as it could be otherwise, as well as a spirit of activism combined with skepticism, urgency, and patience. We act, we doubt. The time is late and we have a long way to go (Ayers, p.158).

This is not a job for conformists, but for radicals. Educational conformists follow the path of least resistance, a path created and mapped by someone in power. Radicals are more curious, prone to challenge the power structure, to ask hard questions, and to embrace the intellectual challenge created by paradoxical, conflicting answers. “It is radical to wonder why” (Breton, p. 437). And why is such “wondering” considered radical? Because it is in asking the “why” questions that an education for dissent is given equal billing with the education that prepares one to accept – and be an assenting, unquestioning, docile member of – the status quo. In asking the “why” questions a teacher challenges “the pervasiveness of a hidden curriculum of conformity” (Butin, p. 222).

The Teacher as Prophet

“The true prophet is not he who peers into the future but he who reads and reveals the present.” Eric Hoffer

W.E.B. Du Bois once wrote of teaching as “a sacred trust for the education of a new and redeeming generation of men,” and added: “This may be a dream but it is worth considering” (in Provenzo, p. 285). Here is a radical proposal – to consider education as a process of redemption not as a religious phenomenon, however, but a regenerating process of individual and social transformation. The idea may be so radical in an era of measurable accountability for standardized “outcomes,” that it can only begin as a dream, a dream that might, after the dreaming, become a vision of a possible “what should be.”

One place to stimulate radical dreaming for America’s future teachers is the educational foundations classroom. Here is perhaps the only place within the typical teacher education program where thoughtful, questioning exploration of teaching as a subversive activity (Postman and Weingartner) is not only a pedagogical option, but an intellectual necessity. To be subversive is to be an agent of change; to be, in the words of Abraham Heschel, a prophet, one who “feels
fiercely . . . who asks the challenging questions” (p. 5). Too often the teacher-education classroom is permeated with formulaic answers, rather than thoughtful questions. Too often predetermined answers saturate the curriculum, and negate the intellectual problematic of significant, unasked questions.

While preparing future teachers for the world of educational reality, we should also charge them with the responsibility to ask the challenging questions about the why and who of that reality. Why does that reality exist, and who has defined the parameters of what a teacher should know and be able to do? What are the political and ideological—as well as philosophical—implications of teaching? What vested interests have been at work in establishing standards, defining the “highly qualified teacher,” and creating (and profiting by) high-stakes-test materials?

There is a prophetic role for the professional educator to fulfill. “The prophet can denounce creeds, and expose superstitions, and mobilize people to use their lights and wits” (Illich, p. 61). It is in the foundations classroom that a future teacher is challenged to think prophetically, to indict unjust educational doctrine and expose ideological credulities. It is here that the teacher-to-be may begin to forge the foundations of “an insurgent intellectual practice” (hooks, p. 11) that will prophetically provoke, stimulate, and transform the thought process of others. The future teacher is asked to envision the teacher’s role as more than that of a well-trained professional, more than a technically sophisticated dispenser of approved and testable knowledge.

The teacher is cautioned that in such an academic setting, he/she will be challenged to experiment with the prophet’s role. He/she may, of course, decline the role. But, it should be offered. The foundations classroom may be the only place within the academic structure of teacher education that a future teacher is offered this opportunity. Here is where the aspiring teacher may find the only challenge offered to consider teaching as a “prophetic calling.” And, of course, “the prophet is an iconoclast . . . ! Beliefs cherished as certainties, institutions endowed with supreme sanctity, he exposes as scandalous pretensions” (Heschel, p. 10). Ah, what a thought for the future teacher to interpret, and to wrestle with, as she/he thinks critically about current educational issues.

In the foundations classroom, the teacher-to-be should be allowed and encouraged to ponder upon what it means to be an educational radical, in the original meaning of the word. Here is an opportunity to “get to the root (Latin, radix)” of an issue, to dig deeply into the why of a bureaucratically derived standard, an NCATE requirement, or a No Child Left Behind directive. Here is a chance to challenge educational certainties, to critically examine educational pretensions that may well be scandalous in their political origins and intended—or unintended—consequences.

At some point in a teacher education curriculum the student should be given cause to consider a prophetic role, and to understand that “prophets (are) shocked not only by acts of injustice on the part of scoundrels, but also by the perversions of justice on the part of the notables” (Heschel, p. 202). Notables, those sitting in the seats of educational and political power, are not immune from inserting hidden agendas into educational policies and procedures. It is the educational prophet who asks the challenging questions about these policies and procedures, even though “the prophet faces a coalition of . . . established authority” (Heschel, p. 16). It is the coalition of established authority that acts to diminish individual teacher autonomy. The future teacher needs to have at least a minimal understanding of what this power represents, and how—and why—it flourishes.

Every teacher education program should provide at least one curricular arena where questions about the motivations and agendas of established authority provide fuel for spirited dialogue. The academic preparation of teachers should be considered incomplete unless there has been a well-defined academic space (a foundations course) in which there has been an open-minded, serious and sustained effort to raise some profound questions about the entire outcomes-based, standards-driven approach to school reform that the traditional, hierarchical, authoritarian organizational structure that has for the past 100 years characterized—and indeed still characterizes—our present system of public education (Clinchy, p. 8).

It is important that a teacher’s ability “to make a difference” not be constrained by a curriculum too narrowly circumscribed by exposure only to handed-down knowledge which has been designed to be tested as part of a certification process. We must think beyond such constricted boundaries noted in the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, which created an expectation for teacher educators to “equip students with the subject matter and pedagogical expertise necessary for preparing students to meet challenging standards.” Challenging standards, yes but related to expanded opportunities to analyze and interpret—and critically question—the broader social, political, economic, and cultural forces that impact the schools of America.”
Teachers are too often the “product” of an instrumentalist, behaviorist curricular model. They are expected to become proficient in the technical, “how to” of teaching, but may not be encouraged to think in broader dimensions. We should be concerned that there is, a lack of pre-service opportunity for potential teachers to think critically about the most salient characteristics of American public education . . . We need literate teachers capable of challenging the technocratic demands of state-managed curricula. Preparing such teachers must begin at the pre-service level; otherwise new teachers will find themselves looking very much like the old ones, mindlessly going through the motions without questioning or reflection (Canestriani and Marlowe, p. 41,42).

Too often the pre-service level focus in schools of education is one of unquestioned preparation for the status quo of educational expectations. There is a passive acceptance of the “handed-down” requirements to prepare future teachers for “testable outcomes”; requirements and outcomes decided upon by an ideologically focused power structure. The counterpoint to this conservative model of teacher education is to expose future teachers to the reality that “teaching is a militant activity (and) risk taking is at the heart of teaching well” (Kohl, pp. 144, 146). In recognizing this reality we are reminded by one well-published educational rebel that

the teacher can’t be neutral . . . We either collude, connive, collaborate, or else actively rebel . . . In order to create a genuine free market of ideas we have to find the courage to bring radical options into the consciousness of children — options which our supervisors, principals, and school board seldom have even dreamed . . . Teachers need to make available a very broad spectrum of contradicting ideas, materials, and leads to outside forms of information (Kozol, pp. 85, 86, 88).

An Education for Discontent – Even Dissent

“Discontent is the way of inquiry . . . Discontent is a movement to go beyond the limitations of what is.”

Jiddu Krishnamurti

Those teachers-of-teachers who serve as stimulators for intellectual exploration in foundations classrooms might well have cause to give heed to a comment by W. E.B. Du Bois. They might consider how this Du Bois’ reflective thought may apply to their own academic efforts: “I cannot promise you happiness always, but I can promise you divine discontent with the imperfect” (found in Foner, p. 101). Preservice teachers are traditionally educated for credentialed admission to the educational status quo; prepared to function within the “what is.” This is, of course, a professional necessity; it reflects a certification reality. Future teachers must be prepared for those high stakes, knowledge-based tests that determine careers. This test-based “credentialing” has become a rite of professional passage.

There should be, however, within the professional/academic preparation of teachers, a place where a “discontent with the imperfect” is allowed to intellectually percolate. And since educational “systems” and power structures tend to be imperfect, [there is] considerable reason for percolation. We are reminded by John Dewey that “the origin of thinking is some perplexity, confusion, or doubt” (Dewey, p. 13). A teacher should be encouraged to doubt, to recognize and build upon discontent, and to actively question, rather than passively accept, officially-sanctioned, transmitted knowledge. “It is within the open boundaries (a paradox?) of foundations courses that (w)e are fortunate to have available an alternate tradition that gives us the authority to educate our students to disbelieve, or at least to be skeptical” (Postman, p. 22).

It is this alternate tradition that allows foundations courses to be a counterpoint to more narrowly defined educational goals. Here we can encourage alternative ways of thinking, seeing, doing, and being. We can create rather than imitate. We can ask and stimulate questions rather than supply answers. We can challenge narrow and prescriptive ways of defining what it means to be a teacher. We can shine a light into unexplored dark corners of educational policy, and seek to make relevant that which may seem unimportant in a world of standardized answers to standardized questions. We can encourage education students to be seekers rather than settlers.

Teacher education students tend not to be seekers of alternative ways of seeing . . . Instead they walk into class searching for recipes for information delivery and classroom discipline. Questions of purpose, context, and power are alien and considered irrelevant. (Kincheloe, p. 14).

Somewhere within a school of education there should be at least one classroom where challenging questions trump pre established answers. At some place within the school-of-education curriculum, the Socratic admonition, “Let the questions be the curriculum,” should be allowed to penetrate the hardening shell of standardized learning.

Even while preparing future teachers for a world of pre determined, politically sanctioned, uncontestable
answers, there is an academic – perhaps moral – responsibility to encourage critical questioning, “a process of seeking fundamental premises about the nature of what we are doing and who we are” (Hansen, p. 91). It is only too infrequently that we engage preservice teachers in an effort to intellectually dig for fundamental premises – to ask why; to be educational prophets and ask the challenging, penetrating, thought-provoking questions that radically “get to the root” of an issue. All too often “we neither model nor teach the importance of dissent . . . Corporate, commercial, and capitalistic practices have been naturalized into the university structure” (Hasseler, 21). When the primary goal of a school of education is preparing teachers for the “what is” of a political and educational bureaucracy, it is all too easy to stifle whatever desire an individual might have to agitate for the “what should be.” Too often

Teachers are helped to see themselves as functionaries in an instrumental system geared to turning out products, some (not all) of which will meet standards of quality control. They still find schools infused with a management orientation, acceding to market measures; and they (seeing no alternative) are wont to narrow and technicize the area of their concern . . . A concern for the critical and the imaginative, for the opening of new ways of looking at things, is wholly at odds with the technical and behaviorist emphases we still find in American schools” (Greene, p. 13, 126).

When we behaviorally condition someone to be a standardized cog in an instrumentally-driven educational machine, we stifle curiosity, imagination, and risk-taking. We fail to challenge that person to ask why? And to demand thoughtful answers. We fail to inspire him/her to search for in depth answers to the educationally and existentially vital questions “who am I?” and “why do I want to teach?” And, in this failure, we also fail to provide the kind of inspiration that leads to the possibility of inner-directed, continual becoming. We focus on outer-directed techniques. When this happens, we narrowly circumscribe the creative possibilities of our educational program. We neglect to build upon the kind of Augustinian “eternal discontent” that provides the motivation for a future teacher to “maintain the state of doubt and to carry on systematic and protracted inquiry – (which) are the essentials of thinking” (Dewey, p. 13). [It is this state of doubt, this inquisitive restlessness, which is a metaphorical spark ready to be fanned into flame.]

When this spark ignites, a future teacher may find the power to be a “transformative intellectual”; to be capable of challenging the dogmatic inflexibility of an educational orthodoxy. William Pink has reminded us that “our responsibility as instructors in foundations classes is to problematize these taken-for-granted, as we assist students to reconceptualize their thinking (p. 48).” This responsibility should not be taken lightly. The predominant model of teacher education is designed to socialize students into the existing system. There is an echo of Emile Durkheim’s belief that the function of an educational system “is to adapt the child to the social milieu . . . It is, then, up to the State to remind the teacher constantly of the ideas, the sentiments that must be impressed upon the child to adjust him to the milieu in which he must live” (Durkheim, p. 79).

Democracy is better served when, rather than adjustment to the milieu, we encourage and facilitate in the student a “creative maladjustment.” To creatively maladjust is to find wisdom in Emerson’s dictum that “a foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of small minds.” It is to dare to question and challenge the current social/political/educational system, rather than engage in lockstep marching to an ideological cadence. Herbert Kohl has written of the “ability to break patterns” (p. 144), and he reminds us that “teaching well is a militant activity . . . It requires developing the courage to maladjust rather than adjust oneself to much of current educational practice” (p. 144-145). To question and challenge the system – to maladjust – may be a radical departure; it may be, in reality, a challenge to the very power that sanctions and accredits the model within which teachers work. But, the questions must be asked — asked somewhere, by someone. For the teacher, these are questions for which we must take responsibility: who gets to learn what, and who gets to decide who learns what? Questions which are linked to societal systems of power . . . At the heart of practice, we must understand that every educator is a social activist . . . We cannot be released nor escape from our responsibility for affecting the wider world in which we live . . . In order to realize possibilities for a more just world, we need to recognize how power operates [even through] the most mundane educational activities (Wilson and Cervro, p. 4-5).

The teacher, at each and every grade level, does have a responsibility to respond to how power as a political, social, and/or economic force impacts education. Can a teacher be anything but a discontented dissenter when he/she evaluates the realities of unequal, and often unjust, power structures and relationships in society? Ninety years ago in Crisis magazine, W.E.B. Du Bois issued a challenge that should even today
continue to reverberate through foundations classrooms; those places of prophetic possibilities where preservice teachers are (or should be) pushed out of their academic and personal comfort zones. To be silent when injustices call out for redress, to fail to speak out when poverty and ignorance keep some in social bondage, to muffle the sounds of indignation and righteous anger is to fail the teacher’s calling (Du Bois, in Huggins, p. 1157).

Indignation and righteous anger may be necessary as responses to powerful voices that seek to drown out challenges to neoconservative vested interest groups whose market-driven goal is “the installation of competition in education at every level (between students, between teachers, between schools, between types of schools, between school districts) as the central organizing principle of human relations” (Marginson, p. 209). In challenging this corporate-style organizing principle we are reminded that “a dissenting voice is sometimes needed to moderate the din made by enthusiastic multitudes” (Postman, Technopoly, p.5).

The enthusiastic multitude – those who uncritically accept social, political, and educational orthodoxies – are ill-prepared to challenge entrenched power structures. One goal of a foundations of education classroom should be to redress this problem - to create fertile intellectual soil for the seed of rational, thoughtful dissent to take root. Dissenting teacher voices are needed to ask challenging questions of an educational orthodoxy, one that prefers conforming acquiescence to its dogmatic pronouncements. Intellectual heretics are needed, and here there is a role for the “radical” foundations of education classroom. Some may even conjure up the word “extremist,” as an antidote to entrenched orthodoxy. But at the same time we should reflect upon the cautionary words of Martin Luther King, Jr., written from the Birmingham jail: “The question is not whether we will be an extremist, but what kind of extremist we will be” (found in Kozol, p. 19).

Conclusion

“Without rebellion mankind would stagnate, and injustice would be irremediable.” Bertrand Russell

Neoliberal and conservative right agendas dominate educational decisions at the federal, state, and local levels. Politically inspired demands for control, predictability, measurable accountability and an ill-defined, market-driven efficiency are standardizing students, teachers, and curricula. Accrediting agencies have pushed teacher education programs toward complicity with these anti progressive forces – forces that are in many cases even anti public school. This scenario makes it important for foundation of education courses in our schools of education to “stand up and be counted” as places where teachers-to-be are helped to challenge the “what is” of educational reality, and give reflective, reasoned thought to “what might be.” They must be helped to uncover, examine, and critique the values and politics that undergird educational decisions and practices, and ask important questions about why we do the things we do in schools . . . To bring more attention to alternative democratic, social justice-oriented visions for schooling, we need a more powerful and strident discourse coming from the educational left, one that can . . . provide impetus and vision (theory and practice) for progressive educational change (Hyttten, p. 223-224).

We may be reminded at this point of Karl Marx’s admonition: “The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways: the point is to change it” (Marx, p. 15). In this context, the frequently invoked phrase, “transformative intellectual,” may be used to describe a teacher’s philosophically tinged role. This can only have meaning in the halls of academia – and the classrooms of America – if we recognize that “any genuine pedagogical practice demands a commitment to social transformation” (Giroux and McLaren, p. 154); a commitment that goes far beyond meekly following the predetermined aims of a standardizing educational orthodoxy. In order to be a transformative intellectual, the teacher must resist the growing trend to diminish teacher autonomy; a trend that closely parallels the standardizing of teacher, student, and content. The teacher is called to take risks, to challenge the system, to rebel in subtle yet meaningful ways. As Rollo May reminded us many years ago:

The rebel insists that his identity be respected; he fights to preserve his intellectual and spiritual integrity against the suppressive demands of (a power structure). He must range himself against the groups which to him represent conformism, adjustment, and the death of his own originality and voice (p. 225-226).

For the teacher, this ability and willingness to challenge a conformist educational system – to be a unique individual capable of personal and social transformation – may be given birth in the foundations-of-education classroom. Here the teacher-of-teachers is indeed an intellectual midwife, facing a difficult task in the birthing of authentic, open-minded critical inquiry. And, “it is not surprising to find many conservatives (and neo liberals) in the United States viewing with suspicion courses and discourses that have the potential for such
inquiry” (Brosio, p. 34). But it is often only in such courses, and in the dialectical discourses which flourish within them, that voices with radical intonations are encouraged to speak up. Here is where democratic pedagogy has a chance to ask the hard, penetrating, risk-inducing questions of the reigning educational orthodoxy. May the best thought process win.

ENDNOTES

1. The official name for this legislation is The Revised Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The original act was passed in 1964, during the administration of Lyndon Johnson.

2. There is a reminder of the ideologically driven Trilateral Commission, a globally powerful organization composed of economic elites from powerful nations. “The Trilateral Commission referred to schools as ‘institutions responsible for the indoctrination of the young’. ” (Chomsky, p. 17)

3. Michael Apple, in the forward to Trivializing Teacher Education: The Accreditation Squeeze, has noted: “Debating how teacher education should be carried on and judged is one of the most important things about which we can and must argue. But current political pressures and bureaucratic models make this very difficult.” (p. xiii)

4. Foundations of education courses are those that reflect upon how various and diverse historical/philosophical/social/political/cultural/economic forces impact education. The Council of Learned Societies indicates that “(t)he purpose of foundations study is to bring these disciplinary resources to bear in developing interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives on education, both inside and outside of schools.”

5. These three goals are part of the School of Education Mission at a midwestern university. This mission is consistent with many other teacher education programs. The question is: which schools “live” the mission, and which only pay lip service? Too often “mission statements” are for the consumption of accrediting bodies, not for active implementation.

6. Note here the difference between a “calling” and a “prophetic calling.” A person may be “called” to teaching as an expression of the inner-self, a way toward self-fulfillment. A prophetic calling responds to an understanding that teaching expands beyond classroom responsibilities. In a prophetic sense, teaching requires an active concern for social and economic justice, human rights, and the dignity of the human person in the wider world community.

7. An example of this kind of ideologically driven agenda: At the April 11, 2006 meeting of the Kansas State Board of Education, a member of the conservative majority exclaimed at one point, “We need to tell them (teachers) what and how to teach.”

8. A high percentage of students beginning a teacher education program will answer the “why do you want to be a teacher” question, by responding: “I want to make a difference.” Do they mean difference in individuals or in society? Does one lead to the other?

9. One of the forces impacting education has been defined as “movement conservatism” – a power generated by highly financed conservative think tanks “with the key ideas being individual gain over public good, deregulation, big tax cuts (for the wealthy), and privatization in all areas of society, including education, health, and public services” (Demarrais, 205).

10. Even the foremost exponent of behaviorism, B.F. Skinner, expressed a concern at a robotic, standardized learning system: “We should view with dismay a system under which every student learned everything listed in a syllabus – although such a condition is far from unthinkable” (Skinner, p. 326).

11. As this commentary is being written a newspaper headline notes the death of the politically liberal, anti-war activist, Henry Sloan Coffin. Rev. Coffin, former chaplain at Yale University, was known for encouraging the power of “doubt,” and for creatively challenging authoritarian power.

12. Paul Kurtz defines a skeptic as one who “requires evidence or reasons for a hypothesis or belief before it is accepted. Always open to inquiry, skeptical inquirers are prepared to change their beliefs in the light of new evidence” (p. 30)
13. I have recently received campus-wide e-mails from a member of the business office of the university where I teach. At the bottom of each e-mail was the motto, “Our students are our customers and our products.” This market-driven, business model has infiltrated the world of higher education.

14. We are reminded that “teachers need to develop a discourse and set of assumptions that allow them to function more specifically as transformative intellectuals . . . concerned with empowering students so they can read the world critically and change it when necessary” (Giroux, xxxiv).

15. I am reminded of a statement made by Jim Lawing, former state legislator from Wichita, Kansas, at an ACLU meeting at the local Unitarian Church: “If you don’t make some people uncomfortable, you’re probably not addressing the real issues.”

16. This statement is made with recognition of the original meaning of the Greek word, hairetikos, from which the English “heretic” is derived. The original Greek meant “having the ability to choose.” Based on this derivation, an intellectual heretic is one who makes freely decided intellectual choices, and is not unduly influenced by authoritarian dogma or ideology.

17. In regard to certain social justice issues, it has been noted that (t)oday, the enemy’s name is neo-liberalism . . . It’s a world . . . in which deregulation, privatization and withdrawal of the state from many areas of social provision is common . . . It says charter schools and vouchers are preferable to public schools (Hirsh, p. 13).
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WHERE RACE INTERSECTS COMMUNITY: THE CASE OF LEHEW V. BRUMMELL

John W. Hunt and Linda C. Morice, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville

Introduction

Historians have long presented conflicting descriptions of the relationship between U. S. public schools and the communities they served in the late nineteenth century. For example, Wayne E. Fuller (1982) studied one-room, public schools in 10 Midwestern states and found their school boards promoted democracy, fostered a sense of community, and gave parents almost complete control of their children’s education. Fuller’s study included Missouri, a border state that remained in the Union during the Civil War.

David Thelen (1986), on the other hand, examined public education in Missouri during the same era. He found public school supporters in this largely rural state played a key role in overthrowing an “old order….when family, work, community, church, politics, and environment intertwined to form an integrated way of life” (11). According to Thelen, the new paradigm of public schools was a growth model that fostered a market economy, promoted railroad expansion, and underscored the values of industrial capitalism—including industry, discipline, punctuality, and obedience to authority. Thelen wrote that champions of growth used public schools to foster these values in children, thus diminishing the role of parents, undermining a sense of community, and inspiring resistance among traditional Missourians (108-116).

Fuller did not figure race into his equation, while Thelen described the experience of African-Americans who gained their first opportunity for public schooling in post-Civil War Missouri. Other scholars, including Morice and Hunt (2007), Morice (2006), Greene, Kremer and Holland (1993), Troen (1975), Parrish (1965) Savage (1931, 1937), and Williams (1920) have written about black schools that were established in Missouri during the late nineteenth century. In aggregate, this body of scholarship raises an important question: To what extent did race enhance or mitigate against the public school’s ability to foster a sense of community? One possible answer can be seen in a rural school district in Grundy County, Missouri, in the case of Lehew v. Brummell. That case—heard by the Missouri Supreme Court in 1890—suggests that race was a polarizing factor for the public school and the community it served.

Method

In conducting the present study, the authors used a mixed method approach to analyze quantitative and qualitative data in primary and secondary sources. These include records in the Recorder of Deeds Office at the Grundy County courthouse in Trenton; Missouri Supreme Court records in the State Archives in Jefferson City; annual state superintendent reports in the State Archives and in the Pius XII Memorial Library at St. Louis University; county histories in the Thomas Jefferson Library at the University of Missouri-St. Louis; and legislative records, county histories, and newspapers in the Missouri State Historical Society in Columbia.

Community background

Located in north central Missouri approximately 25 miles from the Iowa border, Grundy County was organized in 1841 (Ford 1908, 34) and largely settled by people from “Eastern, Middle, and New England States” (Trenton, Missouri, February 8, 1890). The “greatest portion” (Denslow 1939, 252) of its earliest settlers came from the southern states, especially Virginia and Kentucky. By 1860 there were 285 slaves in the county, with a total population of 7,887 (252-253). Grundy residents supported the Democratic Party and cast only a few votes for Lincoln in 1860. With the outbreak of Civil War, however, its citizens were reluctant to “take up arms against their constitutional government” (253). Union and Confederate supporters held meetings in May 1861. A local history notes, “The Union meeting had the largest crowd by far, and from that day the Federalists gained strength and courage, gathering in the great numbers of undecided. The break was now made; Grundy county was with the Union” (254). No confederate companies were formed in Grundy, but about 200 of its citizens fought for the South (254).

One Grundy resident, Rezin DeBolt, was especially active in forming a Union regiment. DeBolt “made stump-speaking tours into surrounding counties” (254) and was subsequently named recruiting officer and captain of Company B of the 23rd Regiment of Volunteer Infantry of Missouri. DeBolt, an attorney and Ohio native, had moved to Grundy County as recently as 1858. Within a short time he became county school commissioner, and by 1863 was elected circuit judge, an office he held until 1875. During the war DeBolt was captured at Shiloh, resigned his commission due to impaired health, and subsequently re-entered the conflict as a major of the 44th Missouri volunteers (Ford, 206).

DeBolt was zealous in his pursuit of the Union cause. For example, in 1864 U. S. Lieutenant William McIlwrath warned his regiment commander about a group of Unionist guerrillas under DeBolt’s leadership
who called on local citizens at night, urging them to leave Grundy County. McIlwrath stated the gang’s victims included citizens who had taken loyalty oaths to the Union, supported the Conservative Unionist slate, or merely refused “to hallow for Jim Lane” (130). (Lane, a U. S. Senator from Kansas, became the hero of free-soilers when he led volunteers in a defense of Lawrence, Kansas, several years earlier.) When McIlwrath offered DeBolt rations, the judge refused them, saying, “that if his men could not find rations for themselves they had no business with him” (Fellman 1989, 130). McIlwrath said he was unaware that these men were in the Missouri militia, and DeBolt replied, “they were not; that he was here in command of an independent company of jawhawkers, out upon a jawhawking expedition” (130). McIlwrath added, “This conversation occurred on the public street, and in the middle of a crowd of some fifteen or twenty of his men, who seemed to relish the idea of being commanded by such a captain” (130). DeBolt would later play a key role in the Lehwv v. Brummell case.

The Civil War slowed Grundy County’s development. At the end of the conflict, conditions there were “still quite primitive. Good prairie land still sold for three dollars an acre. Stock still ran at large, and fences were few” (Ford, 87). However, by 1890, Grundy had undergone rapid population growth. Trenton, the county seat, grew from 943 people in 1870, to 3,370 in 1880, and 6,000 in 1890 (Trenton, Missouri, February 8, 1890). Grundy’s prairie lands supported a largely agricultural economy based on corn, grains, livestock, and fruit production.

Growth occasionally sparked controversy. For example, the county’s citizens repeatedly rejected proposals for railroad bonds (Thelen, 63-64); it took three elections before the required two-thirds vote was obtained (Ford, 181). In 1871 the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railroad came to Grundy County, and other railroads followed, linking farmers to a larger market (89-95). Following the Panic of 1873—which disrupted the U. S. economy and adversely affected debt-ridden farmers—many Grundy citizens joined the Grange, or Patrons of Husbondry, forming 35 lodges by August 1875. One of the Grange’s chief objectives was to do away with “middlemen” (125) so goods produced or used by farmers would go directly to consumers. The Grange also sought to reduce the fees paid to county bureaucrats, and its members boycotted the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railroad for refusing to meet the farmers’ demand for lower rates. A local history notes, “After a few years of prosperity the grange died out in this county almost as rapidly as it had grown. But in 1874 it was a power in the land, and there were comparatively few farmers of influence who did not belong to the order” (126).

The public schools

Grundy County’s first school district was organized in Trenton Township in 1840, when it was still part of Livingston County. By 1850, each of Grundy’s townships had one or more schools. Township school boards operated the public schools until 1875, when authority was transferred to individual districts (Denslow, 213). By 1886, Grundy County had 85 school districts with 5,526 resident children of school age (Ford, 145).

Prior to the Civil War, most of the state’s black population was concentrated in the Missouri and Mississippi River valleys (Gerlach 1986, 23). Grundy—like many other counties beyond the two rivers--had few black residents of school age. Their future was shaped by state legislators who, between 1865 and 1889, enacted a series of laws creating segregated schools and stipulating the minimum number of resident black children for a district to maintain a black school. The laws also mandated, for black schools only, a threshold monthly attendance number that would allow them to operate. If, in any month, attendance fell below that number, a black school was required to close for a period up to six months. There was no minimum attendance number mandating the closure of white schools (Laws of the state of Missouri 1866, 177).

Legislative records reveal the process by which a system of black education was established in the state. Beginning in 1865, a board of education could form a black school if the number of resident African-Americans of school age exceeded 20. However, the black school was required to close if the average number of pupils in attendance in any month was less than 12 (177). Subsequent legislation lowered the minimum number of resident black students from 20 to 15, in order to establish an African-American school. The minimum monthly attendance requirement also dropped from 12 to 10 (Laws of the state of Missouri 1867, 170). An 1869 law permitted two districts to form a union school to achieve the required number of 15 students (Laws of the state of Missouri 1869, 164); 1874 legislation required such a union school in cases when the number of black students fell below 15 (Williams, 1920, p. 148). A new state constitution in 1875 stated that “separate free public schools shall be established for the education of children of African descent” (Williams, 1920, 156).

Annual state superintendent reports indicate that, for
several years following the Civil War, Grundy County had no black schools, even though there were more than 70 black school-aged children there (Report of the public schools 1867, 43). The 1869 report noted, “There being but few colored children in this county, but little interest has been awakened in their behalf, still an effort is being made to organize a school for them” (Report of the public schools 1869, 84). The first black school in Grundy County was erected in Trenton in 1869. It was sold in 1876; a new school was built (Denslow, 21) that would, in subsequent years, be named Garfield School (Report of the public schools, 1900, 85).

Black Missourians opposed segregated schools throughout the late nineteenth century (Greene et al. 1993, 107). In 1873, State Superintendent John Monteith explained their position:

The colored people themselves are forcing a question upon us which sooner or later must be faced: that is, whether the two or three little dark faces isolated in any subdistrict may slip into some corner of the white school. This question has in several instances been brought to me for decision. The colored people claim that they vote, ride in the cars, and that their children play with the white children; that co-education does not imply social equality; and why should they not be permitted, under extraordinary circumstances, to send their little ones to white schools?

My unofficial judgment is that it is very difficult to answer their argument. The official opinion I have given is, that the law contemplates separate schools, and whether colored children shall be admitted to white schools is a question which confronts prejudice, and appeals to benevolence more than to law. I commend this subject to the calm and reflective sense of the people (Report of the public schools 1873, pp. 44-45).

Monteith’s comments were made after the 21 county superintendents expressed concern in their annual letters that the black population was distributed in a manner that made it impossible to educate black children according to law. Three county superintendents recommended that the law be amended to provide for African-American children in sparsely settled districts. The superintendent of Clark County advocated that they be allowed to attend white schools in counties where their numbers were sparse. In 1873, black children in several districts entered white schools with the “tacit consent” (Williams, 147) of the white community. When he was asked whether the black children could be removed from these schools, the State Superintendent replied that there was no law prohibiting it. In 1874 the legislature defeated a civil rights bill that would have opened public schools to all children, regardless of color. That year legislation was passed requiring two or more districts with sparse black populations to unite in forming a union school. At the same time, the law required all taxable property in a township in which a black school was situated to be taxed for its support (147-148). By contrast, each district would support its own school for white children with the help of state aid (Report of the public schools 1876, 12).

The issue of educating black children in counties of sparse black population would ultimately be settled by a controversy in one rural school district in Grundy County.

The case

East of the town of Trenton was a rural district officially known as School District No. 4, Township 61, Range 24, Grundy County, Missouri. Only four African-Americans of school age resided there, all children of William Brummell, a black resident taxpayer. The number of African-American students was well below the legal threshold for establishing a black school in the district. So, with the acquiescence of the three white school district directors—William Carbett, David Thompson, and Henry Neely— the white teacher, James C. Barr, instructed the four Brummell children in the same room as the district’s white students (Lehew v. Brummell 1891).

On October 10, 1887, five of the district’s taxpayers—all white fathers of school-aged children—petitioned the county court for a temporary injunction restraining School District No. 4 from providing instruction to the Brummell children. Included among the plaintiffs were Benjamin F. Lehew, Albert Culver, William H. Dawson, Albert McCrady, and Jacob Bonta. The court issued the restraining order, which was served on Brummell, his four children, Barr, Carbett, Thompson, and Neely. The court subsequently found in favor of the plaintiffs and “made perpetual” (Lehew v. Brummell 1891) the temporary injunction, thereby permanently restraining William Brummell from sending his children to the school. Brummell immediately filed a motion for a new trial. In response to the plaintiffs’ arguments that, under state law, his children must attend the black school in Trenton, some three and one-half miles from his home, Brummell contended that no white child in the district was required to go to another school or to travel a distance greater than two miles to receive an education. Brummell also argued that any attempt to prohibit his four children from attending School District No. 4 was a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment of the U. S.

Attorney Edgar M. Harber represented Brummell, his children, Barr, and the three school directors. Rezin DeBolt represented the plaintiffs (1891). Both attorneys were influential Grundy County citizens. Harber had served as a justice of the peace, a Democratic presidential elector, Trenton city attorney (The History of Grundy County, Missouri 1881, 448-449), and prosecuting attorney (Denslow, 87). One county history notes, “For so young a man, Mr. Harber has reached a prominence in the community in which he lives which is surpassed by few, and in the achievement of this well deserved popularity has laid the foundation for a future of great promise” (The history of Grundy County, Missouri, 448-449). DeBolt, in addition to offices already noted, served from 1875-1877 as a Democrat in the United States Congress. He did not seek re-nomination at the end of his term (Biographical Directory of the United States Congress). Like a majority of Grundy County residents who switched their loyalty to the party of Lincoln during the Civil War, DeBolt had previously supported the Republican ticket (Ford, 126-127, 206). His Democratic congressional race occurred amid widespread Grange activity following the Panic of 1873. A local history notes that during the 1870s and 1880s, “no important undertaking was advanced until the opinion of Judge DeBolt was secured” (Denslow, 197).

While the courts considered the question of school integration, the Missouri legislature passed a law in 1889 requiring separate schools for black children. The district in which the school was located was to assume the burden for its support. When two or more districts joined to create a black school, the districts were to share maintenance expenses in proportion to the number of eligible blacks in each; however, control rested with the board of directors of the district in which the black school was located. African-Americans living in districts with fewer than 15 students could attend any school in the county, with their home district being responsible for tuition. Districts failing to establish a black school according to law could be deprived of state school funds (Williams, 160).

W. E. Coleman, State Superintendent of Schools, discussed in his 1889 annual report the question of “What shall be done with the negro children too far distant from a negro school to attend?” (Report of the public schools, 1890, 9). He noted that at their recent state association meeting Missouri’s black teachers had appointed a committee to formulate a possible legal solution to this problem. Coleman stated that:

The secret of the whole matter is, … negro agitators want to put the negro children into the white schools …. [T]here are some negro teachers who have little judgment enough to suppose they can force the negro and white children into the same schools in Missouri …. [I]t would immediately send about six hundred able-bodied negro school teachers adrift to find employment elsewhere, for not one of them could then hope to be employed to teach a public school in Iowa, Illinois or Ohio. (Report of the public schools 1890, 9-10).

The decision

In 1890 Lehew v. Brummell reached the Missouri Supreme Court. The justices unanimously upheld the order that School District No. 4 cease providing education for the four black children. Justice Francis Marion Black, Jr., wrote the opinion of the court, stating that the laws of the State of Missouri were not in conflict with the Fourteenth Amendment. He noted that: The framers of the [Missouri] constitution and the people by their votes in adopting, it is true, were of the opinion that it would be better to establish and maintain separate schools for colored children…Under it, the colored children of the state have made a rapid stride in the way of education to the great gratification of every right minded man. The schools for white and black persons are carried on at a great public expense, and it has been found expedient and necessary to divide them into classes (Lehew v. Brummell 1891).

Justice Black wrote that no one would question the right of the legislature to provide separate instruction for males and females, or to separate “neglected children who are too far advanced in years to attend the primary department.” He added that “color carries with it natural race peculiarities” (1891) justifying the separation of blacks and whites. Black wrote:

It is true Brummell’s children must go three and one half miles to reach a colored school, while no white child in the district is required to go further than two miles. The distance which these children must go to reach a colored school is a matter of inconvenience to them, but it is an inconvenience which must arise in any school system. The law does not undertake to establish a school with a given distance of any one, white or black. The inequality in distances to be traveled by the children of different families is but an incident to any classification, and furnishes no substantial ground of complaint (1891).

Justice Black stated that the laws of the State of Missouri did not deny African-American children from attending public school, adding, “The fact that the two races are separated for the purpose of receiving instruction deprives neither of any rights. It is but a
reasonable regulation of the exercise of the right” (1891). Black did note that William Brummell’s four minor children were included in the list of defendants “and the suit was prosecuted to final judgment against them, as well as against all other defendants, without the appointment of a guardian ad litem for the infants.” The justice wrote, “After infant defendants have been served with process the suit cannot be further prosecuted until a guardian ad litem is appointed. . . . As to these minors….the judgment is reversed, but as to the other defendants it is affirmed” (1891).

Analysis

An examination of persons and events surrounding the Lehew v. Brummell gives insight into the polarizing effect race had on this small, rural school district community. The fact that the Brummell children were permitted to attend a white school in late nineteenth century Missouri suggests school directors believed these students were a part of the community. Brummell, likewise, felt his children belonged in School District No. 4 and not in the black school in Trenton. However, other residents—namely Lehew, Culver, Dawson, McCrady, and Bonta—believed race was the sole factor that disqualified the Brummell children from inclusion in the rural school community.

County histories and cemetery records reveal no affiliations that caused neighbors to choose one side or the other in the case. Barr, Thompson, and McCrady were descended from early settlers in Grundy County. The McCrady and Harber families had southern roots, while the Neely, Barr, Culver, DeBolt, and Thompson families came from Ohio or Indiana. Thompson, Neely, and DeBolt were Union Civil War veterans. Harber was a Democrat; Barr was a Republican; and DeBolt belonged to both parties during the course of his career. Bonta, Thompson, and Neely were associated with the Grundy Center Methodist Church. Barr, DeBolt, Harber, and Neely were affiliated with the International Order of Odd Fellows, a fraternal society. DeBolt played a key role in securing railroads for the county; Harber was secretary of the Chillicothe & Des Moines City Railroad Company. Parties on both sides of the controversy were farmers and lawyers. (Grundy County Mo. cemeteries; Denslow, 87, 197; Ford, 186-187, 206-207, 247, 736-737, 795; History of Grundy County, 330-449).

It is difficult to determine to what degree the cost of educating the Brummell children entered into the position of either side. The entire township was taxed for support of the black school in Trenton. With the passage of the 1889 law, the district would have been required to pay tuition to the black school. In this case, the five fathers were willing to have the district bear the extra expense. It would appear that race trumped fiscal prudence in drawing the line around community membership.

Epilogue and conclusion

Benjamin Lehew and Rezin DeBolt died in 1891 (Grundy County Mo. cemeteries), shortly after the Missouri Supreme Court’s decision. DeBolt’s death is recalled in the Centennial History of Grundy County: Bespeaking his character, his funeral was probably the largest ever held in Trenton until that time. Practically every town in northwest Missouri was represented and one man came from Chicago—for when he had been in the army, Major DeBolt found him wounded by the wayside and gave him his horse (Denslow, 198).

Eight years after the verdict in Lehew v. Brummell, none of the five fathers who initiated the suit still owned agricultural land in Township 61. Brummell, Thompson, and Neely owned land in 1898, as did Harber (Standard Atlas of Grundy County, 1898, 37). In 1891 and 1894 Brummell borrowed money to purchase additional acres, and became a substantial landowner in the county. He and his wife Victoria signed the legal documents by making their mark (Abstract and Index of Deeds, Grundy County, Missouri, 1888-1896). William Brummell lived until 1932 (Grundy County Mo. cemeteries). His name is not included in any county histories.

Following the decision of Lehew v. Brummell, black students living in Grundy County’s Township 61 attended school in Trenton and later in Chillicothe, Missouri—some 23 miles away. The arrangement continued as a testimony to the powerful influence of race on this community’s public schools until 1954, when the U. S. Supreme Court declared it unconstitutional in Brown v. Board of Education.

A study of events surrounding Lehew v. Brummell revealed that, in one rural Missouri district, race mitigated against the public school’s ability to foster a sense of community. The question of including four black children in a predominantly white school caused residents to line up on both sides of the issue, irrespective of occupation, political party, religious affiliation, fraternal membership, military service, or family history. It is hoped that new research will explore the impact of race on other rural, public schools districts with sparse African-American populations during the late nineteenth century.

Note: This article is the product of research supported by the Dean’s Grant for Research Enhancement, School of
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THE TEACHER AS STORYTELLER
Stanley D. Ivie, Texas Woman’s University, Emeritus

Introduction

“Do you know the way to Santa Fe?” I am, of course, corrupting the line from a popular song. Santa Fe is a fascinating small city that has deep historical roots. Santa Fe was colonized by Spain, and it has retained its Spanish flavor, which can be seen vividly in the downtown plaza. Treasures and trash—everything is for sale. And if you are lucky, you might even find a storyteller doll.

Once, when I was visiting Santa Fe, I purchased a storyteller doll. The doll was made of clay, cast in the figure of a grandmother, surrounded by a score of little children. Her mouth was open, indicating she was telling stories. Cultural stories represent the way in which humans connect one generation (older) with the next (younger). Stories provide us with a sense of who we are. They place the stamp of identity on how we view ourselves in relationship to the world. “The People” is a word commonly used by simple societies to refer to themselves. The Ancient Hebrews were great storytellers. Their stories proved so popular that Christians and Muslims adopted them as their own. How did the world come to be? Genius offers an interesting answer: God created it in six days. Religious fundamentalists still cling tenaciously to the story as immutable truth.

I was once asked, “What was the best piece of luck you have had in life?” I was able to answer the question without a moment’s hesitation: “I was born into a family with a loving mother.” Not only was my mother very loving, she was also a great storyteller. Every night, when my brother and I were ready for bed, our mother read us fairy tales. Fantasy stimulated our imaginations. Our thoughts were filled with dreams of ghoulish giants, beautiful princesses, and heroic deeds. Is it any wonder that I would later write a book about metaphors?

Stories and Teaching

Stories are the principal tools of teaching. They offer a way of viewing abstract ideas in concrete terms. Former students of mine have often remarked, “We can’t remember the theories you presented in class, but we all know your stories by heart.” Stories have a way of sticking to our ribs. They are useful metaphors for explaining complex problems. One of the stories I remember vividly from my childhood is Rumpelstiltskin. He was a funny little man who possessed the magical talent for spinning straw into gold. J. K. Rowling, the author of the Harry Potter books, has demonstrated a similar talent. Teachers like Marva Collins are able to work miracles in the classroom, transforming ghetto children into young scholars.

Have you ever opened “Pandora’s Box?” It is not only a colorful story but a powerful metaphor. How many times have we all rushed in where angels feared to tread. George W. Bush set out to bring freedom and democracy to Iraq. Now no one knows how to put the lid back on Pandora’s Box. Many novice teachers resign after the first year of teaching when they discovered they are not prepared to deal with the real children who live inside Pandora’s Box. Joseph Campbell was one of the brightest minds of the Twentieth Century. His book, The Power of Myth, is an insightful treatment of myths underlie the ideas we accept into our lives. According to Campbell, we are all Ulysses—returning home from an adventure quest. We begin life in a nurturing environment. The world is no bigger than home and heart. When we arrive at adulthood, however, we venture out into the world to seek our fortunes. These adventure quests can take many different forms. Some are military conquests; others result in more scholarly pursuits. All of them result in personal growth. The individual becomes more mature in his or her judgments. The final stage of the adventure quest is when the mature individual returns home to share what he or she has learned with others.

Campbell’s insight can be seen in the children’s storybook, Pinocchio. Pinocchio desired to become a real boy. In order to pursue his dream, he sets out on an adventure quest, which led him to Pleasure Island. There he succeeded in making an ass of himself. He is only transformed into a real boy when he sacrifices himself for others. Here we encounter a universal theme: The old self must die before the new self can be born. I have always found the story of Pinocchio to be rich in symbolic meaning. When I was a child, I was a little wooden-head. (Some of my former colleagues still hold that opinion.) I wanted to become a real boy. What I needed was a model. Fortunately, there was a real boy who lived in my neighborhood, Bryce. He possessed all the qualities of a real boy—resourcefulness, guts, fleet of foot, and good fighting skills. I idealized him. My dad always said, “If Bryce were going to hell, you would be right there with him.” Bryce once crawled through a hole under the old school building. I dreaded the dark, but I was not going to be left behind. We crawled through the air duct system of the school, eventually coming out on top of a pile of coal in the basement of the building. My dad was right—I would indeed have followed Bryce to hell!
Functions of Storytelling

Storytelling performs a number of significant roles or functions. One function is that of modeling. Healthy humans and animals always model up. We admire and try to copy the behavior of those who are ahead of us in their development. Male children require contact with adult men, real or imagined. This point is illustrated by the problems exhibited by adolescent male elephants in Africa. The male elephants of the herd had been killed by poachers. The young elephants had been raised without any adult models. The keepers of the preserve noticed that someone or something was killing off the rhinos. They discovered that the young male elephants were guilty of the crime. They were killing rhinos merely for sport. When they introduced adult male elephants back into the herd, the problem was quickly corrected. Young males possessed great power and strength, but they were lacking in discipline. If this is true of elephants, it is equally true of humans who display delinquent behavior. Dewey once observed that the child who is left to follow his or her own whims is more a prisoner of purposeless emotions than the child who is under the control of a mature adult.

Another function of storytelling is that it allows us to personalize our experiences. Stories help to illustrate who we are at the core of our being. They illustrate the qualities we most cherish about ourselves. When I was six years old, my mother was pregnant with my brother. My parents drove me to a small neighboring town to stay with my aunt. My favorite toy, a red tricycle, went with me. My aunt had a son, Bud, who was six years older than I. Bud was a bully who teased me incessantly. Finally, I had had enough! I climbed on my red tricycle and headed for home. I would still be peddling if my aunt and uncle hadn’t picked me up in their truck. Determination and persistence have always been two of my distinguishing characteristics. Ann Marrow Lindberg once remarked that the qualities that had made her husband great—allowing him to fly across the Atlantic—were the qualities that later gave him trouble in life. The same has been true for my life. Determination and persistence, when carried to an extreme, cease to act as virtues and become vices.

Storytelling and Identity

Who am I? Stories perform the role of offering us an answer to that question. When I was growing up, older people would often ask: “Whose kid are you?” Teachers would see me coming to school and say: “Look—here comes that Ivie boy.” They had me pegged dead to rights. And I didn’t disappoint them! I have always had a talent for kicking things into the air. Look at the titles of some of my publications: “Multicultural Education: Boon or Boondoggle?” “Are Black Studies Relevant?” And “Learning Styles: All Smoke and Mirrors?” My cultural hero for years was Peter Abelard, though I hoped they would not hamstring me along with my philosophy. I have enjoyed playing the role of an iconoclast. The joy of teaching, I have often maintained, was to be found in tromping around the edges.

Imagination is one of the key virtues coming from storytelling. Quintilian once remarked he would sooner have students who showed imagination over those with good memories. Imagination fosters creativity in literature, science, and the arts. The Bible is not all moral allegory. There are passages that convey profound insights. The twenty-third psalm, for example, tells us that: “The Lord is my Shepherd, I shall not want. He makes me lie down in green pastures. He leads me beside still waters; he restores my soul.” Paul in 1 Corinthians says: “When I was a child, I spoke like a child, I thought like a child, I reasoned like a child; when I became an adult, I put an end to childish ways. For now we see in a mirror, dimly, but then we will see face to face. Now I know only in part; then I will know fully, even as I have been fully known. And now faith, hope, and love abide, these three; and the greatest of these is love.” Metaphor allows us to capture poetic truths.

Mary Wollstonecraft-Shelly wrote Frankenstein when she was only nineteen. It is a ghost story with few equals. In 1815 a volcano exploded in Tambora, Java. As the ash from the volcano spread around the world, there was a cooling effect on the climate. The year of 1816 was recorded as the year without a summer. Shelly, Mary, and Lord Byron went to Geneva for a bit of hiking. The weather, however, was so cold they decided to stay inside and to see who could write the scariest ghost story. Mary won the contest, hands down. She later went on to become a pioneer spokesperson for the feminist movement.

Scientific discoveries are, by in large, the product of creative imagination. The lives of two of the greatest scientists, Newton and Einstein, illustrate this point. When he was born, Newton was so small you could have held him in the palm of your hand. No one thought he would live let alone become a person of intellectual stature. When he went to school, Newton was smaller than all the other children. One day, when he was being physically abused by a schoolyard bully, he fought back and gave the bully a good thrashing. Newton’s bulldog like tenacity not only proved useful in fighting but also in his scientific inquiries. Newton had a talent for focusing on a problem and “worrying” it until he had arrived at a solution. He would lock himself in his room.
for weeks on end, hardly bothering to eat or sleep. Once he had formulated an answer to a problem, he was absolutely confident in his conclusions. He hated criticism by others who he regarded as his intellectual inferiors. Newton is best known for his Theory of Gravity and The Calculus. His theories stimulated the Enlightenment of the Eighteenth Century.

Einstein was no less a germinal thinker. He picked up the problems of physics where Newton had left off. Einstein was not considered to be a brilliant student when he was in school. Einstein’s father once asked his son’s teacher what he thought his son might be successful at in life. The teacher replied that it did not matter which profession he might choose. He was likely to fail at any of them. Einstein barely passed his university examinations. Though he desired a university teaching position, none was forthcoming. He had to settle for a clerical position at a patent office. While he was there, he worked on his Special Theory of Relativity, which revolutionized the world of physics. Newton had regarded space, time, and matter as separate realities. Einstein changed Newton’s basic presuppositions. Time for Einstein was relative, changing with the velocity of an object through space. The only constant in the universe was the speed of light. Einstein had a feel for the universe. He once remarked, “to these elementary laws there leads no logical path, but only intuition.” With his General Theory of Relativity, Einstein demonstrated that gravity was a result of the curvature of space created by heavy bodies, suns and planets. At the end of his life, Einstein was working on a Unified Field Theory (or a Theory of Everything). Today’s physicists are still trying to unravel the same Gordian knot.

Storytelling and the Human Condition

Stories reveal universal themes in human character. For example, what do Macbeth, Benedict Arnold, and Richard Nixon all share in common? They were all filled with blind ambition, and they all experienced similar tragic fates. Macbeth listened to witches, accepting their lies as truths about his fortune. Benedict Arnold, whose name is synonymous with the word traitor, was one of Washington’s best generals. However, he wanted to be on the winning side so he cast his lot with the British. Richard Nixon wanted his presidency to be recorded as one of the greatest in the history of the United States. In order that he would have a complete record of everything that went on in the Oval Office, he had secret tapes made of all the conversations. President Nixon did not really trust anyone. He saw himself as surrounded by enemies, and he set out to destroy them. The whole Watergate episode reveals the truth of an old saying: “Oh, what a tangled web we weave when first we practice to deceive.” Nixon’s machinations, in the end, proved his undoing.

A good story should always have a punch line. World War II produced two classic victories. Hitler committed suicide in his bunker as the Russians ransacked Berlin. The United States dropped two atomic bombs on Japan. Victory belonged to the Allies! Do you ever watch boxing? The fight for the heavy weight championship between Marciano and Walcott resulted in a classic knockout punch when Marciano caught Walcott with a right cross. Walcott went down like a sack of potatoes. The Spanish have a flare for the poetry of life. The bull fight, when there is a clean kill, is like a moment of truth, a catharsis. Everyone is the crowd is carried away by the emotions of the moment. The crucifixion of Jesus was another story of death in the afternoon. The Romans and the Jewish leaders thought they were finished with another rabble-rouser. They did not count on Jesus’ resurrection, a triumph over death.

Story as Empowerment

Have you ever thought about changing your life? Perhaps what you need is to reframe your life story—the story you tell yourself and others. By repeating the same old story, day after day, we become stuck in a rut. Open your eyes, entertain a fresh possibility. My aunt Viola had a favorite story line: “No one ever had life as tough as I have.” Her story went downhill from there. I once met a woman whose self-concept consisted of repeating the same confining metaphor: “I am just a little mouse and I hide in my little house.” Talk about windmills of the mind! Another woman told me: “I am the girl whose sister was killed.” When I asked her how long ago that had happened, she replied: “Oh, thirty years ago, when I was in high school.” She had been clinging to the victim story for the past thirty years. The problem with casting yourself into the role of a victim is that it is very limiting. You have no potency of your own; you have to passively accept what life hands you. Nothing can change your life more than ending one career and starting a new one, finding a new mate, getting a dog, moving to a different city. All that is required is that we tell ourselves a different story.

Two things can bring a story to life quicker than anything else, children and animals. Once, when I was visiting the Dallas Zoo, I encountered a little boy who was standing next to the lion’s cage, crying. I knelt down beside him to see if he was lost. Between sobs he told me a sad story. His name was Andy, and he had come to the zoo with his girlfriend, Valery (who was
standing close by), and her father. Before he had left home, his parents had given him five dollars and placed it in his wallet. They had gotten as far as the lion’s cage when some older boys had come running by, snatched his wallet, and ran away. Valery’s father had chased after the boys. I decided I had better stay with the children until Valery’s father returned. After a short time the father came walking down the trail, empty handed. Andy really began to cry. Here was a five-year-old, mugged at the Dallas Zoo. I felt bad for Andy so I pulled out my wallet and offered him twenty dollars, saying: “You can by a new wallet and put some money in it.” Andy refused to take the money. I looked at Valery’s father. He shook his head, not knowing either. The last time I saw Andy he was walking away with Valery and her father, still crying. Why wouldn’t Andy take the money—let me fix up the mess? Andy had experienced one of life’s rude awakenings—being ripped off by others. He had lost something near and dear to him, his innocents and his wallet. The body has its own primitive wisdom. Something inside of Andy was saying: “You need to grieve your losses. If you accept the money from the nice stranger, you will have missed the real message of this experience.”

**Story as Parable**

Finally, stories may reveal novel and surprising truths. Do you remember the old eastern-western, Cong Fu? I watched every episode religiously. When Cong Fu was a still a novice at the monastery, he sought out the Master. He found him meditating at the frog pond. “Master,” Cong Fu asked quietly, “why are you meditating so intently?” The Master raised his eyes and replied: “I was reflecting on the meaning of life, Grasshopper.” “And what is the meaning of life?” Cong Fu asked. The Master lowered his eyes and remained silent for several minutes. “Life is an eternal struggle between two wolves, the white wolf and the gray wolf. The white wolf symbolizes the creative powers of the universe. The gray wolf represents the destructive forces that would undo it. The struggle between the two wolves is not confined to the world around us. It is also taking place inside of every person. The spiritual side of humanity is in constant conflict with its animal desires. Which one should we listen to: logic and light or greed and darkness? Every evening at dusk the two wolves circle one another at a clearing in the woods and begin their ritual dance, tearing at one another’s flesh.” Cong Fu pondered the Master’s words for a long time. Eventually he asked: “But in the end, which wolf will be victorious?” The Master raised his eyes, giving Cong Fu a steely look: “Whichever one you feed, Grasshopper, whichever one you feed.”
BEYOND THE TAKEN-FOR-GRAANTED PERCEPTIONS: THE AKHDMAM AND SCHOOL ATTENDANCE IN YEMEN

Abdullah Modhesh, Oklahoma State University

Introduction. Practices of “Othering” and the low school enrolment rates among the black Yemeni minority “Akhdam”

In the spring of the year 2004, I was writing an essay about a minority group in Yemen called Akhdam. In the course of researching about this group’s children’s enrolment rates in schools, I found that they have the lowest enrolment rates in the country (Al-Khayyat, 1988). Addressing this issue, I made a telephone conversation with a high-ranking official in the ministry of education in Yemen whom I had known for more than five years. I asked him why he thought the black Yemenis “Akhdam” did not participate in the several literacy campaigns organized by the ministry and other agencies, and why they had the lowest school enrolment rates in the country. That time my concern about Akhdam Children’s enrolment was coming from the perspective that the National Literacy Strategy of Yemen had put, which states that one of the main reasons behind the increasing numbers of illiterate people in the country was the fact that huge numbers of school-aged children do not join schools (the national literacy strategy of Yemen, 1999). The answer I received from the official that time was simple and quite expected. He said “they do not want to join schools because they find it better for them to work as beggars and shoe makers … What do you expect? They are Akhdam.” At that time I fully understood his remark and appreciated the exclaiming question “What do you expect?” For me, as it is for him and perhaps for most Yemenis, that was the expected behavior of Akhdam, that they do not think of the future. I documented the official’s response and interpreted it in my paper that the Akhdam do not think of the future or care about preparing for it.

As I was thinking of the topic again now, the question of this high official came back to my mind. This time it was different and raised many more questions, deeper ones. The question is not what I or the officials in the Ministry of Education expect, but why we expect so? Why should we expect so? And how are our expectations connected with how the Akhdam themselves feel and behave? How are our expectations shaped by the society’s structure rather than the Akhdam’s behavior? These questions increased my interest to revisit my comfortable position of blaming the victim and to seek a deeper understanding of the different structures in the Yemeni society that caused the Akhdam to shun away from schools and content themselves with the lowest-paid and lowest-respected jobs.

As I revisit my position and all these questions, the voice of Janet Miller (2005) questioning the extent to which the “societal and cultural expectations and stereotypes become ‘personal’ expectations” (p.60) brings a new angle from which to look at the issues of Akhdam. Miller explains how social stereotypes “shape women’s perceptions of themselves and their potentials to be educated as well as educate.” Although Miller is talking about women here, I find this very illuminating in understanding the situation of black Yemenis, Akhdam. In this essay, I try to focus on the societal and cultural expectations as well as stereotypes that have been “internalized” by the Akhdam resulting in lack of participation in literacy programs and shunning away from schools. I use autobiography to tell the story of my ever evolving, and always at-the-make perception of the issue of Akhdam.

My perceptions first formed as a result of living in Yemen for the first 27 years of my life. But then were illuminated by reading about the history of racism and sexism in the United States, given depth of understanding by reading Paulo Freire’s Pedagogy of the Oppressed and Michael Foucault’s various works questioning the practices that divide the society into ‘normal’ and ‘deviant’, into ‘self’ and ‘other, and by a marvelous dissertation research done by Huda Seif (2003) at the University of Columbia. However, as I present my thought and perceptions now, I understand that they are neither complete nor final. They represent only what I believe now, at this stage of my journey towards understanding the different realities around me.

Background

There is no consensus about the origin of the Yemeni black minority Akhdam. Some believe they are descendants of the Ethiopian soldiers who invaded Yemen in the sixth century and were defeated and enslaved (Al-Hadhrami, 1976; Moqbel, 1977; Seif, 2005). However, many, including the main activists among the Akhdam and researchers such as Huda Seif, argue that this claim is, at best, not substantiated. Some researchers such as Mohammed Shaggab (2004) rather talk about the origins of Akhdam as descendents of the Yemeni Najahites who ruled Yemen during the 5th and part of the 6th century until they were defeated and enslaved. Shaggab asserts that it was the new triumphant leader of Yemen at that time, Ali bin Mahdi Alyazeedy, who first gave them the derogatory label.
“Akhdam” meaning slaves or servants. This view is also expressed by Akhdam activists, such as Al-Qairay and non-Akhdam activists such as Ameen and Alshargaby (2006).

Just as there is no consensus about the origin of this minority there is also no official record of their population. Some reports, like the United Nations Economic and Social Council report of 2003, estimate the population to be 250,000, while others such as the report for the Social Democratic Forum by Ameen and Alshargaby (2006) estimate them to be 300,000. But the leader of the newly established organization “Defending the Free Blacks” argues that the number is indeed 800,000 (Al-Namrani, 2008). With this number the Akhdam are considered the largest minority in the country, whose total population according to the 2004 census was a little above 19 millions (Yemen, NIC).

Majority of the Akhdam dwell in shanty houses and slums that lack the basic services, like electricity, water, telephone, or sewage (Hashem, 1996). They are the poorest people in the country as reported in many human rights reports (e.g., the United States Human Rights Report, 2003, and the report of United Nations Development Program UNDP on persistent inequalities, 2003). Regarding education, the Akhdam have the lowest child enrolment rates in the country, and the lowest literacy rates as well (Al-Khayyat, 1988). Many of the Akhdam members also complain of harassment from the police and the society in general (Aljazeera online, 14/12/2002).

**Akhdam in the Yemeni context as I experienced it**

I came from a less-than-middle-class, but educated family in a village in the mid-south of Yemen. Those poor villages do not have so many attractions to keep their educated people. They are expelling villages that usually send the well-to-do children of the area to the cities. That is how I and four of my seven brothers ended up away from our village. In the village we had at least a dozen black Yemeni (Akhdam) families, whom we were not supposed to befriend.

Generally, the village people tend to help each other and care for each other. However, there are people we are not supposed to mingle with. They are dirty people. They are not us. They are the ‘Others’; the ‘bad others’. They are black and dirty. They do what ‘We’ think is shame. They are called Al-Akhdam. I learned all this at the very beginning of my social interaction. In the village, as well as in the cities, mothers would tell their children that they would become Akhdam if they stayed long in the sun. Such a warning would be enough to push the kids inside immediately for who wants to become Khadem (singular form of Akhdam).

In the village I finished my schooling from elementary to high school. During my 12 years of study there, I had only one classmate of the Akhdam minority group. His name was Khamis, meaning Thursday, and he came from the capital of the socialist southern part of the country, Aden. When he joined us, we were already in the 11th grade, which made it easier for us to accept him, though not fully, and for him to be able to deal with the stereotyping and ridicule.

The Akhdam of the village were always looked down upon. We would not shake hands with them. If they came to ask for food, we would never serve them food inside the house and would not use any bowl or dish they ate from. Elders would tell us that when a Khadem eats from a dish, worms grow in that dish even if you wash it a hundred times. Like this I grew until I was in 11th grade when the Khadem classmate came from Aden, the capital of the socialist southern part of Yemen.

When Khamis, the Khadem, came, my elder brother was a teacher at the school. He was the only teacher who encouraged and befriended Khamis. He invited him home several times and he ate with us. People looked at this with astonishment and sometimes with contempt and even disgust. We were hesitant to obey our elder brother as well. My brother was a socialist himself: He read Marx, Lenin, Engels, and many other Marxist scholars who wrote about class struggle and the right of the oppressed groups to rebel and to lead equal life with the oppressors. My brother did not only believe in Khamis, he liked him and perhaps used him to propagate for his ideological ideas or so it was believed in the village.

The society in the Northern part of the country, where we were administratively living, was a very tribal society with a strong class system. The Akhdam like Khamis were considered inferior and ‘immoral’. Dealing with them was a sign of being morally loose. However, in the case of my brother, some political agendas were stirred instead of tribal. The dominant groups, who were no different from my family in terms of racial background, thought my brother was only seeking easy followers for his socialist political trend that was abhorred by the religious and tribal leaders. The struggle became more political.

I was not impressed from the beginning with whatever my elder brother was doing, but still he left a big question in my mind that will live with me all my life. This question is “How do I understand the Akhdam’s submissiveness to the oppressive roles assigned to them by the dominant groups?” This question led me to come closer to this group and depart...
from the stereotypical perceptions that the average Yemeni would hold towards the Akhdam in continuous attempts to understand the mechanisms of the society that produced such relations. **The societal and cultural expectations and stereotypes that shape Akhdam’s perceptions of themselves.**

I go back here to the Ministry of Education official’s remark and exclamatory question “What do you expect from them? They are Akhdam” as a starting point to find what the society expects from the Akhdam and what have the Akhdam “bought in” and accepted of those expectations. The society’s expectations and stereotypes have been produced throughout ages and injected in the different social structures. Of the most relevance here is the society’s categorization of people into ‘moral’ and ‘immoral’ and the role of the language in conveying as well as creating oppressive schemes and maintaining oppressive and discriminatory discourses. The dichotomy between the moral ‘Self’ and immoral ‘Other’

As I mentioned earlier, the issue of morality—besides cleanliness—was always the barrier between us and the marginalized groups, of which Al-Akhdam is the biggest and least in position. We were told that the Akhdam are immoral, which we easily believed. Even when I started questioning the legitimacy of the society’s judgment of Akhdam as immoral, and thinking that even if they were, the society’s exclusion of this group should also be blamed, I still did not think beyond the stereotypes projected by the dominant society until I read Huda Seif’s (2003) dissertation. My thoughts were that the Akhdam were behaving according to what the culture has assumed they would behave and so they were not to be blamed, nor is the culture. At that stage of my understanding of the issue, my belief was not much different from Gerholm’s (1977) assertion that the social injustices done to the marginalized groups were part of the social systems that were transparent and hence accepted by all and never plotted against. Clearly, this view is taking the taken-for-granted views as justice, and hence justifying rather than criticizing and problematizing the status quo.

Seif (2003) criticizes Gerholm’s views and asserts that the fact of the matter is that the society has produced such a dichotomy because of relations of power and oppression. She builds her case around the notion that the dominant group has long been viewing themselves as the ones who adhere to the moral codes, *Akhlq*, and hence deserve to be called moral, while the less moral or rather the immoral groups, as not adhering to the moral codes. In fact, adhering to the moral codes is expected only from the moral ones who are “confined within the boundaries of moral spaces by a shaming mechanism that punishes the transgressors of the rules of Akhlq” (Seif, 2003, p. 26). The opposite is true about the marginalized immoral people, who are confined within the immoral spaces or outside the moral spaces by a ridiculing mechanism. In other words, if an immoral person tries to adhere to one of the values that are considered as typical for those who are deemed moral, they are ridiculed and lampooned.

Following this line of thoughts, I now remember a conversation or rather a debate I had with a colleague University assistant teacher in Yemen in 2000, who told us a story of a black Yemeni (Khadem) school teacher who once shouted at a student and the student brought his father to the school. The story goes on that the father insulted the Khadem teacher in front of his colleagues and students. The Khadem teacher went in the teachers’ room and cried. Hearing this, my heart was storming with sadness and anger, while my colleague went on to say that he shouted at the (Khadem) teacher and asked why he was crying. The teacher said that he was insulted and that he had dignity. My colleague and the other teachers asked him with contempt “Since when have Akhdam had dignity?” My heated debate with my colleague started at this remark and even though several years have passed, the storm that story had caused has never ended. Was my friend asserting his dignity by stripping the Khadem teacher of it? Perhaps that explains why my friend and his colleagues lampooned the teacher for crying over his lost dignity. He was trying to adhere to a value that the dominant group claims exclusive adherence to. This notion perhaps explains why the society doesn’t expect Akhdam women to wear the traditional veil over their faces. It is a sign of chastity which the women in this group are not expected to adhere to. Could it be that if they do, the dominant group will fear their daughters will no more have a contrasting image to keep them confined to the boundaries of chastity that distinguishes them from the immoral Akhdam?

I find Seif’s (2003) conclusions very illuminating in understanding the behaviors of members of the dominant group towards and contempt of the marginalized people, like Akhdam. In this regard Seif asserts that the ‘immoral’ is perceived as the inverse image of the ‘moral’. In other words, the ‘immoral’ is what makes the ‘moral’ possible. She reports members of the dominant group saying that what makes them ‘moral’ is simply that they do not behave like the
immoral people, like Akhdam. This tautological statement explains in some sense my colleague’s remark. By denying the Khadem’s right to have dignity, my colleague and his friends distinguished themselves from the marginalized person and the immoral in general.

**Language as a tool of oppression and stereotyping**

Based on Miller’s (2005) discussion of language as a tool to create realities, not just convey them, and on Seif’s (2003) emphasis of the created dichotomy between the ‘moral’ and ‘immoral’ as socially constructed realities used to serve oppressive discourses, I reflect here on the semantics of some words heavily used in such discourses in Yemen. The point I wish to get out of this discussion is that education and being educated is one of the attributes of being ‘moral’ and that being ‘Khadem’ as perceived in the Yemeni context excludes the possibility of being educated.

The label Akhdam, which is the word used to refer to this group, is a plural form of the word ‘Khadem’, literally meaning ‘slave’ or ‘servant’. This label is obviously degrading and humiliating. However, individuals from this group identify themselves as Akhdam. Accepting the term shows a historical lack of power which made the Akhdam easily accept the derogatory label.

Looking beyond the conventional dictionary meaning of the word ‘Khadem’, one can see how the word is being used in Yemen and how many attributes are attached to it, attributes that further degrade the marginalized group and emphasize the ‘immoral’ aspects of being Khadem. One of the ways the word Khadem is being used in Yemen is to refer to being heedless and thinking only of today. Seif (2003) argues that the myth that the Akhdam care only about their day and never pay attention to the future is used by the dominant group to both justify their acts of depriving this group from owning lands, and to attach this immoral code to the marginalized group so that members of the dominant group can define themselves in contrast to it. The word as an adjective describing heedlessness is widely spread in the popular culture. A small search for the word ‘Khadem’ in Arabic in the Yemeni web forum, www.al-yemen.org, that has more than 50,000 members, shows it used as an adjective referring to qualities rather than the ethnic group it is originally used to describe. It is even used as a verb to refer to the act of ingratitude. All these uses are informal.

‘Akhdam’ is not the only word that is being used to refer to qualities abhorred by the society besides referring to a minority group. Other words include ‘Dawshan’ which refers to a small minority group and at the same time to the attribute of being too talkative or too loud. Thus, language is not only used to convey meanings, but also to create new meanings to be attached to these minority groups. It is used as a tool to strengthen the dominant group’s position and justify their marginalization of the oppressed minorities.

Contemplating over the stereotypes of the Akhdam as reflected in the language and culture reveals that being educated is not in any way an attribute that the dominant society would attach to the Akhdam. Education implies preparing for the future, When parents decide to send their children to schools and choose to invest in their education, they must be planning for the future. But as previously mentioned, preparing for the future is not an attribute of the Akhdam whose very label denotes being heedless. A famous Yemeni proverb states that “the Khadem’s day is his feast,” which means that the Akhdam do not care about tomorrow. They think only of ‘today’. This takes me back to the question posed by the Ministry of Education official “What do you expect? They are Akhdam.”

Based on the stereotypes that the dominant culture has injected in the social structure, it is not expected— as the official implied— that the Akhdam would send their children to school. It seems that it is their choice that they don’t, but behind some choices are socially constructed reasons and social structures that transform the choices rather into obligations (H. Wang, class talk, November, 22, 2004). Obviously, the Akhdam’s choice not to send their children to school is one of those choices made due to the societal structures coercing them to accept their social position. In other words, the Akhdam have internalized the stereotypes and made them as perceptions of themselves.

**Conclusions**

The apparent and taken-for-granted reasons behind the Akhdam’s low enrolment rates in public education are rather naive when we consider the different cultural and societal stereotypes related to this group. The dominant group’s imposed dichotomy between the moral ‘Self’ and immoral ‘Other’ attaches all the negative attributes that the society wants to get rid of to the immoral groups. Among these attributes is heedlessness which is almost synonymous to the label ‘Khadem’ in the Yemeni popular discourse. Over time, the Akhdam have internalized these stereotypical attributes and one of the results of this internalization is their choice not to join school. As I conclude I must say that the amount of explicit ridicule and harassment a child from this minority has to endure in schools is
enormous (Seif, 2005). So, it is not fair to look only to what the Akhdam have internalized, but also to what discriminatory and racist practices the society very explicitly practices and what the government has not done to limit them.

Still the Yemeni Ministry of Education high-ranking official’s question remains an unanswerable question; “What do I expect? They are Akhdam.” But I hope I have been able to make sense of why I would expect them not to attend school.
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“WAS YOU FER ME?”: ALFALFA BILL MURRAY’S PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN OKLAHOMA

Bruce Niemi, Oklahoma State University

Introduction

The Oklahoma Statehood Centennial celebration and the controversy surrounding an effort before the Board of Regents to rename two historic buildings at Oklahoma State University pique interest in investigating the history of education in Oklahoma and the personalities who contributed to its development. The function of history according to William Appleman Williams “is to help us understand ourselves and our world so that each of us, individually and in conjunction with our fellow men, can formulate relevant reasoned alternatives and become meaningful actors in making history.” Oklahomaans are justifiably proud of their career and technical education system. We call our vocational education system the “crown jewel” of Oklahoma schools and colleges. Occupational education is codified into our earliest constitutional and statutory law. Vocational education was a product of the progressive education movement and the Progressive Age, an era driven by colorful individuals like Oklahoma state legislator, congressman, and Governor William Henry David (“Alfalfa Bill”) Murray. The purpose of this study is to examine the philosophy of Governor Murray and how his philosophy influenced the growth and development of Oklahoma’s system of career and technical education. Such a study not only informs the history of vocational education in Oklahoma but is informed by the history of progressivism in early 20th century America and Oklahoma. Murray’s lifetime spanned the years from Reconstruction to the dawn of the space age. As a member of the political elite of his state he traveled in wider circles than the social network of his constituents in rural Oklahoma. As a progressive at the turn of the century, Murray harbored both very enlightened and abhorrently reactionary policy goals. He received only the most rudimentary formal education yet was one of the most important intellectuals to emerge from the Sooner State. Murray was foremost an agriculturalist who took his opinions about farming and rural life to highest centers of power.

Progressivism dominated the American debate in the years from 1890 to 1920. It defined constituencies that worked toward reform such as anti-monopolism, the social nature of human beings, and social efficiency. The social welfare system, The Federal Reserve, the nonpartisan primary elections, the city manager plan, the pure food and drug laws, and vocational schools were all products of progressivism. Oklahoma became a state in the Progressive Age, with progressives exerting strong influence on public policy during the first decade of statehood.

Southern Agrarianism was a radical conservative American political and literary movement of the interwar era that idealized the Old South and advocated a return to the land and an ideal of subsistence farming as a response to the northern industrial capitalist economy. The movement had its origin after World War I within the “Fugitives,” a post-World War I group of young English professors and graduate students at Vanderbilt University. They included Allan Tate, John Crow Ransome, and Robert Penn Warren, among others. During this era, the Southern Agrarians were influential as a school of literary criticism who [R]ejected industrial capitalism and the culture it produced. In I’ll Take My Stand they called for a return to the small-scale economy of rural America as a means to preserve the cultural amenities of the society they knew. Ransom and Tate believed that only by arresting the progress of industrial capitalism and its imperatives of science and efficiency could a social order capable of fostering and validating humane values and traditional religious faith be preserved. Skeptical and unorthodox themselves, they admired the capacity of orthodox religion to provide surety in life.

The Vanderbilt conservatives failed to see what was going on in rural Georgia or communities in the Oklahoma countryside in the aftermath of the Great War. They did not see the problems: King Cotton, the tenancy system, the worn out soil, and the desperate poverty which was slowly eroding the agrarian fantasy of an antebellum South.

A notable aspect of the Agrarianism movement was autarky, the development of self-sustaining communities. It was essentially a back-to-the-land movement which caught fire during the Depression years. Public opinion began to revile the wild stock market speculation and 1920s Big Business Babbitry. A German conservative on the eve of the National Socialist in Germany summed up the autarky impulse: …they are withdrawing in disappointment and dismay from the gambling table and all its swindles. They are becoming more contented and are again
beginning to direct their lives and thoughts inward…. They’ve begun reflecting about the ground on which they stand, about the society into whose midst they’ve been placed, about family, tribe, and kinship between members of the German Volk. After a precipitous flight into freedom, they’ve found their way back to the ties forged by nature.²

**Life and Times of Alfalfa Bill**

The most colorful and interesting politician in the history of Oklahoma, Bill Murray, was born on November 21, 1869, in Collinsville, Texas, the son of an itinerant teamster and preacher, Uriah Dow Murray. Alfalfa Bill was a son of the Reconstruction South, a place where Johnny Reb came marching home to the culture of the Lost Cause. Reconstruction during Murray’s childhood was in keeping with the North’s expectation that the South would show visible signs of subjugation and regret. The Yankees imposed demanding punitive measures, which fed resentment and discontent that, in turn, begat Populism and nostalgia for the Jeffersonian myth and the promotion of the agrarian system. As one sympathetic Southern historian observed,

> It is difficult to evaluate the Reconstruction era impartially. It was a period of social upheaval in which many necessary adjustments and some constructive reforms were made. This was especially true of the field of public education, where the carpetbag legislation was progressive in theory, however inadequately it may have been enforced. At the same time it must be kept in mind that the carpetbag regimes were corrupt, that they drew much of their support from illiterate freedmen and that they were forced upon the South by Northern occupation forces. Under the circumstances, white Southerners could hardly be expected to accept such governments as a permanent solution to their problems.³

It was up to Murray’s generation to lead, to influence political and social movements and agrarian and labor unrest from the Gilded Age to America’s domination of the world scene at the end of World War II.⁴

Henry and his brothers ran away from home when he was twelve, probably because of continual conflict with his stepmother. Away from the home he worked as a farm hand, a laborer in a brickyard and cotton gin, and lives with various families. While in Keeter he attended a one-room school and lived with the teacher. There he studied, albeit erratically, the *McGuffy’s Second* and *Third Readers*. He excelled in the literary society, oratory, and debate. Later he was to attend school at College Hill Institute in Springtown, Texas. His Professors were John McCracken and D.P. Hurley. He graduated at the age of twenty. His experience at College Hill influenced his philosophy of education throughout his political life.⁵

Upon leaving College Hill Institute with a teacher’s certificate, Murray taught in one-room schoolhouses in Millsap and County Line Schools in Cade. There he polished his reputation as a teacher while writing a newspaper column on his philosophy of education.⁶ He began to attend meetings of the Farmers’ Alliance, a populist movement intent on challenging Bourbon control of the Democratic Party. The Bourbons actively promoted the New South, which favored the business-dominated America transplanted to the South in the last half of the Nineteenth Century.⁷

In 1890 Murray was elected as a delegate to the Texas Democratic Convention. He nominated his College Hill mentor Hurley for State Superintendent of Schools extolling the educator’s principles and truthfulness to the assembled delegates.⁸ Alfalfa Bill held various other non teaching jobs. He was a bookseller, the editor of a country newspaper, and reporter for the *Fort Worth Gazette*. In 1895, he was admitted to the Texas Bar and practiced at Fort Worth before moving to Tishomingo in Indian Territory in 1898.⁹ Immigrating to Indian Territory, Murray was one of the young professional men who settled in the towns where they “often improved their economic and social condition, achieving prestige and influence in Oklahoma which was denied to all but a few young men in the older communities of their home states.”¹⁰ He became legal advisor to Douglas H. Johnston, Governor of the Chickasaw Nation. Murray married Governor Johnston’s niece, Alice Hearrell, through which he won citizenship in the Chickasaw Nation.

Murray became a wealthy lawyer and wrote the Chickasaw tax code but by 1902 he retired from the law to manage 1,600 acres of rich valley bottomland which he rented to sharecroppers. He was the first landowner in Indian Territory to grow alfalfa. He encouraged the planting of alfalfa and lectured widely on the plant as an improvement to the region’s agricultural economy.¹¹ Representing the Chickasaw Nation, Murray appeared before the 1905 Sequoyah Convention which had been convened in Muskogee to frame a constitution for the state of Sequoyah. The proposed state planned to encompass Indian Territory comprising the lands of the Five Civilized Tribes – the Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Creek, and Seminole nations.
Murray was selected to be a vice-president of the convention under the leadership of its president, Creek Nation Chief Pleasant Porter. During this portentous convention, the thirty-five-year-old lawyer authored a section in the constitution providing for courses in horticulture, agriculture, and domestic sciences in the public schools – a proposal that preceded the Smith Hughes Act of 1917, authorizing federal aid to vocational education, by eleven years. The Republican Congress, however, rejected the creation of a separate state for Indian Territory fearing the addition of two extra Democratic members of the U.S. Senate if both Oklahoma and Sequoyah were granted statehood, but Murray gained stature.27

When the statehood convention convened in Guthrie its mission was to write a constitution for a state of Oklahoma Alfalfa Bill was elected president of the "Con-Con." The success earned him the moniker "Father of the Oklahoma Constitution." He wrote much of the document and promoted many progressive features in the Constitution. He made sure his fellow delegates understood his role in the state’s formation on November 16, 1907. During the Con-Con, he carried the draft of the constitution in a metal lockbox. Murray backed down, however, from the "Squirrel Rifle Brigade" fight with President Theodore Roosevelt over the President’s rejection of the document’s more radical features in order to secure his approval.18

Murray brought a coherent educational philosophy to bear on the new constitution. He sided with farmers in the “ivory silo” debate with agriculturalists over the role of land grant colleges.19 Paradoxically, he believed education could not guarantee success as a farmer. He envisioned a vocationally-oriented school system designed to give students a practical, nonprofessional education. An admirer of Luther Burbank to the extent he named his youngest son for the famous horticulturist, Murray called for practical education that would produce a “a thousand [Burbanks] where there was just one.”20

To this end, he inserted in the new constitution’s education article to “provide for the teaching of agriculture, horticulture stock feeding, and domestic science in the common schools of the state.”21 Vocational education became a key plank in the platform of the progressive education movement, which was gaining power across the nation. Agricultural and domestic sciences would be taught. Students were cautioned to “protect themselves in a vocation rather than burden them with a false education which leads exclusively to professions and office holdings, the breeder of the vagabonds of society.”22 The population should be shepherded back to the farm to encourage economic growth. As a result, the constitutional provision contributed to the “laboratory of the states” experimenting with the vocational system ten years before Congress would authorize federal funding for state systems.

First Speaker of the House

Alfalfa Bill graduated from president of the Con-Con to a seat representing Johnston County in the new House of Representatives. He was elected by his fellow Democratic representatives the first Speaker of the House. Before leaving for the State Capitol in Guthrie, Alfalfa Bill was approached by Scott, Foresman & Co. to author a textbook for agricultural schools. He declined the commission citing the upcoming legislative session but referred Scott to a Dr. Cornell in Dallas.

Farmers’ Institutes and District Schools of Agriculture

As a legislative leader Murray influenced his fellow legislature to enact agricultural and industrial education legislation he authored. The bill created farmers’ institutes and agricultural high schools in each Supreme Court judicial district.23

The farmers’ institute was one of the first forms of agricultural extension and adult education. The first institute was founded by Professor Edward Hitchcock of Amherst College in 1853 and many had been established across the nation by 1900. The institutes became a channel between land grant A. & M. colleges, their experimental farms, and farmers desiring information on new crops and agricultural methods. State and African American land grant colleges were created under the Morrill and Second Morrill Acts enacted by Congress in 1862 and 1890, respectively. Funds for agricultural experiment stations were authorized by the Hatch Act of 1887. The institutes held periodic meetings presented by the A. & M. college’s faculty, experiment station staffs, and demonstration farmers.24

Murray shepherded S.B. 112 through the House of Representatives establishing the state Board of Agriculture and creating farmers’ institutes in each county. The law specified an interesting democratic feature for the election of members the state Board. County farmers’ institutes elected delegates to the annual meeting of the state Farmers’ Institute held at the Stillwater A. & M. College. These delegates were empowered under the legislation to elect two Board members from each of the five state Supreme Court judicial districts. The president of the state Board of Agriculture was a constitutional officer elected by the people for a four-year term at each gubernatorial election.25
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Many states paved the way at the turn of the 20th Century for increased agricultural education opportunities for their youth. High schools were a new innovation and were found only in urban school districts. Farm children had to either commute long distances over country roads to towns large enough have a school or board during the school year with a relative or family friend.

Educators and agriculturalists determined there was a need for secondary education for farm youth and furnish them with a scientific basis for farming because most of the children were leaving school before the age twelve to work on the farm or going off to city high schools never to return to farming. This disturbing phenomenon was at the heart of the ivory silo debate. In an effort to meet this need for secondary and agricultural education opportunities for their rural youth, the legislatures of several states in the Midwest and South established agricultural schools along the line of various district schemes. Alabama, Georgia, and Virginia established the special agricultural schools in each congressional district; Arkansas, Michigan, Mississippi, North Dakota, and Wisconsin used various county or district alignments. Oklahoma set up schools in each of the state Supreme Court judicial districts.26

The schools maintained dormitories and operated school experimental farms. The schools were tied to agricultural experiment stations in Alabama.27 In Virginia, the district agricultural schools performed extension work such as agricultural demonstrations, youth activities, and home economics programs that were state models for extension service adopted by Congress in the Smith-Lever Act of 1914.28 The schools emphasized science in their curricula. They were the precursors of federal aid to secondary vocational agricultural education established by the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act of 1917.29

As Speaker of the House, Murray moved quickly to create a “harmonious system of agriculture and industrial education for Oklahoma . . . and agricultural schools of secondary grades in each Supreme Court Judicial District with branch agricultural experimental stations and short courses for farmers.”30 S.B. 109 also established a state Commission of Agricultural and Industrial Education consisting of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction as its chair, the president of the state Board of Agriculture, and the president of the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College. The Commission was charged with carrying out the provisions of the Act. The legislation specified the subjects to be taught and the certification requirements for teachers. In addition, the new law contained language providing for teacher education establishing “Departments of Agriculture and Industrial Education” in state normal schools and designating the A. & M. College as “the technical head of agricultural, industrial, and allied science system of education.” It established a “chair of agriculture for schools” at the A. & M. College responsible for developing curriculum materials and coordinating the efforts of teachers.31

At a banquet honoring the Speaker at the end of the legislative session, Governor Charles N. Haskell praised Murray’s efforts to provide courses in agriculture and domestic science in the public schools. The governor sent Murray the pen he used to sign the agricultural education bill.32 The Second Legislature appropriated funds for opening district agricultural schools in Warner, Goodwell, and Tishomingo. It also passed an appropriations bill naming the district school of agriculture in Tishomingo in Murray’s honor and the district school in Warner for J.P. Connors, the President of the state Board of Agriculture and Board of Regents of the Oklahoma A. & M. College in Stillwater.33 In addition, the legislature appropriated funds for schools in the third, fourth, and fifth districts.34 These schools were established in Broken Arrow, Lawton, and Helena, and were named after Governor Charles N. Haskell, State Superintendent of Public Instruction E.D. Cameron, and Oklahoma Agriculture and Mechanical College (A. & M. College) President J.H. Connell, respectively.35 An additional district school, Panhandle Agricultural Institute in Goodwell, representing the three Panhandle counties – Beaver, Cimarron, and Texas – was carved out of western Oklahoma’s Fifth Supreme Court judicial district.36

While the First Oklahoma Legislature established a system of vocational education, until federal intervention in the field occurred in 1917 vocational education was a hit-and-miss effort. Farmers’ institutes were made up primarily of farmers who could afford to attend the annual convention. Agriculturalists estimated that only about one-tenth of the farmers who received experiment station bulletins took the time to read them and use their recommendations.37

Although well intentioned, there was little political will to adequately finance the activities of the state Agricultural and Industrial Commission. In 1916, a study by the Stillwater A. & M. College chair of agriculture for schools, George Wilson, discovered there were few qualified agriculture teachers, little required training for those teachers, and even less curriculum material. The Oklahoma Farmer-Stockman reported
“the state board of education had cheerfully ignored the law of Oklahoma for nine long years.”

Jim Crow Legislation

The Democratic Party at statehood was a bastion of race baiting. The party was dominant because more than 35 percent of Oklahomans emigrated from the old Confederacy and Border States, and like Murray were products of Reconstruction. The 1907 Democratic State Convention adopted a platform insisting on racial segregation in public schools, on trains, and in railroad stations. The “Oklahoma Commoner,” as leader of the fight for ratification of the constitution, and later, the legislative party caucus, was representative of this attitude, accusing the constitution’s opponents of being from “the three C’s – corporations, ‘carpetbaggers’ and ‘coons’...”

He agreed with Booker T. Washington and conservative Negro leaders that African Americans should be trained for jobs in agriculture, mechanics, and industry. Murray had resisted including Jim Crow provisions in the proposed constitution fearing rejection by President Roosevelt. When the legislature convened the first bills passed were Jim Crow laws requiring public transportation and school segregation, an anti-miscegenation law, and a grandfather clause restricting Negro suffrage. To his credit, Alfalfa Bill opposed the grandfather clause fearing it would be used against foreign-born white voters. It was only after his opposition became an issue in the 1910 gubernatorial election that he changed his position and called for its ratification.

After the legislature adjourned, Murray was elected an Oklahoma delegate-at-large to the 1908 Democratic National Convention in Denver. The new state’s delegation endorsed the nomination of William Jennings Bryan and intended to make a significant contribution to the party platform. Governor Haskell, another at-large delegate, described Oklahoma as “built on Bryanism and... Bryanism in operation.”

As a member of the resolutions committee Alfalfa Bill was responsible for a plank advocating expansion of agricultural, mechanical, and industrial education through district agricultural experiment stations and secondary agricultural and mechanical schools.

Mr. Murray goes to Washington

Alfalfa Bill believed he was “knifed” in the back by his political allies in the 1910 gubernatorial election, but in 1912 he was easily elected to an at-large congressional seat. As a delegate to the Democratic National Convention in Baltimore that year he helped broker a deal between supporters of William Jennings Bryant and New York’s Tammany Hall nominating the scholarly Governor Woodrow Wilson of New Jersey for president. Murray was reelected to Congress in 1914 from the Fourth District.

Murray brought vocational education philosophy with him to the nation’s capital. His remarks reaffirmed his support of vocational education he had announced. On December 13, 1913, Alfalfa Bill spoke during the debate on the Smith-Lever Bill for agricultural extension education calling for expansion of vocational schools. He criticized agricultural and mechanical colleges for being mishandled by professional educators who were devoid of practical ideas for training farm boys and girls. Murray contrasted classical and industrial education, using the University of Oklahoma as an example of the former, which opposed agriculture and that A. & M. graduates seldom returned to the farm. Vocational education, for Murray, offered a means to greater production and improved market efforts, lowered the cost of living, created better farmers and strengthened their ability to feed the world. He cited his efforts on behalf of agricultural education at the Sequoyah and constitutional conventions and in the state legislature. Then Murray offered an amendment to the Smith-Lever bill authorizing federal funding for a system of district junior vocational agricultural colleges similar to those in Oklahoma, Virginia, and other states.

As a lame duck representative in the winter of 1917 he voted in favor of the Smith-Hughes bill. Also, Murray secured a $50,000 appropriation to construct two dorms for Chickasaws at Murray School of Agriculture. This action blocked efforts for by the Oklahoma Legislature to close the school. Alfalfa Bill believed Governor Robert L. Williams was behind the Oklahoma Legislature’s closing the district agricultural schools at Broken Arrow and Helena by America’s entry into World War I.

Murray left Washington within a month. He had lost his bid for reelection because of his call for preparedness and criticism of the insincerity of President Wilson’s campaign slogan “He kept us out of the war.” He was defeated in the 1918 Democratic gubernatorial primary by J.B.A. Robertson because of his radical positions on special privilege for big business that would some day consume the American economy.

Colonel Murray, Bolivian Colonist

A disillusioned Murray retreated to Tishomingo but not for long. Bill soon became restless, not only because of his lack of political involvement but with the growing urbanization of Oklahoma. He was looking for a new frontier like he found when he pioneered in the Chickasaw Nation. Always fascinated by Latin America, he traveled to South America beginning in
1920 to look for a site for an agricultural colony. After several attempts he found a 20,000 acre parcel, El Gran Chaco, in Bolivia near its border with Argentina and Paraguay. The Bolivian government was anxious to have this region inhabited with foreigners to protect their interests in border disputes. Such disputes would erupt in the Chaco War with Paraguay in 1932.

In 1924 Alfalfa Bill led a group of Oklahoma farmers to plant the Murray Colony at Mission Aguairenda, twelve miles northeast of Yacuida in the Departamento Tarji near the Argentine border. The Oklahomans did not last more than a few months in Bolivia but “Colonel” Murray and his family stayed on and became the padrone of the colony. The Bolivian government sent settlers whom Alfalfa Bill would teach American methods to cultivate the lands and operate a cotton gin. The Colonel’s colony would serve as an example of rural development to other Bolivian citizens.56

Governor Murray

The Bolivian colony did not last long. President Hoover toured Latin America in 1928 and promised South American leaders he would limit U.S. concessions in their nations. In 1929 the government of Bolivia seized Murray’s holdings and Bill once again returned to Tishomingo. He toured the state speaking about South America and other nonpartisan issues. On March 13, 1930, “Bolivia Bill” announced his candidacy for Governor in the upcoming state elections at the Labor Temple in Oklahoma City.57 The primary election campaign pitted Murray against five contenders, including former Governor Marvin Trapp, Congressman Ed Howard, and state Treasurer A.S.J. (dubbed by Murray, “Jackass”) Shaw.

For the first time the 1930 elections featured a runoff primary, which was tantamount to election in those one-party days. Bill made the runoff race opposite a self-made oil baron Frank Buttram, a conservative regent of the University of Oklahoma pledged to restore order to state government. Murray’s appeal was to small town and rural voters while Buttram received the support of urban middle and upper-classes. Bryant observed “the well educated, the wealthy, the urban editors and the educators – the ‘best people’ – would not accept as a political leader a man of crude appearance, unsophisticated manners, and purple pose” as Murray.58

Governor Murray and Oklahoma Education

One of the issues alarming cosmopolitan voters in 1930 and throughout his administration was Murray’s feud with the state’s education system. The Sage of Tishomingo was the first farmer and constitutional scholar, to run for governor. Murray was not ignorant and “in spite of own very limited contact with public education, he felt competent to give advice on the fields of study to be taught at colleges and universities and unabashedly denounced the teaching of sociology, for instance, as superfluous.”59 In 1930, as in all of “Cockleburr Bill’s” political endeavors, his platform called for “agricultural improvements to be taught in schools and colleges.”60

During the campaign Murray savagely attacked the waste and frivolity of the state’s colleges. At a rally of Young Democrats, the Alfalfa Statesman railed: “During times like these, our State University has the unmitigated gall to request a big appropriation for a concrete swimming pool. Well so far as I’m concerned they can go to the ‘crick’ to swim.”61 The Sage attacked the work ethic of college professors saying they could teach eight hours a day, six days a week, twelve months a year, the same as everyone else. He said professional meetings were a waste of time.62 Ever the fiscal conservative, Murray decried the waste of taxpayers’ money in colleges that thought more of “football, town balls, and highballs than of education.”63

Alfalfa Bill was sworn into office by his father on January 12, 1931. In his inaugural address, the new governor assured the apprehensive bourgeoisie, saying: “I shall honestly and honorably represent those who chose to call themselves the ‘better element’ but this is one time when Oklahoma’s Injuns, niggers, and po’ white folks are going to have a fair-minded governor too.”64

Alfalfa Bill pursued higher education reform efforts aimed at improving standards, eliminating duplication, and coordinating the wide network of Oklahoma state colleges. A particular higher education target both in the campaign and after the Inaugural was the State University in Norman. OU was in jeopardy undoubtedly because his 1930 runoff opponent, Oklahoma City millionaire Frank Buttram, was a “distinguished” member of the OU Board of Regents. Murray immediately fired Buttram from the Board of Regents contending the University Press printed the rich oilman’s campaign materials. The Sage of the Washita called the new student union a “country club” for students. Murray sneered at the new library’s “Cherokee Gothic” architecture betraying a subtitle appreciation for modern design nuances. As Governor, he accused the university’s president, William Bennett Bizzell, of poor leadership that permitted “flagrant immorality and corruption” among the faculty and students. Murray dispatched a retired U.S. Marshal to Norman to
investigate the university, but the marshal’s report proved nothing and President Bizzell remained at OU until his death in 1941. Murray echoed the belief of most of his constituents that there were too many college graduates in the state. He pressured college presidents to require entrance exams. The Governor thought the University and the A. & M. College should only accept juniors and seniors proposed all students should first attend a junior college echoing the “Chicago Plan” of Robert Maynard Hutchins who ironically deplored the rise of vocationalism and anti-intellectualism in 20th century higher education. The Governor, in true progressive fashion, called for reorganization of Oklahoma’s system of higher education under a “co-ordinated board for the co-ordinated colleges of the greater university.” The coordinated board, a precursor of the contemporary Oklahoma State Board of Regents for Higher Education, which was enacted into the state Constitution in 1941, was responsible for eliminating duplication of curriculum, conducting entrance examinations, and issuing degrees. Equal education opportunity for all Oklahomans was a consistent theme of Alfalfa Bill’s philosophy. He organized women’s clubs to lead the fight for nine-month school years in their local districts. In 1931 the Governor, not satisfied with action by the legislature on his program, including a state free-textbook program, used the initiative process to present it to voters in a special election on December 18, 1931. The initiatives became known as the “Firebells Campaign.” Murray believed the free-textbook system would make education more available and would break up the graft that sustained “one of the state’s most vicious political machines – the Department of Education.” A statute was passed in 1929 authorizing a state textbook commission and a free-textbook program but the Legislature never appropriated funds for its operation. The free-textbooks measure was opposed by State Superintendent of Public Instruction John Vaughn and local schoolmen. Vaughn was angry because the state superintendent was excluded from membership on the proposed textbook commission, while local superintendents predicted if the initiative passed their schools would be closed and they would suffer pay cuts. The free textbooks proposition, State Question 172, was defeated by a vote of 196,579 to 245,743.

In the wake of the Firebells’ defeat, and for the remainder of his single term of office, Governor Alfalfa Bill continued his efforts for free-textbooks. He appointed a state textbook commission that adopted new and lower-priced books for the state’s common schools. By the time Murray left office in 1935 textbooks had been adopted for 65 percent of the subjects taught in the common schools. He spent $267,000 in relief funds to purchase textbooks for children living in poverty. He and “a group of friends of higher education,” including the A. & M. College President Bennett, created William H. Murray Education Foundation to furnish scholarships for needy students in 1931. Long after Murray left the Governor’s Mansion, the state’s electorate ultimately financed the distribution of free-textbooks by approving State Question 318 in the 1946 General Election, thus fulfilling Alfalfa Bill’s most important educational goal. Murray involved in the developing curriculum materials for agricultural education. In 1932, the Governor asked A. & M. College President Bennett to commission a practical agriculture textbook for junior high pupils. The politically astute A. & M. president prevailed upon the College’s Department of Agricultural Education to complete the text, First Problems in Agriculture, by 1934. The faculty completed a subsequent high school vocational agriculture textbook, Practical Agriculture for High Schools, in 1937. Was You Fer Me? Another education issue that concerned the new Governor was one of personnel administration. Murray saw his most difficult problem after his election was filling the state’s appointive offices with men who would be loyal to his administration. As Governor Murray practiced the use of spoils in employment decisions, including hiring and firing presidents and faculties of the state’s public higher education institutions. His belief in patronage and his earlier intervention as a legislator on behalf of friends and family members seeking federal and state jobs had caused him problems in the past. But when the term expired of a state college regent appointed by the previous governor illustrates the Governor had but one concern. The incumbent regent appeared at the Governor’s Office for an interview with Alfalfa Bill. When the regent sat down before Murray made only one inquiry and that question concerned her involvement in the in the 1930 gubernatorial race: “Was you fer me?”

The Governor punished those educators who had neglected to be “fer” him. When Murray took office most of the government’s workforce had been his bitterest political enemies. Alfalfa Bill “know that if left in their places, they would maintain their contact with unfriendly outside influences and embarrass and obstruct him in every conceivable manner. He proceeded to construct an organization of appointive
officials whose loyalty would be unquestionable. Murray replaced more educators than any Oklahoma governor except Jack Walton, removing presidents at Central State College, the Colored Agricultural and Normal University at Langston, Cameron Junior College, Southeastern State College, Murray State College, Northwestern State College, and Northeastern Oklahoma Junior College in Miami. He removed the dean of the University Hospital and issued an executive order allowing chiropRACTORS to practice there. He fired the president of Southwestern State College when faculty members attended meetings opposing the Firebells initiatives. Murray fired Nelms as the supervisor of agricultural education and replaced him with J.B. Perky who would remain head of the vocational education department through 1965. For many years Clay DeFord was chair of the department of social sciences at the Miami junior college. He held the A.M. degree from the University of Chicago and was a former superintendent of schools. Yet Mr. DeFord sought employment in a New Deal adult education school because, he explained, he was fired from the state College “through the political machinations of the minions of our Gov. Murray.”

Henry G. Bennett and Vocational Education

One educator who escaped the Governor’s wrath was Oklahoma A. & M. College’s president Henry Garland Bennett. Bennett was a shrewd political entrepreneur with tenancies that reached out to schoolmen across the state and survived the administrations of seven Oklahoma governors. His land-grant College in Stillwater for the industrial class and farmers appealed to Governor Murray. During his administration Murray signed an executive order entitled the “Memorandum of Agreement by and between the State Department of Vocational Education and the Oklahoma A. & M. College Relative to State Supervision and Teacher Training in the Several Fields of Vocational Education.” The memorandum authorized the A. & M. College to provide office space for the State Division of Vocational Education, pay one-half of the salaries plus the support services for a “resident and itinerant teacher training service.” Murray’s agreement offered courses for the training of “city superintendents and high school principals, supervisors of agricultural education and trade and industrial education vocational agricultural teachers, trade and industrial teachers, commercial teachers, and related subject teachers.”

Bennett scored a triple victory with the residence on campus of the State Vocational Education Board. First, he claimed leadership for the land-grant College in the expanding field of vocational education. Second, in the depths of the Great Depression, Bennett found a source of state and federal funds from the State Department of Vocational Education and the U.S. Office of Education. Finally, the A. & M. College president was the only Oklahoma College president who found favor for higher education from “Alfalfa Bill” Murray. In 1938 Bennett, ever the campus architect, proposed and sought funding from the New Deal’s Public Works Administration for construction of “a classroom and laboratory building for vocational and rural education” on the Stillwater campus in an effort to consolidate the A. & M. College’s position as the premier institution in the field.

Scholarships for the Worthy Poor

While serving as Governor, Alfalfa Bill and some of his friends created the William H. Murray Education Foundation to furnish scholarships for needy students. When Murray ended his term as governor he claimed the foundation had more than $100,000 in money and royalties invested in a trust. The foundation was governed by a three-man board that included A. & M. College’s President Bennett. Its charter specified it was “to educate, or to aid boys and girls to secure higher education, from families of good character,” which did not include “communists and Zionists whether born in America or recently displaced person (D.P.’s): also Atheists, and persons of any race with less morality, than the American Nordic Whites—or different from the Anglo-Saxon Germanic race; but not to include the Aryan American Indian of good character.” The Foundation operated until 1949 but it seemed to take a back seat to political priorities.

Eugenics and the Sterilization Law

Alfalfa Bill’s use of race as a factor in the selection of poor students worthy of receiving the Murray scholarships revealed another dark side of the progressive agenda. Eugenics was a pseudoscientific behaviorist goal of progressivism. A recent study documents eugenics education in Oklahoma and its acceptance by respectable urban middle class for birth control, sterilization, and euthanasia. In his final message to the Oklahoma Legislature, Murray endorsed the passage of the infamous sterilization law under consideration. He cited the example of the “Jukes Sisters” and the costs to the State of New York of their offspring “in criminal prosecution . . . of almshouses, poor houses” and he contrast of the “Killikuk Family” fathered by a Revolutionary soldier with a “half-witted daughter” and “a worthy girl”; the U.S. Army’s experience with testing World War I
draftees, which revealed “mentally and physically Defectives . . . thrown into the discard”; and the “6,000 children with syphilitic blood in the public schools” in calling for enactment of the legislation.\footnote{81}

**Alfalfa Bill at Rest**

Governor Murray left office on January 14, 1935, at the age of 65 and retired to a small farm on Yashau Creek near the town of Broken Bow in McCurtain County. For the next 21 years of Alfalfa Bill he would attempt to retain some influence over the development of Oklahoma in conformance with his belief in the agrarian system. Three times the Yashau Sage attempted races for governor, senator, and congressman-at-large. Murray broke with President Roosevelt, and from 1936 on he supported either Republican or Dixicrat nominees for president. This heresy would hurt him politically but he held fast to what he believed were his true conservative Jeffersonian-Democrat convictions while he flirted with isolationism and fascism. He continued to write prolifically but each book or pamphlet was more vociferous, demented, and extreme. His beloved wife died in 1938 a few weeks after his defeat in a bitter gubernatorial primary. He spent his lonely golden years in deteriorating health either imposing on his sons or in a series of cheap lodgings in Oklahoma City and Tishomingo tramping the streets trying to sell his diatribes.\footnote{82}

In retirement Murray continued his interests in political education and involvement. The consequences of his involvement marginalized him to more extreme positions on the reactionary end of the progressive spectrum. In the 1932 presidential campaign, Governor Murray had been a contender for the Democratic nomination with the motto “Bread, Butter, Bacon, and Beans.” At the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, the Governor received the Oklahoma delegation’s favorite son and had received one vote from North Dakota cast by his brother George.\footnote{83}

Having challenged Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt for the presidential nomination, Murray garnered the undying hatred of the nominee and his Brain Trust throughout the remainder of his term in office. Roosevelt’s chief political adviser, Postmaster General James Farley, and WPA administrator Harry Hopkins bypassed the Governor on patronage decisions and state administration of federal relief. Murray’s political opponents attempted to undermine his control of the party. He opposed the candidacy of his successor, Congressman Ernest Marland.\footnote{84}

Murray became increasingly disillusioned by the New Deal and in 1935 he warned legislators about “co-operating with the Federal Government” and the “brain buster know as brain trusters who are trying to destroy our government.”\footnote{85} He saw in the New Deal a cataclysmic Great Leap Forward into collectivism. The autarky he envisioned in Oklahoma and South America was usurped by one New Deal bureaucracy as a paternalistic propaganda showplace complete with a progressive school designed by John Dewey, then morphed into a green belt model for postwar suburbia and urban renewal by another Roosevelt Brain Truster.\footnote{86}

After moving to Yashau Creek, Murray had founded, and served as National Director of, the Association for Economy and Tax Equity operating it out of his farm home. The purpose of the Association was to elect an economy-minded congress.\footnote{87} The following year, while hesitating to cut his ties with the Democratic party, Murray aligned himself with former Democratic presidential nominees James W. Davis and Al Smith and other “real” Democrats in voting for his neighboring Governor, Alf Landon. This heresy and Murray’s opposition to packing the Supreme Court caused President Roosevelt to scuttle his chances to run to the governorship in 1938. Murray returned the favor by openly campaigning for Wendell Willkie for president, whom he later denounced as a “world government crowd front-man.”\footnote{88}

In 1941 Alfalfa Bill joined the America First National Committee.\footnote{89} America First was an isolationism movement intent on keeping the United States out of war in Europe and unimpaired freedom of action. Isolationists joined forces with pacifists after the invasion of Poland by Germany in September 1939. They agreed that participation in war would weaken the United States and jeopardize her survival as a free republic.\footnote{90} The 1941 isolationist coalition was a diverse group of groups and individuals,

[It included, of course, the openly pro-Nazi membership of the German-American Bund; the more numerous and widely dispersed Communist claue - to whom, between Sept. 1939 and June 1941, the struggle was merely an “imperialist war” initiated by Britain and France; native fascists like Gerald L. K. Smith, with a long record of hate- mongering against minorities; simpleminded heirs of the “Know-nothing” tradition like Verne Marshall, whose “No Foreign War Committee” achieved a brief notoriety at the end of 1940; high-ranking members of the Catholic hierarchy like Cardinal O’Connell of Boston, whose Christian principles, one is tempted to think, were not uncolored by an honest Irish hatred of Britain; men of unquestioned ability in industry and commerce, like General Robert Wood of Sears, Roebuck; professional
protesters like Norman Thomas, the perennial Socialist candidate for president; professional left-wing turned reactionary John T. Flynn; soft headed college presidents like Nobel MacCracken of Vassar and hard headed ones like Robert Maynard Hutchins of Chicago; assorted political figures, ranging from the unaltered irreconcilable foe of the League of Nations, Hiram Johnson, and that imperious patriot, Representative Hamilton Fish, to extravagant demagogues as Senators Burton K. Wheeler and Gerald P. Nye; unclassifiable eccentrics like Col. Robert R. McCormick of the Chicago Tribune; and finally, also unclassifiable, and by all odds the most able spokesman for the cause, the nation's one-time idol, Col. Charles A. Lindbergh.59

The conservatives within the coalition believed war would imperil capitalism through inflation, wage and price controls, and compulsory unionism, meanwhile liberals thought total war would end New Deal reform and engulf the nation in “wartime economics,” foretelling fascism and the cold war’s military-industrial complex. Pacifists refused to sanction any conflict but many isolationists supported a strong national defense and American imperialism and economic spheres of influence.92 Whatever their motivation for opposing participation in World War II, Murray and his fellow isolationists were marginalized and painted as “extreme Right-wing” and “narrow, provincial, small-minded, and reactionary Mid-westerners not as attuned as they themselves were to the great, cosmopolitan world of Europe and Asia” by interventionist Eastern journalists.93

It was through America First that Alfalfa Bill initiated a relationship with the Rev. Gerald L. K. Smith of Eureka Springs and the native-fascists faction. It was a curious alliance and precipitated a series of publications that brought into focus some of the Sage of Tishomingo’s rabid racist and anti-Semitic attitudes that would haunt his legacy.94

For the remainder of his life Murray stuck with his new found Right-wing principles. In 1948 he attended the national convention in Birmingham of the State’s Rights Democratic party (Dixiecrats) but was unsuccessful in getting ballot access for his nominee Gov. J. Strom Thurmond of South Carolina. In 1952 Murray cast a write-in vote for Douglas MacArthur by pasting the General’s picture on the ballot.95

Murray was a prolific writer in retirement. His writings during this time included: Rights of Americans (1937); The Presidency, the Supreme Court and Seven Senators (1939); Uncle Sam Needs a Doctor (1940); The Finished Scholar (1941); The Negro’s Place in Call of Race: The Last Word on Segregation of Races Considered in Every Capable Light as Disclosed by Experience (1942); Essays on Forms of Government from Theocracy to Foolocracy (1942); his five-volume autobiography, Memoirs of Governor William H. Murray and a True History of Oklahoma (1945); Palestine: Shall Arabs or Jews Control It or America Admit 100,000 Communist Jews from behind the Iron Curtain? (1948); Christian Mothers (1950); and Adam and Cain (1952). In his Memoirs and the other polemics, Murray both “established himself as a racist of unbounded hatred … and sang the praises of agrarianism, and he never ceased to formulate his beliefs and judge the actions of others within its narrow framework.”96

The Finished Scholar was another of Murray’s treatises revealing more of his philosophy of education. It is an essentialist text that bemoaned the loss of morality, grammar, and manners among the nation’s youth. He urged the reading of “strong literature” including his own writings. Murray wrote the book while living in an Oklahoma City hotel and in it praised the work of his mentors at College Hill Institute and his own rudimentary self-education.97

Conclusion

We know about Alfalfa Bill Murray’s philosophy of education, society, agrarianism, politics, and race from his extensive writing and speeches. He never held back his opinions even in the twilight years of his life when his Victorian Age attitudes had long been eclipsed by modernity.

William H. Murray was one of the founders of Oklahoma and in a sense exemplified the new state and its people during its first half century of statehood. Like many early Oklahomans he was a son of the South and a product of the pain of the Lost Cause. Alfalfa Bill believed, “civilization begins and ends with the plow, and when you junk the plow, you junk civilization.” Agrarianism and the welfare of farmers were always his paramount goals. He rejected the 20th century’s race toward industrialization and urbanism, and at all times strived to create a self-sustaining agricultural community.

Robert M. Hutchins, the distinguished statesman of American education once concluded:

The purpose of public schools is not accomplished by having them free, universal and compulsory. Schools are pubic because they are dedicated to the maintenance and improvement of the public thing, the res publica; they are the common schools of the
commonwealth, the political community. They may do many things for the young; they may amuse them, comfort them, look after their health, keep them off the streets. But they are not public schools unless they start their pupils toward an understanding of what it means to be a self-governing citizen of a self-governing political community.

Alfalfa Bill was a populist-progressive Democrat. Murray’s progressivism seemed to dissolve into isolationism and extreme nationalism that usually goes with it – including at times hatred of Europe and Europeans, racial, religious and nativist phobias, resentment of big business, trade-unionism, intellectuals, the Eastern seaboard and its culture – all of these were found not only in opposition with reform but also at times oddly combined with it. Bill’s education philosophy was weighted with the idea of creating a citizen participating in a self-governing political, agrarian community. He believed the self-governing citizen should possess the practical skills through agricultural and mechanical education to contribute to the commonwealth. Agricultural schools, free textbooks, and less emphasis on higher professional education were all aimed at creating a society of self-sustaining yeoman farmers under the Southern Agrarian model.
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On his home page (http://www.w3.org/People/Berners-Lee/) Berners-Lee answers a “kid's” question on whether the web was “a good idea or a bad one” at length: “I think the main thing to remember is that any really powerful thing can be used for good or evil. Dynamite can be used to build tunnels or to make missiles. Engines can be put in ambulances or tanks. Nuclear power can be used for bombs or for electrical power. So... what is made of the web is up to us.” (Schorow, 2007).

Introduction

The most recent Digest of Education Statistics (2006), stated that the average public school contained 136 instructional computers and that 93% of instructional rooms were connected to the Internet. With a majority of classrooms connected, the question becomes, “How does the [W]eb impact the educational experience for our students?” The answer is that it depends upon how that educational experience is packaged. A framework built on game theory can be viable only with a sound pedagogical foundation.

First, we need to have a common understanding of what the [W]eb is. The words, “Web 1.0,” “Web 2.0,” and “Web 3.0” are frequently used in an imprecise manner. This paper attempts to define each of these iterations of the [W]eb. Normally, with software, version numbers are provided to distinguish between the major implementations. Various people have coined the terms “[Web 1.0,” “Web 2.0,”] and “Web 3.0” to be used in conjunction with different aspects of the [W]eb. After clarifying the meanings of these terms, we will explore the advantages and disadvantages of using the [W]eb for instruction. Furthermore, “Web 3.0” gave us the virtual worlds within which a new theory of play will have to be articulated.

“Web 1.0”

Timothy Berners-Lee is credited with inventing the World Wide Web. In 1989, while at the European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN), he proposed his concept for the [W]eb. “He launched it on the Internet in 1991 and continued to refine its design through 1993.” (Schorow, 2007). The first iteration of the web, “Web 1.0,” could be considered the “read-only web.” Very little user interaction or content contribution occurred. Basically, one was able to search for information and read it. Many web site owners wanted to establish a web presence in order to make their information available to anyone 24x7.

“Web 2.0”

The next iteration of the web, dubbed “Web 2.0,” was the “read-write web.” The main difference between “Web 1.0” and “Web 2.0” was that users now have the ability to contribute content and to interact with other web users. A wiki is a website where multiple users contribute content. Wikipedia, (http://www.wikipedia.org), is the most prominent example of a wiki. It is available in multiple languages.

Other examples of these interactive types of web interfaces that allow users to interact with other web participants are discussion lists and blogs. Discussion lists can be threaded or non-threaded. Blogs (web logs) are discussion lists where the last posting is listed at the top. They provide commentary or news on a particular subject.

Most social networking sites are included in the category, “Web 2.0.” One example of this is a social bookmarking system called del.icio.us (http://del.icio.us), pronounced “delicious.” Its primary purpose is to store an individual’s bookmarks online, which allows that individual to access the same bookmarks from any computer and add bookmarks from anywhere. Users store, classify, share, and search bookmarks to web pages that they find useful.

Other “Web 2.0” tools include YouTube, Facebook, and MySpace. YouTube (http://www.youtube.com/) is a web site for publishing your own videos. Facebook (http://www.facebook.com) is a social utility to primarily connect an individual with people around them. Another social utility is MySpace (http://www.myspace.com), the largest social networking community (Tapscott, 2006, p 48).

“Web 3.0”

“Web 3.0” constitutes a “read-write-execute web.” Getting (2007) defines the read-write-execute web as including two principles: semantic markup and web services. We will next examine what is meant by each of these terms.

Getting (2007) explains that “semantic markup refers to the communication gap between human web users and computerized applications.” The problem, as Getting points out, with placing information online is that there exists no context for the data. This means that the computer sees the data but does not know how to interpret it. The idea of semantic markup is to have data
The ability to format data to be understood by software agents provides a segue to discussing web services which is the “execute” portion of Getting’s definition. “A web service is a software system designed to support computer-to-computer interaction over the Internet.” (Getting, 2007). Numerous web services are currently available. One popular form of web service is an Application Programming Interface (API). A good example of an API is the website Flickr (http://www.flickr.com/). Flickr is a photo-sharing website which provides a web service whereby developers can programmatically interface with it to search for images. Flickr started in 2003 as an online multi-layer game. The photo trading feature was added as an afterthought (Tapscott, 2006, p 286).

A virtual world is another example of where “Web 3.0” will transport us. Second Life is one prominent virtual world. Social networking is also practiced in these virtual worlds.

**Second Life (A Virtual World)**

Second Life (SL) was started by Linden Lab in 2003. At first glance, it appears to be one of those massive multiplayer online role-playing games, minus the aspect of winning or losing. Virtual games refer to locations as “worlds” or “islands” where buildings can be created. Its users are called “residents”, who interact with each other through motional avatars, a computer “person”. Avatars provide an advanced level of a social networking service. Residents can explore, socialize, participate in individual and group activities, [and] create and trade items (virtual property) and services from one another. Individuals jointly inhabit a 3D landscape and build their world. One can experiment with building objects, changing their color, size, position, and texture, which are the same principles used in building anything in Second Life. For example, each avatar is able to select the color and type of hair style that they will wear in their virtual world.

The websites previously mentioned (Facebook, YouTube, and MySpace) along with the method we use to create our virtual worlds tend to be influenced by the media. We now examine more closely the role of the media in technology.

**Internet Play**

The media is a very powerful force in influencing our children. For example, during the 2003 invasion of Iraq, Grugeon observed that some children were calling the hiding places on the boundaries of playgrounds ‘bunkers’. (Goldstein et al, 2004, p 85).

The crux of Goldstein’s (2004) book is that “technology is increasingly applied to the pursuit of pleasure.” What he means is that the merger through various media is being increasingly applied to the pursuit of something called edutainment. This poses a problem only when pedagogical goals are lost sight of. (Goldstein et al, 2004, p 1).

Seiter describes the internet as a child’s playground. She poses several important questions for consideration: “How do games on the web compare with more traditional forms of children’s play? How do issues of access and social communication differ between computers and playgrounds?” (Goldstein et al, 2004, p 6) Addressing these questions is the first thing that we have to do prior to creating games.

**Instant Messaging**

“The Pew Internet & American Life Project produces reports that explore the impact of the internet on families, communities, work and home, daily life, education, health care, and civic and political life.” (http://www.pewinternet.org/) They have reported that 78% of teenagers with Internet access use Instant Messaging.

Although Instant Messaging is still available, cell phones with the ability to text message have gained greater prominence. Grugeon found that even though cell phones were banned for the study, the practice of texting occurred in exercise books and notes passed between the children. Examples included text messages such as “cuL8er,” “ru up4it?” “n-ew ay,” “up2u.” Creating this kind of private communication proved irresistible. Here again, banning by teachers continued to provide an incentive for many games. (Gruegeon see Goldstein, 2004)

Have brt (be right there) and cu soo n (see you soon) promoted a deterioration in written skills? The consensus among most educators is that it has.

So if text messaging is considered to be detrimental toward writing, are there any studies that describe advantages to text messaging? Seiter discovered that Instant Messaging seems to be functioning in a way that both facilitates interaction between boys and girls and disrupts cliques. Popular girls and nerdy boys find themselves in conversation much more often than is typical at school” (see Goldstein et al, 2004, p 102).

O’Brien (2001), for example, claimed that young people use the network to channel their social concerns (see Goldstein, 2004, p 117).

Another advantage to showing student writing on the internet is in the feedback received. Other students are able to view the writing and critique it. Poor writing is seldom tolerated. The incentive is to edit one’s writing
in order to avoid criticism.

**Growing Up Digital**

Downes (1999) discovered that parents placed a high educational value on the Internet; whereas, their children viewed it as a means of entertainment (Goldstein 2004, p 118). Students tend to use educational web pages only to complete an assignment; otherwise they tend to find them boring. (Tapscott, 1998; O'Brien, 2001 see Goldstein, 2004, p 116). For children the internet is a means to chat with their friends.

Seiter stated that five generalizations can be made about the nature of children’s play with computers:

1. Browsing the Web is the consistent activity of choice over using installed software on the computer.
2. Television holds the tightest connection to the Internet in the children’s minds.
3. Children locate new Web sites through word of mouth rather than search engines, portals, or banners.
4. All the favorite sites were those with video and audio streaming as well as the capability of handling large amounts of traffic.
5. Game playing was the preferred activity of younger students. (Goldstein et al, 2004, p 95-96).

Even young children are being influenced in the new ways of the internet. “In its capacity as a market researcher, Neopets projects that young people spend 12.1 hours on the Internet per week as compared with 7.5 hours watching television.” (Seiter, see Goldstein, 2004, p 99) Players who log on to neopets (http://www.neopets.com) are able to navigate a series of worlds embedded in the game. They can gain points to expand their collection of pets, buy food or services for their pets, or engage in combat with other pets. This last point is one of concern.

Young children can benefit in their learning and development by using technology. “Therefore, early childhood educators have a responsibility to critically examine the impact of technology on children and be prepared to use technology to benefit children.” (Wright & Shade 1994 in NAECY position paper)

Early childhood educators must influence events that will transform the daily lives of children and families. The National Association for the Education of Young Children created the following policy statutes: “(1) the essential role of the teacher in evaluating appropriate uses of technology; (2) the potential benefits of appropriate use of technology in early childhood programs; (3) the integration of technology into the typical learning environment; (4) equitable access to technology, including children with special needs; (5) stereotyping and violence in software; (6) the role of teachers and parents as advocates; and (7) the implications of technology for professional development.” (NAECY, 1996) succinctly stated this policy: “If computer experiences are not developmentally appropriate, children would be better served with no computer access.” Thus, if we are to use technology, we must use it with proper pedagogical objectives in mind. This is true even for our [youngest] students.

This leads one to question whether the computer is a transitional object that has moved children from playing with toys to pursuing media-based fan activities, a form of social networking. Neopets is a virtual world using avatars just like in Second Life, another form of social networking. Second Life is an Internet-based virtual world video game in which its users, called “Residents,” interact with each other through motional avatars.

**Second Life Revisited**

Various marketers have already entered Second Life. One of Toyota’s new car lines, Scion, debuted in Second Life (The Economist, 2006). Various articles advocating for different forms of counseling in Second Life such as grief counseling, marriage counseling, and spiritual counseling are prevalent on the internet. The counseling sought in a virtual world would be paid for with virtual money.

Some doctors, salesmen and executives have turned to social networking sites to consult and commiserate with peers. (Vascellaro, 2007, p D1). For example, a doctor was able to turn to fellow physicians for diagnostic help on Sermo.com (http://www.sermo.com), a physicians’ only social networking site. Many fellow physicians offered suggestions, including the correct diagnosis. Other professional social networking sites include INmobile.org (http://www.INmobile.com/) for wireless telecommunications, AdGabber.com (http://www.AdGabber.com/) for advertising, and a new Reuters site for finance (http://secondlife.reuters.com/).

The creator of imagiLEARNING island uses it to introduce traditional educators and business persons to Second Life. He believes that Second Life will replace the traditional web-based delivery system in education. Furthermore, as technology improves, disability issues will be reduced. The imagiLEARNING island creator demonstrated at the 2007 International Game Developers Conference demonstrated the ability to control virtual characters through his brainwaves. “This technology will become integral to virtual worlds. Technology also exists for visual implants to bypass damaged optic tissue and send virtual data directly to the brain.” (Deubel, 2007). Blind students would be able to interact with visual students in an online course on an equal platform.
A growing number of colleges and universities are exploring Second Life for its marketing possibilities. Even though SL has a steep learning curve, colleges/universities want to ensure that they have a web presence in this new virtual world.

With such a steep learning curve, why would anyone in education want to use Second Life when you consider the variability among all learners? Second Life has potential to increase student engagement, allow rapid prototyping of objects, give students exposure to public relations and marketing, and to provide a setting for experiential learning. Deubel (2007) “was immediately struck by the potential for immersive learning activities and the opportunity to create a new approach to learning that is more appropriate to digital learners who have grown up in these virtual environments.” Some of these users learn best when they are having fun. Second Life is a virtual world in which one can explore and experiment.

Research on the Convergence of the Internet and Play

Marshall McLuhan (1964) said that the “medium is the message.” New media were not necessarily good or evil, but they often did profoundly alter the course of a culture. McLuhan went on to state, “Any understanding of social and cultural change is impossible without knowledge of the way the media work as environments.”

Tapscott (1998) argued that the only way out of the crisis in modern education [was] to “shift” from broadcast learning to interactive learning. And the tool for achieving that shift was the Internet. It was the networking of home computers that changed the one-way passivity of television audiences into a dynamic network of active learners. (Goldstein et al, 2004, p 139).

Negroponte (1995), Tapscott (1998), and Rushkoff (1999) portray the coming of “cyber gaming” as a revolutionizing force in children’s lives overthrowing the authoritarian, centralized, elitist model of mass media in favor of emancipatory, decentralized, distributed, and populist “republic” of networked interactivity by which digital kids will feel most at home surfing the net and playing video games. (Goldstein, 2004, p 140)

It is not surprising, therefore, that on the other side of the information highway, Neil Postman’s (1993) book Technopoly has provided what is perhaps the clearest expression of simple skepticism about the potential of computers for kids. For Postman (1993), computers, like TV, fostered a mindless escapism that hastened the declining literacy and growing uncivility of the Nintendo generation. Postman (1993) lamented that another generation was about to be amused to death by vapid entertainment delivered through new electronic channels. (Goldstein, 2004, p 143) Postman (1993) challenged the idea the computers are inherently educational, preferring to point to the commercial institutions and cultural practices that program and profit from it.

Although the potential for harm exists, computer/internet play has been validated as educational (Gee, 2003; McFarland, Sparrowhawk, & Heald, 2002; Prensky, 2001), and computer games are promoted as a vehicle for stealth learning (Goldstein, 2004, p 219).

If a computer game is to be effectively used as an educational medium in an educational setting an explicit, intended object to be learned [should] exist. The intended object of learning, as seen generally from the teacher’s perspective, is somehow realized in the classroom as a particular way of organizing the learning process. (Linderoth et al see Goldstein, 2004, p 174)

Conclusion

In 1981, Alvin Toffler’s book, The Third Wave, first popularized faith in computers as a progressive force for social change. History, claimed Toffler (1981), teaches that technological invention was the most powerful force for changing the whole of society. Rather than bend humans to mechanical age rhythms and routines, computers would help make mass society more responsive to the range of human needs and desires.

In 1995, Nicholas Negroponte’s, Being Digital, stated “Like a force of nature, the digital age cannot be denied or stopped. It has four very powerful qualities that will result in its ultimate triumph: decentralizing, globalizing, harmonizing, and empowering.”

Sutton-Smith states that two messages are fairly prevalent. The negative message is “about the failure of various ‘educationally loaded’ media to absorb children, and the other is largely positive about the success of play to continue its existence within the new context of these multiple media.” (Goldstein et al, 2004, p 7)

The silicon apostles of the coming digital era claimed that Toffler was right. Because young people were to be the pioneers in this brave new digital world, we could look to them to understand what was happening argued Negroponte, for their lives were the first to be transformed (see Goldstein, 2004, p 137).

How virtual worlds, computer games, and various web sites can be used as educational tools must therefore be studied further. How we transform the educational lives of our students is worthy of our attention. Using technology for the sake of technology does not make for good pedagogy. The articulation of a
new theory of play using “Web 3.0” will have to be oriented towards pedagogical goals if these tools are to be at all meaningful for educators.
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Introduction
Not confined to episodic school shootings such as Columbine and Virginia Tech, US schoolchildren are subjected to experiences and tales of classmates’ suicides, gang-related killings inside and outside schools, and emotional and physical bullying and torment. Especially sought out and subjected to such abuse are children perceived by others as occupying some identity characteristic outside the dominant culture’s norm: openly gay or perceived as gay, non-white, non-English-speaking, non-“Christian,” too smart, or differently-abled. Each of these acts of violence causes children suffering, each act sets in motion a wave of loss that must be mourned. This is to say nothing of the epoch-defining events of the September 11th, 2001 terrorist attacks and the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. Given the number of losses and the scope of that loss we know children have experienced over the past decade and must cope with, educators and society at large are not, it would seem, facing squarely the need to work with children on loss, mourning, its attendant emotions, and the potential of such critical moments to create new energy in the wake of loss and mourning.

Education and Childhood
In the modern Western construction of childhood, children are invested with the characteristics of vulnerability and innocence (Stearns, 2003). Such vulnerability requires they be reliably protected from death, violence, and the loss that accompanies such events. Paradoxically, this holds true even as children regularly view extreme violence on television and in motion pictures, as they consume in their daily play violent video games, and as many routinely experience violence at school.

In this paper I offer an argument that can be used to lay the groundwork for a philosophy of educating children for loss and mourning and a philosophy of educating during loss and mourning. I begin with a concise background on the shift in Western society’s views, attitudes, and behaviors about loss and mourning, specifically differences between the Victorian conventions surrounding loss and mourning and the modern, scientifically-grounded pronouncements on the navigation of mourning and grief. I draw primarily from Freudian theory to construct the grounding for this historical period of transition across attitudes and rituals of loss and mourning. I then examine Manet’s final paintings, representations of bouquets of flowers brought him by friends during the last days of his life. I claim these paintings as poignant examples of the pre-modern notion of loss and as an example of educating for and during loss and mourning: tragic and yet pitiless. I will use my analysis of these paintings to begin to construct my philosophy. Finally, I offer a present-day example of school children’s loss to demonstrate the meaning and value of embracing such a philosophy.

Before science significantly lengthened the lifetimes of those fortunate enough to have been born in an industrialized nation, before there was a general expectation of understanding and cure, before Freud’s (1961) “talking cure” pathologized the emotional trappings of mourning (grief, melancholia, hysteria), loss—though no less deeply felt according to scholars of the history of emotion (Stearns & Lewis, 1998)—occupied a central role in the lives of all. No amount of money or fame or resource could stave epidemic, pandemic, the fragility of new life or the dangers of human birth. Loss of life earned its characterization as “the great equalizer.”

The Victorian’s was a culture “deeply enmeshed in the natural world” (Salamon, 2001) when, although “loss was commonplace, ...that [did not] make it more manageable” (p. E1). An overwhelming number of biographies, autobiographies and autobiographical novels detail their writers’ losses but also chronicle how their experiences of loss, while taking a weighty psychic toll, inspired the creative processes to new heights. Too numerous to list properly, I name but a few of these: Abraham Lincoln, Elie Wiesel, Willa Cather, Donald Woods Winnicott, Horace Mann, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Nathaniel Hawthorne, Virginia Woolf, Marcel Proust, William and Henry [James—all] humans who endured profound loss, but did not become lost.

Pre Modern, Modern and Postmodern Ideas of Loss
What I call the pre-modern notion of loss predates Freud’s (1961) essay on mourning and melancholy and was behaviorally exhibited as a “process of ‘genuine mourning’” in which “the acceptance and assimilation of loss” (Steele, 1998, p. 103) and the navigation of the grief process was yet to be confined by the boundaries and timelines of an assigned normalcy. Mourners of the Victorian era were willing to feel grief, to remain tied to the lives of those grieved, and to be reminded of the physicality of loss, characterized by the genre of postmortem photography and other objects of mourning. Of significance during this pre-modern period is not simply the scope of loss sustained, but just how adept Victorians and their predecessors were at incorporating
loss and mourning education and rituals into their day-to-day existence. The genre of pre- and postmortem photography richly demonstrates “one of the characteristics that so distinguishes nineteenth- and twentieth-century memory practices in the relative willingness of the Victorians to indulge in painful memories that sustained their grief” (Jalland paraphrased in West, 2000; p. 140), and thus reflects “a conception of memory as bound up in the necessity, indeed the desirability, of mourning” (p. 140).

In contrast, what I characterize as the modern notion of loss is abbreviated, cut off when an acceptable time period has elapsed, according to Freud, as “a way of divesting ourselves of pain, of getting it over and done with” (Steele, p. 93). Modern loss allows the mourner grief, but adoption of the objects of grief is reinvented as pathological. Extended mourning must be steeped in nostalgic, happy moments of lives lived together, captured in time, completely absent morbid overtures (West, 2000). “In this paradigm [of modern mourning], emotional and cultural maturity is measured in terms of the capacity to terminate a process of ‘mourning’ that links one to the past” (p. 94) and an ability to avoid the pernicious descent into melancholia.

As distinctly un-nostalgic objects of mourning, I propose Manet’s small paintings of bouquets to be perfect representations of pre-modern loss. They reflect the artist’s steeling against the inevitability of loss in the same way a small child might brace against the [inevitable] onset of sleep, the loss of consciousness, the loss of this world and one’s entry into another. They document the delicious tension created by their reliance on impending loss for their very impetus on the one hand, while embodying a distinct push away—the fear and loathing of it—on the other. The bouquets bespeak the intimate knowledge possessed by his dear friends of Manet’s sensibilities: “...these flower paintings belong to a period of decline and, one must imagine, of occasional despair. But even at his most bitter moments Manet’s spirits would revive at the sight of flowers” (Gordon and Forge, 1986, p. 5). These small paintings point to a creative departure from the substantial, sensational portraits that marked Manet as a modern master. They are tiny still lifes, coincidently what the French call nature morte, intimate remembrances of the fleeting nature of life: fragile blossoms brought the dying man who made his visiting dear friends laugh aloud (Gordon and Forge, 1986) though they trembled with foreshadowed grief, with their present pain and concern. They foretell the intimacy of that period’s friendship, the love for and deep knowledge of the loves and wishes of the one visited, all captured within the most intimate, everyday genre of painting.

How are these pictures of impending loss, impending [mourning,] aligned with a pre-modern notion of loss? Loss intrudes in the same way well-meaning visitors do to one on his sickbed, moreover his deathbed: in the ritual of bringing flowers to the bedside of the patient, the bouquets themselves become the beautiful, casual, fragrant reminder of the grave illness of the one visited, are frothy with the cheer the one visited seeks and gives in return, yet they hold a literal place for those flowers that will become his funeral wreath, that will mark the carriage that carries him to his grave. After the visit itself, the bouquet (and then the painting) becomes “the trace of the departed visitor” (Gordon and Forge, 1986, p. 13), a remembrance of the visit’s talk and the steady comfort of friends. These casual bouquets, these small means of remembrance tell of impending loss, function as a referent for something already lost, the love of the other [the mother], and the beauty and fecundity of the mortal world. Yet close-at-heels is the gravity of the situation, and with that a fetid quality. They are metaphors for the delicacy and perishable nature of life, for the solitude invoked by illness, for the seductive nature of illness— tho’ historians intimate that Manet declined to be seduced by his illness (Gordon and Forge, 1986)—and for the certain and ultimate solitude realized by one facing his own imminent demise.

These bouquets, these objects are seductive memorials, celebratory, but at the same time mocking. Bouquets and nosegays meant to celebrate life or a close brush with death, they are simultaneously invested in death, the fragility of the body and all its infirmities. These objects of mourning confront mortality with the intent of memorializing fleeting beauty by way of the boldest painting, the barest composition Manet ever attempted. They are at once defiant of and resigned to their ultimate meaning. It is precisely this quality that renders them “desperately moving” (Schjeldahl, 2000, p. 104). But, “although we cannot fail to project sadness into these paintings and a sense of parting, they are without self-pity. There is something debonair about them, a hint of the corsage, the boutonniere, an evening out. ... For all the innocence of its subject, it is a tragic, pitiless image” (Gordon and Forge, 1986, pp. 14–15). Within the rich, oftentimes contradictory complexity of tragic and pitiless meanings generated by these paintings that the one viewing is invited to construct one’s own loss, and a text with which to begin to construct a philosophy of educating for and during loss and mourning.

While these small paintings epitomize a pre-modern
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notion of loss, indeed appear as permanent objects of mourning, such objects, when viewed in the context of modern loss, prove taboo. Perhaps nowhere is this contrast more apparent than in schools, where the navigation of loss and its solid objects is so often braced against, forbidden and feared [after all, many schools don’t even “celebrate” All Hallows Eve with its joyously creepy trappings of death anymore]. Since in the modern notion of loss humans seem to have lost, or at minimum misplaced, their tolerance to sustain grief, in the long term we become willing only to feel a particular, peculiar and sanitized nostalgia for those lost. Witness the skyrocketing number of new prescriptions for antidepressants written by US physicians immediately following the September 11th attacks. Would so many Americans have exhibited behavior branded abnormal, would so many have been medicated had we not perfectly pathologized sustained grief? Such a scenario places the “great equalizer” and its emotional navigation exclusively within the realm of adults and something from which children must remain protected. Since US schooling is carefully organized around the scientific principles of human development and as a culture we are deeply invested in the notion of the child as innocent and vulnerable (Stearns, 2003), the navigation of grief is unlikely to occur in schools, no matter what the scope of loss.

Virginia Worley (2006) recounts a powerful example of just such unwillingness on the part of the school and her response as a teacher from her time in an urban secondary classroom in a poor, largely black school in Oklahoma City. Many of the students in her classroom were personally affected by this local terrorist attack since many had parents, relatives, or neighbors employed by the federal government, siblings in daycare at the Federal Building. She recounts there were few students of the school untouched by death or horrible injury, many only learning of loss after long hours and days of waiting to hear the fate of the missing. Her students, many from poor economic circumstances themselves, galvanized to sell commemorative ribbons created to symbolize hope for those missing, for the future of their community and their city, to benefit those affected by loss of loved ones. Despite living lives that left some reliably hungry, her students collected food and assembled boxes to take to victims’ families. These activities, rituals of pre-modern mourning, brought her class together as a community, galvanizing their creativity, empathy, and energies to an extent that she could not have imagined.

With each ribbon sold and each dollar and box of food delivered, students freed themselves from the oppressive event and aftermath, even as they knew they would never be free of the horrible memory, from the absence of those they loved, from the haunting promises of support, medical treatment, grief counseling, and childcare that, for many, never materialized. These students who had not always gotten along well now grew strong together. (p. 519) In spite of the children’s needs, in spite of the role and responsibility of schools, in spite of our culture’s insistence on childhood as an innocent and vulnerable state of human development, the care her students needed and were entitled to would not come from the institution, but from within: from other children who endured unspeakable and profound loss, from children who were perhaps the least likely among us to be prepared to do so, from children who heroically refused to become lost. The school’s shockingly clinical response (mind you, the school’s response is not pathologized, as students’ responses are) is reflective of the modern notion of loss and its attendant institutional social emotions: clinical, litigious, suspicious, dismissive, petty. For:

Having experienced the bombing, heard the blast, seen the concussion bow the bank of classroom windows and then waiting, hoping, mourning, and grieving together in its aftermath of death, injury, and fear, the students galvanized. The institution responded. “I hope you’re not selling those ribbons for your club!” “We cannot authorize your taking students in a van or bus to deliver money and food....” [among other such proclamations]. Undeterred, convinced of their “right action,” students volunteered their cars; I took my car. We delivered $310.00 and boxes of food for bomb victims and their families..... While asking themselves hard questions about the bombing and its aftermath, students freed themselves from blindly accepting and obeying the school’s party line for “dealing with” students after the bombing; anonymous powers ignored students’ anxiety, grief, lack of stability and security, homelessness, feelings of disorientation, and emotional pain; refused to call in grief counselors; and learn which students’ family members were injured, missing, or found dead; declared a state of “business as usual,” rather than a state of emergency. Behind closed classroom doors, students supported each other as they mourned lost family members, soothed one another’s pain, and calmed each other’s anxiety and fretfulness. Behind closed doors, they freed themselves from the pigeon
holes in which they had awakened one day believing no escape existed. (Worley, 2006, pp. 519–520)

Conclusion

Given the intolerance of humans and human-built institutions for sustained grief, for a pre-modern notion of loss, what might Manet’s last paintings teach educators about the necessity of declining to pathologize extended mourning? Now, just over six years after the September 11th attacks, with many children in the nation’s schools in possession of some understanding of those days’ events and their aftermath; with the even closer and grisly, haunting specter of Hurricane Katrina’s ravages and continuing shocking lack of government and insurance-industry response; with the US currently engaged in an unjust ground war and casualties mounting by the hour, how might we confront both the notion of the child as vulnerable and the taboo against challenging the innocence of the child in order to reframe loss into a place of possibility in education, capable of inspiring those grieving to new heights of creativity? The examples Manet left in his few final paintings poignantly demonstrate the complex relation between the critical moments of one’s life and the omnipresence, omnipotence, omniscience of loss. And it is such a critical moment that harbors possibility of creative transformation: when one prepared for loss and mourning utilizes that preparation as a means to awaken a novel aspect of one’s creative self. I call this moment “the extreme difficulty of deciding to try” (Otto, 2000) which “arises out of a tension created by the continuous close proximity of the possibility of loss in the life of an individual. … Without the tension generated by impending loss, were it not always and forever a threat, the decision to try would never arise. In effect, there would be nothing to try for, no need to make an effort to press out against that which lies just beyond the boundary, ready to crush us” (p. 5).

Rather than banish death and loss from school curricula, brand it taboo, as emotionally dangerous and pathological, we might instead employ a pre-modern notion to construct a philosophy of educating children for loss and mourning and a philosophy of educating during loss and mourning. It is only in so doing that educators stand to realize the potential of loss to stimulate health, growth, and with that, happiness. History’s many examples of creative individuals who experienced loss but did not become lost align with Manet’s revelatory paintings, for although Édouard Manet could not win his battle against loss, all the same, he was transformed by it. His small paintings, objects of mourning created to steady himself as he negotiated his own mortality and its effect on his genius, are examples from which we may draw inspiration to reinvent and re-inscribe the modern notion of loss, of memory, the cultural tolerance for pain, grief and discomfort and how that modern conception of loss proves at odds with education’s moral and political imperative to aid children in transcending such loss. But, Manet’s final flowers are more than memorials, more than proof of a new creative height: they are poignant evidence of his rich life, echo the laughter and concern of dear friends, and evidence the willingness of those friends to bear the pain of his certain future. Adoption of the pre-modern notion of loss as we build curricula banishes the invisibility and pathology of loss and mourning, replaces it with a creative process, a creative object that is dynamic rather than morbid, re-centered on the rightful place of death in life. For, though grim harbingers of the certain mortality of all that lives, Manet’s bouquets celebrate deep friendship, the comforts of companionship, love, beauty, and joy, they symbolize care, they foretell of the coming journey, and they mark the pathway for those [who] will follow.
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LEARNING TO DIE IN A FAST FOOD NATION: INITIAL THOUGHTS

Shawn Pendley, University of Oklahoma

Introduction

Josef Pieper (1969) observed that the notion of learning to die entails both an unlearned way to die and that dying is not merely a physiological end but also an action to be performed. To the earliest systematic educators in the West, the Platonists, learning to die was virtually indistinguishable from learning to live, and this opinion held until quite recently. Funeral home franchises, hospice, long term hospital stays, and nursing homes are all modern inventions. Up until the twentieth century, the majority of families lived in close proximity to the dying, and most children would have witnessed the death of at least one member of the household. The world we inhabit is greatly changed. We remove the dying from view, speak about death euphemistically, and feel a responsibility to shelter youth from it—excepting the unreality of death and dying found in videogames and films. Secondary school teachers are not usually philosophers, and so their concerns merely reflect the moral and intellectual milieu of the day. Consequently, learning to die is no longer an aim of formal education, and death, the penultimate ethical subject, is reduced to an element of tragic drama. I intend to revisit the notion of learning to die, to examine its relation to ethical awareness, and to make clear what its absence entails about our “culture of achievement.” To aid in sketching the cultural landscape in which our schools are situated, I will draw from Eric Schlosser’s book, Fast Food Nation. My reading of the text will be guided by the radically deferential ethics of Emmanuel Levinas, whose revolt against the idea of self-fulfillment constitutes a unique challenge to the values and goals of a market-obsessed education.

In defense of the notion that learning to die is not only an appropriate theme for secondary school instruction but that it is key to the education of the person, I hope to lay out the various dimensions of the problem in the context of current pedagogical practices, identify the aims appropriate to the subject matter, clarify and explain the relevance of the theme for adolescents, and suggest a framework for classroom practice. However, before diving into the mechanics of applicability, I would like to explore the main reasons why the subject of death, and consequently learning to die, poses the problem of applicability in the first place. Why do we approach something as biologically natural as our mortality with trepidation? Why do we treat death as a murderer from whom we should shield our children, rather than as a fruit ripening from within; a foregone conclusion of bodily existence? When the concept of death is examined closely, does it remain content to appear in these terms? Is it even possible to think of death as an enemy while holding that dying is a natural affair, a source of wisdom applicable to living? It is not my intention to provide definitive answers to perennial philosophical questions, but rather to point out that these questions constitute a challenge to common assumptions about the impropriety of death as a subject of study. And then, if the popular attitude toward death has been absorbed from an unexamined cultural atmosphere, learned through the back door, as it were, should we not ask whether it is best unlearned? We might clarify this question by understanding the relationship, if any, between a learned death and a life lived well. This brings us within view of our inquiry, and furnishes the final question by implication: have secondary school educators been remiss in taking our common aversion to the theme of death and dying for granted? With these starter questions in mind, we can begin to appreciate the problem of applicability.

The Problem of Applicability

In our current cultural climate, there is a certain logic in the resistance to teaching youth about death and dying. If this logic could be phrased syllogistically, it might go: Dying is not desirable, and the aims of education are all desirable; therefore, dying is not an aim of education. As an unqualified statement, the major premise is uncontroversial. Unless in the throws of depression or seriously ill or injured, most will not consider dying an attractive prospect. However, a present day Empedocles might insist that, in light of mortality, living and dying are really one in the same, and the whole question of whether or not dying is desirable is anyway a moot point. A student in the vigor of his youth is, from another perspective, a goner. Thus, Seneca to the younger Lucilius:

No count is taken of years. Just where death is expecting you is something we cannot know; so, for your part, expect him everywhere.

So what of the major premise? What if the distinction between living and dying is mere convention? Empedocles is credited with having said, “Double is the coming to be of mortal things, and double is their failing.” According to this pre-Socratic philosopher, coming into being and dying are a matter of combination and separation, of love and strife, though
more of the former than the latter. Love is the one-making motive of the universe, whereas strife differentiates even to the point of absolute separation, of death. Their interplay comprises the mortality of living things. I think Empedocles can offer valuable insight for our contemporary aversion to the subject of dying, because the first problem of applicability, as I see it, boils down to connotation. In common parlance, dying means not, as Seneca would have it, ‘living with death in view,’ or being reasonably mindful of mortality, but rather that one is standing at death’s door, summons in hand. This is the meaning of dying that has understandably led away from teaching youth the invaluable lesson of learning to die. Let it stand as an initial statement to be developed in succeeding sections that learning to die means learning that mortality is comprised, in unequal measure, of love and strife. We will see in the philosophy of Levinas a similar capitulation to the inescapability of pain and the necessity of love.

For now, we turn to the minor premise, that the aims of education are all desirable; a truth in principle though not in fact. The primary aim of American public schools, from the standpoint of federal legislation, is market preparation. This either is a desirable aim or it is not, depending on whether one believes that success on the market is the sumnum bonum of American public life. Is success in the workforce our highest good, the pursuit of which should order the aims and beliefs of responsible citizens, or is there some worthier end toward which to direct our youth? While the answer to that question is material to the current discussion, it is enough to note that the apparent weightlessness of truth in principle is sufficient to establish the conclusion in the logic of public opinion. This constitutes the second dimension to the problem of application. It is all well and good to have principles, a word now synonymous with ideals or fantasies (or worse, idylls or fancies), but school is for practical matters, such as reading and mathematics. I do not mean to suggest there is anything wrong with learning to read, as long as it leads to literacy, or learning mathematics; but neither is there anything particularly impractical about learning to live wisely. In fact, literacy and wisdom are historically inseparable subjects in the West. Yet somehow wisdom is displaced in the aerie region of truths in principle, while the pursuit of impractically meager skills in reading and mathematics receive ready approval from financially strapped communities intent on surviving in a competitive global economy. This widespread fear of poverty, and dependence upon jobs within the service industry, shapes the institutional values and disciplinary goals of the public school.

In simplest terms, living wisely is viewed as an unaffordable luxury or as an impractical affair; as something either to be pursued by the wealthy or outgrown. If the first problem of applicability can be termed the connotational problem, then this second dimension might be called the oppositional problem. It is easy to see how the latter problem nourishes the former; that is, how economic worries married to a materialist “practicality” limit our openness to the rich psychological dimensions of language. This has a troubling reverberation throughout our vocabulary. Progress takes its meaning from consumerism, rather than from ethical considerations or moral convictions. Likewise, cultural innovation refers not to relieving need or improving education but to synergy. Any reflection upon mortality, which may oblige us to defer to the person in need, stands in stark opposition to the ruthless efficiency of the market and is, therefore, subversive. So runs the logic that preserves as taboo the most natural fact of our existence, i.e., our mortality.

I do not mean to reduce the disturbing quality of dying to rampant capitalism, but perhaps such a suggestion is not far off the mark insofar as rampant capitalism is an expression of greed—the greed of the overvalued self confronted with its own annihilation. Rather, what I mean to suggest is that, in the words of Emmanuel Levinas, “reality has weight when one discovers its contexts.” The context for the weightlessness of truths in principle, relative to the weight of materialist practicality, derives from our condition as hostages to consumerism. This hostage taking occurs while we are too young to avoid the godlike omnipresence of advertising, which we will come to in the next section. In the meantime, we can round off the problem of applicability with the following summary: If there is no real weight to truths in principle, it is because the circumstances that give meaning to the pursuit of such truths are rare in a consumer culture, and the educational standards set forth in the No Child Left Behind Act do nothing to raise the language from the poverty of the consumer lexicon. Emmanuel Levinas suggests that at the heart of the matter is a displacement of the original ethical situation of human beings. This displacement amounts to the usurpation of the ethical by self-interested consumers, intent on self-fulfillment; but how, in such a cultural environment, do we train our students to take life seriously in an ethical sense? In order both to dramatize and to detail this cultural environment, we will bring Levinas’ ethical challenge to bear upon an examination of Eric Schlosser’s Fast Food Nation (2002).
The Connotational and Oppositional Problems

The connotational and oppositional problems highlight the relationship between learning to die and learning to live ethically.

Eric Schlosser, borrowing a phrase from Upton Sinclair, pictures the contemporary American wage slave as an easily replaceable, or disposable, “cog” in the great machine. Wage slaves live an uprooted existence both at work and at home. The very ideas of community, progress, and success that gave meaning and nutritive value to work have long since been counterfeited by advertisers. McDonald’s, and not the native community, is now America’s “trusted friend.” Progress, Schlosser remarks, has become synonymous with “the ruthless efficiency of the market;” a market which has engaged in economic Darwinism against homegrown businesses. This is both the logical outcome of the consumerist worldview and the effect of unnecessary legislative choices on the levels of state and federal government. The lesson to be learned is that, in a progress-as-production society, a hard and unsentimental worldview exerts unbounded sway over business practices, it severs individuals from the values of their communities, and it fractures the work environment through manic specialization. Yet these are broad statements of the problem. Schlosser (2002) details the Reagan and Bush administrations’ deregulation of the meat packing industry for the sake of friendly lobbyists, with the latter president appointing a vice president of the Cattlemen’s Association to run the USDA’s Food Marketing and Inspection Service. The sanctity of profit was put before the sanctity of human life.

Throughout the text, Schlosser offers many more examples of business practices operating beyond considerations of conscience. For example, one reads of how Walt Disney hired thugs to rough up his own employees, striking for fair wages. He is reported as having told them, “it’s the law of the universe that the strong shall survive and the weak must fall by the way, and I don’t give a damn what idealistic plan is cooked up, nothing can change that.” (2002) Ray Kroc, the great franchiser of McDonald’s, told a reporter, “Look, it’s ridiculous to call this an industry... This is not. This is rat eat rat, dog eat dog. I’ll kill ‘em, and I’m going to kill ‘em before they kill me. You’re talking about the American way of survival of the fittest.” Of course, this is ridiculous double-talk, as Schlosser is quick to point out. Both Disney and McDonald’s have relied on substantial handouts from the government, and other large businesses, including major meatpackers, have taken entire states hostage by demanding exorbitant sums of money in the form of tax subsidies. The rugged individuals trumpeted by conservative politicians, e.g. captains of industry, exist only on the level of rhetoric, and consequently the material practicality at the core of consumerist epistemology is nothing more than a “cooked up ideal.”

Some of the more disturbing features of the fast food nation covered by Schlosser are the “trusted friend” campaign of the McDonald’s corporation, the hydrogen sulfide problem surrounding slaughterhouses, the tax payer subsidies going toward floating the costs of big business, the tax breaks that are forcing public schools to seek money from corporate sponsors, the meat packing industry’s attempt to prevent microbial testing of meat for fear of expensive recalls and bad publicity, the callousness that led McDonald’s to hand out leaflets at the parking lot of the Museum for the Dachau Concentration Camp, and McDonald’s use of Scotland Yard to infiltrate and suppress London Greenpeace’s attempt to educate the public about the health hazards posed by McDonald’s food. These are each distinctly ethical problems tied to a worldview that disregards the sanctity of human life, and this is illustrated sharply in the discussion of the treatment of children by the fast food industry. Schlosser reports that, in 1978, when Michael Pertschuk, the head of the FTC, attempted to shield children from being targeted by advertisers, a ban that had support from the American Academy of Pediatrics, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the Consumers Union, and the Child Welfare League, industry groups sued in federal court to block Pertschuk from future FTC meetings on the issue. Months after Reagan’s inauguration, the FTC effectively killed the proposal. These industry groups, with the aid of Republican allies, set the stage for the predatory advertising that was then and is now known to “exploit the present-mindedness of children.” (2002)

Institutional education is inextricably tied to dominant worldviews, and therefore the aims of American public education are largely defined by the needs of the industrial-food complex and the service industry at large. An educative environment premised upon engagement with community, social consciousness, and cultural knowledge was long ago superseded by market preparation strategies in virtually every arena of public education. Any philosophy of education in the US that aspires to be more than a palliative, than a Band-Aid on the head wound trauma of public education, must aggressively confront the spiritual sterility of a massively generic super-environment. It must actively restore education as a community enterprise, while attempting to change the
work environment awaiting students upon graduation. As a starting point for locally engaged, community rooted educational practices, educators might look to a much different philosophy of progress than what is found in the consumerist lexicon. Perhaps we could begin with Simone Weil’s idea of progress as “a transition to a state of human society in which people will not suffer from hunger” (1952)

Weil treated hunger as a malleable analogy for humanity’s most pressing needs, for which she used the phrase “spiritual needs.” Just as the obligation to feed the body must be met in order for the body to grow, there are certain obligations which, if met, feed the growth of the soul. All such spiritual obligations, e.g., order, liberty, obedience, responsibility, equality, hierarchism, honor, punishment, et al., are features of rooted, engaged community life. Weil’s community might act as the proper environment for the education of the whole person; a concept lost in the generic, institutional framework of our fast food culture. This approach to the problem highlights the fact that uprootedness is the central problem, largely unaddressed, facing educators in any mobile culture. In her book, The Need for Roots (1952), Weil says a person has roots “by virtue of his real, active, and natural participation in the life of the community, which preserves in living shape certain particular treasures of the past and certain particular expectations for the future.”

This short attendance to the thought of Simone Weil is occasioned by remarks from Emmanuel Levinas in an interview with Salomon Malka (1989). Levinas believed that the truly human begins when a person’s good conscience is thrown into question, which opens up the possibility of awareness of one’s responsibility for another. Levinas took this view to an extreme, insinuating that Weil had not quite shed herself of her good conscience because she held out some measure of belief in herself as an accomplished reality. This is a criticism entangled in Levinas’ metaphysics, the finer details of which should not concern us here. The salient point is that Weil’s practical and philosophical concern for the other person offers an example of selflessness which, in practice, is indistinguishable from Levinasian selflessness, and therefore offers the critic of Levinasian metaphysics a model on which to agree in practice.

What is important about the intersecting thought of Levinas and Weil is the acknowledgment of the displacement of an original concern for the welfare of others by a socio-economic system that denies essential need.

Learning to Die: Two Perspectives

We can turn now to the question which brought us in view of the inquiry: in a consumer culture, what is the relationship between a learned death and a life lived well? In order to answer the question from Levinas’ perspective, it is important to understand that he believed it to be a fundamental delusion that we can find the meaning of our lives within ourselves alone. The Levinasian lesson in learning to die is that one must throw off the consumerist myth of self-sufficiency and embrace the fact that the fundamentally human consists in prioritizing the other. What this means is that learning to die concerns not the mortality of the self but the mortality of the other person. Levinas called this an ethics of the encounter, and its main feature is a disruption of one’s own good conscience. (1996) In other words, the ethical encounter should shake one up and put the self into question; it should amount to a conceptual shock, something which disrupts the ordinary categories of thinking. Since the ethical situation is, according to Levinas, originary and pre-philosophical, it would result in a radicalized classroom; one in which the circumstances of the broader cultural environment must be to some extent unlearned. So Levinas remarks:

Ethics is no longer a simple moralism of rules which decree what is virtuous. It is the original awakening of an I responsible for the other; the accession of my person to the uniqueness of the I called and elected to responsibility for the other. The human I is not a unity closed in upon itself, like the uniqueness of the atom, but rather an opening, that of responsibility, which is the true beginning of the human and of spirituality. (1996)

The relationship between learning die, or attending to the mortality of the other, and living well consists in the evocation of the question: have I the right to be? Levinas would have us ask ourselves, and our students, whether our very existence does unintentional violence to the other. This is both an undeniably relevant and deeply disconcerting question to pose in a fast food culture; a culture in which our food is prepared, packaged, and distributed in unsafe working conditions by underpaid migrant workers who live and work and struggle completely out of sight and with the antipathy of the general public. What, he might encourage us to ask, is the human cost of our cheap and efficient value meals?

For anyone who feels that the basic structure of human existence points to hope, Levinas’ message may be unacceptably grim. “Evil is the order of being, pure and simple,” he warns us. “And on the contrary, to go toward the other is the breaking through of the human in
being.” (1996) The picture he paints is of the meager light of human being sending sparks into an overwhelming darkness. I do not mean to insinuate that he has it wrong. This message of the distressing frailty, or underwhelming strength, of human being resonates with the relationship of the dispossessed to the inhumane, crushing economic forces discussed in Fast Food Nation.

There is another way of approaching the subject of learning to die that I would like to mention in closing; a position which takes account of the classically Western idea of the status viatoris. Josef Pieper explains the idea in his book, Death and Immortality:

In reality the concept of status viatoris involves nothing sentimental, nor even anything distinctively religious or theological. What is meant, rather, is that man, as long as he exists in this world, is characterized by an inward, as it were ontological quality of being-on-the-way to somewhere else. (1969)

The status viatoris receives early expression in the humanistic stoicism of Seneca, who wrote extensively on the subject of death. He believed that learning to die meant unlearning slavery to one’s desires, which can only be effected through cultivating gratitude for the life one is given. It means embracing the being-on-the-way of human existence. He writes in a letter to a younger friend, Lucilius, that death must continually be studied precisely because “we are not in a position to test whether we know it.” In other words, not only is human being in a sense wayward but death is always in the distance; something never fully present to consciousness. Recognizable in this idea is the Hellenistic “beyond” that characterizes death. So how does one connect this death-as-always-beyond to the matter of learning to live in a consumer society? How do we bridge the gap between the notion that death is something which happens to others but not ourselves and the recognition that we have a responsibility to the deaths of others? If the status viatoris denies Levinas’ claim that human being is realized by responding to the need of the other person, then in what does its human responsibility consist? If, for Levinas, the genuinely human rests in strife, i.e., striving to meet the other, then on this classical view what is truly human is revealed in an act of loving attendance of the death of another (1996).

Pieper (1969) says, “what is imparted to the lover faced with the actual death of the beloved person who must not die is that he himself experiences this death – for in this case, it is not really another who is dying – not just from outside, but as if from within.” He goes on to qualify the meaning of love as “that wholly selfless affirmation which can be read in the eyes as they gaze upon the beloved, an affirmation which says: How good that you are!” For Pieper, love is the mode of seeing and experiencing, and the classroom would be no less radicalized in light of this concept of learning to die than it would following Levinas’ view.

Conclusion

The pre-Socratic philosopher Empedocles, who held that mortality consisted in unequal measure of living and dying, ended his life by throwing himself into a volcano, or so recorded Diogenes Laertius. He wanted to prove to everyone that he was an immortal god, and if there is any truth to the story, we can assume that the experiment was a disaster. The moral his death might propose, for the purposes of this paper, is that learning to die must take on the weight of reality; that a concern for mortality must be tied into a concern for the mortality of others. It takes a selfish philosopher to jump into a volcano when there are mouths to feed and other deaths to attend.

REFERENCES


Pieper, Josef (2000) Death and Immortality, South Bend, IN: St. Augustine’s Press.


INCONVENIENT PEOPLE: THE ISSUE OF HOMELESSNESS IN A NATION OF PROSPERITY

Mary Alice Ramey, University of Arkansas

Abstract

During the Reagan administration, there was a rapid increase in the number of people who became homeless. In 1987, federal legislation was enacted to address the problems associated with the growing number of people that are homeless. By 2005, more legislation occurred in an effort to develop community partnerships to end the homelessness of people living in extreme poverty. Finally, programs to establish 10-year plans to end homelessness in many cities across the United States were developed.

Introduction

Homelessness has been a global problem for many years. Early records indicate that the homeless have been with us since the beginning of recorded history. In the United States, the Great Depression made the situation more noticeable as many people lost their jobs and a good number of people lost their home. This prompted Congress and President Roosevelt to enact the Social Security Act of 1935 (Social Security Act, 2007) and many other entitlements hoping to help poor families. In recent years, the Fair Housing Act of 1968 (Fair Housing Act, 2007) helped to eliminate discrimination based on race, color, national origin, religion, and gender. Then, the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, further reduced discrimination for people with disabilities and families with children (Fair Housing Amendment Act, 2007). In addition, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 enforces accessibility to people with disabilities through federal financial assistance with Housing and Urban Development (Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 2007). Finally in 1990, the Americans with Disabilities Act provided for the elimination of reasonable accommodations for people with disabilities from housing providers (Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 2007).

In the early 1980’s, the Reagan administration refused to see homelessness as a problem that required federal intervention. Then in 1983, the first task force to gather information regarding the homeless was developed and soon the Reagan administration could no longer ignore the growing number of Americans who were homeless. Advocates continued to release more information about the growing problem of the homeless. In 1986, Congress adopted the Homeless Housing Act creating the Emergency Shelter Grant program for a transitional housing demonstration project overseen by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

By 1987, the first comprehensive Federal legislation to address the issues of the homeless, including health, education and social welfare needs, was the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (Public Law 100-77) (Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, 2007). Signed into law by President Reagan, the act is intended to provide relief to the homeless population in the United States. The act was to provide funding for emergency food and shelter, education, and transitional and permanent housing, as well as address the multitude of health problems faced by people who are homeless. As a result of the McKinney Act, more than twenty different programs to assist the homeless were developed that included seven different federal agencies. Many grants were made available that would assist in the operational costs of a shelter. The McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act was reauthorized in 2002 (The McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, 2007). With many homeless families, the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act provides assistance to ensure access of homeless children and youth to the same free, appropriate public education, including a public preschool education, as is provided to other children and youth (National Coalition for the Homeless, 2006). This is especially important with the No Child Left Behind legislation (No Child Left Behind, 2007) since the children of the homeless were included in the various testing and oversight programs. School districts across the nation were forced to acknowledge the homeless-student problem. This meant providing educational programs to meet the needs of the homeless. And finally, the Community Partnership to End Homelessness Act of 2005 (Senate Bill 1801) introduced by Jack Reed of Rhode Island places an emphasis on mainstreaming services and provides discharge planning for people exiting homeless shelters (Community Partnership to End Homelessness, 2007).

Who are the homeless?

Homelessness can affect anyone. There are many people who are homeless due to a stressful life event. Homelessness is not completely an economic problem. Other factors include mental illness, drug and/or alcohol use, marital problems, domestic violence, physical or sexual abuses as a child, having lived in foster care, accidents, physical illness and problems with law enforcement (Zugazago, 2004). Although there are many “safety nets” to help people who are in danger of losing their home, many entitlement programs such as Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF),
Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and food assistance programs such as Food Stamps and Women, Infants and Children (WIC) are not able to help those who have trouble accessing these services (Gale, 2003). Efforts to help people who are homeless to receive housing and to gain access to additional services are the ongoing goals of homeless shelters (Cohen, Mulroy, Tull, White, and Crowley, 2004).

The National Alliance to End Homelessness has produced a “Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness” (National Alliance to End Homelessness, 2007). The plan provides cities with a program to end homelessness within their community within ten years. Many ideas about homelessness revolve around prevention but when prevention is difficult social intervention is required (Shinn, Baumohl, and Hopper, 2001). One city, Columbus, Ohio, is using this plan to help coordinate services within their community with mixed results (Community Shelter Board, 2002). Columbus is working to develop a discharge plan for people who are released from prison as well as other people within the city. As they use the ten-year plan, they will be releasing information to other cities. The program in Columbus, Ohio seeks to provide homelessness prevention, emergency shelter, housing services and supportive housing. Stable housing is an important piece to breaking the cycle of homelessness (Zlotnick, Robertson, and Lahiff, 1999).

The project to end homelessness will be a difficult one. Recently, President Bush released his new budget, which includes a “50% cut in housing for people with disabilities and a 25% cut to housing for the elderly” (National Policy and Advocacy Council on Homelessness, 2007). Other social service grants were eliminated which left the poor and underserved in a difficult situation. Most of the cuts associated with the new budget decrease the majority of services and safety net options for the poor such as Medicaid, Child Support Enforcement, SSI, foster care and welfare programs. Still, foundations such as Charles and Helen Schwab Foundation are optimistic about ending homelessness since the level of awareness has increased and many cities now recognize the scope of the problem (Putman, 2002).

Severity of the problem

In the United States, it is estimated that as many as one million people are homeless on a given night and as many as 3.5 million people experience homelessness at some point within a year. No one knows for certain how many people are homeless because an accurate count is difficult if not impossible. Point in time counts are one way that counts are taken. Typically, counts are taken on a very cold night because more people seek shelter on cold nights. Still, this leaves room for error because many people live in tents, abandoned buildings and other places where they may go unnoticed such as underneath a bridge. The Veteran’s Administration estimates that about 200,000 veterans are homeless on any given night (National Coalition for Homeless Veterans, 2007). Various configurations of families are affected. Not only intact families with both a mother and a father and children, but also single-parent families—fathers or, more often, mothers with their children, and young teenagers with small babies are homeless. There is no age discrimination with the homeless population, older men and women become homeless as well as teenagers who might be runaways. People who are sick are homeless including many people with sexually transmitted diseases, HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, Cancer and a whole host of other physically ailments. Many of the homeless have mental and emotional problems. People of all races and cultures are also among the homeless. One serious problem is the number of people who are affected by substance abuse problems as well as chronic alcoholism. Substance abuse is often a causative factor in homelessness but can also be a consequence of “life on the streets.”

Homelessness is a national issue. It’s hard to imagine that people don’t just take care of other people because it is the right thing to do. But, many people try not to notice the homeless for a myriad of reasons. The day-to-day grind of getting to work and getting things done for one’s own well being and for that of their family has led to an increase in how little a person is willing to do for another human being (Gallagher, 1994). Often people just don’t know what might be helpful. Should one give money to the person on the street? Will that be a help or just enable? Not everyone ignores the situation, obviously, but if more people would help with the problems faced by people who are homeless, the possibility that we could end homelessness for good does exist.

The current administration has expressed a goal to end homelessness in the United States by 2012. That is an admirable objective; however, the fiscal year 2007 governmental budget had huge cuts in spending that offer assistance to the poorest people in our country. This lends very little hope that homelessness will end by 2012. But all is not lost because there are wonderful people within communities all over the country that are making serious efforts to end homelessness in their own communities. In many communities, large groups of people are trying to make a difference by joining together to end homelessness. Programs such as Habitat
for Humanity, local shelters and food banks, religious and service organizations provide opportunities for people to get involved.

Governmental agencies are involved with people who are homeless and are important stakeholders in several ways both positive and negative. Looking at the positive side, when a person who is homeless is able to qualify and receive Supplemental Security Income (SSI) or Social Security Disability Income (SSDI) it increases their chances of getting into and maintaining a home. In addition, people who qualify for these benefits are able to get the necessary health care (both physical and mental). Medicaid also helps pay for medical needs. But there is a negative side as well. SSI and SSDI require difficult and lengthy processes to receive benefits. In many cases, it can take two to three years to receive these benefits. The police and court system also have a positive and negative side. Some people who are homeless may be “acting out” their mental illness in a way that the police and court system must get involved so that they do not harm themselves or others.

The homelessness have always been around us but as a result of many patients who were institutionalized in mental hospitals being released, more and more people with mental illness and emotional problems have become homeless. In the early 1980’s, President Ronald Reagan chose to ignore the problem of homelessness because he felt that it was not an issue that requires federal intervention leaving it for the state and local governments to deal with. According to Cobb and Ross (1997), ignoring a problem or refusing to acknowledge or admit that a problem exists is a strategy used by government to ward off complaints or public insistence. Reagan felt that homelessness was a “nonissue” that he didn’t need to address. But, with public outcry and pressure from Congress, Reagan eventually signed the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (Public Law 100-77) in 1987.

Since the development of the Homeless Assistance Act, the public was somewhat satisfied that something was going to be done about the situation and things quieted down in the public arena despite a lack of a solution to end homelessness. Cobb and Ross (1997) argue that when a problem persists that the government does not really want to engage, one of the best strategies for a President is to create a commission to oversee the problem in order to show the public that the government is being proactive in trying to eliminate the situation. The trouble with this type of response is that it doesn’t answer or solve the problem but it quiets down the public, especially when used against groups that have little voice, such as the poor and mentally disabled.

President Reagan created the Interagency Council on Homelessness to handle the issue of homelessness (Interagency Council on Homelessness, 2007). The Council on Homelessness did little to end the problem of homelessness. The media got involved by showing that more and more people were living on the streets and that many homeless people were veterans and even more were mentally ill causing problems for local law enforcement. In addition, the media complained that it was disgraceful for the richest country in the world to have more than three million people who for whatever reason are homeless. Baumgartner and Jones (1993) refer to different images of current policy as tone. Because the tone of people voicing concern about homelessness joined with the media’s attention to the disgrace of a growing problem, the social condition of homelessness pushed the government to do something about the situation.

Rochefort and Cobb (1994) have explained that by defining a problem, such as homelessness as an emergency, only temporary solutions are found. In the case of the Bush 10-year plan to end homelessness, the problem is defined with an “end-means” basis that is laid out as a “deliberate course of action” to end the problem of homelessness (Rochefort and Cobb, 1994, page 24).

The problem of homelessness is about the same in any city. It is a struggle over resources or lack of resources that make the situation impossible to solve. Sharp (1994) states, “the public readily loses interest in issues that are irresolvable” (page 100). Like the war on drugs and the war of poverty, the problem of the homeless will continue without sweeping social changes. Without strong financial support to back up an aggressive 10-year plan to end homelessness, defining the problem as “solved” with Bush’s plan is basically maintaining the status quo.

For 20 years, homelessness did not get any better despite legislation identifying the situation as serious. With a push by the public and the media for an end to homelessness, President Bush introduced a “Ten-year Plan to End Homelessness” to show that he was ready to handle the situation and that with the support of the American people, homelessness could end in 10 years.

Theoretically, the plan to end homelessness is sound. However, the project is grossly underfunded. President Bush describes the 10-year plan as innovative and a whole new way to look at the problem of homelessness. Unfortunately, with more and more cuts to housing and medical programs, it will be impossible to end homelessness with this plan. Local community involvement is the key to ending homelessness but
having the resources to find housing or building transitional housing is difficult.
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Introduction

In this paper, I examine methodological and practical difficulties experienced by women who research masculinity through a feminist framework in the field of education. I assert that it is vital for women to conduct research in masculinity in order to bring about equitable changes within the educational system. It was my trepidation of allowing prejudice or preconceived images of masculinity that may cloud my representation of men and masculinity which has led to this study.

The focus of my dissertation is men in nursing and how they situate masculinity in a female-dominated occupation. This may seem like a confusing field for me to investigate as I am not a nurse. I have never been a nurse although M*A*S*H was my favorite television program as a young teen. I consider myself a feminist; I am also a woman, middle-aged with grown children, contentedly ensconced in the world of teaching. To study men in a female-dominated occupation is a striking contradiction for me also as I am female in a very traditional occupation for women.

My interest in researching men in nursing emanated from the provocations of my son during a heated discussion about women in non-traditional or male-dominated careers. He posited that it was more difficult for a man to enter a female sex-role specific profession than for a woman to enter into a male sex-role specific occupation. It is true that occupations historically have become gendered for both sexes and the ramifications for each are tremendous (Gordon, 2004; Henson & Rogers, 2004; kincheloe, 1999; Sargent, 2001; Williams, 1995). Lease (2003) discovered that there is little research available about changing societal views on gender specific occupations. She argued that typically, when a woman enters a male dominated job she is viewed as making a positive career choice. These same perceptions do not often hold true for a man who enters a female-dominated occupation. While we encourage our daughters to become doctors, overall, Americans generally, do not applaud their sons for choosing a career in nursing. A focus of equity should examine nontraditional male career choices in conjunction with women working in male dominated occupations. It is my hope that a feminist research methodology which focuses on masculinity may contribute to the field by bringing about an awareness of the difficulties faced by women when conducting research on men and masculinities.

Reflection is a needed and ongoing practice for qualitative researchers especially when the researched is of a different gender (DeVault & Gross, 2007). Bias and assumptions must be constantly examined along with how representation of the researched is portrayed. As Deborah Appleman (2003) contemplated in her study with racially diverse adolescents, “... I wonder if my portrayal of them served only my scholarly needs and not theirs at all. In fact, I wonder if my research not only failed to benefit them, but was, in some ways, actually harmful.” Tisdale (2004) also warned of the need for the researcher to be diligently aware of the power they have to assist or to injure the researched through their study.

Problem Statement and Significance

Several researchers have noted the need for more feminist studies of men and the various aspects of masculinities within education (Robinson, 2002; Gardiner, 2002; Kimmel, 2002). The importance of a feminist analysis of masculinity is to achieve balance within a study of gender. As Kimmel and Messner (2004) contended it is a necessity to study masculinity given that for generations men have considered themselves as being without gender. Forbes (2002) emphasized that “… categories of men and masculinity are frequently central to feminist analyses, but remain taken for granted, hidden, and unexamined” (p. 269). Schwalbe and Wolkomir (2007) stated that “For most of the history of social science, men were considered the standard, normal, unmarked category of human beings, and so it would have seemed odd, not that long ago, to write about interviewing men …” (p. 55). By scrutinizing masculinity through a feminist framework, it may be possible to gain a more inclusive picture of social constructs and how they affect both sexes (Gardiner, 2002). Potentially, through a study of dominant and nondominant forms of masculinity and various constructs throughout society, we may begin to diminish the power of patriarchy. Some feminist researchers such as Robinson (2002) believed men may be harmed just as much by patriarchy as women; “Oddly, feminism and patriarchy can be seen to work hand in hand, both limiting the possibilities available to men who are forced to adhere to oppressive gender scripts” (p. 153). It is essential that feminist theory include a diligent understanding of masculinity as part of the larger picture.
of the overarching delineation of gender studies.

**Research question**

This conceptual analysis will examine feminist research conducted in the field of education on men and masculinity. I will attempt to identify the dominant trends in masculinity research and the potential impact to gender studies through an examination of how women have negotiated a study of men and masculinities. I will present facts about practical and ethical considerations along with issues of reflexivity within qualitative research methods that women have utilized in their studies of men. I assert that it is vital for women to conduct research in masculinity in order to bring to light issues of equity. I hope this investigation will make a contribution to feminist methodological practices.

**Theoretical Framework**

I believe the use of a multicultural feminist lens is the most effective framework for a study of men in feminist research. Gender is often socially constructed around two axes, femininity and masculinity (Kramer, 2005). These definitions are powerfully perpetuated through the family, the school, the media, and through occupations, with unspoken rules that govern what is proper behavior for those classified within a specific gender complete with strict penalties for those who defy these rules (Kramer, 2005; Risman, 2004; Schacht, 2004).

Decades after the Civil Rights Act and other laws to assure equality, American women are still marginalized socially and economically. Feminism, in all of its various forms, has existed for well over a century, and yet women are far from parity in many dimensions of culture. A simple enumeration of the problem is not adequate to understand why gender is strongly determined and classified (Kimmel, 2000).

Critical researchers have recognized that how individuals view themselves is strongly influenced by societal factors, and that “mainstream research practices are generally, although most often unwittingly, implicated in the reproduction of systems of class, race, and gender oppression” (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005, p. 304). Kramer (2005) detailed the importance of discussing the interdependence of race and social class along with gender in regard to the media, education, and the criminal justice system. A part of the equation to true equity in America may be that gender is understood in relation to racial and socioeconomic class. Within the realm of education, there has been extensive feminist research concerning the means by which schools overtly and subtly perpetuate gender differences (Francis, 2000).

Multicultural feminist theories of education are explored in order to understand the interrelation between class, heterosexual privilege, Euro-centralism, and male hegemony in education. In an effort to identify the hierarchies which exist, a multicultural feminist frame contends that women are gendered by society and are viewed as a class by virtue of sexual differences. A woman’s race and class status can impact their identity with myriad consequences. This framework recognizes that male dominance within education has restricted women from achieving parity with men (Arnot, 2002).

A multicultural-feminist paradigm allows for an understanding of the patriarchal macrostructures perpetuated in the home, school, church, and the media. This perspective supposes a critical evaluation of the role that schools have in the future development of career choice and individual identity for students. Critical educational studies have cautioned that education must be recognized as intrinsically political and intricately weaves itself within the “political and moral economies” of a state (Apple, 1999, p.13).

To understand the ramifications of the development of masculinity in a patriarchal society, R.W. Connell (1987) developed his theory of “hegemonic masculinity” (p. 184). This idea proposed that the dominant group of a culture determined and prescribed standards of conduct for men and women along with values that must be embraced for desired gender character. This construct is promoted throughout the media, schools, churches, and work. European-American males in our culture have dictated the current model of perfection for men which include specific traits such as domination, aggressiveness, competitiveness, athletic prowess, and control (Cheng, 1999; Lease, 2003; Williams, 1995).

hooks (2000) elaborated a lucid and well-referenced theory on how to make feminism accessible to all people, men and women, and how it can be used to ameliorate issues of class and racism. She articulated a scathing criticism of the feminist movement promulgated by Freidan (2001) and others for their inability to be effective sources of change as a consequence of the lack of emphasis on race and class issues that were keeping the movement stagnated. hooks (2000) challenged the unspoken influences that dominated feminist theory and alienated the majority of women in the United States. She redefined what it meant to be a feminist in a patriarchal, capitalistic culture and proclaimed that one is not automatically a feminist just by virtue of being born a woman. Ending sexist oppression will not be accomplished through the promotion of an anti-male agenda, but through a critical
evaluation of deeply ingrained societal issues of race, class, and gender that threaten equality for all people.

Feminist theory is not exclusively for women. hooks (2000) devoted much emphasis on the harm patriarchy does to boys and men, specifically men of color and those who are poor and of low socioeconomic status. She identified men as “our comrades in struggle” (p. 68).

Previous literature concerning feminist studies of men

An effort to understand a distinctly feminist research methodology has been challenging since a review of the literature offers a diverse and complex definition of what feminist research methodology incorporates. Haig (1999) proposed that feminist methodologies include certain characteristics which include: a persistent influence of gender relations, a liberatory methodology, and a strong support of non hierarchal research relationships. The latter theme was of interest in this study as a feminist woman researching men in a female-dominated occupation would necessitate heightened awareness of gender affiliations. To accomplish attentiveness to aspects of difference necessitates that the researcher “partially identify with the researched” (p. 224) in order to achieve reciprocity in the relationship. This is similar to research models proposed by DeVault and Gross (2007) who discovered that women who interview men need to be attentive to prior assumptions about the researched and that the researcher also needs to be cognizant of the informant’s prior assumptions about them.

Other studies have cautioned feminist researchers to be aware of privileges of power and to recognize their part in its reproduction. “All social researchers, however, can exercise power by turning people’s lives into authoritative texts: by hearing some things and excluding others… “ (Ramazanoglu & Holland, 2004, p. 113). Power and researcher positioning was emphasized by Forbes (2002) as she advocated the need for recognition of masculinity in its various constructs within gender studies. She contended such inclusion “served to highlight women’s experiences as victims of hegemonic structures of patriarchy” (p. 270). Without this understanding, women may inadvertently perpetuate a reproduction of masculinity. Qualitative researchers need to recognize issues of ethics within their studies. Preissle (2007) elaborated, “all feminists understand that research is itself value laden rather than value neutral and hence are attempting to realize some value through their research” (p. 520). Who is affected and how they may be helped or harmed by a particular investigation need to be carefully examined.

Millen (1997) discussed the need for understanding the power of the research relationship within feminist methodologies and the difficulties she encountered with women who did not identify themselves as feminist. In fact, they actively rejected tenets of feminism because of its perceived ‘negative social image’ (p. 5). This relationship of power and recognition of the damage it may replicate is critical to bear in mind for feminist who are conducting research with men.

Connell (2003) proposed a compelling inquiry concerning masculinity studies and integration with other forms of gendered power relationships. He discussed the future of men’s studies and masculinity research as relevant to an understanding of other fields of investigation such as: international diplomacy, economic development in the Third World, and domestic and sexual violence. One of the possible difficulties of masculinity research that he pondered is the concern that it will take resources and focus away from women. He stated “one must recognize that men are part of the problem, and should be part of the solution, in gender inequalities and in development” (p. 252).

Methodology – Content analysis of previous research

A close reading of research conducted by women on men and issues of masculinity revealed remarkable information and as DeVault and Gross (2007) cautioned any researcher who applies the label of feminist to their study must be prepared to articulate the meanings and differences of the term. Finding specific instances of feminist research methods within masculinity was a more difficult task.

Judith Kegan Gardiner (2002) edited a provocative volume concerning masculinity studies from a feminist perspective that contains a wealth of information. This book illuminates issues of concern related to feminism and the construction of masculinity in society. As Michael Kimmel (2002) summarized in the introduction, these writings examine the interconnectivity of feminism and masculinity studies. Wiegman (2002) wrote of the need to deconstruct masculinity and understand the historical process of a feminist interrogation of men and masculinity. This is a critical juncture for feminist studies in that,

Such “unmasking’… of the category of men importantly makes masculinity as pertinent to if not constitutive of female subjectivity, thereby rendering complex feminism’s ability to negotiate the distinctions and interconnections between sex, sexuality, and gender” (p. 33).

She also warned of the need to recognize the power that feminist researchers have in representations of men and
masculinity.

In another chapter of this book, Thomas (2002) discussed the importance of masculinity studies to feminism. He acknowledged criticism from feminists that a focus on masculinity may perpetuate a “reproduction of male dominance” (p. 61). He argued that to leave masculinity unstudied is to assume men as the natural, the norm and therefore, unchallenged and unchanged. “What is ultimately at issue in masculinity studies is, or should be, the effect of masculinity construction on women” (p. 62). While these understandings are vital to feminist researchers there was no pragmatic discourse concerning feminist research of men.

An article by Williams and Heikes (1993) reported on the importance of gender dynamics in qualitative research. They discovered a lack of research concerning the ramifications of the gender dynamics of in-depth interviews. At the time of their research, they could find no studies that discussed the importance of researcher’s gender in the in-depth interview. “. . . the question is therefore not if gender makes a difference but, rather, how does gender matter?” (p. 282). Their research involved conducting interviews with men in the field of nursing and compared and contrasted how these men interacted with either a male or female interviewer. It was discovered that there was a marked difference in the way the men presented an image of themselves to each interviewer. To the male interviewer the men were much more direct and forceful than with the female interviewer. The answers given to either researcher also appeared to be tailored to “maximize social desirability in the particular gender context” (p. 285). They reiterated the importance of recognizing gendered contexts of an in-depth interview. This article served to caution women of the difficulties that may be encountered when researching men.

The most valuable piece I read in this content analysis was Schwalbe and Wolkomir’s (2003), Interviewing men. The reading contained exceptionally pragmatic advice for women interviewing men and illuminated how “men do gender in an interview” (p.55). I have had the opportunity to conduct several interviews with men in the nursing profession concerning their views on working in a female-dominated occupation, and while reading this piece I noticed how many of the examples they cited had occurred in my interviews. For example, men “do” gender in an interview by how they answer questions and how they interact with the interviewer. The authors cautioned that if the interview is about gender, it is particularly important to notice how the respondents display masculinity (p.56). Samples of this were observed in an interview I conducted with a man who was then serving in an administrative nursing role. It was obvious that he missed working directly with patients as he continually accentuated throughout the interview how when he was working in a busy inner city emergency room. He was the “go-to-person” for the doctors. He told several account of how other nurses would seek him out in order to perform complicated procedures. My perception of the way that he expressed himself as an expert in the field of nursing was an attempt to show me that even though he is a man in a female-dominated occupation, he was an exceptionally competent nurse. Could this be how he positions his masculinity to a feminist researcher? I can only guess as there is insufficient research conducted on feminist women who conduct research on men and masculinity.

Schwalbe and Wolkomir’s (2003) article also articulated how men in an interview are striving to construct a specific view of their image. They may become defensive when asked questions they perceive as a direct threat to their masculinity. A female interviewer may not be cognizant of these implications, as I was clearly not during one of my interviews with a man in nursing. It was only as I was completing a transcript of the meeting that I realized how much this gentleman was attempting to present an image of himself and what he perceived as a very specific view of masculinity.

In certain circumstances during an interview between a male respondent and a female researcher, there may be the perception by the man of a threat or confrontation. Some constructions of masculinity stipulate autonomy, control, and risk taking (Schwalbe & Wolkomir, 2007) and men who put themselves in an interview situation, particularly with a woman researcher, may feel that they are opening themselves up to an interrogation. I was never told directly that I could not understand what it meant to be a man in a female-dominated occupation; however, the men I interviewed clearly articulated the troubles they had while working with women and especially with women in positions of authority. One man told me that he had reached the pinnacle of his career in a position of mid-management because the hospital where he worked was dominated by women in nursing administration. Did this man perceive me as part of the group that was keeping him from achieving a higher career status?

It is also important to consider that not all men will internalize defined notions of hegemonic masculinity. It is impossible and grossly negligent to make generalizations of any person’s behavior based on
categorical descriptions and social constructs. An older man, whom I interviewed, described an incident which occurred to him while attending nursing school in the mid-1970’s. The instructor was teaching about massage and asked him to volunteer to be the patient. He agreed and as the course continued he was asked to take off his shirt. He told me that quite unexpectedly the female instructor pulled down his pants in front of the all female students. He expressed to me his embarrassment and how he felt exposed and exploited. I was not expecting this type of candor with a stranger, and yet he felt comfortable enough to reveal what he considered to be a humiliating experience in his nurses training to me. This reflection allowed me to realize that I have a certain pre-conceived idea of how men think and act and what they are willing or not willing to disclose to a stranger. This may be part of my prejudice and bias and further reflexivity is necessary before I complete my dissertation.

**Findings and Importance**

DeVault and Gross (2007) suggested that it is significant for feminist researchers to debate who should research which issues and “which researchers should interview which participants” (p. 180). Hesse-Biber and Yaiser (2004) emphasized the importance of researching across differences, “Difference is critical to all aspects of the research process. It is important to incorporate difference into our views of reality, truth, and knowledge” (p. 117).

This examination of difference demands that as feminist researchers we consider how our research of men and masculinities can increase our understanding of gender construction and to ameliorate bias and prejudice which only serves to perpetuate the problem. Within the scope of this limited project, there seems to be an urgent need for more studies conducted into the implications of feminist research in masculinity. It is crucial that women who are pursuing feminist research with men and masculinity be aware of researcher and researched assumptions, preconceived bias, and the researcher power in representation.
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Introduction

As part of the overall movement initiated by the No Child Left Behind Act, many organizations (such as the U. S. Department of Education and various grant funding entities) have demanded that schools employ only evidence-based practices in teaching. Further, these entities have insisted that the only evidence permissible is that derived from experimental research. This demand has made its way into all aspects of education, including teacher and school leadership preparation, ignoring the difficulty of conducting experimental research in educational settings. Their thinking, apparently, is that experimental research is the only way to establish causation, and therefore, is the only way to know that the methods used in teaching are really having the desired and significant effects.

Almost everyone engaged in teaching and preparing educators would say that they employ evidence-based practice. One might say, “I’ve been doing this for years and I know it works. Every time I do this it achieves the desired result.” Does such observation constitute evidence? At first glance, one would believe that reasonably intelligent adults are capable of recognizing cause and effect relationships. It is not necessarily so. Consider the common cold. Many people are willing to state quite emphatically, “I caught this cold from you.” In so stating, they are almost always committing the post hoc fallacy. More fully, the fallacy is “post hoc ergo propter hoc,” or, after this, therefore because of this. That is, because one event occurs before another, the first must be the cause of the second. In the case of the common cold, people often say, “I saw him Thursday and he had a cold. On Friday, I got a cold. Therefore, I caught this cold from him.” This reasoning ignores all of the hundreds of other possibilities. Most people see dozens, if not hundreds of other people every day. They open doors, touch surfaces, and breathe air that others have come in contact with. The cold virus could easily have come from someone the victim did not even see. They are also ignoring the incubation period required for cold viruses. Many viruses require a three-day or more incubation period before the infected host exhibits symptoms.

Cause and Effect

In education, we never talk about cause and effect directly. We hint at it, we talk around it, and we assume that it happens. Journal articles rarely directly state “x caused y.” But they imply it. That’s because they would be soundly chastised or laughed at if they made such a statement. There seems to be an unspoken agreement that we can assume cause and effect if we never actually utter those words.

When we look at issues in education, the factors to be considered are numerous. In research terminology, there are too many intervening variables to label event x as the cause of event y, based on casual observation. In fact, a very carefully designed experimental study cannot consider all of the possible variables. University doctoral faculty frequently see this as they work with students attempting to set up their research methodology

- From a positivist perspective, causality is extremely difficult to establish. All of the following are required:
  - The purported cause must always occur before the effect.
  - Occurrence of the purported cause must always result in the effect.
  - The effect must never occur without the prior occurrence of the cause.
  - In most cases, concomitant variation must apply. As more of the cause occurs, more of the effect must occur.

In addition, many causes are composed of multiple parts. These parts must be considered individually. Each must be established as a necessary condition. In other words, the effect cannot occur without a necessary condition which is a component of a sufficient condition (when the sufficient condition occurs, the effect always occurs). Only in the rarest of circumstances in educational research is a condition both necessary and sufficient.

The positivist would also say that any research intended to establish causation must use subjects that are randomly selected and randomly assigned to treatment groups. In addition, each research project must include a control group that receives no treatment. Research must be replicated numerous times, achieving the same results each time. Given these requirements, it is no surprise that educational practice does not measure up to positivist expectations. In fact, ethics and practical considerations preclude the possibility of such research on a large scale in education.

Given that the positivist vision of determining the accuracy of the assumptions of cause and effect that we
rely on every day is impractical and impracticable, how can we justify the practices that we use? What constitutes evidence-based practice? Is it possible to claim that we employ evidence-based practice?

Professional Wisdom

Professional wisdom is one term bantered about as an avenue to evidence-based practice. Whitehurst (2002) defines it as the judgment individuals acquire through experience and consensus views. True professional wisdom is the product of reflection and systematic examination. Conventional wisdom is quite different. It masquerades as professional wisdom, but lacks reflection and examination. In short, it abandons sound practice for mindless repetition of established habits. We see dozens of studies that find grade retention to be counterproductive in terms of promoting high school graduation. Yet grade retention is widely practiced and even mandated by many states. Conventional wisdom says that students who do not achieve at a certain level should be retained at that grade level until they are ready for the next level. Corporal punishment is an example of conventional wisdom not achieving the desired results. Round-robin reading is another. These practices, and many others, would seem to be propagated by conventional wisdom.

A real difficulty with professional wisdom is that life does not occur in neatly organized segments. Too many things are going on for us to engage in systematic analysis of one issue without extraneous factors intruding on our analysis. It requires great effort to focus our inquiry on one issue so that we are not constantly distracted by others. Systematic inquiry, then, becomes the key to arriving at any sort of useful conclusions about educational practices and the question becomes how one can truly engage in systematic inquiry?

Experimental research is difficult to conduct in even the “hard” sciences. Trying to move it into the “soft” sciences such as education is extremely difficult. One approach is to employ positivist methods without strict adherence to the impossible positivist requirements for establishing causation. Random selection of subjects, for example, is rarely possible. So research may be done systematically, but ignoring the tenets of random selection and assignment and true control groups. Instead, we might typically use convenience samples of intact groups and comparison groups. To compensate for these shortcomings, we very carefully note that the results are not generalizable and they do not constitute proof, but we generalize the results to other populations and treat the results as proof, anyway. Of course, if we did not do that, there would be no reason to do the research in the first place.

There is also a tendency to ignore the meaning of inferential statistics. Of course, using inferential statistics is inappropriate unless we are generalizing from a sample to the population from which that sample is drawn. But we do it anyway. When we interpret the statement, p < .05, we often think it means there is a 95% probability that the findings are due to the treatment. In reality, of course, it means that there is a 95% probability that the findings are due to something other than chance. This misinterpretation leaves the door open for factors other than the treatment to affect the outcome of the research.

Such shortcomings can be overcome to some extent. Careful design can reduce the extraneous variables that could come into play. Care must be taken, however, not to create an artificial context for the study. Replication that supports initial findings can also lend more credibility to research. In fact, replication should be required before the implementation of any program based on the findings.

Another approach to systematic inquiry is qualitative research. It has the advantage of taking place in authentic settings and it studies real situations. Researchers acknowledge their biases rather than trying to eliminate them from the study. They allow the study to take shape as it progresses, based on the findings to that point. Thus, the final outcome is based on the real situation rather than being forced into predetermined questions. Some would say that qualitative research is not precise enough. “It is like nailing Jell-O to the wall” is one metaphor often used to denigrate qualitative research. Another reservation posits that it represents a different way of thinking, a paradigm shift that many researchers are not willing to make.

The qualitative method shares some potential shortcomings with the quantitative, positivist method. Both are subject to manipulation by the researcher. And perhaps worst of all, both are highly subject to the misapplication of practitioners.

Another avenue for systematic inquiry is the mixed-methods approach. This is seen by many as incorporating the best of quantitative and qualitative methods.

Evidence-Based Practice

So what constitutes evidence-based practice? In short, evidence-based practice is that which has been subjected to systematic inquiry numerous times and has been demonstrated to be an effective method of teaching when properly implemented in appropriate settings.

Of course, this definition raises a question about the
future. Must we draw a line and say no new practices can be developed since they are not supported by evidence? Perhaps not, if we include the practitioner in the equation. If an overarching goal of educational research is to help teachers to become more effective in developing performance of students, then we must also recognize that effective teaching and appropriate settings are the domain of classroom teachers who modify their practices as situations change, a practice that John Bransford and his colleagues call “adaptive expertise” (Bransford, et al., 1999). At least one study (Roehler, Duffy, & Warren, 1988) found that highly effective teachers modified researchers’ recommendations when they felt the findings did not quite fit their classroom situations. As Duffy (2007) points out:

The essential….task is not to insist that teachers know and use research based practices. Rather, it is a much more complex matter of putting teachers in a position to adapt research based practices to their particular situation.
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Introduction

John Dewey and Randolph Bourne took different positions on World War One. Although conflicted, Dewey saw the war as an opportunity to expand a more American style democracy into some of the as yet undemocratic states in Europe. Randolph Bourne, a former student of Dewey, on the other hand, believed that the consequences of war created problems that would prevent significant change. This paper is a description of this disagreement as a means of analyzing the positions of both Dewey and Bourne on the issue of the war and, further, it is an investigation of similarities of the rhetoric surrounding the American entrance into World War I and our current situation. This is then used to generate some questions concerning the role of the intellectuals in a time of war – preemptive or otherwise. Actually I would like to begin with last item first.

Dewey

Two years before America’s entry into world War I, Dewey wrote German Philosophy and Politics based on lectures delivered in February 1915 at the University of North Carolina. The war was into its seventh month and the sinking of the Lusitania was two months in the future. Neutrality was the governmental line but many Americans denounced the German barbarity in the invasion of neutral Belgium and clamored for entry on the allied side. Former President Theodore Roosevelt gave speeches across the country supporting the build up of the military and over all military preparedness. His critics claimed that Dewey had succumbed to the war fever but Sidney Hook in his introduction to volume eight of the Middle Works of Dewey’s collected works says German Philosophy and Politics is primarily an essay in the history of ideas.

Dewey tried to avoid the pitfall of historians who used history for purposes other than the search for the unfolding of the human experience. The influence of Hegel might be seen in his view that,

“... historians are really engaged in construing the past in terms of the problems and interests of an impending future, instead of reporting a past in order to discover some mathematical curve which future events are bound to describe.”

The lectures and the ensuing book discuss the relationships among German culture, politics, and philosophy. But they also look into the German philosophy of history and the relationships of philosophy, culture, society, politics, and social psychology. Marxist economic determinism is found, for example, to be dogmatic, holding that “economic forces present an inevitable and systematic change or evolution, of which state and church, art and literature, science and philosophy are by-products.”

German idealistic philosophy reflects the historic evolution and organization “as an organic instrument of the accomplishment of an Absolute Will and Law...” (MW8:199-200)

Outside of Germany,” he continues, the career of the German idealistic philosophy has been mainly professional and literary. It has exercised considerable upon the teaching of philosophy in France, England and this country. Beyond professional circles, its influence has been considerable in theological directions. Without a doubt, it has modulated for many persons the transition from a supernatural to a spiritual religion; it has enabled them to give up historical and miraculous elements... and to retain the moral substance and emotional values of Christianity. But the Germans are quite right in feeling that only in Germany is this form of idealistic thinking both indigenous and widely applied.

Dewey, of course, finds experimental philosophy more appropriate for American society. He wrote,

“It is difficult to see how any a priori philosophy, or any systematic absolutism, is to get a footing among us, at least beyond narrow and professional circles. Psychologists talk about learning by the method of trial and error or success. Our social organization commits us to this philosophy of life. Our working principle is to try’ to find out by trying and to measure the worth of the ideas and theories tried by the success with which they meet the test of application in practice. Concrete consequences rather than a priori rules supply our guiding principles.”

Dewey saw America’s situation as different from Germany or, for that matter, Europe. The openness of the society in America made it unsusceptible to the dogmatic and absolutist philosophies of the old world. The constitutional democracy mitigated against continued domination by any one group. The hypothetical and tentative mind set extended to the entire society. He said,

America is too new to afford a foundation for an a priori philosophy; we have not the requisite background of law, institutions and achieved social organization... Our history is too obviously future. Our country is too big and too unformed... We must have system, constructive method, springing
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from a widely inventive imagination, a method
checked up at each turn by results achieved.\textsuperscript{9}

Dewey lays much of the blame for the war on the
nationalist attitudes so prevalent in Europe in the late
nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. He tied
German nationalism, philosophy, needs for unification,
and views on race to the drive toward conflict. Writing
about nationalism, he said,

Philosophical justification of war follows inevitably
from a philosophy of history composed in
nationalistic terms . . . . The idea that friendly
intercourse among all the peoples of the earth is a
legitimate aim of human effort is in basic
contradiction of such a philosophy.\textsuperscript{3}

Along with nationalism, Kantian philosophy,
thought Dewey, played a role in the development or
pretty well described the German psyche. He found,
Kant’s decisive contribution is the idea of a dual
legislation of reason by which are marked off two
distinct realms – that of science and that of morals.
Each of the two realms has its own final and
authoritative constitution: On one hand, there is the
world of sense, the world of phenomena in space and
time in which science is at home; on the other hand,
is the supersensible, the noumenal world, the world of
moral duty and moral freedom.\textsuperscript{6}

The importance of this is that,
Kantianism has helped formulate a sense of a
national mission and destiny . . . . his formulation
and its influence aids us to understand why the
German consciousness has never been swamped by
its technical efficiency and devotion . . . . Freedom
of soul and subordination of action dwell in
harmony. Obedience, definite subjection and control,
detailed organization is the lesson enforced by the
rule of causal necessity in the outer world of space
and time in which action takes place. Unlimited
freedom, the heightening of consciousness for its
own sake, sheer reveling in noble ideals, the law of
the inner world. What more can mortal man ask.\textsuperscript{9}

In addition to nationalism and Kant’s philosophy,
Dewey viewed the influence of racial considerations as
important in the cultural and social development of the
German world view. He wrote,

A purely artificial cult of race has so flourished in
Germany that many social movements — like
antisemitism — and some of Germany’s political
ambitions cannot be understood apart from the
mystic identification of Race, Culture and the State.
In the light of actual science, this is so mythological
that the remark of an American periodical that race
means a number of people reading the same
newspapers is sober scientific fact compared with
it.\textsuperscript{10}

German Philosophy and Politics, prepared and
delivered in the early days of the war underscored how
an otherwise highly civilized people could become so
warlike and ruthless. Dewey was critical of the war and
the underlying causes, nationalism, racism, and
absolutist philosophy. The book was intended for the
American audience as a warning about the admixture of
Realpolitik with absolutist idealist philosophy. Dewey
recognized that the class stratification and hierarchical
nature of social organization were supported by the
“immutable principles,” social, historical, and
philosophical in nature and that these attributes
contributed to the will to war.

The prevalence of an idealistic philosophy full of
talk of Duty, Will, and Ultimate Ideas and Ideals,
and of the indwelling of the absolute in German
history for the redeeming of humanity has disguised
from the mass of the German people, upon whose
support the policy of the leaders ultimately depends
for success, the real nature of the enterprise in which
they are engaged.\textsuperscript{11}

Dewey believed, however, that America should not
be too complacent. He thought that the war had shown
that rapid change and development, advances in science,
the development of technology, industry, and
commerce, as desirable as they seemed at the time, are
not progress. They may provide the environment for
progress but they may just as surely provide an
environment for a more efficient means of extending the
status quo. He said, “We have confused . . . rapidity of
change with progress . . . the breaking down of barriers
by which advance is made possible with advance
itself.\textsuperscript{12}

Dewey thought that the war might serve as a wake-up
call, a reason to reassess the condition of the world.
He wrote,

If we have been living in a fool’s paradise, in a
dream of automatic uninterrupted progress, it is well
to be awakened. If we have been putting our trust in
false gods, it is a good thing to have our confidence
shaken, even rudely . . . . We can hardly welcome
the war merely because it has made us think, . . . but
since the war has come we may welcome whatever
revelations of our stupidity and carelessness it brings
with it and set about the institution of a more manly
and more responsible faith in progress than that in
which we have indulged in the past.\textsuperscript{13}

Progress had been overcome by the use of force. For
Dewey force “is the only thing in the world that affects
anything.”\textsuperscript{14} Force consists of “power or energy,
coercion, violence, and law and these often “come into conflict; they clash.” Force, then is to be used, it is a means to achieve and end and is to be treated as such. He wrote, “To be interested in the ends and to have contempt for the means which alone secure them is the last stage of intellectual demoralization.”

Dewey’s support for the war had its qualifications. He could recognize the existence of the conflicts, historical, philosophical, ethnic, economic, imperial, etc. that led up to the war. He could recognize the misapplication of science, technology, and force to achieve an end that was not necessarily desirable and was certainly not worth the costs involved. “Men justify war,” he said, in behalf of words which would be empty were they not charged with emotional force — words like honor, liberty, civilization, divine purpose and destiny — forgetting that a war, like anything else has specific concrete results on earth. Unless war can be shown to be the most economical method of securing the results which are desirable with a minimum of the undesirable results.

Pacifism was not acceptable to Dewey. He found the pacifists’ objections to force of any kind as unacceptable, making the peace movement a movement based on the mistaken impression that war springs from the emotions of hate, pugnacity and greed rather than from the objective causes which call these emotions into play reduces the peace movement to the futile plane of hortatory preaching.

Dewey did, however, allow for conscientious objection to the war. He believed that American society had an innate sense of good will and that to create a sense of war was the supreme stupidity. Increasingly, after the Spanish American War, an isolationist attitude grew. When the war came it was, at first, viewed as “over there.” Dewey summarized the changing mood of the people. He said, “we at peace were the preservers of sanity in a world gone mad . . . . (P)acifism was identified with good business, philanthropy, morality and religion. Combine Mr. Carnegie and Mr. Bryan and you have as near the typical American as you are likely to find.” Peace, divorce, and temperance were the main topics in the churches. Young people took those lessons to heart. It is no wonder that many could not make the transition from maintaining the peace to killing the Hun. Dewey thought “ . . . such young people deserve something better than accusations, varying from pro-Germanism and the crime of Socialism to traitorous disloyalty, which the newspapers so readily “hurl” at them.” And that it was insufficient to provide jobs for conscientious objects which would keep them off the front lines but forcing them to serve. That such action might be the means “to punish the objects as dangerous malefactors instead of asking to what tasks they may most usefully be assigned.”

Dewey’s tacit support for the war was tempered by his realization of the dangers inherent in wartime activities. He called for toleration while recognizing that almost all men have learned the lesson of toleration with respect to past heresies and divisions . . . when some affair of our own day demands cohesive action and stirs deep feeling, we at once dignify the unpopular cause with persecution . . . and lend it importance by the conspicuousness of our efforts at suppression.

He thought too much power was ascribed to the “Greenwich Village pacifists or socialists”— Bourne and a number of leftists, pacifists, and socialists lived in Greenwich Village — who we try to gag and force from sight. These were accomplished through Woodrow Wilson’s Patriot Acts which Dewey opposed because “with the entry of the United States into the war what had been before wrongheadedness became sedition and what had been folly became treason.” The Espionage Act of 1917, which made it a crime for a person to convey information with intent to interfere with the operation or success of the armed forces of the United States or to promote the success of its enemies. The Sedition Act of 1918 made it illegal to speak out against the government. Eugene V. Debs was jailed for obstructing recruiting after his Canton, Ohio speech opposing the war and the Postmaster General was given the authority to declare letters, circulars, newspapers, pamphlets, and other materials that violated the Act to be unmaillable. Newspapers like The Appeal to Reason, the New York Call, the Milwaukee Leader and other newspapers and journals were denied the use of the mails.

Dewey observed that “the official in Washington . . . will deny the mails to the Call and the Vorwaerts. If he does it is possible the act will mark a turning point. If the act should not elect Hillquit (the Socialist candidate) as Mayor of the City of New York, it would come so near to doing so that, as the saying goes, there would be no fun in it.” (MW9:293) Hillquit lost to the Hearst and Tammany-backed candidate but so did the incumbent notwithstanding the boisterous help of Theodore Roosevelt and the jingoist pro war campaign.

Dewey, always the democrat, appreciated the play of ideas. He thought effective democracy was more likely to be hampered by the lack of open debate and discussion. He felt that “the ultimate American
participation should consist not in money nor in men, but in the final determination of peace policies which is made possible by the contribution of men and money. He might have added ideas, after all, the cornerstone of Wilson’s plan for lasting peace consisting of Fourteen Points had been discussed in the Socialist press for two years before they appeared in his 1918 speech.

Another concern of Dewey was the status of education in wartime. He delivered a statement and participated in a question and answer session before the Committee on Military Affairs hearing on Senate Bill 1695, Universal Military Training. The bill provided for military training for the male youth of the country between the ages of 12 and 23. He was concerned that Universal Military Training would soon become the task of the schools. Dewey said he appeared “as one humble representative of the multitudes who still believe in the historic spirit and ideal of democratic America . . . but as one can not contemplate with anything but abhorrence a system which should preoccupy his sons from the age of 12 with military instruction.” He did not trust the program as envisioned to provide the physical, social, and moral benefits nor did he think that the proposed program of training would meet the needs of the military resulting in the expansion of military training taking resources away from all other aspects of education.

Dewey noted that hygiene training was an important part of the bill though no provision was made for the training of girls in the schools. He suggested that the military aspect be dropped and concentration be placed on

- universal medical inspection, on school and neighborhood clinics for the care of teeth, eyes, and orthopedic remedies, secure intelligent supervision and instruction to eliminate from schools the faults which breed physical defects, undertake a nationwide movement for providing playgrounds and instructors to lead in healthful games and plays, promote such organizations as Boy Scouts and the Pioneers, and there can be no doubt about the result.

Dewey thought that supporters of the proposed bill held a low opinion of the moral, physical, and social condition of the youth of America. To him they drew a lurid picture of the “moral degeneration of the American youth, their lack of respect for their elders and for work, the decline in obedience, the increase in flabby self-indulgence, the unwillingness to make any sacrifice for a common good, etc.” Of course much of this sounds like generation-gap thinking. The older generation always thinks the youth are not what they should be. On the other hand, Dewey doubts whether the proposed law would make matters much better. He continues,

Then military training, automatic obedience to the command of a superior, is offered as a moral patent medicine. At the same time we are informed that the same course will promote the independence, the initiative, and voluntary cooperative spirit of those who . . . become cogs in a vast machine.

What Dewey supported was voluntary training with the primary emphasis put on health and sanitation and that physical education be expanded and to be begun by the age of eight so that some of the childhood afflictions could be caught and limited. He also supported raising military pay in order to provide a volunteer military.

Dewey’s support for the war centered on the realization that peace is not an absolute and war, though an evil, was sometimes a necessary evil to be exploited for socially beneficial goals. The opportunity existed, he thought, to improve the international social order, to reconstruct American society. Problems like unemployment, the class structure, inefficient production and distribution, drift and lack of organization . . . now would be liquidated as by-products of the past, alterable with the application of sufficient will, determination and force . . . Recognition of the common good would transcend private greed.

America’s role in the war was not successful in improving the international social order let alone the reconstruction of American society. The failures of the Treaty of Versailles, the League of Nations, the Five-Power Treaty, and Four Power Treaty and other diplomatic efforts to institute a lasting peace. The war proved to be an ineffective means for spreading democracy or indeed ending war itself. What it did accomplish, Dewey hoped, was to end the isolation of America from the rest of the world. America would influence other nations rather than other nations influencing America.

Randolph Bourne

Randolph Bourne was born in 1886 to a middle class family in Bloomfield New Jersey. His birth was difficult. He was pulled from the womb rather harshly by forceps. This left his head misshapen and scarred. At the age of four a case of spinal tuberculosis stunted his growth and deformed his back. He never attained the height of five feet. But what Bourne lacked in appearance or size was made up for in personality and intellect. Raised in the Presbyterian church and educated in Bloomfield High School, Bourne was a good student and a faithful church member. Bourne recorded in his diary that the Bible verse read to the not yet
fifteen-year-old deformed boy at his church union ceremony was “Whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely.” In school “Randolph not only developed a forceful, active identity, he projected confidence and ability. He was a debater, and editor as well as a writer, a memorizer of Bible verses, a student, a success. His classmates elected him senior class president.”

Bourne graduated from high school in 1903 and was admitted to Princeton but he was denied financial support for higher education. He wanted to work in New York City but was unable to find any job for the two years he tried. No one was interested in hiring what one of his friends described as a frog prince. Finally he began giving piano lessons in the “parlor of the big house on Belleville Avenue, like a maiden aunt” and later worked as a factory hand in the office of a Morristown relative playing piano at the movie theater and as an accompanist. In 1905 Bourne found work making piano rolls by playing popular music on a machine that cut the rolls.

Bourne was a voracious reader. While still in high school he read as many of the accepted literary works as he could. He bought many of them in the inexpensively bound sets offered at that time. His interests shifted from the works of Scott, Lowell, Whittier, Longfellow, etc. to the contemporary social conditions. Through his reading he became interested in unitarianism and socialism, supporting the liberalization of the young-men's Bible class and the Boy Scouts. His socialism was of the populist variety. He was not a great scholar of Marx and Engels, or, for that matter, Lenin and the Bolsheviks. Later he would write in Columbia Monthly,

“Much of Marxism are doctrinaire and static in its concepts, and yet the three cardinal propositions of Marx — the economic interpretation of history, the class struggle, and the exploitation of the workers by capitalistic private ownership of the means of production — if interpreted ‘progressively and experimentally’ are the sine qua non of Socialism . . . . Anyone who accepts these three propositions as an interpretation of history, a philosophy of society, and the basis of a collective struggle for reform, is a Socialist.”

For him that was sufficient.

In 1909 Bourne took the scholarship examination at Columbia and received a full-tuition scholarship. Six years after high school the twenty-three-year-old Bourne entered Columbia soon making friends and joining the Intercollegiate Socialist Society founded in 1906 by Upton Sinclair and Jack London. In January of 1910 Bourne’s first essay was published in the Columbia Monthly and by the spring of 1911 at the end of his sophomore year, the Atlantic Monthly helped launch Bourne on his literary career. It was, in fact, at the request of Ellery Sedgwick, the Atlantic Monthly publisher, that Bourne wrote his essay, “The Handicapped, By One of Them” (Atlantic Monthly: 1911) Later published in Youth and Life as A Philosophy of Handicap. He described the attitude of the handicapped person,

He has constantly with him the sense of being obliged to make extra efforts to overcome the bad impression of his physical defects, and he is haunted with a constant feeling of weakness and low vitality which makes effort more difficult and renders him easily faint-hearted and discouraged by failure. He is never confident of himself, because he has grown up in an atmosphere where nobody has been very confident of him; and yet his environment and circumstances call out all sorts of ambitions and energies in him which, form the nature of his case, are bound to be immediately thwarted. This attitude is likely to keep him at a generally low level of accomplishment unless he have an unusually strong will, and a strong will is perhaps the last thing to develop under such circumstances.

Then he offered the following advice,

So to all the handicapped and the unappreciated, I would say, — Grow up as fast as you can. Cultivate the widest interests you can, and cherish all your friends. Cultivate some artistic talent, for you will find it the most durable of satisfactions and perhaps one of the surest means of livelihood as well . . . . do not take the world too seriously, nor let too many social conventions oppress you . . . . In a word, keep looking outward; look out eagerly for those things that interest you, for people who will interest you and be friends with you, for new interests and for opportunities to express yourself. You will find that your disability will come to have little meaning for you, that it will begin to fade quite completely out of your sight; you will wake up some fine morning and find yourself, after all the struggles that seemed so bitter to you, really and truly adjusted to the world.

Bourne was often seen on the streets and in the restaurants and coffee shops of Greenwich Village dressed in a black cape to obscure his hunchback. He was evidently a person with many friends of whom he said, “My friends, I can say with truth, since I have no other treasure, are my fortune. I really live only when I am with my friends.”

Bourne at some time during his career at Columbia
became interested in the work of the pragmatists. The thought of William James captivated him and the ideas and writing of John Dewey became important. He called Dewey the most significant thinker in America since the death of William James. Bourne was in one or more of Dewey’s classes at Columbia. Of Dewey as a teacher, Bourne observed, “It will do you no good to hear him lecture. His sentences, flowing and exact and lucid when read, you will find strung out in festoons of obscurity between pauses for the awaited right word.” He used Dewey’s *Ethics* and other works in his criticism and book review essays and called himself an instrumentalist, accepting wholeheartedly “assumption behind Dewey’s pragmatism that human intelligence could envisage the future clearly because human beings, in addition to being purposeful, were at heart rational and good.”

Bourne came to appreciate the significance of the application of pragmatism to the social order. In a short essay, “John Dewey’s Philosophy,” Bourne writes, His philosophy of “instrumentalism” has an edge on it that would smash up the habits of thought, the customs and institutions in which our society has been living for centuries . . . his tolerant democracy loves all human values, and finds nothing so intolerable as artificial inequality . . . Professor Dewey’s fundamental thesis has been that . . . the mind is not a looking-glass, reflecting the world for its private contemplation, not a logic-machine for building up truth, but a tool by which we adjust ourselves to the situations in which life puts us. Reason is not a divinely appointed guide to eternal truth, but a practical instrument by which we solve problems. Words are not invariable symbols for invariable things, but clues to meanings.

Bourne also recognized the value of Dewey’s philosophy to the development of the new society, the broader application of science to the evolving American democracy. He wrote,

> It is in showing the unity of all the democratic strivings, the social movement, the new educational ideals, the freer ethics, the popular revolt in politics, of all the aspects of the modern restless, forward-looking personal and social life, and the applicability to all of them of scientific method, with its hypotheses and bold experimentation, that Professor Dewey has been the first thinker to put the moral and social goal a notch ahead.

Bourne understood the dilemma of pragmatism. He wrote,

> I am conscious of his horror of having his ideas petrified into a system. He knows that it will do no good to have his philosophy intellectually believed unless it is also thought and lived. And he knows the uncanny propensity of stupid men to turn even the most dynamic ideas into dogma. He has seen that in his school world.

As the recipient of the Gilder Fellowship on graduation from Columbia, Bourne traveled to Europe in 1913. He visited England, France, Italy and Germany. He was in Dresden on the day Austria declared war on Serbia and in Berlin two days later when the Kaiser arrived to cheering crowds. His views of the populace reinforced Dewey’s analysis of the *Kultur*, an eager unquestioning belief in the Kaiser and the State. Bourne recognized the relationship between culture and politics and the seduction of citizens who will most greatly sacrifice for the State. When one sees Europe at this point in history, one sees a clear vision of what this complex thing called Americanism must not become. Austria declaring war on Serbia, Germany invading Belgium, madness is brewing there, and it is a madness fueled by age-old fears and hatreds of other races and cultures. We must learn from the terrible mistake Europe is making and stay out of this war at all costs. War is a killer of culture and culture is America’s only hope.

He wrote,

> Patriotism becomes the dominant feeling, and produces immediately that intense and hopeless confusion between the relations which the individual bears and should bear toward the society of which he is a part. The patriot loses all sense of the distinction between State, nation, and government.

The problem was that patriotism and pacifism or antiwar feelings became mutually exclusive. Bourne thought that Dewey had missed a big segment of the antiwar sentiment, the segment that, neither wants martyrdom nor hopes to be saved for its amiable sentiments . . . and it is just this attitude, far more significantly ‘American’ than ‘conscientious objection,’ that John Dewey has ignored in his recent article on ‘Conscience and Compulsion.’ The result has been to apply his pragmatic philosophy in its least convincing form . . . . the instrumental use of the intelligence for the realization of conscious social purpose.

> “How,” questioned Bourne, “could the pragmatist mind accept war without more violent protest, without a greater wrench?” In *Twilight of Idols*, Bourne expresses his displeasure with John Dewey for what he saw as the misapplication of the pragmatist/instrumentalist philosophy.

We are in the war because an American Government
practiced a philosophy of adjustment, and an instrumentality for minor ends... an intellectual attitude of mere adjustment, of mere use of the creative intelligence to make your progress, must end in caution, regression, and a virtual failure to effect even that change which you so clearly and desirously see... instead of creating new values and setting at once a large standard to which the nations might repair. 50

Bourne, I think, still believed in Dewey’s philosophy but was chagrined that it was not being applied as it should be and that its misuse constituted a return to irrationality, blind faith patriotism, and the search for dissenters, pacifists, German sympathisers, and traitors. He thought,

The recent articles of John Dewey’s on the war suggest a slackening in his thought for our guidance and stir, and the inadequacy of his pragmatism as a philosophy of life in this emergency. 51

Bourne blamed Dewey and other intellectuals for failing to see that democracy cannot be spread by war. The consequences of war do not lend themselves to remaking the world and the restructuring of the social order. This has been often proven since. Dewey, thought Bourne, should have known better. He said,

A philosopher who senses so little the sinister forces of war, who is so much more concerned over the excesses of the pacifists than over the excesses of military policy, who can feel only amusement at the idea that any one should try to conscript thought, who assumes that the war-technique can be used without trailing along with it the mob-fanaticisms, the injustices and hatreds, that are organically bound up with it, is speaking to another element of the younger intelligentsia than that to which I belong. 52

For three years there was sufficient resistance to entering the war and much discussion about the advantages and disadvantages to entering the war was published. The idea of the war making the world safer for democracy, the concept of and international organization that might prevent or minimize another war, and the pursuit of ways to limit the size of armies and the manufacture and maintenance of weapons were all products of this time. Eventually, however, war was chosen from motives alien to our cultural needs, and for political ends alien to the happiness of the individual. But nations, of course, are not rational entities, and they act within their most irrational rights when they accept war as the most important thing the nation can do in the face of metaphysical menaces of imperial prestige. What concerns us here is the relative ease with which the pragmatist intellectuals,’ with Professor Dewey at the head, have moved out their philosophy, bag and baggage, from education to war. 53

Bourne considered the war to be so contrary to Dewey’s experiences that it removed him from his intellectual environment and forced him to apply his intelligence to the problematic situation. Bourne found his response lacking. He wrote,

Evidently the attitudes which war calls out are fiercer and more incaulcable than Professor Dewey is accustomed to take into his hopeful and intelligent imagination, and the pragmatist mind... it is not an arena of creative intelligence our country’s mind is now, but of mob-psychology. 54

Bourne thought that the war intellectuals were being disingenuous. He found, “contrast between what liberals ought to be doing and saying if democratic values are to be conserved, and what the real forces are imposing upon them.” 55

In Europe it was patriotism that helped provoke the war. In America the war succeeded in evoking patriotism, a patriotism of blind faith. This kind of patriotism is distinguished from the genuine patriotism of good works whose other name is public spirit or civic virtue. To practice the real patriotism of civic virtue is the first duty of a citizen; an instinctive and servile loyalty to the group, right or wrong, is not citizenship it is subjection. Bourne wrote,

War is the health of the State. It automatically sets in motion throughout society those irresistible forces for uniformity, for passionate cooperation with the Government in coercing into obedience the minority groups and individuals which lack the larger herd sense. The machinery of government sets and enforces the drastic penalties; the minorities are either intimidated into silence, or brought slowly around by a subtle process of persuasion which may seem to them really to be converting them... the nation in war-time attains a uniformity of feeling, a hierarchy of values culminating at the undisputed apex of the State ideal, which could not possibly be produced through any other agency than war... The State is intimately connected with war, for it is the organization of the collective community when it acts in a political manner, and to act in a political manner towards a rival group has meant, throughout all history - war... 56

In “The Collapse of American Strategy,” Bourne asked how entering the war was to serve as a means for the creation of an international order that would prevent future wars. Bourne suggested the use of naval force as
a means of armed neutrality to keep the shipping lanes free. If successful in stopping submarine warfare the Germans would be deterred and the United States could still serve as peace broker. As soon as the United States entered the war, any hope of “peace without victory” was lost. The Allies were then primed for an ultimate victory over the Germans. American strategy was forgotten. Progressives defended American intervention in the war on the grounds that it would provide a unique opportunity to reorganize the world into a radically democratic social order. Bourne countered that participation in the war would negate any opportunity for expanding democracy. He said,

If the German people cannot effect their own political reorganization, nobody can do it for them. They would continue to prefer the native Hohenzollerns to the most liberal government imposed by their conquering enemies . . . . Guarding neutrality, we might have counted toward a speedy and democratic peace. In the war we are a ruderless nation to be exploited as the Allies wish, politically and materially, and towed . . . in any direction which they may desire . . . . The new strategy . . . ‘conquer or submit.’"37

Bourne and Dewey

Bourne, I think, never ceased to be a supporter of Dewey and his instrumentalism. I believe that he was disappointed in the intellectuals, especially the progressives, in America for not remaining true to their ideals. He was disappointed in John Dewey in particular. For if there was one person who should have been able to foresee the consequences of America’s entry into the war it was Dewey. His criticism of Dewey led him back to William James. He wondered if James would have provided a different kind of intellectual leadership. “Whether James would have given us just that note of spiritual adventure which would make the national enterprise seem creative for an American future, this we can never know.”38 He thought for James to support the war he would have had to give up his “moral equivalent for war” for an “immoral equivalent for war.”39 Bourne said, “I evoked the spirit of William James, with its gay passion for ideas, and its freedom of speculation, when I felt the slightly pedestrian gait into which the war had brought pragmatism. It is the creative desire more than the creative intelligence that we shall need if we are ever to fly.”40

John Dewey on the other hand came to dislike the Greenwich Village pacifists and socialists and Bourne especially. When Dewey was selected as an editor of the Dial when it moved from Chicago to New York along with Thorstein Veblen, Helen Marot, and George Donlin he noticed according to the organization plan the associate editors would be the real editors. Among the associate editors was listed Randolph Bourne. Dewey immediately resigned as a Dial editor. The publisher upon learning of Dewey’s resignation and the reason dismissed Bourne as an associate editor and encouraged Dewey to return. Bourne continued submitting articles to the Dial but the articles printed were largely limited to review essays. Bourne’s dissent no longer had a place for expression. A similar fate befell Bourne at the New Republic. Once the decision was made to go to war, Bourne’s dissenting voice was not allowed to be heard. He was limited to educational and literary topics. The Seven Arts published several of Bourne’s more provocative essays beginning in April 1917 but The Seven Arts lost its benefactor and was forced to cease publication in September 1917.

Only after the failure of the Versailles Treaty to implement the Fourteen Points and the failure of the international community to set up a workable organization to limit war and provide the means to settle disputes between nations did Dewey come to realize that American involvement might have been manipulated to the benefit of the allies. A Dial editorial under the names of the editors, Dewey, Veblen, and Marot read,

America won the war; America has lost the peace, the object for which she fought. It is a thankless task to bring in a bill of particulars---to show in detail how one by one the fourteen points to which America and the Allies bound themselves have been abrogated by the actual pact. 61

Dewey observed that “might still makes right,” that all that can be done by “those who favored America’s action in the war from idealistic reasons” is “to make the best of it . . . blurring over disagreeable features so as to salve vanity . . . . The consistent pacifist has much to urge now in his own justification.”62 But by the time these words were written, Bourne had been dead for ten months.

Education

It is interesting and somewhat ironic that it was in the period of the First World War that Dewey’s capstone works in education appeared, Schools of Tomorrow and Democracy and Education. Dewey included a statement of the importance of education,

Education is the means of the advancement of humanity toward realization of its divine perfection. Education is the work of the State. The syllogism completes itself. But in order that the State may carry on its educational or moral mission it must not only possess organization and commensurate power, but it must also control the conditions which secure
the possibility offered to the individuals composing it. To adopt Aristotle’s phrase, men must live before they can live nobly. The primary condition of a secure life is that everyone be able to live by his own labor. Without this, moral self-determination is a mockery.\textsuperscript{63}

Perhaps his experiences with the First World War broadened Dewey’s thinking from psychology and education to a more inclusive philosophy and social theory. *Reconstruction in Philosophy, Human Nature and Conduct, Experience and Nature, The Public and Its Problems,* and *A Quest for Certainty* were all written in the in the 1920s.

Bourne had a great appreciation for the application of instrumentalism to education. His first published essay in the *New Republic* criticized the life in schoolrooms.

Here were these thirty children, all more or less acquainted, and so congenial and sympathetic that the slightest touch threw them all together into a solid mass of attention and feeling. Yet they were forced, in accordance with some principle of order, to sit at these stiff little desks, equidistantly apart, and prevented under penalty from communicating with each other . . . . As I sat and watched these interesting children struggling . . . . I reflected that even with the best of people, thinking cannot be done without talking.\textsuperscript{64}

Bourne wrote *The Gary Schools* describing the implementation of Dewey’s educational ideas in Gary, Indiana which helped spread the ideas of progressive education. And even though he would later take Dewey to task over his war views wrote that,

Dewey’s philosophy . . . prosperous and with a fund of progressive good-will . . . is a philosophy of hope, of clear-sighted comprehension of materials and means. Where institutions are at all malleable, it is the only clue for improvement. It is scientific method applied to ‘uplift.’ But this careful adaptation of means to desired ends, this experimental working out of control over brute forces and dead matter in the interests of communal life, depends on a store of rationality, and is effective only where there is strong desire for progress. It is precisely the school, the institution to which Dewey’s philosophy was first applied, that is of all our institutions the most malleable. And it is the will to educate that has seemed, in these days, among all our social attitudes the most rationally motivated. It was education, and almost education alone, that seemed susceptible to the steady pressure of an ‘instrumental’ philosophy. Intelligence really seemed about to come into conscious control of an institution, and that one the most potent in molding the attitudes needed for a civilized society and the aptitudes needed for the happiness of the individual.\textsuperscript{65}

Dewey’s philosophy, properly applied, might have made a difference but proper application did not mean creating a Deweyan system or converting Dewey’s precepts to some kind of dogma. Bourne appreciated Dewey’s “horror of having his ideas petrified into a system. He knows that it will do no good to have his philosophy intellectually believed unless it is also thought and lived.”\textsuperscript{66} As was discovered when the New York City Schools tried to institute the Gary system, the transfer of even a successful system to another environment is fraught with problems. Still Bourne observed,

For both our revolutionary conceptions of what education means, and for the intellectual strategy of its approach, this country is immeasurably indebted to the influence of Professor Dewey’s philosophy. With these ideas sincerely felt, a rational nation would have chosen education as its national enterprise. Into this it would have thrown its energy though the heavens fell and the earth rocked around it. But the nation did not use its isolation from the conflict to educate itself.\textsuperscript{67}

War

John Dewey, if I have read him correctly, would not approve of the current state of affairs, let alone Randolph Bourne. Dewey came to see, as Bourne saw from the first, that war is not the extension of civilizing forces and is not capable of producing good from its evil. Only the selfless application of intelligence can overcome the horrors of war. After World War II the creation of the United Nations provided a means to seek other means to solve international problems without resolution to armed conflict. The Marshall Plan allowed Western Europe to rebuild and regain some of its power in the world. But the rise of great-power politics and the cold war limited the effectiveness of both the world organization and the American charity.

Naomi Wolf’s book, *Fascist America, in 10 easy steps*, looks at the condition of American democracy. Wolf’s “ten easy steps” are:

1. Invoke a terrifying internal and external enemy. Drugs, terrorism, Iraq, Iran, Russia, North Korea; take your pick.
2. Create a gulag. Guantanamo and other camps, some known, some secret hold “enemy combatants” and, perhaps, others.
3. Develop a thug caste. Security contractors work
outside the law in Iraq and have been deployed in the United States after Katrina in New Orleans. Organized poll watchers harassed voters in Florida.

4. Set up an internal surveillance system. The National Security Agency has the ability to monitor all kinds of personal activities, from phone and email to banking and library transactions.

5. Harass citizens’ groups. Any group that dissents may become a target for investigation.

6. Engage in arbitrary detention and release. Many people are prevented from air transportation because of expressing anti-war or anti-government sentiments.

7. Target key individuals. If they won’t go along with the program, get rid of them which is exactly what the justice department did to eight otherwise competent federal prosecutors. Valerie Plame’s identification as a CIA operative causes irreparable harm to that agency because her husband wrote an op-ed criticism of the administration. How many people have left the administration for ideological (or ethical) reasons?

8. Control the press. Reporters are consistently fed the “correct” information about the Iraq war. There is no opportunity for a free press and serious investigative reporting.

9. Dissent equals treason. The right to dissent is no longer taken for granted. There have been too many instances of individuals who have been threatened with punishment for speaking out against the activities of the government.

10. Suspend the rule of law. States of emergency can now be used to mobilize the National Guard at the behest of the President. Virtual martial law. One of the things she mentions is the complacency of American citizens. We assume that things are pretty much OK. We are told that things are pretty much OK. Information to the contrary is limited. We don’t recognize the dangers that are inherent in the steps the government is taking during the various wars we have won but are still engaged in. Machiavelli recommended to the Prince that he keep his nation on a war footing. We are in up over our boots.

Dewey’s pre war optimism is of little help to us now. His post-war realism would be more appropriate. Bourne’s skepticism about the role of nations exporting ideology (Democratic or otherwise) seems to ring true.

Bourne has a ghost,

a tiny twisted unscarred ghost in a black cloak
hopping along the grimy old brick and brownstone streets
still left in downtown New York,
crying out in a shrill soundless giggle;

War is the health of the state.

John Dos Passos, 1919
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TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY PARTNERSHIP: COLLECTIVE VISION OR GLOBAL CAPITALISM?

Sam Stack, University of West Virginia

Introduction

This paper explores the Framework for 21st Century Learning, a partnership composed of global capitalists such as Dell, Intel, Junior Achievement, Microsoft, Blackboard, Cisco, Oracle, Ford, ETS, Verizon, Adobe, SAS, Texas Instruments as well as the NEA, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and the American Association of School Librarians. Strategic partners include the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE). The U.S. Conference of Mayors has also passed a resolution supporting a framework for 21st century skills. The partnership includes the states of Wisconsin, Massachusetts, North Carolina, West Virginia, South Dakota and Maine. This seems like an interesting collaboration and I believe it is. The mission statement of the collaboration is “To bring 21st Century Skills to every child in America by serving as a catalyst for change in teaching, learning, and assessment and as an advocate among education policy makers through a unique partnership among education, business, and government leaders.”

From a historical perspective, this alliance is not new or unique in education. The partnership seems to accept the premise of No Child Left Behind and its focus on core subjects including English; reading or language arts; math; science; foreign language; civics; government; economics; arts; history; and geography. The partnership stresses the importance of global awareness, civic literacy and health awareness and it claims to promote critical thinking, communication skills, creativity, collaboration and media literacy skills. The partnership also addresses leadership, ethics, accountability, productivity, people skills, self-direction and social and personal responsibility.

Not surprisingly, the framework calls for students to be able to use technology. There is an emphasis on assessments using the latest modern technology for increased efficiency and timeliness. It calls for the use of high quality effective standardized assessments. While there appears strong democratic rhetoric in the language of the partnership, one wonders if the real emphasis is on global competition and work place productivity at the expense of true reflection and democratic inquiry. This paper briefly examines the historical background of the role of technology in current and past education reform and the social, political and economic forces often behind the impetus.

Twenty-first Century Children

According to the partnership, all children are to have the skills to be “effective citizens, workers and leaders in the 21st century.” One driving force seems to be the understanding that what kids currently learn in school often has little to do with the real world, how it works and how one learns to live in it. They argue certain skills are necessary for a globally competitive workforce and maintain these skills are necessary to maintain that workforce. Many of these skills are grounded in technological application, believed necessary to strengthen American education for the future. These skills are divided into core subjects, content, learning and thinking skills, technological literacy, life skills and assessments.

Underlying the agenda is the belief that educational reform means economic benefits with technology leading the way. There is strong support to suggest the US economy has been helped by technology and the information age, although we all remember the bursting of the internet bubble and the many dot.com failures. Kevin Phillips, author of Wealth and Democracy believes the key to success in the future, as it has been in the past, is to be continually creating rather than relying on one’s past laurels. Creativity and critical thinking are some of the goals of the framework, but one wonders at what level. Let’s take a moment to look at technology, economic growth and education from a historical point of view.

Technology and Education

The word we use for technology derives from the Greek word techne, which can mean art, skill, craft, trade, handiwork or making or doing something. Aristotle defines it as that deliberately created by human beings, not of physis or by nature. He believed the theoretical sciences were superior to the practical and productive; math might be an example of a theoretical science, ethics in the practical, and poetry in the productive realm. Aristotle contended the practical more important than the productive. For Aristotle we make things in order to use them, but it was contemplation he held in highest regard. According the Larry Hickman, Dewey turns Aristotle on his head, “going beyond theory and beyond praxis to production: his concern is with the making and tasting of new entities including
extra-organic tools as well as goals and ideas.”  Perhaps one is reminded of William James’ statement, “the proof is in the pudding.”  Technology can refer to how to do or make something as opposed to why things are the way they are.  The ancients more aesthetic understanding of technology seems to challenge the current view of many educational reformers and policy makers who often see it as an end in itself. We have come to a point in our society where technology is the new God. The virtual deification of technology in our society and even the university finds itself as a facet of modern education. If it exists and is available to us we must use it, even without asking the appropriate moral questions affecting our very humanity. For educators, the one basic question is whether the technology enhances student learning . . .

David Tyack and Larry Cuban argue in their book Tinkering with Utopia that Americans have always relished “technological solution to the problems of learning.” In 1841 a commentator wrote about one of those solutions stating, “The inventor or introduction of the system deserves to be ranked among the best contributions of learning and science, if not among the greatest benefactors of mankind.” An advertisement of this same invention referred to it as like a mirror reflecting the “workings, character and quality of the individual mind.” Both are speaking about the blackboard.

The US has a long history of linking technology to economic growth, essentially from the birth of the Republic. Perhaps this is connected to the Enlightenment focus on science which challenged ideas not within the paradigm of the scientific method. Jefferson and Franklin were both inventors and tinkerers. However it is the early 19th century that births what we see as modern technology. In the 1820s and 1830s, the modern use of the word technology came into general discourse. American textile manufacturers were some of the wealthiest Americans of the time and their wealth was grounded in the technological inventions of the spinning wheel [1766], the steam engine [1768], the power loom and the cotton gin. We should note that this growth of industry parallels the early growth and discussion of the common school movement. This is clearly argued in Bowles and Gintis’ classic sociology of education study, Schools in Capitalist America.

Horace Mann was clearly concerned about the social and economic effects of the industrial revolution and articulated such in some of his reports. We are all familiar with the following quote from the 12th Annual Report written in 1848, the publication year of the Communist Manifesto. Mann wrote, “Now surely, nothing but Universal Education can counter-work this tendency to the domination of capital and the servility of labor . . . Property and labor, in different classes, are essentially antagonistic; but property and labor in the same class, are essentially fraternal . . . Education, then beyond all other devices of human origin, it’s the great equalizer of the conditions of men, the balance wheel of the social machinery.”

Mann had personally witnessed the effects of the industrial revolution in Massachusetts and in his trip to Europe in 1843 and had experienced what he perceived as class warfare. Mann believed albeit naively, that the creation of wealth through education and transportation would trickle down to the working classes. History tends to tell a different story with “technology, like finance, being the arena of the elite.” His statement, “the balance wheel of the social machinery,” implies he viewed society in a technological framework, that it was something that could be fixed through the tool of education.

Unfortunately, war tends to use and may generate technology and the American Civil War stimulated the use of more effective weapons, but at the same time improved railroad transportation and medical science. Technology loosed the rifled musket and cannon both which could kill at 1000 yards or miles respectfully. Unfortunately military tactics on both sides relied on Napoleonic procedures such as marching in tight formation resulting in enormous causalities. Trench warfare, used later in the war to greater effect made the technology less effective. The war made devastating use of technology even though most of these technologies had been created before the war. Prior to the war, the best engineering school in the US was most likely West Point, which stressed a more modern scientific approach to problems. Harvard and Yale hired their early instructors in engineering from West Point, about forty years after the academy opened.

The late 19th and early 20th centuries seemed to be the first to strongly push notions of efficiency and standardization in education. Why not? The machine could overcome the human variable in production equations. Men and women were inconsistent, wasteful and fallible. Machines more closely approached perfection and manufacturers and, my emphasis, educators, for many school people revamped production systems to stress precision and exactness. By the 1890s technology had helped create fortunes for Rockefeller, Carnegie, Vanderbilt and Astor. Business leaders were active from the late 19th century to the
depression in school reform. Technology played a role because of their concerns that the Germans and English were beginning to control world markets. Business leaders argued Germany’s prowess was due to their “school-based vocational training.” Keep this in mind as concerns over global markets currently drive educational reform from A Nation at Risk to No Child Left Behind. The modern American public school was built during the era of the late 19th century, often with the railroad industry being perceived as the best model for school organization.

The turn of the 20th century continued our integration of technology in schools or at least the attempt. Although compulsory education had been around for some time, the early 20th century saw individual states more serious about mandating attendance until age sixteen. Some of this was to keep them out of the job market, but also to keep them in an institution where they could attend general purpose trade schools where they took specialized industrial courses. Some states had separate industrial education boards and Wisconsin in 1911 required towns of a population of five thousand or more to erect an industrial school. According to historians of technology Alan Marcus and Howard Segal, “Passage of the Smith Hughes Act of 1917 nationalized vocational education by providing matching federal money for pre-collegiate industrial education but, required states to gain project approval from a national vocational board.”

Continuing our societal love affair with technology, Larry Cuban quotes Thomas Edison who in 1913 stated, “Books will soon be obsolete in the schools. Schools will soon be instructional through the eye. It is possible to touch every branch of human knowledge with the motion picture.” It should be noted that one year before, 1912, the most technologically sophisticated ship of its day, the Titanic, had struck an iceberg and sunk. It has only recently come to light that the bolts used to hold parts of the ship together were defective. Blame for the disaster at the time seemed directed at Captain Smith rather than the owner, not the White Star Line and/or its technology. The Titanic disaster did not slow down the love affair with technology. Technology even became a principal solution to our large problems even during the Depression era where many held inventors, scientists, and engineers as responsible as the greedy capitalists. Regardless of these accusations, Americans did not become Luddites. One need only peruse advertisements in educational journals well into the mid-century to see the pedagogical fetish with film and radio. The journal Progressive Education has numerous advertisements for film and how its use was going to change the educational landscape, “to breathe visual reality into the spoken and printed word.” Advertisers proclaimed that the new technology would replace teachers and texts. During the 1930s these propagandists did not note that thousands of rural American schools had no electricity. Overall, teachers gave a cold shoulder to the power of the film as they often did with much technology, most likely using it to supplement the text rather than replace it.

World War II brought about more changes and really birthed the modern computer. Early computer pioneers like Alan Turing developed machines that could break codes so fast the Allies often read messages before the Axis powers. Perhaps this kind of success has led the modern view of technology as something to do with electronic systems. Edward Tenner in his book Own Devices suggests that this should not be so. “Just because microprocessors are all machines,” he writes, “does not mean that all machines, even all important machines, are built around chips and circuits.” Tenner defines technology as the human modification of the natural world and that there is constant interplay between technology, economics and values. He also emphasizes there is a difference between technology and technique, a distinction I believe most teachers understand and why they have historically held some skepticism for technology. Tenner suggests that technology consists of the “structures, devices, and systems we use,” while technique is applying our skills in using the technology. Historians of technology Alan Marcus and Howard Segal state, “technologies are the products of ideas and assumptions, and their implementation also depends on ideas; persons repeatedly ask themselves a simple question: Given how we understand what we face-what we perceive as our condition or situation—is this technology a likely solution or amelioration?” They further reiterate that the late 19th and early 20th century technology was obsessed with the concepts of system, efficiency, standardization, centralization and nationalism. These were familiar concepts with educators at the turn of the century and still are a part of current discourse and renewed emphasis in education.

Conclusion

As implied in the 21st Century Partnership, technology is still perceived as part of the solution and a necessary skill for the future; being technologically literate and digitally attuned are signs of prestige and status in our society; almost a type of digital “high fashion.” Today kids are referred to as digital natives,
which I think means they are born into a culture of technology. Herbert Marcuse, writing about utopia and technology wrote, “Today we have the capacity to turn the world into hell, and we are well on the way to doing so. We also have the capacity to turn it into the opposite of hell.” There is much to ponder in this statement. Many technologies have found their way into the classroom; the blackboard, slates, cheap paper, globes, maps, ballpoint pens, calculators, computers, whiteboards, Palm Pilots, and I am sure I have missed a few. Even the quill pen and chalk are technologies. Yet, historically there is an interesting relationship between teachers and technology. Teachers have a long history of being skeptical about using technologies in their classrooms. Cuban writes that while “Palm Pilots and laptops, cell phones and [I add iPods] might strike our grandparents as novel ways of learning they would clearly recognize the text and teacher centeredness of the class, even the ‘end products’ of the machine.” He refers to this as the classroom topography. Why this hesitancy of teachers to change? We tend to think that educators adopt every fad that comes along, but history of technology in the classroom tells a different story. Are teachers just content with the way they’ve always done it—the tried and true regardless of what the experts are saying? Perhaps that is the case to some degree, but it is also important to maintain a degree of healthy skepticism. This is made difficult due to the collaboration of the media, Silicon Valley, the Department of Defense and the lauding of technology.

We all probably recall from the Persian Gulf War, the infatuation with various forms of technology, particularly the Patriot missile system. We now had the use of smart bombs that only hit the bad guys. It made war seem less dirty, more sanitized. It is far from it. Many astronomers are concerned about how activity of the sun can effect our technology and are watchful of its impact within the next decade.

It is healthy to view technology with skepticism and we should be particularly skeptical of those that argue that “the growth of technology and the growth of democracy are reciprocal.” Historians of technology suggest that technology comes with mixed blessings at best. The automobile replaced the horse and buggy, but led to depletion of the ozone and the gradual loss of much mass transit; the Gatling gun, invented by a doctor to shock people into the horror of war and avoid violence, led to the birth of the modern machine gun and its devastating power; the iPod makes knowledge and media accessible, but recent studies link it to potential hearing loss. While the Internet has spawned access to information and communication unimaginable decades earlier, it has also served as a mechanism for racism and hatred and has the capacity for intrusiveness and theft.

Benjamin Barber writes, “We may be natural consumers and born narcissists, but citizens have to be made.” Larry Cuban reminds us that 19th and 20th century reformers in education, often business and political elites knew that schools played an important role in doing this. They directed their concern primarily at the children of the working classes and lower middle class. Bill Gates and Michael Dell are clever and savvy businessmen and understand the lucrative market of the school. States are beginning to show interest in the 21st Century Framework, grasping on to the notion that technology is one and perhaps the primary key to the future, whatever that means, but it is usually tied to global capital and competition. Technology and its development must be held responsible and of course this may include its inventors. Experience and inquiry, the exercise of imagination, and creativity and diligence need to be a part of our use and acceptance of technology in society and definitely in education and schools. Far too often “economics and class interests have intervened where experimentation would have been appropriate.” Schools are a lucrative market, the research and development labs as well as its dumping ground for technology. Todd Oppenheimer, in his book The Flickering Mind cautions teachers and school administrators to be aware of the technology expert, “making predictions about what school will be about in the future.” He suggests we better hold on to our wallets. Teachers and schools were not part of the economic boom of the 1990s with federal funding for poor schools being cut by 6 billion in 2003. Steven Jobs, who has always expressed an interest in linking education and technology admits that “what’s wrong with education cannot be fixed with technology,” and has stated that the information society has created an information overload. The English poet William Blake once wrote, “You never know what is enough unless you know what is more than enough.”

I do not see technology ever replacing the most important characteristics of the teacher, that human element of love, caring, compassion, sympathy, imagination and creativity. Technology is merely a tool, one that can benefit us greatly in enhancing inquiry, reflection and the desire to learn, but must be kept in context, never separating means and ends, like so many educational policy reformers, business leaders and others have too and so often advocated.
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THE XX FACTOR IN EDUCATION
Lu Stephens, San Angelo State University

The XX factor in education is women. Good women and not-so-good women have influenced education through the ages. Extraordinary women, rulers and rebels, influenced education even though they were not classified as educators. This paper will take a look at some extraordinary women who triumphed over attitudes or conditions that were adverse. Many women mentioned in this paper are thought of as heroines, but once they were thought of as the “Most hated woman” in that situation. Women have been spat upon, jailed or even murdered. Most had electrifying personalities. Some seemed larger than life. Wonder what their neighbors thought of them?

Historians like to talk about what powerful women looked like. But some of these women did daring deeds. Not all are good role models. But the following stories are of women who were good, bad and some of both. These women have stories about the power of women throughout history, and their influence can be understood. All women have stories.

CLEOPATRA 69 B.C. - 30 B.C.

Cleopatra was her father’s favorite. She spent her childhood in the women’s apartments, but she studied the same subjects as boys. She studied literature, philosophy, science, music and art. Egypt’s rulers deliberately married family members to keep the family in power. Family politics often meant a short lifespan. Through this process, Cleopatra developed nerves of steel. She was alive at eighteen and became queen. She spoke eight languages. She asked the opinion of ordinary Egyptians and was a shrewd business person. (Kruell, 2000)

Cleopatra traveled a lot, and she looted foreign libraries to add to her famous library in Alexandria. She made a literary contribution— a book on cosmetics. She was a bit of a drama queen and a diva. She knew how to make a grand entrance. She wanted to meet Julius Caesar, so she had herself wrapped in a large oriental rug and had it delivered to Caesar. They cruised the Nile River discussing politics. Her next boyfriend was Marc Anthony and that called for another grand entrance. She arrived on a ship covered in gold with sails of purple and silver oars, rowed in time to flutes and harps played by the musicians on deck. Antony won her heart by giving her scrolls for her library and killing her only remaining sister. They used unheard of luxury, and wore fancy clothes and jewels. Food and drink were the best.

All good things must come to an end, it seems. Anthony was told that Cleopatra was dead, so he committed suicide. Cleo was devastated, so she decided to research ways to die. Legend has it that she had a magnificent last meal, had her hair done, dressed up and let a cobra bite her. She died at 39. They found her on a golden couch perfumed, with her crown in place. She still lives on in the imaginations of writers who created plays, poetry, art and movies. She died 2,000 years ago, but still lives on. Could the secret of her success be the library?

JOAN OF ARC

Born in France in 1412 and died in France in 1431. A Blazing light, Joan was a French military heroine and a model of and inspiring leader. (Kruell, 2000)

Joan believed that saints called her for God, at age thirteen, to leave her village and save France from the English invaders. She did not go to school and she never learned to read or write. Later, she learned to sign her name. At age sixteen, she put on a red dress and cut off her hair and left home. She was persistent and shrewd, and convinced the French of her mission. What could they do? They put her in charge of an army. They gave her a horse, a sword, white enamelled armor that weighed 60 pounds, and she began to impose new discipline on the troops. She allowed no swearing, no looting and no unmarried female companions. She showed courage, and constantly urged, “Be of good heart!” She was wounded several times, but would not leave the battle field. She dressed like a man. She used military strategies that were uncommon and she and her army won many battles. She became a national heroine. In time, she was dragged off her horse and taken prisoner, and was jailed. The English questioned, scolded, drilled, and threatened her for five months, but she kept her cool, and was sometimes defiant. They were outraged, and filed charges against her of wearing men’s clothes – considered a crime against nature. They sentenced her to death at age 19 and burned her at the stake. Even some of her enemies thought that the execution was a mistake.

Twenty-two years later, France ejected the English and a second trial was held and Joan was cleared of all charges. Five hundred year later, Joan was canonized as a saint by the Catholic Church. Approximately ten thousand books have been written about Joan’s life and leadership … more than any other woman. She is a symbol for different causes related to her leadership, courage, integrity, and martyrdom. Writers inspired by Joan are Shakespeare and Mark Twain.

ELIZABETH I

The Queen of English was born in 1533 and died in 1603. When she was six, it is said that she looked as
serious as a 40-year-old. In this day and time, we would say that Elizabeth had a hard childhood. She had a dysfunctional family. Her father, King Henry VIII beheaded her mother, Anne Boleyn. Elizabeth grew up with many stepmothers, and she had barely escaped being imprisoned or worse. When she was eight, her father had another of his wives beheaded. Elizabeth said at that point she would never marry. (Kruell, 2000)

Despite a horrendous childhood, she matured into one of the most educated women of her day. Scholarship in women was still attacked as evil, but Elizabeth studied Greek and Roman classics, played music, read history and theology, and learned nine languages. Her hobby was riding horses … fast.

All of Elizabeth’s actions were done with energy and gusto. She had a little mean streak and was mischievous. She was a flirt, but refused to marry. She hated men with bad breath. She loved to outrage people. She loved presents. The more outrageous the better. She had a quick temper. She was a bully, and she could spit, swear, scream personal abuse and make death threats. Then, she would be gracious and charming. She was underweight and did not like sweets, but adored dancing. Her doctors told her that she would die of so many vigorous walks. Six of her doctors died before she did. She ruled for 45 years.

The Queen’s original poetry, prayers, and speeches reveal hard work. Her love of music, drama, and poetry encouraged enormous cultural growth, and she became the subject of many works of art. With the literary life officially viewed as a worthy endeavor, many of England’s greatest writers blossomed, and the earliest women writers referred to Elizabeth as a scholar whose work made their own work possible.

Catherine the Great

Born in Poland in 1779 and died in Russia in 1796. Catherine was the Russian empress for thirty-four years during with Russia become a world power. (Kruell, 2000)

Catherine was thirty-three when she seized the Russian throne, but she was not Russian. She asked her doctors to drain her blood and replace it with that of a Russian. She came to Russia as a German and married Peter, the future emperor. He was horrible. He abused her, tortured their dogs, threw wine on his footmen, and brought his toy soldiers to bed and made her participate in mock military maneuvers. Catherine held on by constantly reading literature and riding her horse thirteen hours a day. Peter was overthrown, Catherine was crowned empress, and within six days Peter died mysteriously. She threw herself into straightening out Russia’s chaos.

Catherine wrote guidelines for new laws, reduced religious persecution, tripled the number of factories, and embarked on mapping her vast territory and assembled the country’s first dictionary. She founded the first medical school. She was passionate about improving education. She sponsored the General Plan for the Education of Young People of Both Sexes. She founded the first school for girls and personally paid for those who did not have money. In a society where women had few rights (a man could cut off the nose of his wife if she offended him), Catherine made efforts to better women’s lives and she appointed some to important posts.

Catherine’s hold on the throne was not strong enough for her to do all she wanted to do, and her contributions were overlooked for years. Instead she was well known for her social life. When communism collapsed, scholars began to focus on Catherine. Her palace in Peterhof is now Russia’s most popular tourist attraction.

Jeanette Rankin

Born in Montana in 1880 and died in California in 1971. Jeanette was the first woman to be elected to the U.S. Congress. When asked about her life, she said, “Next time I’ll be nastier.”

Jeanette showed promise in architecture and design, but those careers were not open to women at the time. She graduated from the new University of Montana with a degree in biology and worked as a teacher, seamstress, and social worker. She denied all proposals because she had helped raise six siblings and did not want to lose her freedom. When she was thirty, she began to fight to get Montana women the right to vote. She decided to try for a seat in the U.S. Congress. She defeated seven men in the election. The media mobbed her house, wanting to know if she was a freak, if she could cook, and what she looked like. She voted against World War I and lost the next two elections. When she was close to sixty, she ran for Congress again, and won. When President Franklin Roosevelt asked congress to declare war on Japan, the vote was 388 to 1. She was instantly notorious as the only person to vote against both World Wars. When she finished her term, her political career was over. She then began lectures on world peace. She moved to rural Georgia and befriended children.

When she was eighty-seven years old, she led a silent march of 5,000 women dressed in black in Washington, D.C. and brought national attention to the fact that all people did not support the Vietnam War. She hinted that she might run for Congress again, but her health failed and she died at age ninety-two.

Jeanette introduced the Nineteenth Amendment to
Congress and saw it ratified. She was the only woman who ever voted to give women the right to vote. When she spoke in high schools, she predicted that a woman someday would be president. Boys would burst into laughter, then stop when Jeannette told them that there would be opportunities for boys too. She told them that someday they might be the husband of a president.

These women are but a few of the influential women in history who have influenced governments, education, and leadership in their countries and ours. Other women we will not discuss in this paper who were notorious are Queen Victoria, Indira Gandhi, Marie Antoinette, Eleanor Roosevelt, Harriet Tubman, Chief Wilma Mankiller, Gertrude Bell, and Eva Peron.

**AMERICAN WOMEN AND THEIR ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

1715 Elizabet h Elstob publishes The Rudiments of Grammar, the first Anglo-Saxon grammar.

1760 The Moor’s Charity School for Indians was established.

1770 Phillus Wheatley publishes her first poem.

1780 Kenneth Lockridge estimates that the literacy rate of New England women was half that of men’s.

1787 Young Ladies Academy opens in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

1792 Sarah Pierce opens a school in her home with one student. By 1816 she had taught 157 girls.

1792 Judith Sargent Murray published On the Equality of the Sexes.

1819 Emma Willard writes her “plan for Improving Female Education” which although unsuccessful, defines the issue of women’s education at the time.

1821 Emma Willard opened Troy Female Seminary in New York.

1823 Catherine Beecher opened a school for girls in Hartford, Connecticut.

1824 Mary Lyon opened her own school.

1826 First public high schools for girls opened in New York and Boston.

1833 Prudence Crandall opened the first private boarding school for black girls in New England.

1833 Oberlin College, in Ohio, is the first coeducational college in the world.

1838 Mount Holyoke College is established in Massachusetts as the first college for women.

1848 Seneca Falls Convention

1849 Elizabeth Blackwell became the first woman in the world to receive a medical degree.

1850 The Female (later Women’s) Medical College was founded in Pennsylvania.

1852 Catherine Esther Beecher founded the American Woman’s Educational Association.

1852 Mary Atkins opens the Young Ladies Seminary at Benicia (later Mills College).

1858 Mary Fellows is the first woman west of the Mississippi River to receive a baccalaureate degree.

1862 Mary Jane Patterson became the first African-American woman to get her bachelor’s degree.

1865 Vassar College opened.

1868 The Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute was opened to educate African Americans.

1870 Upon her death, Sophia Smith left $393,000 to fund the opening of Smith College.

1870 The average female teacher earned $12 a week, while male teachers earned an average of $35 a week.

1871 Harriette J. Cooke becomes the first woman college professor in the United States appointed full professor with a salary equal to her male peers.

1873 Ellen Swallow Richards becomes the first woman to receive a Bachelor of Science from MIT.

1875 Smith College opened.

1875 Wellesley opened.

1877 Helen Magill became the first woman in the United States to earn her PhD.

1878 The Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute began admitting Native Americans.

1881 The Atlanta Baptist Female Seminary (later Spelman College) opened.

1885 The Romona School for Indian Girls opened in Santa Fe.

1885 Bryn Mawr opened.

1886 Montgomery Industrial School for Girls was opened by Alice White.

1889 Barnard College opens.

1889 Jane Addams and Ellen Starr open Hull House, one of the United States first settlement houses.

1892 Laura J. Eisenhuth was the first woman elected to state office as Superintendent of Public Instruction.

1897 National Congress of Mothers formed (now P. T. A.).

1898 Emma M. Gillet and Ellen Spencer Mussey open the Washington College of Law.

1901 Margaret Haley becomes the first woman and first teacher to speak from the floor at a meeting of the National Education Association.

1903 Mother Jones leads a demonstration, saying working children belong in schools.

1904 Margaret Haley calls for teachers to organize.

1904 Helen Keller becomes the first blind-deaf person to graduate from college.

1904 Mary McLeod Bethune opens Daytona School for Negro Girls.

1909 Ella Flagg Young became the first female superintendent of a large city school system.
1910 The Education of Women was published, written by Marion Talbot, the Dean of women at Chicago.
1911 In The Child and the State, Margaret McMillan argues that schools discriminate against working class children.
1918 Beatrice Chambers founded a progressive school for girls named Maltman’s Green.
1921 The Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers opened.
1921 The Dean of Girls in Chicago High Schools published Manners and Conduct in Schools and Out.
1925 Zora Neale Hurston is the first African American woman to be admitted to Barnard College.
1936 Maria Montessori published The Secret of Childhood.
1941 Several pieces of legislation passed which put an end to the marriage bars that prevented married women from teaching.
1945 The first class of women is admitted to Harvard Medical School.
1948 Education was proclaimed a human right in Article 26 of Universal Declaration of Human Rights.
1954 Brown v. Board of Education
1965 Affirmative Action became law in the United States.
1965 Higher Education Act is passed in the United States.
1972 Title IX passed.
1973 Sexism in School and Society, by Nancy Frazier and Myra Sadker, was published.
1980 Mary Swanson started the AVID program in high schools.
1980 Women make up 51% of college students.
1996 Virginia Military Institute was forced by the Supreme Court to admit women.

The following narrative will highlight some of the outstanding women mentioned in the above time line. These women were ahead of their time. Their ideas may have been considered radical. Some of the women were not seen as educators, but as philosophers. But they did influence education in many ways. Some were journalists. Some became educators. All are noteworthy for their contributions.

**JUDITH SARGENT MURRAY (1751-1820)**

Judith felt that the typical chores of women’s lives did not offer any intellectual stimulation and if women did not find more uses for their intellect, they would use it for ill purposes. She believed that the accusation that women were inferior was not from their natural abilities, but from the way they were raised, as boys were encouraged to learn while girls were neglected. She never taught school or worked as an educational administrator. She was thought of as a pioneering philosopher. Judith was capable of abstract and original thought, and she did not limit herself to educational philosophy, but wrote eloquently and with wit on aesthetics, ethics, politics and more.

**EMMA HART WILLARD (1787-1870)**

Emma was the ninth of the ten children her mother had when married to Samuel Hart. (James, James, and Boyer, 1971) Her mother was descended from mid 17th century American colonists on both sides. Her father encouraged her intellectually and she was enrolled in school. She began teaching in a school in her father’s house. While teaching, she continued her own education, as she did throughout her life. She married a doctor who was fifty years old when she was twenty-two, and had one son. Her husband’s nephew lived with them while attending college and Emma’s friendship with him fired Emma’s sense of intellectual deprivation which was typical for women of her time. She used her nephew’s books to educate herself because her request to enter Middlebury College was denied. When her husband suffered financial losses, Emma decided to help her family economically. She opened Middlebury Female Seminary, a girl’s school, in their home. This effort taught her two things: she could teach the subjects herself and female students could master material which was traditionally denied to women. She wanted to enlarge her school, so she moved her school to Waterford, New York. When the New York Legislature denied her support for the school she was forced to move again. Troy, New York wanted her school, and they offered funding. Her school became Troy Female Seminary. She offered core academic subjects as well as finishing school staples. She understood that most of her pupils would become wives and mothers and spend time in the lives in the home. If suitable books were not available, Emma developed the curriculum and wrote some of the books herself. Her school trained generations of teachers who took her message of intellectual and educational rights for women throughout the United States, especially to the frontier areas.

**SARAH J. HALE (1788-1879)**

Sarah preached the gospel of “true womanhood.” She often wrote about the moral superiority with which God graced women. She went about making female education fashionable. Sarah was a writer and the editor of a popular women’s magazine, Godey’s Ladies Journal. This journal was the Victorian Bible of the Parlor.

Born on a farm in New Hampshire, like most girls of the era, she received a limited education from family
members and what she could teach herself. One of her famous thoughts is the heart is in perpetually vigorous motion and the brain should be as busy as the heart.

MARY LYON (1797-1849)

“Go where no one else will go, do what no one else will do.” -Mary Lyon

Mary was five when her father died. She worked alongside her mother for eight years and learned about running a farm. She had six siblings. Her mother remarried when Mary was thirteen, and the mother moved away and did not take Mary with her. Mary stayed and worked for her brother. She was able to go to school from the age of four to age thirteen. That was more education than most girls received. When Mary was seventeen, she was offered a teaching job. At that time, teachers needed no formal training. She had a reputation as a good student. Female teachers were in demand due to a population growth and people moving west in search of better opportunities.

Men were paid ten to twelve dollars a month, but Mary was paid seventy-five cents a week. She stayed in students’ homes and moved every five days. Teaching inspired Mary’s desire to continue her own education. This was not an easy goal for this time period. She was frugal and she saved some of her salary. She made quilts and coverlets and traded them for her room and board. Her reputation as a gifted teacher spread. She taught for twenty years and became an authority on the education of women. She worked hard to expand academic opportunities for young women and to prepare them to become teachers. In 1834, Mary was an assistant principal. She decided to focus her attention on founding an institution of higher learning for women. She worked for three years and endured ridicule from those who thought her undertaking was too ambitious and would be wasted on women. But she did not give up. She was thinking through a name for the new school and a friend suggested “Pangynaskean.” This is a Greek word meaning “all powers of women.” Mary decided on “Mount Holyoke” – the name of a mountain near the town where the seminary would be located. Mary had political savvy – the term seminary was more politically correct. The words seminary and college were used to describe schools at a variety of levels. A college would give instructions either to university students or to those high school age students and even younger. A seminary could be preparatory school or offer a college education or graduate and professional training. Mary felt that she could attract more funding with the word seminary than college. The idea of a college for women in the 1830’s was horrifying.

Mary was ahead of her time. She required seven courses in science and mathematics for graduation. This was unheard of in other seminaries. She introduced women to new ways to learn science-laboratory experiments which they performed themselves. She took them on field trips. She invited famous scientists to give lectures, and inspired women to go after careers as college teachers and researchers. Mary herself taught chemistry. Her leadership in the sciences continues today. The success of Mount Holyoke opened the doors of higher education to women. Her impact on education was felt across the United States and to the corners of the world. The alumnae teachers and their work improved the quality of elementary and high school education nationwide.

CATHERINE ESTHER BEECHER (1800-1878)

Catherine was an American Educator. She devoted most of her life to the cause of women’s education, believing that women were responsible for the education and moral development of the next generation. Her circumstances were a bit different from some of the other women in this paper, in that she was the eldest of thirteen children. She was sixteen when her mother died, and she became head of household. She became engaged, but her fiancé was lost at sea. He left her his fortune, and she founded many schools with her money. As she founded schools, she wrote on education and women’s place in society. She was dissatisfied with existing textbooks and she set about to prepare others to write books in certain subject areas. She had the power of analysis and keen thought, so she incited others to do what she had only the strength to conceive. Her gradually increasing physical weakness kept her from active labors. She was the author of many books relating to the training of women.

PRUDENCE CRANDALL (1803-1890)

Prudence was a remarkable woman who opened one of the first schools for African American girls, despite the ridicule and harassment she faced because of her actions. Oprah opened her girl’s school in Africa recently without anything but praise. Prudence was an educator, emancipator, and human rights advocate. She established a school which, in 1833, became the first Black female academy in Canterbury, Connecticut. This action resulted in her arrest and imprisonment for violating “Black Law.” She was released later on a technicality. But had to close the school after being attacked by a mob. She and her preacher husband moved to Illinois. After her husband died in 1874, she and her brother moved to Elk Falls, Kansas.

Prudence taught throughout her long life and continued to be outspoken on equality of education for women and the rights of women. She died in Elk Falls.
in 1890 and is buried there. More than a hundred years later, legal arguments used by her 1834 trial lawyers were submitted to the Supreme Court during their consideration of the historic civil rights case of Brown vs. Topeka Board of Education. Prudence’s courage and determination serve as examples to all who face seemingly insurmountable odds and to those who refuse to be limited by social conventions. She is remembered by a Kansas Historical Marker on US 160 west of Elk Falls, Kansas.

MARY MCLEOD BETHUNE (1875-1955)

Mary was a revolutionary educator who not only provided her students with an academic education, but also with an education in life. She gave them the skills and confidence necessary to be successful, and she set standards, but for the entire world, she was the only woman of color at the founding meeting of the United Nations.

NANNIE HELEN BURROUGHS (1878-1961)

Nannie, nationally known Black educator, church leader, and suffrage supporter, founded the national Training School for Women and Girls in Washington, D.C. (1909) as a national model school for the teaching of African American women. Believing that education, job training, and voting rights were the tools for black women’s empowerment, she wrote an article in the Crisis (1915), the official journal of the NAACP, demanding the ballot as a protection for African American women and the route to racial advancement.

LINDA CHAVEZ (1947-)

Linda saw reform possibilities in Education. She wanted to destroy negative stereotypes of Hispanic minorities as helpless, illiterate and impoverished. She was driven by a desire to eliminate affirmative action and racial quota systems.

She first felt discrimination when she was nine in Colorado. She went on to the University of Colorado and decided to be a teacher. She went to the University of California to a graduate program in English literature but she became frustrated with the way she was treated as a Hispanic. She moved to Washington, D.C. to work with the National Education Association and served as a consultant to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. She landed a job with the American Federation of Teachers and edited AFT’s publications. She has worked with different groups and she has received criticism from many groups of her conservative views.

Linda became a consultant to President Reagan in 1981, and he appointed her to serve as the Director of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Finding herself lacking support from most Hispanic activists and Democrats, she officially joined the Republican Party and became the Director of the Office of the White House Public Liaison. She left after less than a year to run for a U.S. Senate seat. She did not win. She returned to social and educational issues and over the years she established herself as a policy expert and political commentator. She was selected as a think-tank member of a Manhattan group, published a book, and spoke in many places. Her words were controversial with many, but nonetheless had the effect of bringing about serious discussions about the state of the nation’s attitude toward minorities. Despite the criticism she has received, she has emerged as one of the most visible and influential figures fighting for civil rights and educational reforms.

In 2001, President George W. Bush nominated Linda for Secretary of Labor, but the nomination was withdrawn after it was revealed that she had allegedly given money to an illegal immigrant who lived in her home. The woman, who is now a citizen of the United States, insists that she was not an employee of Mrs. Chavez, but that Chavez helped her when she needed it most. A later investigation of the matter found Chavez not guilty of any wrongdoing. If she had been confirmed by the United State Senate, Linda would have become the first Hispanic female member of the United States Cabinet.

Linda is married and has three children and eight grandchildren. She lives in Virginia. In 2000 she was named Library of Congress Living Legend.

Conclusion

So, there you have it, an overview of the lives of extraordinary women that ranges from 69 B.C. to the present. This brief narrative of the research done spotlights women who have wielded power and it tells of the feats and defeats. They all have stories. You have received a little taste of what they were really like. You know what some of them did for fun. You now know about their tragedies and triumphs. Krull thinks (Krull, 2000) they are wild and mild, hated or beloved, but each dared to stand up and be a leader.

THE DOUBLE X FACTOR IN EDUCATION IS WOMEN.
REFERENCES
“ALL REFORMS WHICH REST SIMPLY UPON THE LAW OR THE THREATENING OF CERTAIN PENALTIES . . . ARE TRANSITORY AND FUTILE” [JOHN DEWEY]: HIGH STAKES TESTING AND ITS EFFECTS

Martha Tevis and John McBride, University of Texas, Pan American

Introduction
My colleague, John McBride and I have worked for about ten years with a tuition pay program for elementary and secondary teachers who desire to improve their knowledge and delivery through pursuing masters’ degrees. Recently we have noticed a significant increase in dissatisfaction with No Child Left Behind and the emphasis on high stakes testing, and the effect has been that our area has lost and will continue to lose exceptional, talented and dedicated teachers.

Their concerns are that: They are not only tired of teaching to the tests—now a year long activity, but they express concern about their ability to reach the students who need them the most due to the barriers set up by high stakes testing required by NCLB. They talk about the growing number of children they see who do not like to come to school, the young children who throw up on test days, the deletion or marginalizing of playground/PE/recess/art/music, their fear of the rising dropout rates, and the rules that effect the waivers for special education and Limited English Proficient (LEP) children.

Demographics
The geographic area served by our teachers is the poorest in the United States. According to the U.S. Census Quick Facts the population in Hidalgo County, Texas is among the fastest growing with one of the fastest growing school age populations in the country. Hidalgo County is about 89.5% Mexican American with an estimated population of 700,634 in 2006 a population change of 23% since 2000. The per capita income in 2004 was $9,899 with persons below the poverty level at 30.5%. About one-third under 25 have 9th grade education or less (fact) and one-third five years and older . . . speak English less than ‘very well’ (American Factfinder).

Background
High-stakes testing in the United States today is mandated by law and reinforced with punishments. Surely, no one can argue with the idea of having “no child left behind.” But the reality of the effects of the prescription offered by the law negates that idealism.

How did we arrive at this point? Some of us remember being in education classes in the late 1950’s and early 1960’s when a paper written with a position against federal aid to education was certain to be well received by the professors.

The emphasis that England and France placed on testing was presented as out of date and almost anti-American. The federal funding of the GI Bill and the National Defense Education Act were expenditures considered acceptable because they were brought about as an appreciation of war service and for defense after Sputnik. However, they did pave the way for future federal funding of public education and, by extension, high stakes testing.

When confirmed New Dealer Lyndon Johnson became president, he determined that one of his first tasks would be to set a sweeping agenda for public education. He selected the men to write a bill, told them what he wanted in it, and oversaw its approval in Congress without one comma being changed. With the approval of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) more than one billion dollars, more than all federal expenditures for education in U.S. history was channeled into public education.

After ESEA education remained on the national agenda with the creation of a cabinet level position and later “Nation at Risk” which so impressed the Texas governor that he appointed Ross Perot to chair a committee which would make recommendations to the Texas legislature concerning school reform. Those reforms included testing of current teachers in order for them to remain certified, testing of prospective teachers for certification, testing students in various grades, and testing as a requirement for graduation.

Funding
In Texas the Texas Assessment of Basic Skills testing was followed by the Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills, and then the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) was introduced in the fall of 1990 to show accountability. “In fiscal 1998, the state allocated $19 million just for testing plus $7.5 million just for its accountability and accreditation program. Thus, the Texas Education Agency spent about $26.5 million that year on accountability and testing. Roughly 38% of the agency’s entire budget was devoted to testing and accountability . . . . twice that of the next highest spender, Indiana . . . .” Today this level of spending continues.

Circumvention
Nel Noddings expresses concern when she writes,
It is disheartening to read of the increase of cheating among students, teachers, and administrators, and it is frightening to hear how much time is now spent on seeking loopholes to meet the adequate yearly progress [AYP] required by NCLB instead of providing the educational services needed by individual students. When reviewing AYP the phrase “being set up for failure” applies. If a school does not meet the NCLB test scores then the following occurs: parents are notified, students may transfer to another school, the school is subject to closure or takeover, and funds are lost by the district. With punishments such as these, the temptation and pressures are great to circumvent the rules or to cheat. Circumvention can occur for example when the assistance is concentrated on the “bubble.” or marginal, child, encouraging the lowest to leave because of failure, and when low achievers are placed in special education.

Linda Darling-Hammond states that in 2003 “the ‘Texas Miracle,’ which was the model for the federal No Child Left behind, boosted test scores in part by keeping many students out of the testing count and making tens of thousands disappear from school altogether.”

The Poor
George Wood points out that “retention seems to be reaching epidemic proportions.” Children “retained in the same grade for more than one year [increase] the likelihood that they will drop out . . . .” There is a direct correlation between dropout rate and socio-economic status. Thus, the poor child is at a disadvantage. Schools may allow special education children to take a different test “only if these students constitute 1 per cent or less of the student body.” Also, “too many of our LEP students are forced to take the test before they are ready. (70) In Texas in 2006 “only 12% of eighth-grade students passed all TAKS standards . . . . Only 8% of tenth-graders met all standards.”

Perhaps the strongest statement on high stakes testing from the student’s point of view was made by a fifth grade student who decided not to take the test. He went to his father and said, “I am not going to take the test because of what it is doing to other students.” His father supported him and has had to go to his son’s school every year to assure that his son would be promoted even though he had not taken the test. The child was later on the Today show.

No one opposes accountability and testing when it is implemented in a positive manner. However, implementation is destroying the intent of the legislation. Only time will tell whether changes will some day produce successful results.
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PEDAGOGY UNBOUND: POSSIBILITIES FOR EDUCATION IN AN AGE OF ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION

Peter A. Theodore, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville

Introduction

This essay explores the implications of a new era of communication, particularly for education. The thesis that underlies this work is that different communication paradigms fundamentally alter how we can think and learn, and therefore have profound implications for education. More specifically, I argue that a major shift took place with the advent of the printing press, and that the print paradigm has continued to be dominant up to the present day. Further, I argue that computer-mediated communication presents a new paradigm which is displacing print as the dominant medium of communication.

There are some inherent difficulties that arise for what I am attempting here. For one thing, the sort of shift that I argue is taking place is an immense phenomenon, and also a very recent one. Imagine someone a few years after the invention of the printing press trying to understand and describe the sorts of changes in society in general, and in education in particular, that the printing press was bringing about. A second difficulty is that I am trying to use the print paradigm in this paper to explore the nature and possibilities of a paradigm which is fundamentally different. This is analogous to trying to adequately describe groundbreaking visual effects in a movie rather than showing examples of these effects. Some of what I am attempting here would be better done in a computer-mediated form, such as a hypertext, and hypermedia, Web site. The above being said, I will attempt here to describe in print something of the nature and history of the shift that is taking place, and provide some preliminary explorations of some of the specific shapes this shift might take.

Philosophies of education

In order to meaningfully explore the implications of new forms of communication for education, it is important first to clarify a key point with regard to educational philosophy. The central issue in this essay is that some forms of communicating are different in important ways from other forms of communicating, and that these differences have significant implications for education. This discussion only makes sense if one believes that the content of education is subject to change. In a strict form of perennialism, for example, the content of education remains the same. With this philosophical stance, no discussion of whether modes of communication have important implications for education can even get started, since it is assumed that an unchanging human nature implies an unchanging curriculum. While I will be arguing primarily that new communications technologies make it possible to implement some of John Dewey's ideas about education in new and powerful ways, I believe that the ideas about communication and education expressed in this essay have relevance for a variety of educational philosophies, as long as these philosophies admit the possibility of change.

I will use the definition of education John Dewey sets forth in Democracy and Education:

We thus reach a technical definition of education: It is that reconstruction or reorganization of experience which adds to the meaning of experience, and which increases ability to direct the course of subsequent experience. (1) The increment of meaning corresponds to the increased perception of the connections and continuities of the activities in which we are engaged. . .

(2) The other side of an educative experience is an added power of subsequent direction or control. (1916/1997, pp. 76-77)

In other words, education consists in becoming aware of more connections among things, which enables one to have an increased ability to control those things toward one's ends. For example, imagine a person without knowledge about cooking who walks into a well-stocked kitchen. This person might see a stove top, a skillet, and various foodstuffs, including garlic, olive oil, basil, oregano, salt, pepper, and tomatoes, but would have no idea what to do with any of these. One who is educated about cooking can see the connections between these items, such as how the olive oil can be placed in the skillet and heated on the stove top, which will enable one to have more power—the power for example to combine these items to create a sauce for a meal.

The transformation theory of language technologies and the print paradigm

The idea that the mode of communication affects the content that is communicated and how it is understood goes back at least as far as Eric Havelock's Preface to Plato (1963) and Marshall McLuhan's declaration that "the medium is the message" (1964). Michael Heim, building especially on the work of Havelock (1963) and
Walter Ong (1982), has discussed it as “the transformation theory of language technologies” (Heim, 1987/1999, p. 49). A key point is that the mode of communication is a part of what is communicated, that media shape the content of communication. In other words, the “same thing” cannot be spoken, written, printed, communicated in hypertext, or shown in a multimedia presentation. While the media may not be the message, it clearly, according to this transformation theory, affects the message.

An example may make this point more clearly. Look at the poem by E.E. Cummings (1994) below:

```
l(a
le
af
fa
ll
s)
one
l
iness (p. 673)
```

Ironically enough, although poetry is typically thought of as an aural, and oral, art form, this poem can only convey its full meaning in print. The various visual references to the number one, including the double meaning of the letter “l” as both a letter and the numeral one, as well as the visual suggestion of the leaf actually falling, could not be conveyed in any oral reading of the poem. It is a poem meant to be seen on the printed page, and it communicates what it does because of what writing, and print, can do that speaking cannot. It is important to note at this point that this transformation theory does not imply a superiority of one type of communication over another, just a difference. It is not that writing is necessarily superior to speaking. On the contrary, there are some things that can only be communicated orally. The point is that there are important differences among various media of communication. Furthermore, if there is any truth to John Dewey’s assertion that “education consists primarily in transmission through communication” (Dewey, 1916-1997, p. 9), then these differences have important implications for education.

There is evidence that many of our current ideas about education are to a large degree a product of, and are bound up in, the technology of print. In her seminal work, The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early-Modern Europe, Elizabeth Eisenstein (1997) discusses several effects of printing that can be seen to have shaped education. According to Eisenstein, the mass distribution and subsequent publicizing of works in print helped create “lay culture heroes” (p. 59). Since one person’s work could be presented in multiple copies and widely disseminated, printing helped to establish authorities and experts, a “one best view” orientation. It is easy to see how this helped to foster standardization in education—everyone reads the same book, or set of books. Furthermore, the way that these mass-printed textbooks organize information in a linear manner affects how knowledge and learning are viewed (p. 102). Eisenstein argues that such things as “regularly numbered pages, punctuation marks, section breaks, indices, and so forth helped to reorder the thought of all readers” (p. 105). The way that information was organized in printed books affected how people thought about and understood that information, including such things as what constituted a distinct discipline and which disciplines should be grouped together under headings such as sciences and humanities (pp. 105-7). According to Eisenstein, “possessive individualism” about one’s work, along with notions of “plagiarism” and “copyright,” are functions of print (p. 121). A distinct division between children and adults, and, even more clearly, the division and separation of children into age-groups and numbered grades was to a large extent a function of print, with different books being produced for different groups (p. 134).

More recently, Halliday (1993) discussed the centrality of different types of language, written as opposed to oral, in understanding how children learn, stating, “Reconstituting language means reconstituting reality” (p. 109). Contrasting electronic hypertext to print, Landow (1997) wrote:

> It changes the roles of teacher and student in much the same way it changes those of writer and reader. Its emphasis upon the active, empowered reader, which fundamentally calls into question general assumptions about reading, writing, and texts, similarly calls into question our assumptions about the nature and institutions of literary education that depend upon these texts (p. 219).

With regard to written, and especially printed, language, Bolter (2001) said, “... our cultural construction of print ... remains shaped by the idea of the codex book to be read in a fixed order” (pp. 100-101). Kress (2003) contrasted the “logic of writing,” which is fundamentally “temporal/sequential,” with the “logic of image,” which is “spatial/simultaneous,” and asserted that the “screen” is now dominant, rather than the “book,” with the implication that writing will now follow the logic of the image (p. 20).

The main point to be drawn from the above for the present argument is that many of the core characteristics
of education and schooling, such as distinct subject areas typically accompanied by corresponding textbooks and a sequence of numbered grade levels, can be seen to be functions of print technology, and not anything inherent in the process of education itself. Therefore, new technologies of communication make it possible to consider fundamentally different structures and content of education.

One question that arises is why the recent changes in communications technology that have come about as a result of computer-mediated communication and the Internet are likely to have such a profound effect on education when other communications technologies that have arisen since the printing press, such as the telegraph, radio, the telephone, motion pictures, and television, have not. The primary answer to this question lies in what has changed in terms of how information is distributed. The basic change brought about by the printing press was the ability to distribute material from one source to many people, commonly referred to now as one-to-many communication. Radio, motion pictures, and television do not fundamentally change this distribution paradigm; they change the content and speed of what is communicated, but not the distribution structure—they are still essentially one-to-many distribution systems. The telegraph and the telephone enable rapid, long-distance, one-to-one communication, and the telephone, to a limited extent via conference calls, a rudimentary many-to-many communication. Furthermore, in the case of the limited many-to-many communication that the telephone makes possible, the communication is what has been called fugitive; it is gone virtually the moment it is made. Computer-mediated communication and the Internet bring about many-to-many communication that is non-fugitive; many people can contribute to the creation of a developing text that remains in place to be read and responded to. Furthermore, this new communication incorporates powerful elements, such as hypertext and multimedia, which bring new possibilities to the content of what is communicated. This combination of new structures of communication and new content that can be communicated brings about powerful ways for learners not only to receive information, but to contribute actively to the creation of information, and creates unprecedented possibilities for educational practice.

Envisioning the possibilities

In order to provide a more concrete and specific picture of the sorts of changes I am asserting are made possible by new technologies of communication, I would like to present one vision for how schools could be organized, using Dewey's philosophy and properties of new communications technologies as a framework. I want to emphasize that this is just one of many potential visions, and hold the door open for others.

The basic structure of this new educational model is two networks mirroring one another, one concerned with the content of education and one with the people in education. The basic shift in terms of content is from a linear model to an associative model. The basic shift in terms of people is from a hierarchical structure to a participatory structure. Both of these shifts are consistent with Dewey's ideas for democratic education, and are made more practicable by the new communications technologies that have been discussed above.

A network of content

A rough example of what the structure of curriculum content might look like in this network model can be seen in figure 1:

![Figure 1](image-url)

In our current schools, students progress through a sequence of numbered grades, and are typically given a certificate of completion, such as a high school diploma, after successfully completing the 12th, or final, grade in the sequence. At least in theory, the successful completion of a lower grade is the requirement for entry into the next higher grade. Curriculum guides, lists of standards, etc., are designed to operate within this sequenced progression of grade levels. Figure 1 shows a
very rough idea of a different sort of structure. Here, the various kinds of knowledge and skills that a student needs to master before being able to be granted a diploma are arranged in a network. Students might acquire different aspects of this body of knowledge at different times and in a different order. At whatever time sufficient mastery was attained, a student would receive a certificate certifying this attainment.

This networked curriculum reflects a new conceptualization of knowledge brought about by the supplanting of the print paradigm by computer-mediated communication. With reference to transformations in the literature curriculum brought about by hypertext, an aspect of computer-mediated communication, Landow writes about a portion of his literature class that included the pamphlet, “Hudson's Statue,” by Thomas Carlyle and historical materials related to it:

... unlike a print environment, an electronic one permits perceiving the relation of such materials in opposite manners. The historical materials can appear as annotations to the Carlyle text, or, conversely, “Hudson's Statue” can appear—be experienced as—an annotation to the historical materials. Both, in other words, exist in a networked field in which their relationship depends solely upon the reader's need and purpose (1997, p. 71).

By extension, this networked relationship of material made possible by computer-mediated communication can apply not only to English literature, but to the curriculum as a whole.

Dewey's educational philosophy also supports the idea of the curriculum as an interconnected network. He argues that the kind of interconnection that we should strive for in a democratic society should be reflected in the curriculum:

The tendency to assign separate values to each study and to regard the curriculum in its entirety as a kind of composite made by the aggregation of segregated values is a result of the isolation of social groups and classes. Hence it is the business of education in a democratic social group to struggle against this isolation in order that the various interests may reinforce and play into one another (1916/1997, p. 249).

Dewey also supports the idea of flexibility in the curriculum, of an educational system that responds flexibly to student needs rather than one that is fixed, asserting that “the teacher should be occupied not with the subject matter in itself but in its interaction with the pupils' present needs and capacities” (Dewey, 1916/1997, p. 183). He warns against set aims in education that are not subject to modification by teachers in concrete situations:

Even the most valid aims which can be put in words will, as words, do more harm than good unless one recognizes that they are not aims, but rather suggestions to educators as to how to observe, how to look ahead, and how to choose in liberating and directing the energies of the concrete situations in which they find themselves (Dewey, 1916/1997, p. 107).

The affordances of computer-mediated communication interact with Dewey's ideas about flexible teacher response, making them more practically realizable by an increased availability and flexibility of supporting informational material. When printed books comprised most of the informational resources available to teachers and students, educators were somewhat constrained by matters of cost and availability. In a class of 25 students learning science, for example, there might be 25 textbooks that each contain a diagram of a frog as part of an explanation of how food is converted into energy in living things. The teacher might be willing to let different students explore different instances of this biological principle, but not have the time or the money to make the necessary variety of appropriate resources available. In a classroom equipped with one or more computers connected to the Internet, however, a wide variety of resources become available without any significant additional cost.

A network of people

In Dewey's philosophy, a non-linear conception of educational progress implies a less hierarchical conception of human relationships within the educational process.

Our tendency to take immaturity as mere lack, and growth as something which fills up the gap between the immature and the mature is due to regarding childhood comparatively, instead of intrinsically. We treat it simply as a privation because we are measuring it by adulthood as a fixed standard. This fixes attention upon what the child has not, and will not have till he becomes a man. This comparative standpoint is legitimate enough for some purposes, but if we make it final, the question arises whether we are not guilty of an overweening presumption (Dewey, 1916-1997, p. 42).

Normal child and normal adult alike, in other words, are engaged in growing. The difference between them is not the difference between growth and no growth, but between the modes of growth appropriate to different conditions. With respect to the development of powers devoted to coping with specific scientific and economic problems we may say the child should be growing in manhood. With respect to sympathetic curiosity, unbiased responsiveness, and openness of mind, we may
say that the adult should be growing in childlikeness. One statement is as true as the other (Dewey, 1916-1997, p. 50).

Certain aspects of computer-mediated communication (CMC) also tend toward the disruption of hierarchy. Hypertext is one of these. According to Landow: “Certain key features of hypertext systems intrinsically promote a new kind of academic freedom and empowerment. Reader-controlled texts permit students to choose their own way” (1997, p.281). Another aspect of CMC that works against hierarchy is the asynchronous, many-to-many communication seen in electronic bulletin board discussions. Discussing specifically how text-based computer-mediated communication can facilitate collaborative learning, Warschauer noted that the “historical divide between speech and writing has been overcome with the interactional and reflective aspects of language merged in a single medium” and that “[students’ own interactions can now become a basis for epistemic engagement” (Warschauer, 1997, ¶16). According to Barnes (2003), “CMC equalizes control among group participants. Instead of controlling the flow of conversation, the teacher becomes a facilitator and students take charge of the discussion” (p. 219).

An examination of one of the key features of bulletin board discussions, a type of asynchronous, many-to-many communication that is one type of CMC, will make clear how this form of communication facilitates this more democratic, non-hierarchical educational structure. In a bulletin board discussion, every participant has the opportunity to compose what s/he wants to say and post it to the ongoing record of the discussion. While others may post more often, and at greater length, this does not prevent anyone else from putting what s/he wishes to say into the conversation. This contrasts with face-to-face discussion, where one person's monopolization of the conversation can have the effect of silencing others, of preventing them from making any contribution to what is said. This is not to say that there are not numerous ways in which hierarchical relations can enter into and affect a bulletin board discussion. If a teacher in a class is participating, for example, what s/he says may be perceived as more important than the contributions of students. Also, a teacher often has the ability to delete the posts of students and effect a silencing of that particular contribution and contributor. Nonetheless, the asynchronous, many-to-many communications structure provided by the bulletin board discussion has a democratizing potential that is there to be realized by teachers, and schools, that choose to do so.

Conclusion
The shape of education in the future will be the result of interaction between what is desired and what is possible. The primary argument I have attempted to put forward here is that the advent of computer-mediated communication makes new things possible. What precisely will be made of these new possibilities is, of course, an open question. New technologies of communication do not determine in any precise way what use will be made of them. Nonetheless, these technologies are not neutral—they have particular characteristics which make certain sorts of practices and experiences more likely than others. I have argued here that many of the characteristics of computer-mediated communication tend toward a more democratic conception of education, both in terms of the organization of the people engaged in the educational process and in terms of the nature of knowledge itself. Specifically, I have tried to demonstrate a synergy between the educational philosophy of John Dewey and the character and affordances of computer-mediated communication.

While there is no reason to believe that books and other products of print technology are going to disappear, there is also no reason that the print paradigm should continue to be the dominant influence in education that it has been. Computer-mediated communication is still a very recent phenomenon. It is also a many-faceted one, and one that is continuing to develop and change rapidly. Continued exploration of what computer-mediated communication can, and should, make possible for education will be, I believe, an important line of inquiry for educational philosophers and others for quite some time to come.
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Introduction

The Middle East is a cauldron of ethnic violence. Whether this is due to western intervention to obtain and retain oil supplies as well as establish permanent military bases or divergent religious fundamentalists whose world vision differs or Islamic efforts for social control and power, is for future scholars to determine. Talking heads on television, the Internet and print media have a multitude of opinions and theories as to the cause of Islamic subculture violence. Most of the suicide bombers are between 18 and 30, most poor unemployed, dismissed or fired from jobs for ineffectiveness (in one case a young British Muslim was fired for telling a kafir (unbeliever) to cover up) at the lower levels of society, a few come from wealthy educated families, others have been jailed for various offenses. Directed by older Imans’ with access to technology and funds, they engage in subversive activities using Western technology against itself. Glasser (2005) points out that al-Qaida has become the first guerrilla movement in history to migrate from physical space to cyberspace. Lap tops and DVDs used in secret hideouts and neighborhood Internet cafes provide jihadists the tools to support and reach suicide bombers, ambush American, coalition, and Iraqi units in the country. Al Qaida, operatives have adopted encryption to avoid detection whenever possible according to Glasser. One might infer Muslim clerics directing and espousing violence are seeking power and social control as they tell the world that all violence would stop when the West leaves Muslim countries.

Alienated Muslim youth gain a sense of community with other like minded individuals directed by nontraditional often sidewalk preachers (Brandon and Thorne, 2005). Meanwhile daily reports of suicide and bombings, beheadings, as well as destroying Iraq’s infrastructure such as electric power and water supplies make the search for political and social stability a work in progress. Whether called nationalists, or insurgents or terrorists their ability to intimidate and frighten citizens, attack foreign embassies and their representatives, threaten coalition forces has proven effective. Al Qaida’s use of broadcast media to mobilize militants, and terrorize the West is a continuing carefully timed and spaced effort. The London 7/7 terror that suicide bombers carried out were praised by Ayman al-Zawahin, Al Qaeda’s number two man. He said the attacks were directly tied to British involvement in the Iraq War. Ayman said the British and Americans must withdraw from Iraq or cause more violence and bloodshed in their homelands. This was a rapid response to British Prime Minister Toni Blair’s insistence that London attacks have nothing to do with Iraq (Murphy, 2005). The efficiency and media skill of Al Qaeda suggests international expertise in communication networks. It is not inconceivable, as the London terror reveals, that highly trained scientists and media experts in the West are helping terrorists in many ways including getting their message of fear and death out to the world. School children, rail passengers, office workers, by passers, Iraq and coalition forces, and women lives are at risk anywhere in the world.

Terrorism has been defined as interpretation of events and their causes. Interpretations are not unbiased attempts to depict truth but conscious efforts to manipulate perceptions to promote certain interests at the expense of others. It has been identified as a social construction, as social control, as political violence, as a form of communication, as an organizing model for carrying out special interests (Turk, 2004; Krieger and Maleckova, 2003; Jenkins, 2003, Tuastad, Dag, 2003; Gibbs, 1989; Schmid, 1982.) In an electronic connected world, terrorists have an effective tool in the Internet to recruit Jihadists. Evan Kohlmann, an American terrorism consultant who had tracked Jhadi websites since the late 1990s, finds it is the confluence of America’s decision to invade Iraq and new communication technologies that has created an effective recruiting machine for new terrorists. Although terrorists are estimated to be only one percent of the Muslim population, they are effective in destabilizing the economic, religious and social structure. (Murphy, 2005). Ghosh (2005) in a Time special issue reported on an interview with a suicide bomber in Baghdad. Terrorist’s field commanders prepare suicide bombers with mental and physical discipline as well as self purification while alienating them from family and friends. Potential terrorists are given pictures, literature, and assure them martyrdom in heaven. Ghosh noted the preparation for death includes isolation, seclusion, spiritual contemplation and prayer, to free their minds of negative thoughts toward their fellow men, except Americans and their Iraqi “infidel” supporters.

Organizing Terrorism

Early surveys of the literature about the episode revealed linkages and connections between corporate
organizational structure and the terrorists’ infrastructure. Corporations are designed to organize and structure routes of authority whether top down or horizontal networking, and often use devious means to achieve bottom line results. The Enron episode of accounting, the cover up of losses and manipulation of stock prices, the mutual fund illegal trading scandals, and a series of cooperate mismanagement fiascos reveal the need for accountability and oversight of the corporate sector. One can view Bin Laden’s Al Qaeda operation through the lenses of corporate models. A difference might be the religious fundamentalism of Jihad or holy war against infidels.

In our electronic interconnected interdependent world, linkages are to be found in international corporations as well as in terrorists’ organizations. Corporate models are deeply embedded in organizations throughout the world. Corporations are neither moral nor immoral; they are amoral and serve as a means to an end. Corporations are a means of organizing human activity. Brown, creator of BugNet, in his The History of the Corporation (2003) traced the evolution of the Corporation. Derived from the Latin corporae, the word means to make corporal, or physically embody. After the fall of Rome, the world’s most powerful corporations all tried to embody the Christian God. God, demon, servant, master, parasite or provider—what exactly, Brown asks, is a corporation?

The Supreme Court’s Chief Justice John Marshall’s in The Trustees of Dartmouth College v. Woodward in 1819 wrote that a corporation is an artificial being, invisible, intangible, and existing only in the contemplation of the law. Among the most important of its qualities are immortality and individuality; properties by which a perpetual succession of many persons may be considered the same. Marshall also emphasized that a corporation is created to promote their founders’ purpose.

Throughout American history efforts have been made to rein in corporate excesses through legislation and law. The Jungle, a 1906 novel by Upton Sinclair, described business exploitation of immigrants, which led to the Pure Food and Drug Act. In 1911, President Theodore Roosevelt implemented anti-trust laws to break up monopolies, including Standard Oil. Hence the term muckrakers, was given to writers and progressives who exposed corruption and exploitation in American corporations.

In the early years of the 21st century, Congressional legislation tackled corporate leadership malfeasance and corruption. Corporate governance became more complex as intertwined companies functioned at the national and international level. In 2001-2002, there was a “dot.com” explosion when new high tech corporations were selling for up to 1,000 times their earnings. Many new Internet companies made no money. Financial managers called it a new era where profits did not matter. When financial manipulation was uncovered, the bubble burst and stocks took a major dive. Life savings evaporated within a matter of weeks and months, as layers of financial misdeeds were uncovered. Major corporations such as Enron, Worldcom and Arthur Andersen were forced into bankruptcy as financial manipulation to keep stock prices up became apparent. Illegal financial scandals in mutual funds and short-term traders were also revealed. Such a series of events does not occur in isolation. History repeats itself as corporate excesses bloom periodically and public outcry leads to increased surveillance of financial markets and corporate governance. Because a corporation operates as an entity, as John Marshall noted, “it is chiefly for the purpose of clothing bodies of men, in succession, with the power to manage its own affairs, to hold property without perpessing intricacies, the hazardous and endless necessity of perpetual conveyances, for the purpose of passing it from hand to hand.” (Dartmouth v. Woodward, 1819).

In the international arena corporate power was often interwoven with national security issues. Middle Eastern oil resources was a concern of several presidential administrations. Dependable oil resources for Western Industrial nations were vital and major oil corporations were given extraordinary powers to deal with power brokers in the Middle East. Europe and the United States were often involved with behind the scenes manipulation of Middle Eastern governments. The retaliatory attacks on Western institutions, values and innocent civilians need to be examined in an attempt to ferret out the underlying causes of recent violence. Georgetown University historian David Painter (1986) used a corporate framework to analyze American oil policy during the cold war. Hogan (1999) noted that Painter examined American oil policy during the first decade of the cold war period. Painter traced the evolution of a mutually beneficial strategy with private enterprise taking over day-to-day management of the oil fields, while public officials combated Third World nationalism and British imperialism. Painter wrote that what was good for ARAMCO was probably not good for America, but in the geopolitical environment of the time, it was probably the best option available in the Middle East.

Kimon Vallaskakis (2001), President of the Global Governance Group-Club of Athens, and former

Alcohol, and nonmarital sex. Most Muslims avoid pork.

Koranic law. Observant Muslims forego cigarettes, halal/haram victors of wars, terror attacks, and assassinations.

Fatwa: An Islamic scholar’s legal opinion about whether something is permissible. Usually on mundane topics, but radicals have issued death sentences fatwas against opponents. (Glossary of Islamic Terms, Christian Science Monitor (2005, July 22):7.

 Origins of Terrorism. Murphy and LaFanchi (2005) traced the evolution of Al Qaeda from its founding by Osama bin Laden in 1988. Al Qaedaism is an ideology of global confrontation and jihad, struggle or holy war. It has emerged into a lose decentralized set of organizations under a secretive shura or consultative council. A variety of communication networks and shifting training camps provide contact, materials and religious justification for violence against humanity. Al Qaeda leadership maintains command and control centers it is believed in Pakistan. Taped television announcements through Al Jazeera television newscasts are believed to provide direction to Islamists such as a June 17 tape calling for revenge against Great Britain for allying and supporting U.S. forces in Iraq. The militants seek a superstate or caliphate that will apply the Koran literally. The theoretical base stems from the Salafist movement within Islam’s Sunni sect. Followers of Mohammed ibn abd al-Wahhab, an 18th century preacher, are intolerant of Shiites and are trying to stir up a civil war in Iraq. Murphy and LaFranchi quote the Koran’s injunctions against murder. “Whoever slays a human being, unless it be for murder or for spreading corruption on earthy, it shall be as though he had slain all mankind” (5:32). The Koran’s message against suicide is clear “Do not kill yourselves. . . . whoever does so, in transgression and wrongfully, we shall roast in a fire” (4:20). The Koran justifies violence against those who practice oppression or spreading corruption on earth or those who fight against you. But the limits are clear “fight in the cause of God against those who
fight against you, but do not transgress limits. God loves not transgressors” (2:190) and let “there be no hostility, except to those who practice oppression” (2-193). Al Qaeda is against democracy, Western values, and works diligently to strike at the economic underpinnings of America and Western Europe. The 7/7 attacks on London represented this effort which instills fear in the general populace and whether or not British withdrawal of troops from Iraq would end the terror remains to be seen. Since the Spanish troop withdrawal there has been at least to date no suicide bombing and terrorism in the country. Social control is a rationale for Al Qaeda. Once unleashed it will be difficult to end the cycle of terror. Terror groups change their names, have different, but overlapping interests. Murphy continues by noting that although American Muslim leaders issued a Fatwa condemning terrorism and violence against civilians, the message is not heard by radicalized young who do not listen to leaders they see as Westernized (Murphy and LaFranchi, 2005). The jihad is flexible, a moving target, groups who change their names frequently, submerging and reemerging to strike a different target.

Peterson (2007) notes that there is a rise in Shiite power in the Middle East. Shiites are expanding their power base outwards from Iran to Lebanon’s Hizbullah, to Hamas in the Palestinian Gaza strip as well as to Iraq which many predict will be a Shiite state. Although a minority of world’s Muslims, Shiites power base with massive oil fields in Iran and Iraq together with a philosophy of fighting perceived injustice with martyrdom leads to increased fear in the Sunni world. Peterson (2007: June 7) notes that Shiite power base comes from reaching out to the lower classes with services as well as expanding the concept of Muslim unity.

Organizing terrorism.

Murphy (2003) reported on divisions within Shiite factions in Karbala, site of Shiite Islam’s second holiest shrines, struggling to control the shrines of Abbas and Hussein. With American troops trying to maintain order in Iraq, marjgas (Shiite Religious Scholars) continue to issue fatwas or religious rulings with different views on the role of Islam in the state. Popular religious scholars have the power to use these as they wish. Shiites and Sunnis split in the seventh century over who should lead the religion. Sunnis have a loose hierarchical organization, while Shiites believe religious scholars are needed to help interpret the will of God in modern context with religious rulings or fatwa. Murphy further noted that efforts toward mediation among various clerics are underway. Meanwhile American forces try to maintain security while low-level conflict with some 25 to 80 and above fights and bombings with more spikes of serious combat continue daily. There was an increased in violence as the July 1st date to hand over some governmental duties to Iraqis came closer. Militant Islamic fundamentalism is debated by scholars in a growing number of books and articles as they seek to analyze current and historical roots of conflict. As the aftermath of September 11, suicide bombings in the Middle East and Asia demonstrate Islamic terrorism under its various banners threaten Western economic stability and the anchors of Western civilization. Formal and informal calls for a holy war against the infidels from the mosques threaten American and coalition forces. Funds and ammunition are provided through a variety of organizational channels.

Due to the unforeseen attacks on U.S citizens, governmental agencies, institutions, and corporations a few observations and reflections are in order. Our language does not contain words that adequately describe the intensity of horror, range of emotions, and of helplessness felt by most Americans as they watched repeated television images of passenger planes crashing into the Twin Towers World Trade Center and the Pentagon. Islamic religious leaders in the Muslim world continue to send mixed messages as to whether the hijackers were committing an act of martyrdom or of suicide. Fatwas, opinions, are often issued by Mufi or religious scholars trained in issuing opinions on Islamic law. Unfortunately fatwas are often issued by uneducated charismatic personalities leading to increased dogmatism, absolutism, and conflict.

On October 24, 2001, 43 days after the tragedy of 9-11, Grand Ayatollah Mohammed Hussein Fadlallah, an influential Lebanon Shiite Muslim cleric once linked to terrorists, condemned the bombings in the United States as acts of terrorism, said he did not believe the September 11 hijackers committed an act of martyrdom, a prized duty in Islam, but suicide, a crime in the faith. Other clerics gave different opinions and interpretations of the bombings. Richey (2001) reported on an emergency meeting of the foreign ministers of a 56-member Organization of the Islamic Conference. The organization issued a communiqué condemning the September 11 attacks, but called for a distinction to be made between terrorism and a people’s legitimate right to defend their freedom and self-determination. This distinction is difficult for Americans to understand but provides a rationalization for terrorist acts by individuals such as bin Laden, who have temporarily captured the imagination of Muslim public opinion. In late 2003, six months after the Iraqi-U.S. war, the Organization of Islamic Conference, after calling for withdrawal of
American troops from the country at the earliest possible time, supported the U.S. appointed Iraqi Governing Council to represent the nation until a permanent government was established and in operation. Restive ethnic and religious groups continued to plague American efforts toward building a democratic society, partisan politics energized war opponents, and Congress questioned the Bush administration’s 87 billion dollar request for rebuilding Iraqi infrastructure. Congress voted for the expenditure of the funds but called for using Iraqi oil funds to continue the effort as soon as feasible.

Marquand (2001) wrote of a Muslim extremist, Hasan Ali, of East Pakistan who dreams of an Islamic state spanning the globe. All nations would be under the control of sharia (Islamic Law) with the local authority in Saudi Arabia. Hasan Ali looks to Osama bin Laden, “our hero number one, our religious leader, our model, our general.” No one knows how many Muslims think like Hasan Ali, an Islamic Law Student who was arrested at age 15 as a member of Egypt’s Muslim brotherhood and is now a guiding intellect of Mr. bin Ladin’s Al Qaeda terrorist network. In July 2003, Islamic Militants struck Egypt’s lucrative tourist trade by bombing the Ghazala Garden’s hotel and the Naama Bay area. Police focused on a number of militants including Yousef Badran, as

Other networks operate under the theme of the Islamic Resistance Movement, such as Hamas that recruits and trains suicide bombers in the Middle East. Islamic Jihad and Abu Sayyaf, Hezbollah are other terrorist organizations, many of whose members were trained in Afghanistan. Funding for the various groups’ nefarious activities come from Iran, and American philanthropic organizations whose contributions, ostensibly for worthy causes, is used to support suicide bombers programs as well as for families of so-called martyrs. As efforts were made by U.S. and International forces to eradicate terrorism, the power of Osama bin Laden’s message of a holy war against infidels continued to find support in the Muslim world. Typical of that support was a statement by Abu Bakar Ba’asyir, an Indonesian Muslim cleric (Lekic, 2002). “I am not a member of al-Qaeda, but I really respect the struggle of Osama bin Laden, who has bravely represented the world’s Muslims in their fight against the arrogant United States of America and their allies,” and he continued by noting that “Osama bin Laden, who in our view is a true Muslim fighter, and al-Qaeda have not yet been found guilty in an international court, yet they have been massacred by pro-Western imperialist media.”

Suspected Terrorists Groups

Following are various groups around the world that appear to be terrorists groups.

**Abu Nidal Organization.** Split from the Palestinian Liberation Organization in 1974. Has been accused of carrying out bombings and hijackings against the United States France, Israel, and other nations killing or injuring more than 900 people. Has attacked PLO leaders and other non-Western targets since the late 1980s.

**Abu Sayyaf Group (ASG).** One of the Islamic separatist groups operating in the Southern Philippines. It has been charged with conducting assassinations, bombings, human mutilation, kidnapping for ransom. The American military has been involved in training Philippine troops to fight ASG, which is a sensitive issue in the Philippines since American presence is questioned by the nation’s officialdom.

**Al Qaeda.** Responsible for the September 11 attacks in New York and Washington, and the 2000 attack on the USS Cole in Yemen, the bombing of American embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998, and possibly the destruction of commuter trains in Spain in 2004. Al Qaeda was formed in the late 1980s by Osama bin Laden, has cells all over the world, and is funded by bin Laden and a number of businesses.

**Hamas.** Formed in 1987 to establish an Islamic Palestinian State in Israel. Targets civilians including Americans living or visiting in Israel. Suicide bombers attack restaurants, public busses and any place where civilians congregate. Receives funding from Iran as well as Palestinian expatriates and supporters in Saudi Arabia, Europe and North America.

**Hezbollah.** Formed in 1982 in response to the Israeli invasion of Lebanon. Known or suspected to have committed a number of attacks against Americans, including the suicide truck bombing of U.S. Marine barracks in Beirut in 1983. Receives financial support from Iran, and their operatives have established cells in Europe, Africa, South America, North America and Asia.

**Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), The National Liberation Army (ELN) and the United Self-Defense Groups of Colombia (AUC).** The FARC and ELN, around since the 1960s, are armed Marxist groups that have conducted bombings, as well as kidnappings and assassinations of Colombians and foreigners. Believed to be supported through drug-trafficking profits, both groups have been in peace negotiations with the Colombia government for several years. The AUC is a paramilitary organization established to counter both the FARC and the ELN insurgencies. The AUC gets much of its money from
organizations and leaders are needed to help arbitrate Muslims. Page and Kelley suggest the use of religious reminder of the Christian Holy War against the aftermath of September 11, which was an inadvertent reminder of the Christian Holy War against the Muslims. Page and Kelley suggest the use of religious organizations and leaders are needed to help arbitrate disputes. The attacks on American troops in Iraq since their invasion pinpoint terrorism against modernity as well as a backlash against their cultural folkways and mores. Meanwhile, finding peace in an ancient land with multiple ethnic, tribal, cultural and religious groups will continue to be a work in progress. Extremists throughout the Middle East work diligently to connect their violence with the Israel-Palestinian conflict. This is used as a justification for international savagery.

By June 2003 efforts to achieve peace in Israel and Palestine involved using an ancient pre-Islamic mediation method. Hudna was a period of calm, quiet or relaxation with no contact between the parties. Violations cannot be avenged by one side or the other unilaterally but must be resolved by mediators. After a period of calm complete reconciliation or sulha follows. In sulha, interaction between the rivals is vital. The mediator known in Arabic as jaha invites the two sides for coffee. The coffee is usually prepared by the stronger of the two parties and offered the weaker to restore an injured sense of honor. During the course of the settlement three cups of coffee are consumed, each representing a stage toward peace. Finally a handshake symbolizes the end of the conflict. A feast seals the peace settlement (Fletcher, 2003). Whether the process will help settle the seemingly intractable Israeli-Palestinian, Iraqi or Afghanistan conflict remains to be seen.

On March 19-24, 2003 the United States launched war in Iraq. The shock and awe of massive land, sea and air firepower was demonstrated as troops rolled into Iraq from Kuwait. By April 15, with the fall of Tikrit, the war was said to be over with President Bush referring to the end of major combat on May 1, 2003.

By early 2004, after Saddam Hussein was captured there were continued problems in stabilizing Iraq and providing security, water, electric power, and sanitation. Congress continued to seek an investigation into the rationale for the war. A major theme of Democrats running for President was the Bush administration’s unpreparedness for looting and inadequate security after the war ended. Daily television and print news sought explanations as to why there was inadequate preparation for dealing with the war’s aftermath. Since no weapons of mass destruction were found including any nuclear or biological stockpiles, questions about the war’s rationale grew. Peterson (2002) examined disinformation as a weapon in the arsenal of war, finding that selective use of intelligence and information to justify war and political objectives has a long history. With daily deaths of U.S. soldiers increasing, as well as occasional mass Iraqi protests against U.S. occupation, criticism of the
building the peace process. By early 2005, U.S. military recruitment
significantly missed targets and bonuses up to $40,000 were offered for urgently needed military and
technological skills.

The opposition party in Congress continued a
withering attack on the President for failure to plan
adequately for the wars aftermath, the escalating cost of
the war, and the justification for regime change and the
media reported daily deaths of coalition forces. In
response overt and covert attempts were made to
explore political solutions to the escalating conflict. By
early 2007, with a democratic sweep of both houses of
Congress, the Bush Administration has been forced to
rethink alternative Iraq strategies. The human and fiscal
cost of the war has escalated to the point, opponents of
the war have called for troop withdrawal. The 2006
Congressional election results were influenced by the
growing chaos in Iraq as Sunnis and Shia are at the
brink of civil war, if not already in a civil war. A Baker-
Hamilton Committee formed to analyze and recommend
strategies for the war, submitted a list of suggestions
that were mainly a rehash of efforts that had already
been tried. After the election, Donald Rumsfeld was
replaced as defense secretary by a former CIA director
and President of Texas A and M, Gates. Although the
loss of military lives is small by comparison with other
wars, our Media era, makes the Iraq War an emotional
conflict. Horror is depicted in television reports
throughout the world with talking heads giving instant
one minute news analysis. Future historians will build
narrations of a conflict with unforeseen unintended
results by those leaders who led the nation into the
conflict. Persistent, ruthless attacks, in Congress, in the
press, in a multitude of books, depicting the American
president as a liar, incompetent, mule headed, and too
idealistic, have taken their tool on public domestic and
international public opinion. The effort to build a
democratic society in the Middle East, a worthy goal,
has led to awareness of severe ethnic, religious, cultural
conflicts. The future may see an Islamic Republic of
Iraq based on the Iranian model of government by
Islamic Clergy and Islamic Law.

Peterson (2003) noted that the failure of the United
States to provide security and postwar improvements
has led Iraqis to lose hope. Some of the 25 million Iraqis
have turned to violence and anti-Americanism,
believing conditions are worse under United States
occupation than under Saddam Hussein. There are some
improvements in the north and south of the country,
often unheralded due to the media’s focus on violence.
By September 2003, it was believed that international
terrorism was operating within Iraq. For example, car
bombing of the Jordanian Embassy, suicide bombings
against the United Nations, the Red Cross, various
foreign embassies including Jordan’s, violent battles in
the heart of Baghdad with the death of innocent Iraqi
civilians, increased Iraqi fear, anger, and resistance to
American presence in the country, particularly in the
Sunni heartland. (Peterson, 2003). By late 2004 Shiite
Cleric, populist Moqtada al-Sadr, led an uprising against
American and coalition forces seeking to establish his
role in the eventual control of the country (Murphy,
2004). The United States also faces questions about the
role that religion played in Iraq. Efforts are underway to
reform Iraqi schools, but the U.S. Agency for
International Development cannot use funds in a way
that violates the U.S. constitution on separation of
church and state. Lurking in the background is the ever-
present possibility of an emerging Islamic State based
on the model of Iran. With lack of security in Iraq, the
powerful Islamic fundamentalists have the opening to
create security and retreat from modernity (Zehr, Mary
Ann, 2003). American coalition forces improved
intelligence gathering prior to and after the capture of
Saddam Hussein as intelligence agencies gain
knowledge of Iraq family oriented culture. As this is
written, attacks on Americans through roadside and
suicide bombing, as well as targeting major hotels
housing foreign reporters continue unabated. In
addition, terrorists attacked Iraqi police, and law
enforcement personnel working with coalition forces.
American military and intelligence forces in Iraq
continued to hope terrorism would abate as preparations
for an Iraqi takeover of the reigns of government by late
spring of 2004 grew nearer. By 2005, it was clear Iraqi
military forces, with few exceptions, were unable to
provide law and order in the nation. So fearful were
many Iraqi troops that they would be recognized and
condemned to death by insurgents, that they wore masks
to hide their identity. It should be noted however, that
there were Iraqi’s who were capable law enforcement
and military forces, doing an excellent job against heavy
odds. With Iraq governmental representatives struggling
to meet an August 15 deadline for completing the
constitution, and an increasingly effective Islamic
militancy, there were increasing voices of frustration
with the war in the United States. President Bush’s
standing in the polls deteriorated as the number of
American causalities increased. Iran and Syria’s
involvement in efforts to destabilize the society were
suspected. When American soldiers were killed in larger
numbers with no Iraqi causalities many Iraqi expressed
pleasure. Murphy (2005) noted that hard line Islamists,
takfiri (rejectionists) are increasingly isolated from mainstream Muslims.

The Role of Education in the Middle East Education.

It remains for future historians to determine the factors and influences that led to the second Iraqi War in just over a decade. Weapons of mass destruction were not found. Perhaps Iraqis will be more engaged in taking over the rebuilding of the infrastructure. Efforts at rebuilding and reforming Iraq’s educational system is continuing through funds and instructional materials from the United Nations and a number of countries including Japan, Canada, Britain and the United States as well as the coalition for Iraqi freedom in the country (Zehr, 2003). Middle East National Resource Centers established for teachers to understand and teach about a volatile and misunderstood region have been criticized for bias. Pro-Arabian, pro-Islamic, Anti-Israeli bias had led to proposals such as creating a board comprised of officials from different federal agencies, think tanks, and others to set expectations for unbiased federal Title I programs (Cavanagh, 2003). United States federal funding for establishing bias free educational programs in Iraq, initially to be developed by American university personnel, has been turned over the Iraq educational officials. Tolerance, respect for individual differences, is expected to be developed by Iraqi curriculum specialists. American and coalition forces are sensitive to imposing their values on the Iraqi culture.

Terrorism as Social Control.

Educational programs in the Arabian and Middle Eastern World have been criticized for supporting Islamic militancy against the West. Saudia Arabia and other Middle Eastern countries are making attempts to change educational curriculums to achieve a more balanced and fair picture of the West. Peterson (2002) notes that although the Saudi Arabian Ministry of education seeks to merge the women’s education department within the Education Ministry to prevent religious police actions harmful to students, hardliners are fighting the effort. Fifteen schoolgirls died in a fire in Mecca because religious police would not let them leave the burning school without their black abayas. Wild inflammatory rumors abound in the Saudi right wing religious community including anti-Jewish rumors that 4,000 Jews did not show up for work at the World Trade Center on September 11, that prime Minister Ariel Sharon himself warned them, or that the September 11 attacks were orchestrated by the CIA and the Mossad. Periodic reports from Saudi Arabia indicated religious leaders are encouraging dissidents to take out their venom on American troops in Iraq. Iraqi government and religious officials in their attempt to deal with the insurgency, delineate boundaries of acceptable behavior to be forgiven for their violence. They tend to indicate that it is permissible to attack American and coalition foreign forces, but not to harm Iraqis. The effort to find political solutions to the conflict continue, but it is interesting to note, Iraqi government officials risk their lives daily to continue the difficult and lengthy effort to establish a new democratic government. Whatever the future of the effort, one can be assured the new governance system and body will be different for Western expectations and philosophy.

The Saudi religious police, the Muttawain, are often illiterate and know nothing about the context of Koran and Islam (Peterson, 2002). Macfarquhar (2002) reiterates the attempt of the Saudi royal family to moderate the teachings of Muhammad bin abd al Wahhab. A holy war, Jihad, against non-believers or infidels is a Wahhab basic tenet. Bigoted, intolerant imams, especially from the puritanical Wahhab sect, have a stranglehold on Saudi officials due in part to an alliance with the house of Saud over 250 years ago to unite the kingdom. Saudi Arabia has 64 new colleges, with a curriculum that has not changed in 40 years. Some teachers cannot read, but change is difficult because control of education is in the hands of fundamentalist religious institutions. Currently Saudi police are trying to ferret out terrorists who have committed suicide bombings against Western interests. These efforts are continuing as American members of Congress seek to examine more fully United States-Saudi relations in terms of U.S. national security.

Robelen (2003) noted the efforts of the Rand Corporation to modernize schools in Qatar. Moving away from rote learning, providing periodic tests to assure accountability, decentralizing the educational effort and providing funds to upgrade school facilities and provide instructional resources are the main objectives of Rand. U.S. officials are helping countries in educational need, but also pursue economic, political and national security objectives to confront terrorism. Teachers College at Columbia University, is contributing to educational reform in Afghanistan. Creative Associates International with $63 million in U.S. funding is working to reconstruct Iraq’s educational system. Care is taken in these efforts to develop a western style education system in Islamic countries (Robelen, 2003).

With a history of “Made in Britain Kingdom of Iraq,” however, the country was made up of a disconnected hodge-podge of ethnic groups, tribes, and a variety of Muslim faith offshoots. There were the Kurds, Sunnis, and Shiites, in the North, Central and
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South of the country. A country drawn on the map by British and French imperialists as they divided the Middle East and moved leaders around like pawns on a chessboard, the country ended up with a variety of disconnected tribes and powerful religious leaders (Kaplan, 1993). After centuries of infighting among tribal groups, Saddam Hussein, an educated and urbanized peasant from the Sunni town of Tikrit, north of Baghdad, took over the country’s leadership as a totalitarian dictator. Saddam used vicious means to control the population (Kaplan: 250-252). With that historical background, American troops found the nation difficult to get under control as rebuilding efforts took place. Critics of the war and its aftermath questioned the reason for intervention in the first place, noting the influence of the military industrial complex. They raised the issue of corporate influence from major oil companies in seeking access and stability in energy sources.

Critics of the war also noted the awarding of billions of dollars in rebuilding efforts to large United States corporations such as Halliburton. The corporate influence in national security decisions was widely debated in the summer of 2003. Saddam’s dictatorship and the horrors of uncovering of mass graves of Iraqis killed by biological and traditional weapons revealed a possible ethical rationale for war, even if weapons of mass destruction are never found. The deaths of American soldiers by terrorists in Iraq also suggests the war may be justified on grounds of attacking destroyers of Western civilization at their source. The end result of the war remains to be determined, but American oil corporations’ need for new sources of energy has a long history. Politics, national security interests, corporate influence, and war rationale are all interrelated.

**Diversity of Cultures: Cultural Wars**

Peterson (2001) describes foot soldiers that find the killing of innocent people is relative to the cause of protecting the faith from infidels, to justify the deaths of civilians in the World Trade Center. Obaidur Rahman from Yemen, now in a Northern Alliance prison, joined a holy war at age 17. He trained in a bin Laden camp in Afghanistan and declared that every American is guilty. There were no innocent people in those skyscrapers, Obaidur declared. While reciting U.S. military action as two atomic bombs dropped on Japan in 1945, as well as policies toward Iraq, Libya, Israel, and Somalia as justification for terrorism, he ignores the bondage of women, the medieval treatment of those of different beliefs, tribes, political and economic philosophies.

Mussenden, Powers and McKay (2003) reported on several arrests in the U.S for “material support” to Palestinian Islamic Jihad. Efforts continue to track financing for suicide bombers, although the Patriot Act passed by Congress after September 11, 2001 under which arrests were made is under legal challenge. Collie (2003) reported on young *shahid* (suicide bombers) recruited to kill Israelis have recently chosen to have themselves photographed against a background of Jerusalem’s Al-Aqsa Mosque, one of the holiest shrines in Islam. A member of the Palestinian Islamic Jihad who killed 23 people with his suicide bomb made a picture of himself standing against the Manhattan skyline in honor of the September 11 terrorists.

As President Bush continues the fight against terrorism under a slogan of preemptive strikes, his rhetoric has led to some backlash throughout the world. George W. Bush referred to Iraq, North Korea and Iran as an “axis of evil,” with each country threatening world peace through support of terrorism as well as maintaining weapons of mass destruction. Efron (2002) reported on a strong reserve of good will toward the United States. However, the percentage of people reporting a favorable opinion of the United States has fallen in 20 of the 27 nations where benchmark data are available, according to a study by the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press. By the late spring of 2003, newspaper headlines in Europe refer to Bush as an “out-of-control cowboy with an attitude.” Worldwide protests against an Iraqi War with multiple news agencies referring to Bush as a bully to the United Nations continue to grow. Arab newspapers refer to Bush as a power hungry Texan.

In Europe, Arabia, Pakistan, Turkey, and other countries, polling surveys reflect a growing tendency to find Bush a greater danger than Saddam Hussein. These perceptions and attitudes may change if the situation in Iraq stabilizes and Iraqis demonstrate ability to find compromises with the diverse forces in the country. While the Bush administration sought to push the U.N. toward a vote for war against Iraq, and Americans express concern about nuclear weapons of mass destruction, citizens in other parts of the world have different priorities. They cite AIDS and infectious diseases, pollution and environmental problems, ethnic and religious strife and the gap between rich and poor as major concerns. Crime and political corruption were cited more widely than terrorism as “very big” problems (Efron, 2003).

**Women and Islam.**

Islamic law and custom requires women to wear *hijab* (head scarves) and a marriage is considered dissolved if the husband twice (some say three times) tells his wife he divorces her. Women’s Fagan dress
codes were typical of those in the Arabian world. (see www.Islamfortoday.com) Saudi Arabia’s Committee for the Preservation of Virtue and the Prevention of Vice recently condemned a U.S. Central Command order that allowed U.S. service women serving in the country to ignore head-to-toe robes or abaya. A Virtue and Vice committee member (“U.S. Female Troops Told to Wear Head-to-Toe Robes,” 2002) said, “everybody is considered equal under Islam. Whoever doesn’t like it can go back home.” This issue indicates the difficulty of networking and communication between western and mid-eastern cultures. Besides growing a beard, Fagan men generally wear the salwar kameez. Under Taliban rule women were required to follow rules as to dress, work, and were forbidden from going to school. Beating with length of cable was the punishment for infractions of Taliban decrees. Whether these customs are restrictive or medieval depends on the mores and folkways of a society. Recently, however, Muslim Palestinian women have become suicide bombers with varying support from their families and communities.

**Selective Jihad.**

In addition, Islamic militants overlook the disparity of wealth in the Middle East or blame such uneven distribution of wealth on American support for totalitarian regimes, based on their need for supplies of energy. Wealthy religious or political figures often use their wealth, not for the assistance of poverty-stricken peoples, but rather for training terrorists who threaten anyone who has a different belief system.

While Arabian spokespersons frequently bring up the Israel-Palestine conflict as a justification for terrorism, few show an understanding of the historical antecedents. A half-century of continuing and increasingly violent Israel-Palestinian conflict suggests a persistent if not intractable problem. Suicide bombing creates massive deaths of innocent civilians, including very young and old. The Middle East conflict continues to claims lives as the istsihan (self-martyr) movement expands under the tutelage of single spiritual guides or handlers. The handlers assure prospects that they will be given special access to heaven according to their Muslim beliefs. It is interesting to note that most of the suicide bombers are young. The clergy and handlers who send them to their deaths are generally from an older generation.

For their suicide bombings, families receive compensation from various Arab charities throughout the Arabian world. In addition, Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein, when in power, provided more than $25,000 for suicide attacks on Israelis (Collie, 2002), and after the Israeli military responded, Hussein increased his spending for helping Palestinian rebuilding efforts. Blanford (2002) points to the difficulty of dealing with terrorist movements such as Iranian sponsored (officially or unofficially) Hezbollah. One of the organization’s southern commanders, Sheikh Nabil Qaouk, sees their violent actions as a strategic option for the Arabs and the intifada against the nightmare of a Zionist entity. The United States is placed in a difficult position, as it seeks to balance national interests with efforts to achieve a Middle East peace. The terrorist groups, under whatever banner by which they espouse political rhetoric, are connected in multiple communication networks. Late Fall, 2002, terrorist attacks in Indonesia, the Philippines, the Gulf, and elsewhere suggest Al Qaeda is alive and active, regardless of the massive U.S. attacks in Afghanistan as well as efforts to restrict financing of the nefarious groups.

Smucker (2002) noted the role of money in bin Laden’s Al Qaeda movement. Passing envelopes of money around (from $300 to $10,000 and up in local currency) to tribal elders for support in their terrorist networks, as well as greasing the way for Bin Laden’s escape to Pakistan, was the Taliban and Al Qaeda’s modus operandi. In the late spring of 2002, leaflets were distributed throughout Afghanistan offering $50,000 for dead American Soldiers and $100,000 for live ones. Meanwhile the United States continued to distribute leaflets throughout the country promising cash for information and intelligence about Taliban and Al Qaeda whereabouts. By early 2004, efforts were made to develop a democratic government in Afghanistan, although there were continued attacks by Taliban forces. Pakistani President Pervez Musharraf who supported United States attacks against Taliban forces narrowly escaped suicide bombers several times as his motorcade was attacked. Pakistan’s radical Islamic militants anti-American rhetoric and violence has made it difficult for Musharraf to support American forces (Haven, 2003). He has remained steadfast, however, in his support for American efforts to establish a democratic government in Afghanistan and eliminate the power of the Taliban and Al Qaeda.

United States forces have been subject to suicide bombers. In a Beirut, Lebanon barracks attack in 1983, 241 U.S. servicemen as well as 58 French paratroopers were killed (Collie, 2002). Whatever the reason, whether religious indoctrination, brain washing, money, struggle against injustice, return of land, mass psychosis, personal problems, suicide bombing is a fact of life in the early years of the 21st century.

**Israeli-Palestine Conflict.**
During World War I, British forces captured Jerusalem, and from 1922-1948 Britain was given League of Nations mandate over Palestine. The Balfour Declaration was issued during this period. By 1947, a United Special Committee set forth a plan to divide Palestine into a Jewish and an Arab state, a proposal which Jews accepted and Arabs rejected. On May 14, 1948 Israel declared itself an independent state, forming a government and having an outbreak of war within 24 hours. By 1949, a truce was signed, and by 1950 Israel declared Jerusalem as its capital. By 1956 the nationalization of the Suez Canal led to a second Israel-Palestine war. Under U.N. and U.S. pressure, Israel withdrew from all land taken. In 1967, Israel had a six-day war reacting to the closing of the Gulf of Aqaba. Israel occupied the Golan Heights, Gaza, the Sinai, the West Bank and the Old City of Jerusalem. By 1973, Israel and Egypt had a brief war due to Egyptian attacks. In December 1973 the United Nations encouraged Israel and Palestine to have a peace conference. In 1978, Palestinian guerrillas launched a raid in Israel through Lebanon, leading to an Israeli invasion. In July 1980, Israel affirmed Jerusalem as the capital, and by 1982 Israel moved into South Lebanon. Also in 1982, Egypt was given the Sinai Peninsula in the Camp David accords.

In December 1987, Arabs staged an intifada, and by 1993 Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) signed an Oslo peace accord designed to provide for Palestinian recognition and self-rule in Gaza, West Bank, and Jericho. In 1994 Israel agreed on Palestinian control and authority in those areas. In 1995, in an Israeli-Palestinian Interim Agreement, Israel and the PLO agreed on a transition to Palestine of responsibility for the Temple Mount in Jerusalem. Both sides viewed the Temple Mount as having historical religious significance. A provocative visit to the Temple Mount on September 28, 2000 by Ariel Sharon led to an Araba uprising, an Intifada and ensuing violence. On Feb 6, 2001 Sharon succeeded Ehud Barak as prime minister. From 2000 through 2004 an increasing number of suicide bombers from Hamas and other terrorist groups created a wall of violence throughout Israel and killing hundreds of civilians. Israeli officials started to build a wall to protect citizens from suicide bombers. American and European officials criticized the wall, but Sharon continued the project in an effort to prevent the killing of innocent civilians.

Israel has a population of 80.1 percent Jewish, 14.6 percent Muslims, Christians 2.1 percent and 3.2 percent not categorized. West Bank and Gaza strip have a population of 3,268,832. Seventy-five percent of the West Bank was formerly Muslim, 17 percent Jewish and 8 percent Christian. As of December 2001, Muslims comprise 98.7 percent, Christian 0.7 percent and Jewish 0.6 percent (Israel Conflict, Sun-Sentinel December 9, 2001). The level of suicide bombing reached epic levels as killings took place on Passover and other revered religious holidays. Prime Minister Sharon unleashed his military forces on Palestinian population centers to ferret out Islamic militants in the late spring of 2002. Unfortunately, suicide bombers hid among the civilian population and collateral damage took place, resulting in massive protests in Arabian countries as well as in Europe, England and on U.S. campuses. President Bush called on Sharon to halt the incursion, but troop withdrawal was delayed as the Israelis sought to eliminate terrorist cells to the degree possible. Rebuilding the Palestinian infrastructure will require large expenditures by Arabian, European countries as well as the United States.

**Searching for Answers.**

There are no easy answers to the complex intrigues of terror throughout the Middle East and the Muslim world. There were few authors and analysts of the Middle East conflict who mentioned the alternative of expenditures for a war on poverty, illiteracy, hate crimes and irrational violence, which could create a model society for the 21st century. Krueer and Maleckova (2003, June 6) sought to find the roots of terrorism. They found terrorists generally are well-educated middle- to- upper- class citizens who buy into the goals of a terrorist organization. Analysis of backgrounds of Israeli terrorists such as the Gush Emunim (block of the faithful) revealed well-educated, deeply religious individuals in high paying jobs, including teachers, university students, writers, an engineer, a combat pilot, chemist, and computer programmer. Hamas and other Islamic terrorists individuals were found to be well-educated, upper income, very religious and committed to action against real or perceived humiliation. Statements such as “the Israelis humiliate us, occupy our lands and destroy our history” were common findings of Krueer and Maleckova. They also noted that Timothy McVeigh’s terrorist act was tied to hate language and action commonly found on some Internet sites.

Further findings from a December 2001 survey of the Palestinian Center for Policy and Survey research were that from 74 to 90 percent of the population supported attacks on Israeli targets and a majority over 60 percent believed attacks against Israeli civilians help achieve Palestinian rights in a way negotiations could not have. Most terrorist acts are likely committed by
individuals who grew up under repressive political regimes. Krueer and Maleckova also noted that the Koran rejects suicide, and classical Islamic legal texts consider it a sin. However, a fighter who dies for faith or another noble cause is held in great esteem in both legal and cultural traditions, and those who die on the path of God are promised immediate recompense. The funds expended by the Arab regimes on fomenting violence would be enough to create a compassionate, just, educated community that would be a model for economic and social justice in our time.

Long (2001) reported on a talk by a Middle Eastern Studies, University of Texas, Austin professor, noting that the September 11 human calamity is leading Americans to a desire to learn more about other parts of the world. After the Soviet troop withdrawal February 14, 1989, the United States and Pakistan supported the Taliban takeover of Afghanistan for stability and to secure the border. Long also reported that after the Afghanistan-Russian conflict, America gave Pakistan financial aid that could have been used in madrassas or theological Islamic schools. Over 7,000 of these schools exist in Pakistan where radical teachings are prevalent. Pakistan and Afghanistan have only six percent of their population attending schools and universities.

September 11, 2001 will be a historical date of infamy both similar to, and different from the Pearl Harbor attack on December 7, 1941. On both dates, unexpected violence committed on unprepared individuals created havoc, fear, anxiety, anger and frustration. The difference is that the attack on Pearl Harbor was on military facilities, although innocent civilians were part of collateral damage, while the attack on New York City’s World Trade Center’s twin towers was on innocent civilians from all religions, cultures, ethnic and racial backgrounds. Women, children, young and old, were intentionally targeted for a crime against humanity. Adding insult to murder, the terrorists caused major causalities in the Pentagon, the nation’s major defense center. Whether domestic or foreign, bioterrorism is creating a wave of fear and increased surveillance of citizens, governmental agencies, and in some instances terrorist profiling. The anthrax scare together with the terrorists’ suicides and unspeakable violence has created what Bin Laden called for in one of his many television appearances. That is his call for making all Americans live in abject fear and terror in their homes, churches, communities and nations. Whenever the bioterrorists, domestic or foreign are found, identified and brought to justice, we may have a momentary respite from attacks.

Islamic Philosophy: Theorizing Terrorism.

However, in the long run Americans will have to deal with our daily headlines Why Do They Hate Us? (Appleyard, 2001; Ford, 2001; Greenberg, 2001). There are no simple answers to the complexities this question raises. Ford finds the attacks on America are due to differences between Islam and American style capitalism, a mood of resentment toward American and its behavior in the world, injustices done to Palestinians, continued sanctions against Iraq, and support of repressive and corrupt regimes. Ford concludes with a recently published poem in Al-Hayat, a leading Arabic newspaper.

Children are dying, but no one makes a move.
Houses are demolished, but no one makes a move
Holy places are desecrated, but no one makes a move
I am fed up with life in the world of mortals
Find me a hole near you. For a life of dignity is in those holes.

Appleyard (2001) writing in the London Sunday Times noted that during his childhood, demonstrators were convinced an inevitable nuclear holocaust would be the fault of Americans. As a student, Appleyard saw protests against the Vietnam War. Protestors used the war as an excuse for violence, waving Mao Tse-Tung’s Little Red Book, a guide to mass murder, as they tried to storm the American Embassy. Appleyard saw what Americans did between two world wars. They saved Europe from barbarism, rebuilt the continent from ashes, confronted and peacefully defeated Soviet communism, ejected Iraq from Kuwait, helped the British to evict Argentina from the Falklands, created the world’s best universities, and are a world center for excellence in films and television. Appleyard concluded that America has made mistakes in its foreign policy in the Middle East and elsewhere. He noted that Winston Churchill once said that Americans usually do the right things once they have tried all the alternatives!

Award winning writer Paul Greenberg (2001) suggests there is no need for a reason to hate the United States. We don’t need a reason to hate any more than we need a reason to love. Neither hate nor love is reasonable. They are acts of good and evil, grace or malice. He asked, “did the Nazis have a reason to hate Jews?” “Did Stalin need a reason to hate capitalists?” A category in his book encompassed any peasant with a hoe and a cow. Did Timothy McVeigh need a reason to hate his own government and his own people? Greenberg concludes that bin Laden and other terrorists
do not hate Americans for what we do, but what we are, and what we represent that infuriates them. They can’t stand democracy in theory and practice, according to Greenberg. The result of the hate, violence, intolerance and terror is a major and continuing crisis for our capitalistic, corporate society, requiring massive expensive intervention strategies to meet the need of surviving families and to clean up the debris from the crime. Corporations reeled from the disaster of September 11, pushing the nation into a recession. An amount over 200 billion dollars was raised through private, government and corporate donations and assistance. Meanwhile well over 100,000 employees were laid off from the airlines and supporting industries, in addition to heavy corporate lay-offs prior to the tragedy. Thousands of other employees across the corporate structure, and in some instances in state agencies, have been laid off as downsizing increased to compensate for declining business and governmental funds.

A few corporations worked to maintain their workforce during the economic down cycle, including Wal-Mart and Southwest Airways while other corporations sought to have workers take reduced salaries to prevent layoffs. Meanwhile, the global economy took a hit as Japan moved more deeply into a recession. Government’s worldwide moved to provide support networks for a growing number of unemployed.

As an American military response took place with massive bombing of military targets in Afghanistan, including some collateral damage, protests on and off college campuses were taking place. American bombing during Ramadan was used by some Muslims as a propaganda weapon, as was the killing of civilians due to technical or human error. Ramadan is a holy month of purification and fasting. During the daytime Muslims are forbidden from having sexual intercourse, or eating, drinking or smoking. Iftar, or the evening meal, ends the fast and is a time for reflection and prayer. Eid ul-Fitr, The Festival of Fast-Breaking, is a three-day observance at the end of Ramadan when a new moon is sighted. Often Muslims greet each other with Eid Mubarak, or blessed festival. Ramadan and haji or hadj (the annual pilgrimage to Mecca), together with daily prayers, and charity to the poor and repeating of the Shahada, or God is great and Muhammad was his final prophet are the five major themes of Islam. Some protestors called for peace and saw the terrorist attack of 9/11 as an assault on international trade and globalization caused by the excesses of a capitalistic society. A speaker at a teach-in (lecture, discussion, focused dialogue) at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill called for an apology to the tortured and impoverished and all other victims of American imperialism. This resulted in other incidents of hate crime and hate language against Islamic students and organizations that took place on and off campuses (Leo, 2001). The American Association of University Professors national office is keeping track of faculty speeches on the issue of terrorism. One professor mentioned to his class that if anyplace was bombed, his vote would be for the Pentagon. A student in his class was married to a state legislator, who called for the faculty member’s dismissal (Leo, 2001). Other responses to outspoken faculty include dismissal, semesters without pay, and appointment of senior faculty committees to report on rights and responsibilities of faculty during periods of national crisis.

**Terrorists Corporate Model.**

In light of attacks on capitalism, its theory and practice, particularly intense during World Trade Organization meetings, it is interesting that McCoy and Cauchon (2001) find Osama bin Laden has built his Al-Qaeda terrorist network into a worldwide force of money and men that in some ways resemble a Fortune 500 company. McCoy and Cauchon note that Osama is a charismatic leader, part entrepreneur, part CEO and part godfather. By the fall of 2002 whether dead or alive, Bin Laden’s influence still was seen in the survival of Al Qaeda cells. Bin Laden, like any good CEO, had prepared for his succession and had developed a multitiered network. People could step in and fill the shoes of those who had been killed or captured. It was estimated two-thirds of Al Qaeda’s leadership and untold foot soldiers were still capable of terrorism (Bowers, 2002).

Referred to as the big boss, Osama moves money around through *hawala*, an informal, largely undocumented money transfer system common in the Middle East. Bin Laden operates with a 30-member policy board or *shura*, Arabic for a council of mutual consultation. Bin Laden’s *Shura*, however, is a council of terror. He operates on the basis of deniability, never admitting to terror but siding with the attacks as a matter of policy against infidels or non-believers. Bin Laden, as other terrorists, uses the media effectively to whip up Islamic protests against the West. Nightly television newscasts show pictures of huge mobs burning U.S. flags and shouting slogans of hate, violence, and intolerance. Newscasts show jubilation in the streets as citizens of Middle Eastern nations demonstrated with joy at the devastation, destruction, and death of innocent
While some analysts suggest those supporting terrorism are only a small part of the Islamic world, others believe such intolerance and hate language is widespread. Children are taught violence, hate, distrust, intolerance and how to become human time bombs throughout their schooling in most nations of the Middle East. Again how widespread such teachings are remains a subject for future debate. Sennott (2002) found that the Saudi Arabian educational system based on Wahhabi religious institutions fosters a volatile mix of intolerance, rote learning, anti-Western bias, and a religious call to duty too often misinterpreted as holy war. Fifteen of the September 11 attack terrorists were Saudis, members of Osama Bin Laden’s Al Qaeda network. As a visitor in the Arabian world in recent years, I found it difficult if not impossible to visit Islamic schools.

Islamic Diversity.

Glaberson (2001) identifies the difficulty of trying to understand Islamic law. Islam at home and in Muslim countries is decentralized. Consequently many different voices and views are heard. Islamic law consists of the Koran, the sayings of the prophet Mohammed and centuries of interpretation by Muslim scholars and judges. In many instances charismatic characters lack basic knowledge of Islamic law and just declare themselves interpreters of the law, whipping up public opinion through a variety of techniques designed to create crimes against humanity. Islamic law is subject to a wide variety of interpretations by religious leaders. Glaberson reports on efforts to interpret Islamic Law. One panel of 12 professors and directors of Islamic centers in the United States, Fiqh Council of North America, is working to better translate and understand Islamic law.

The Taliban interpretation of Islamic law involved treating women as second or third-class citizens, as well as invoking rules that required killing individuals who committed immoral acts as defined by the Taliban Ministry for the Promotion of Virtue and Prevention of Vice. Death penalties for infractions of regulations for both men and women were often carried out in sports stadiums with crowds cheering as the killing was carried out. In some cases family members were required to kill their relatives deemed guilty of offenses. Women fully veiled were killed with rifle shots to their heads while kneeling on the ground. Some suggest that terrorists have twisted Islamic words. Jihad is used by terrorists to define a holy war against non-believers or infidels, while scholars find Jihad refers to striving for spiritual good (Weinberg, 2001).

As the United States continues bombing of Afghanistan with increased incidents of collateral damage, behind the scene efforts are underway to stabilize the country when and if the Taliban are defeated. Smith (2001) refers to one effort to get various Afghan tribes to begin meetings among themselves to select representatives to a loya jirga, or grand council or assembly to form an interim government. Afghanistan’s 87-year-old former king, Zahir Shah, is being courted by the United States and Western Europe to call for, and lead a loya jirga for, social, economic and political stability.

As the Taliban were defeated by the fall of 2001, World Health and the United Nations World Food Program organizations provided massive injections of food, clothing and tents for large refugee populations. The United States continued to provide food airdrops as well as trucking grain and other foodstuffs into major population centers. In some areas lawlessness made trucking foodstuffs into Afghanistan difficult. Meanwhile, international efforts to create a stable government representing all the ethnic populations within the country were intensified. The United Nations, with widespread world support sought to bring representatives from Afghanistan’s ethnic groups together to develop a broad based provisional government. Germany, Italy, Great Britain, and Japan sent military forces to help in distributing food to displaced populations and to maintain law and order throughout the country. Osama Bin Laden and the Al Qaeda remained objects of pursuit by American rapid response teams into December of 2001. In fact, the United States offered a reward of $25 million for information leading to the capture or death of Osama Bin Laden.

Some women removed head to toe burqas, went back to teaching, nursing, and reading the news on television while music, television and other banned activities by the Taliban spread throughout the country. Movie houses and video stores reopened in major population centers. However, at Afghanistan’s constitutional convention, or loya jirga, in December 2003, the 100 women delegates were disappointed when no female delegates were elected. The chairman, Sebaghatullah Mojadeddi, told the women not to put themselves on a level with men, since God had not given them equal rights (Francis, 2003). This harkens back to the 1600s of Puritan days in Old Massachusetts Bay Colony when women were often forbidden to speak at religious or governmental functions.

Terrorism Strikes: How Schools Reacted.
Meanwhile, in the United States 8000 New York City students were moved to temporary locations. Some teachers had led their children to safety as buildings crumbled behind them. There were outpourings of love and caring from around the nation as school children were helped to deal with emotional aftereffects of the shock and terror (Galley, Johnston, 2001). Hoff and Manzo (2001) reported on a changed educational landscape after the September 11 attacks. Students and teachers turned to the Internet for maps and information on the Middle East. Some experts predicted an increased focus on patriotism in the curriculum. Others like Gilbert T. Sewall, president of the New York City based American Textbook Council, which monitors history and social studies textbooks, noted there has been a lot of anti-Americanism in peace, global education and world history in the last twenty years which might be reversed very fast (pp. 10, 12). Borja (2001) reported on the impact of terrorist assaults on schools, teachers, students and administrators.

How Schools Reacted

| A national survey October 10, 2001 of 1241 public and private school students who were asked how their schools reacted to the recent terrorist attacks. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| I watched TV coverage at school the day it happened | All students | Ages 8-9 | Ages 10-12 | Ages 13-15 | Ages 16-18 |
| Teachers have been talking about the tragedy in class | 60% | 18% | 34% | 73% | 75% |
| My school made counselors available | 66 | 49 | 60 | 70 | 72 |
| I have been allowed to watch TV at school | 52 | 34 | 43 | 54 | 60 |
| My school had an assembly to explain what happened. | 27 | 10 | 17 | 31 | 34 |
| My school or teachers sent letters home to my parents about the tragedy | 23 | 27 | 24 | 20 | 23 |
| My teachers have tried to avoid talking about the tragedy. | 21 | 40 | 27 | 22 | 10 |


News headlines such as “Panic Over Anthrax Attacks Spreads to Schools,” underline the multiplier effects of the terrorist’s attacks—both the Twin Towers and bioterrorism. Martel (2002) noted that in recent years, school shootings by students put a premium on metal detectors, locker searches and student counseling. Since September 11, Martel, addressing the National School Boards Association in New Orleans, said school security plans should consider international travel risks, new procedures for opening mail, watching for suspicious people near schools and even restricting cell phone use. Whatever the future holds for us, it is vital that educators and students create, design and implement a program that will lead to a continuing world war on intolerance, hate language and violence, bias, prejudice, divisiveness, social fragmentation and close-mindedness.

Appreciation for the rich diversity of human resources, of age, race, gender, ethnicity, culture and faith, is what makes America a beacon of hope for peoples from throughout the world. Individuals from countries filled with hate language and violence against
the United States as well as others throughout the world, line up each day at American Embassy visa offices to gain access to the country. Many spend their life savings, hire lawyers, and work to gain entrance to the U.S., eventually seeking green cards and U.S. citizenship.

American response to 9/11 included massive surveillance of airline passengers as well as other transportation systems on sea and land. So pervasive is the national effort to prevent future attacks that even small communities have monitors in public places. For example, the law library at the county courthouse in Barnstable, Cape Cod, Massachusetts, requires one to go through the same procedure as at airports i.e., taking everything out of one’s pockets, and putting one’s briefcase on an x-ray conveyor belt. New x-ray machines expose every part of the body as individuals go to their airport gates. On October 24, 2001 the 107th Congress passed the USA Patriot Act to deter and punish terrorist’s acts in the United States and around the world, to enhance law enforcement investigatory tools, and for other purposes. Civil rights advocates are raising increasing concerns about the danger of impinging on individual privacy as the federal government enacts legislation and agencies expand powers to monitor peoples’ lives. By 2005 airport surveillance systems changed the culture of traditional freedoms and rights. Senior citizens, the young, foreigners and the public were subjected to thorough searches much like those of Israel’s Ali Ali passengers. The challenge is to balance national responsibilities for citizens’ safety with protection of individual freedoms and rights so essential in a democracy.

In Washington, D.C., as around the country, focused dialogues on freedom are taking place in high schools led by local lawyers and judges. The American Bar Association directs these dialogues to whether American values can be seen as offering a hope rather than a threat to the rest of the world. Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy drafted a scenario for students’ response. The scenario describes students marooned in a poor country hostile to the United States. The country, called Quest, with its environment resembling the Middle East, is home to a charismatic religious leader who preaches hatred of America. A young woman tells the student that what is wrong with Quest and other underdeveloped nations is the influence of American culture and that a movement should be started that resists American culture. Kennedy’s scenario concludes with the question. “What do you tell her?” (Revving Up Students’ Civil Values, 2002).

In a rapidly changing world with instant communication systems and rapid global transportation access it is impossible to predict the future with any degree of certainty. Political, economic, religious, demographic, and cultural diversity interplay on the stage of human history. As the Vietnam War demonstrated, enemies of yesteryear are trading partners today. Cold War theories of containment, domino effect, and propaganda were on the stage for over half a century. The Berlin wall fell; the Soviet Union evolved into a loose confederation of states with Russia at its center. Japan and China became economic powerhouses, and fears of communist expansion were replaced by fears of Islamic fundamentalism.

Search for Answers.

Etzioni (2004) suggests American civil and military officials fail to recognize the explosive nature of a society unleashed from totalitarianism. In the chaos that follows, some will wish for a return to a stable society regardless of totalitarianism. Etzioni notes the importance of encouraging moderate mullahs to shore up social order, rather than imposing Western values and ideologies. Religious schools (madrassahs) should be allowed to flourish as long as the focus is on subjects such as science and math, with qualified teachers, and religious texts that reflect moderate rather than virulent Islam.

Dag Hammarskjöld, former secretary of the United Nations, once noted that there are some seemingly intractable problems we never really resolve, we just grow out of them by reaching another language level. Compromise, mutual respect, willingness to learn from one another, negotiations, and conquering the tendency to superimpose values from the powerful to the weak, all play a role in overcoming obstacles to peaceful resolutions of complex problems. John Rawls, philosopher and author of The Theory of Justice (1971), postulated an ideal society where distribution of goods and services provided access and opportunity to all citizens. American legal support for affirmative action programs fulfill Rawls’goals of a just and fair society to the degree possible. In his The Law of Peoples (1999) and later writings, Rawls addressed the challenges of justice and fairness within varying political systems. Rawls described Islamic regimes that represent decent stable societies that although lacking democratic principles, still function in humane conditions. He identified six basic concepts for achieving these conditions. First, all groups within the society must be consulted. Second, each member of the people must belong to a group. Third, each group must be represented by a body that contains at least some of the group’s own members who know and share fundamental
attacks increase as efforts to democratize the region advance. In the long run, as Toni Blair, recently pointed out after the rail bombing shook the nation in July 2005, we need to address the root causes of terrorism. Unemployment, wealth distribution, poverty together with religious dogmatism is fertile grounds for insurgencies.

The cost of rebuilding Iraq was greater than foreseen, and the United States sought financial and military help from United Nations member states. With religious groups demanding power and control, Iraq proved to be an arena for tension and conflict. Vincent (2005) reported on the influence of Iran on Shiite groups in Basra, Iraq. Armed men from various Shiite religious groups scrutinize females students at the gates of Basra University to make sure their dresses are the right length and their makeup properly modest. Religious extremists order no alcohol, no music CDs, force women to wear hijab, murder people in the streets for failure to comply with fundamentalists philosophy. Iranian influence in Basra is everywhere present. Meanwhile, Iraq’s constitution writers race to finish the constitution. U.S. and Iraqi official believe keeping the political process on track will blunt the insurgency. Sunni constitution writers have been killed, and the remaining ones are withdrawing from the process at least temporarily. Sunnis who participate in the political process are being identified and killed. Yet, The General Conference of Sunnis, a loose-knit group of clerics and politicians, urged Iraq Sunnis to register to vote to claim the ir rightful share of the decision making (MacDonald, Neil, 2005). How the future will be shaped in Iraq, the Middle East and the Muslim world, remains to be determined. Whether a fledgling democracy will be allowed to develop, or be taken over by religious power figures, a resolution of the conflict will probably take place over time. It will require compromise, dialogue, mutual respect and understanding of ethnic, religious, cultural and historical differences in order to move beyond terrorism. The challenges of our 21st century will provide an opportunity to develop an emerging humane civilization but the timing and shape of such a vision depends on the willingness of a polarized society at home and abroad finding a way to build bridges of mutual respect and understanding to reach a civilized consensus. Cultural Wars are not isolated events, rather intertwined and interrelated. Religiosity under various banners of fundamentalism needs to be addressed in an ever more interdependent world. To think that terrorism is not interconnected throughout the world is to be misinformed about the power of the global superinformation highway. Whether 9/11 or 7/7 in the
U.S. and Britain, the terrorist interwoven connections weave the same web of attacks against Western interests and culture.

**Perceptions of the United States abroad.**

Having worked and lived in South America for the University of Oklahoma, educational program in Cali, Colombia, South America; the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville’s Bolivian program, the University of Alabama’s Quito, Ecuador, as well as traveling in Russia, China, Yugoslavia, Greece, Egypt, Romania and several other countries with the education society, Phi Delta Kappa, certain observations can be made. First, wherever we traveled in non-Western areas of the world, there was a perception American’s had plenty of money, goods, and materials. Americans were universally perceived as wealthy based on the movies, print, and media sources as well as friends who had traveled to the United States. American and British troops and command structure in Iraq are reporting endless requests for cars, supplies. Iraqis cannot understand why wealthy America cannot immediately supply electric power, gasoline supplies, and goods and services throughout the country. Vincent (2005) reports that the British who oversee the security in Basra and Southern Iraq privately accuse the Iraqis of having a case of the “gimmies”, as in “gimme this, gimme that.” If they supply 30 new cars, they want 30 more. It is true there is a need for more supplies and equipment, but there is a tendency to rely on the west to supply everything.

Secondly, the media overplays the sensational. Careful analysis of media and press reports of events abroad, show that hyperbole, and the spectacular overshadow balanced reporting. When we were in Russia after Chernobyl accident, Western reporting exaggerated the nuclear fall out. The fall out was dangerous, a catastrophe but did not affect the country as much as the media declared. We traveled extensively throughout Russia with no real difficulties shortly after the event. In the long run, as American tourists often report, they are probably more likely to be killed on the streets of New York City as in cities overseas. This in no way implies we are not facing the horrors of international terrorism and its threats against Western interests. Rather it is important to note, Western media’s interests lay in selling stories, the more spectacular, sensational the better.

As John Dewey once noted:

> The catastrophic, namely, crime, accident, family rows, personal clashes and conflicts, are the most obvious forms of breaches of continuity; they supply the element of shock which is the strictest meaning of sensation; they are the new par excellence, even though only the date of the newspaper could inform us whether they happened last year or this, so completely are they isolated from their connections. *(The Public and Its Problems, LW 2, p. 347)*

Two West Point Research Studies, “Stealing al Qaeda’s Playbook” and Harmony and Disharmony: Exploiting al Qaeda’s Organizational Vulnerabilities”, analyze the organizational structure of the terror group. Al Qaeda is viewed as a flawed corporation, with the same inherent personality conflicts, intra-organizational disputes, and arguments over allocating resources as any other business. The CNN (2006) report finds the corporate culture is like other modern organizations. Al Qaeda has vacation plans, seven days every three weeks for married members, five days a month for bachelors and provides its members with 15 days of sick leave a year. The organization uses modern management principles with instructions on using information technology, manipulating the media and researching the use of nuclear weapons for the cause of jihad. The CNN (2006) report on the West Point Studies identifies ways the U.S. could more effectively respond to the terrorists culture. Targeting its finances, confusing and embarrassing the rank and file and exploiting ideological rifts and establishing a think tank staffed with experts on the Middle East and counterinsurgency to identify the major jihad thinkers and analyze their works are suggestions for dealing with Al Qaeda and its many branches.

Polls of attitudes in four Muslim countries (Egypt, Pakistan, Morocco, Indonesia) reveal a majority of respondents support two of Al Qaeda’s main goals. They want strict Islamic Law (sharia) in Muslim countries and especially the uniting of all Islamic countries into a single state, or Caliphate. Murphy (2007) continued by reporting that most respondents want the U.S. out of the Middle East and many approve of attacks on U.S. troops there. Large majorities say that undermining Islam was a key goal of U.S. Foreign policy. However the poll also revealed a rejection of the violence and treatment of women currently exhibited by Al Qaeda with some support for limited Democracy (Murphy, 2007).
REFERENCES


Collie, Tim (2002, April 7). “Suicide Bombers Earn Praise, Revulsion,” *South Florida Sun Sentinel*: 1, 14 A.
Collie, Tim (2002, April 14). “The Solution is Land For Peace,” South Florida Sun Sentinel: 3 G.


Fletcher, Elaine Ruth (2003, August 2). “Ancient Peacemaking Rite Struggles to Gain foothold in Middle East,” Arkansas Democrat Gazette: 3 H.


Malernee, Jamie (2003, April 13). “Education After These Messages,” *South Florida Sun-Sentinel*: 6 B.


Molnar, Alex and Morales, Jennifer (2000, October). “Commercialism@SchoolsEducational Leadership: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: 39-44.


“Suspected Terrorist Groups,” (2003, January 26). CIA World Factbook and State Department and Staff Interviews. South Florida Sun Sentinel: 3 F.


“Teacher Pleads in Test Copy Case,” (2002 April 14). South Florida Sun Sentinel: 8 B.

The Trustees of Dartmouth College v. Woodward. 4 Wheat (U.S.) 518, (1819.)


Chief Justice John Roberts noted that it is a sordid business, this divvying us up by race (The Monitor’s View, 2006).

The Supreme Court, District Courts and Appeals Courts analyze emerging cases often through the lenses of prior cases. The most recent affirmative action case in June 2007 referred to many of the reverse discrimination cases identified below. When the high court debates educational affirmative action cases, advocates for both sides of the issue file pro and con file briefs. Strong advocates of affirmative action engaged in political action include The American Council on Education, The American Educational Research Association, The National Collegiate Athletic Association, American Association of Community Colleges, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, American Association of University Professors, The College Board, The Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities, National Council for College Admissions and Counseling, 19 former chancellors of the University of California as well as over 550 social scientists filed briefs supporting affirmative action.

Opponents of affirmative action include The U.S. Justice Department, the National Association of Scholars, American Civil Rights Institute, The Center for Equality of Opportunity, The Center for Individual Rights, The Pacific Legal Foundation, Scholars such as Abigail and Stephen Thernstrom. These individuals and groups challenge affirmative action on the basis that its policies violate the U.S. Constitution’s Equal Protection Law. With a seriously polarized society and congress, it is clear that appointments to the Supreme Court will reflect the majority in that legislative body. Further, as has been seen by the grueling legislative grilling of Justice Roberts, confirmation to the high court will be challenging.

Affirmative Action Watersheds

*Plessy v. Ferguson* 1896 Separate but equal public facilities including education.

*Brown v. Board of Education* 1954 Separate but equal facilities in education struck down. School to integrate for fairness and justice.

*Brown v. Board of Education* 1955. School segregation to end forthwith.


Reverse Discrimination Cases


Reverse Discrimination. Question of the role of race in university admissions. Race not quotas may be used as one criterion for admissions. Most cases 5-4.


*Grutter v. Boliinder* (U of Michigan 2003). Reverse Discrimination Question of giving special consideration to minorities for law school admissions. Race can be used to achieve a compelling state interest in student diversity.

Gratz a mover and shaker in Michigan legislation to limit affirmative action in the state. Voters approved eliminating affirmative action 2006.

*Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1* (2007, June 28) Reverse discrimination in public schools. High court struck down use of race as a basis for admission to public schools. Justice Kennedy’s swing vote left the door open for the use of race in school admissions. But narrow focus and strict scrutiny was to be followed.

School districts should make good faith efforts to avoid labeling and sorting students by race . It is interesting to note that the Jefferson County Kentucky school district whose reverse discrimination lawsuit was combined with Parents Involved has decided to continue to use race in student school assignments but with an attempt to meet the high court’s ruling for strict scrutiny in using such a strategy.

Other Cases.

*Adarand Constructors v. Pena* (1995) affirmative action should be based on narrowly focused assignments tailored to achieve a compelling governmental interest. The latest Parents Involved Case referred to Adarand and also stipulated the importance of strict scrutiny in dealing with racial school assignments. Efforts were to be made to find other ways then reverse discrimination to achieve compelling state interests of diversity. Justice Roberts noted that the way to stop discriminating on race is to stop discrimination on race. He further wrote that simply because a school district may seek a worthy goal does not mean that they are free to discriminate on the basis of race to achieve it, or that their racial
classifications should be subject to less exacting scrutiny.

**Future of Affirmative Action**

Finding other means of achieving diversity will be a goal of school districts. Using income as a basis for affirmative action is increasingly used. However in Louisville, Kentucky the school district will continue to use race but in such a way as to meet the stipulated restrictions of the Supreme Court ruling.

Attempts for evidence based research in education are challenging. The high court uses the expertise of educators, historians, sociologists, comparative theorists and researchers of note in coming to its rulings. The evidence is always murky when based on social justice which is hard to quantify. Thus in the most recent affirmative action case, there were wide ranges to provide evidence of student diversity. In Seattle the range was 41 percent white students and 59 percent minority. In Louisville, Kentucky the range was a minimum of black enrollment of 15 percent and a maximum of 50 percent.

Watershed cases demonstrate democracy in theory and practice. The court and school districts continue to search for routes to a more humane society based on economic and social justice. The focus should be on better schools and highly qualified teachers. There are variations in how to achieve that objective. The Supreme Court rulings through the years suggest there are challenges and opportunities in dealing with affirmative action. Women and minorities have been given opportunities for equal access and opportunity.

The support for affirmative action includes many of the nation’s institutions including education, the military, the business and industrial community, religious groups and churches. Sandra Day O’Connor noted the influence of these institutional representatives when the high court was completely filled and the streets leading to the Supreme Court were packed with people all advocates for affirmative action. The court one suspects does listen to public opinion expressed through political action advocates. But Justice O’Connor opined that we may not need affirmative action 25 years in the future.
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**OTHER**

CULTURAL WARS- U.S FRAGMENTATION

James Van Patten, Jerry Siegrist and David Snelgrove, Florida Atlantic University, Valdosta State University, University of Central Oklahoma

The Media: Evolution of Distrust

A few years ago Mario Benitez shared Niccolo Machiavelli’s Moral Advice to Political Leaders from The Prince (1513). Niccolo noted that the ultimate goal of politics is to win and prevail over others while running for office, while in office and while being re-elected. This should be the only basis of your morality. The end justifies the means in politics only when the means used are necessary to achieve the ultimate end: be elected and have enough power to be re-elected. Machiavelli’s foresight is clear in our political arena today. Governmental gridlock reflects deepening polarization in society. This polarization and social fragmentation is reflected in school policies and decisions. Affirmative action and the role of religion in education are just two examples of our cultural wars.

Continuing conflict between modernists and postmodernist, traditionalists and advocates of social change, social fragmentation reflected in hard line and moderation in immigration debates, anti-and pro-war are a few of the cultural wars in our era.

Conservative-Liberal Educators

Last year NCATE removed a social justice requirement titled “professional dispositions” from its accreditation agenda due to complaints from conservative activists. Laurie Moses Hines, likens disposition evaluations to the loyalty oaths and “mental hygiene” requirements teachers faced during the first half of the twentieth century. The “professional dispositions” reflected a social justice agenda that required teacher education candidates to have the right perspective multiculturalism, ethnicity, and diversity to name a few. At the 2007 AERA annual meeting advocates of social justice stressed the challenge of anti-gay violence, social inequality and the obligation of teacher-training programs to include a commitment to the public good. Two dozen activists wore bright red clothing in protest of AERA’s cowardice in recent policy disputes. Conservative activists and conservative civil rights groups have condemned advocates of professional dispositions. Conservative activists claim universities unconstitutionally use professional dispositions to bully prospective teachers into accepting left wing orthodoxies (Glenn, 2007).

“If we are to have freedom of the mind in America, we must produce a generation of men and women who will tower above the press, as well as the crowd, and make tolerance for all ideas the symbol of virtue.”


Traditional Limited Information Channels.

A variety of factors has led to distrust of politicians at all power levels. One of the factors has been the power of multimedia outlets to develop and form public opinion. Purvis (2007) notes that there is consolidation of media ownership among a small number of large conglomerates. While there is a decline in print readership, web sites and blogs are gaining as an alternative to tradition news distribution. The Nixon, Clinton fiascos demonstrated media attacks on structure, authority and leadership. Lawyers were deeply involved on both sides of the issue for each of these leaders. Until the Nixon years, there was more trust in governmental leaders. During the Nixon years new phenomena appeared. Individuals in government with access to secret and privileged information became major leakers.

Deep throat was an example of disseminating inside information. In succeeding years, divisiveness, fragmentation, single interest groups have used both litigation and the feeding frenzy of media search for stories that sell. In the George W. Bush administrations, insiders sold books attacking their president. In a democracy the right to know and the protection of the fourth estate-news, requires transparency. However, using fourth estate protection to distribute and disseminate unsubstantiated beliefs, opinions and outright misinformation on a 24-7 basis is detrimental to required stability in governmental structure. Historians will lose valuable information as Presidential films, videotapes, taping of conferences, consultations with governmental officials, records of Presidential advise seeking will no longer be available after the Nixon years. Lyndon Johnson administration was the last one to have a record of his private and public life through films, taping of oval office conversations and consultations. Media attacks on educators and education are reflected in public opinion holding schooling in low regard. However, as Phi Delta Kappa annual polls note, parents criticize educators but support those teachers and administrators in schools their children attend.

Monitoring Quality of Internet Information.

A journalist Henry (2007) notes the strengths and weaknesses of an Internet age. On the one hand all parts of the world are reachable by wireless communication, cell phone, and satellite networks. Direct and immediate
digital transfers of text, sound, high resolution still images, and video and instant Web publication, are accessible by computers worldwide. On the other hand there is exploitation of the technology to disseminate rumor, lies, artifice, propaganda, and distortion. A growing array of unprofessional practices, intentional frauds, and other forms of corruption are represented in the culture of the nation’s media. Blogging has become increasingly popular. The American Association of School Administrators and the National Association of Elementary School Principals are getting involved through their annual association meetings.

Blogging by school administrators

Archer (2007) identified typical administrator blogs.

The Worthless Lesson Plan

I say that we should start a revolution and quit making teachers fill our lesson plans for us but instead prepare for great classroom instruction.

Potential New Hires

I’m more convinced than ever that teaching requires risk takers, people with passion about something outside of the classroom, like their hockey team, the band they’ve been playing in for years or fish.

Parent Conference From Across the Globe

I put him on speaker phone and he participated in the parent conference from Iraq. It was mind-boggling that his father could take the time out from his stressful job in the middle of a war zone to talk with us about how his child was doing in math and reading.

So What Would You Tell the Congressman?

Someone at the federal decision making level needs to spend some time in the classrooms of today and see if this level of accountability is worth it.

Administrator’s use of blogs will be limited as such information can be subjects for litigation. The Internet age with one minute sound bites, blogging, identity theft, 24-7 cultural politics of personal and corporate destruction, misinformation, public opinion manipulation, distrust of authority at all governmental and institutional levels, hackers, and round the clock talking heads, make this a challenging time for reasoned discourse and timely compromise. Such media influence and power leads or will lead to governmental and institutional instability. There is no privacy on the Internet. Users need to be aware that anything they write can be accessed and may result in protracted litigation as is seen in current political machination of information. Educators need to be proactive in monitoring student internet use and encouraging critical inquiry in Internet use.

Litigation

Litigation is the name of the game in American society as all major corporations face lawsuits many of which are either fishing expeditions or outright frivolous as witness the massive lawsuit against a mom and pop store over a pair of pants. Even class action lawyers were embarrassed by the lawsuit. Reading First Programs and College Student Financial Aid officials both were shown to be manipulated to get money, and to use only those agencies that would give various forms of kickbacks. The firing of Ward Churchill was based on his intellectual dishonesty and plagiarism not on his constitutional free speech rights. Professors may use a variety of methods to get students engaged in intellectual inquiry, but the AAUP 1940 Commission on Rights and Responsibilities stress the importance of living up to high standards of discourse and concentration on academic specialization. However, in the humanities there is a degree of subjectivity and constitutional free speech protections exist even for those who take unpopular positions. On a more basic level, all of us in the educational enterprise face unexpected litigation. A school bus driver in one of our rural school districts put her hand on a student’s shoulder to tell the student the importance of not running in front on coming traffic. The child’s parents brought a lawsuit accusing the bus driver of false imprisonment. The bus driver had to hire a lawyer to defend herself. This creates fear in other staff members that they may offend some parents and face litigation. Another bus driver friend tells difficult students that if they misbehave he will take them to the principal’s office after having been accused of child abuse when he took a student by the arm to teach the importance of manners. When the bus driver now takes the unruly child to the principal’s office, his action is not well received by the principal who has in his view other more pressing issues. We may well see another form of litigation due to the use of blackboard turitin to check for cheating and plagiarism sweeping the public school and higher education student bodies.

Kenneth H. Ryesky (2007) discusses America’s growing litigious over the past few decades as well as an upswing of litigation in instances of schools actions against students for plagiarism.

Sensitivity to Diverse Populations

Political correctness prevails in American society. Sensitivity to beliefs and feelings of others, however, is essential in society and education. History demonstrates various forms of political correctness. The Spanish Inquisition, the era of McCarthyism, and our own Puritan heritage. Ann Hutchinson’s challenge to clergy authority led to a religious synod in 1637 to deal with the issue. Clergy in attendance issued eighty-two unsafe
opinions, and nine unwholesome expressions as Ann was banished from Old Massachusetts Bay Colony (Erickson, 1966). Constitutional free speech rights are no barrier to the power of single interests groups using media to force individuals who use language that might be offensive to be dismissed from their jobs. Unintended off the cuff remarks may offend some individual or group leading to job dismissal especially high profile individuals. While many individuals use language that may be offensive to others in private life, national recognized individuals need to be especially sensitive to language usage. The Islamic World including Saudi Arabia often have religious police (mutaween), called the Commission for the Promotion of Virtue and the Prevention of Vice. These police crossed the line of humanity in 2002 when they prevented school girls from leaving a burning building because they lacked head dress (BBC News, 2001).

Diane Ravitch’s *The Language Police: How Pressure Groups Restrict What Students Learn* illustrates the power of special interest groups in determining acceptable language usage, curriculum content, and values students ought to be taught. She discusses dumbing down the educational process to assure there is no bias. With self righteous pedagogical censors making sure students encounter only texts that meet a daunting list of guidelines for including multiculturalism and excluding all kinds of perceived biases, Ravitch questions how it is possible to transmit our culture to the younger generation.

**Affirmative action**

An effort to correct past historical injustice, has been in litigation since Plessy v. Ferguson (1896) and Brown v. Board of Education (1954). After over half a century of legal ruling on race based admissions and school assignments, the Supreme Court in Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1 (June 28, 2007) ruled against race based policies in Seattle and Louisville. In a 5-4 split decision much like Bakke (1978) the justices disagreed over the continued use of racial placements to achieve diversity. In the Parents v. Seattle Cases, Justice Anthony Kennedy, the swing vote, indicated race could still be used but in a narrow strict scrutiny manner (Bravin and Golden, 2007). One can say without equivocation, affirmative action in all its forms, will be the subject of further Supreme Court rulings in the future.

**Religion in Public Schools and Higher Education**

Religion has been a subject of litigation and controversy since 1791 when the first amendment to the constitution included the statements that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of people to peaceably assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Although court decisions may be modified over time, Lemon v. Kurtzman (1971), although weakened considerably in recent court rulings, has been a model for the role of government and religion in schools. The Lemon test includes, first, the statute must have a secular legislative purpose; second the principal or primary effect must be one that neither advances nor prohibits religion and third, that there shall be no governmental entanglement with religion (Alexander and Alexander, 2001). With more religious diversity in the United States, it is increasingly difficult to follow Thomas Jefferson’s concept of a wall of separation between the school and state. Educational and constitutional law professionals continue to debate the role of religion in society and schools. Most scholars and legal rulings have called for separation of religion and public schools. However Haynes (2007) discusses school administrators and teachers in Carver Elementary School, San Diego who were confronted with a large influx of Somali Muslims whose religion requires praying five times a day. Administrators set aside 15 minutes a day during school time for Muslim student prayer. Other students could study or use the time as they saw fit. Critics of the right and left, according to Haynes, called the policy a violation of the First Amendment’s establishment clauses, and as a double standard that favors one religion over others. The San Diego School District eliminated the practice of letting Muslim students pray during school time and moved prayer to recess periods due to a continuing outcry from critics. School administrators will try recess time as a period when students could pray or play as they choose under teacher supervision. With a rapidly growing Muslim population America’s institutions will be encouraged to adjust to diverse cultures. Huffstutter (2007) reported that the University of Michigan’s Dearborn campus is installing foot baths for Muslim student’s prayer requirements. With 11 percent of the student population Muslim, university authorities made provision for prayer rugs and footbaths. The issue has become controversial as critics find such action with some 2,000 different religious groups a slippery slope. Separation of church and state will continue to be an issue as religious demands for special accommodations will increase in the future. Whatever the end result of the Iraqi war, there will be a significant increase of Iraqis coming to the U.S. as refugees. These cultural challenges will continue to grow as new demographics
involve heterogeneous not homogenous populations.

Our Future

As we face the end of the first decade of our 21st century, history shows us that the challenges we face have been faced by educators in the past. Schools continue in our time as in the past to be seen as a universal panacea to cure all social ills. As Dewey once noted schools are miniature societies. All the challenges affecting society, influence our schools, their curriculum and students perceptions and attitudes. In turn as we help our future generations learn both academics and personal responsibility for being the best one can be, we can be assured our children will influence society positively. As members of our society have discussed critical current and past issues in education, we have shared our critical inquiry in the spirit of collegiality.

We have taken home new information and knowledge to share with our students. Our society is always an inspiration as we gain insights from our mutual exchange and dialogue. From each other we gain not only new insights, but strength to carry on in our mission of teaching and administration. The items covered in this paper will be debated and discussed in the future and they have been in the past. The strains and stresses in an open society in the long run are our strengths as Dewey once noted we are always in the process of building a greater community. Our emerging community will be more diverse and multiracial than in the past. Our educators will need to address the changing demographics which now include California and all major inner cities in the country as a majority minority.

In other words, minorities make up the majority of the population. While reactionary politicians push for more border walls and law enforcement patrols, the Supreme Court in Plyler v. Doe (1982) ruled that undocumented children have a right to a free public education as do U.S. citizens and permanent residents. Public school personnel are prohibited under Plyler from taking actions that would deny children access to education because of their immigrant status. The child benefit concept is part of our humane national heritage. We will continue to develop a philosophy of humaneness in theory and practice as we honor and respect our students in their career and academic endeavors.
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United States is still coming to terms with its own loyalty of the individual members of society. The plethora of cultural groups that compete for the ruling culture is reluctant to share power and the interest of the many will outweigh the interest of the few but that the rights of the few will not be unduly limited. Tyranny of the majority is just as abhorrent as the tyranny of the minority or the tyranny of an individual. John Dunne writes, “The principle of democratic rule is equality, the presumption that, when it comes to shaping a community and exercising power, everyone’s judgement deserves as much weight as everyone else’s.” Democracy implies nowadays the desire for the maximum of freedom, human rights, and, increasingly, economic prosperity. The fact that competition among citizens, cultural groups, and economic groups leads to some in the society having more freedom, human rights, and economic prosperity indicates that democratic society has not yet achieved all that it can. Add to that the dilemma of freedom versus security and it becomes obvious that we can sometimes take backward steps in the attainment of the kind of open society that is most desired.

Democracy has also become the only means to legitimate a government. Dunne said, “What we mean by democracy is not that we govern ourselves . . . (but that) the government that does so much to organize our lives, draws its legitimacy from us . . . . from holding regular elections, in which every adult citizen can vote freely and without fear . . . their votes have reasonably equal weight. . . . Any uncriminalized political opinion can compete freely for them.”

One citizen, one vote in a marketplace of political ideas and politicians who compete for the right to govern is the democratic ideal.

When it comes to this principle of legitimacy, Paul Woodruff suggests that democracy is plagued by confusion with its doubles. He identifies three doubles that should cause us some concern. Woodruff’s doubles are voting, majority rule, and elected representatives.
“Voting,” he says, “does not make a democracy . . . . A clique’s control of the nomination process (can throw) an election out of bounds. What is crucial to democracy is how issues and candidates are chosen and presented for voting.”

Do the voters have any real say in what they are voting on or have they been given choices between which there is little or no difference? Governor George Wallace running for President as a segregationist third-party candidate in 1968 said there wasn’t a dime’s worth of difference between the other two parties.

Majority rule, Woodruff’s second double, can lead to mob rule. He writes, “Mob rule is plainly a kind of tyranny; it frightens and excludes and puts the minority under the absolute power of the majority. And the tyranny of the majority kills freedom as dead as any other form of tyranny. It’s not freedom if you have to join the majority in order to feel that you are free.” It is the rule of law that restrains the majority. What, however, is the source of the law and who is to judge whether laws are in the best interests of the democracy?

Woodruff’s third double, elected representatives, guarantees the representation of special interests and political parties more than the interests of the citizens who elected them. Rule of law requires lawmakers who have the best interests of the people at heart. But it seems that we increasing are faced with political candidates whose primary interest is self or partisan. To guarantee the continued political power of the parties, safe voting districts are created, greatly increasing the likelihood of reelection of the incumbent or the election of a replacement of the same party. “The political party that controls the state draws the districts in such a way as to determine the results in its favor.” This is not a new phenomenon, Patrick Henry in the Virginia Legislature got legislation passed to try to guarantee that James Madison not be elected to the first Congress.

Oklahoma and Texas are two examples of states which have redistricted to favor the continued success of the majority party. The Texas Democratic Caucus left the state to deny the legislature a quorum to draw attention to the redistricting problem. Districts in many other states have been carefully drawn to provide an advantage for one party or the other. Usually the needs of the people in those districts are of secondary consideration if they are considered at all. Woodward says,

(A) government is a democracy, insofar as it tries to express the seven ideas: freedom from tyranny, harmony, the rule of law, natural equality, citizen wisdom, reasoning without knowledge, and general education. I might add virtues such as justice and reverence, but these are so widely admired that they do not pick out a system of government.”

He goes on to say that, “Three of them—harmony, the rule of law, and freedom-belong to every ancient theory of good government . . . . The remaining four ideas are specific to democracy, and they are all related to one another: natural equality, citizen wisdom, reasoning without knowledge, and general education.

Partisan political activity did not make Woodwards’s list but seems to be the most common attribute of contemporary politics.

Many of these problems have been known for centuries. The Old Oligarch, discussing Athenian democracy observed that “the cream of society is in opposition to the democracy.” The cream of society wishes to lead and in the process of leading, to guarantee that they will be allowed to continue to lead and to limit the ability of opponents to wrest the leadership from them. Laws seldom increase the amount of freedom. They usually impose further limits on the freedoms of the citizens.

The idea of pluralism is also a modern concept. Great civilizations of the past were not pluralist societies, they were societies in which a dominant culture rules and the non dominant cultures were ruled. Even the first democracies were monistic, not pluralistic. James Madison in Federalist 10 recognized political pluralism would keep any one set of political beliefs from dominating the government by allowing competing factions to ensure political competition. Political pluralism is only one aspect. Pluralism in society demands that various racial, ethnic, economic, religious, political, ideological, linguistic, and social behaviors and beliefs be accepted within a broader social framework that is the modern state. It might be argued that the ruling culture is reluctant to share power with the plethora of subcultures that compete for the loyalty of the individual members of society.

Americanization, the assimilation of immigrant cultures, held sway in the United States until well after World War I. Americanization was a nativist movement which sought to remove the ways of the original cultures of the emigrants. Native languages were especially subject to eradication. The melting pot theory allowed for some aspects of immigrant culture to cross into American culture. Cultural pluralism essentially rejected cultural assimilation and insisted that immigrant cultures be maintained as the immigrants became Americanized and that cultural and economic rights be added to the legal rights already guaranteed by the Bill of Rights and the Constitution. Americanization was accomplished in the public schools. Training of the
immigrant child to become a good American citizen was one of the important tasks of the school systems across the country. Often that meant punishment for students caught using their native language and the study of foreign language and non American culture was limited in the schools.

While cultural pluralism was allied with the more progressive political ideas, not all progressives were pluralists. Theodore Roosevelt supported English language only and Woodrow Wilson condemned ethnic associations and anything that might be seen to advance foreign interests. The Johnson-Reed Act of 1924 made it clear that northern and western English-speaking immigrants were to be preferred to southern and central Europeans and certainly to those from Asia and Africa.

The term “cultural pluralism” was coined by Horace Kallen, Jewish emigre philosopher and longtime friend of John Dewey. Kallen first spoke of cultural pluralism, he says, in George Santayana’s Harvard classroom where Alain Locke was a student and Kallen was Santayana’s assistant. By 1915, Kallen had expressed in print the idea of pluralism applied to culture. Kallen first used ‘cultural pluralism’ in print in 1924 in Culture and Democracy in the United States where he wrote,

The standpoint of these essays can be described briefly as Cultural Pluralism. The outcome of the observation they embody is the view that democracy is an essential prerequisite to culture, that culture can be and sometimes is a fine flowering of democracy, and that the history of the relation of the two in the United States exhibits this fact.

An earlier essay of Kallen, “Democracy Versus the Melting Pot,” was more focused on the group as the primary source of identity. For Kallen the United States was a federation of enduring cultures, a celebration of difference. Kallen, in reaction to the assimilationist idea of the melting pot, developed the analogy of the symphony orchestra to describe the role of cultural groups in American society. Kallen’s symphony emphasized the integrity and autonomy of ethno-racial groups. He defended the right of immigrants to resist Anglo-Protestant assimilation and maintain cohesive cultural communities. Kallen’s friend, John Dewey, viewed Kallen’s ideas as extreme and warned him against the undemocratic dangers of segregation and identifying individuals too closely with groups. Kallen later expanded his view of cultural pluralism. He wrote,

In my mind, here is what it fundamentally signifies: first, a concept that social science and social philosophy can and do employ as a working hypothesis concerning human nature and human relations; second, an ethical ideal---an article of faith which challenges certain prevailing philosophical conceptions about both. It postulates that individuality is indefeasible, that differences are primary, and that consequently human beings have an indefeasible right to their differences and should not be penalized for their differences, however they may be constituted, whatever they may consist in: color, faith, sex, occupation, possessions, or what have you.

Randolph Bourne, a World War I era radical, anticipated the pluralism of the 20th and 21st centuries. In his essay, “Trans National America,” he observed that the metaphor of the “melting pot” was no longer applicable. He called for a new cosmopolitanism in which the cultures of the then new waves of immigrants would be accepted for the contributions that they could make to American culture. He recognized the role of the schools in the development of a cosmopolitan America but not through the teaching of myth and patriotism as a replacement for history. He wrote,

We cannot Americanize America worthily by sentimentalizing and moralizing history. When the best schools are expressly renouncing the questionable duty of teaching patriotism by means of history, it is not the time to force shibboleth upon the immigrant. This form of Americanization has been heard because it appealed to the vestiges of our old sentimentalized and moralized patriotism. This has so far held the field as the expression of the new American's new devotion. The inflections of other voices have been drowned. They must be heard.

Bourne wanted to extend the American dream to all comers but to enlarge the American dream to include their own aspirations and wants could be realized. He believed

All our idealisms must be those of future social goals in which all can participate, the good life of personality lived in the environment of the Beloved Community. No mere doubtful triumphs of the past, which redound to the glory of only one of our trans-nationalities, can satisfy us. It must be a future America, on which all can unite, which pulls us irresistibly toward it, as we understand each other more warmly.

The goal of culture wars was always to gain social, political, or economic advantage. The desired outcome was a society with some type of peaceful coexistence among the various groups that comprise it. Our problem now is that there are groups, national and extra national, who will not accept peaceful coexistence but demand the destruction of the society in order to recreate it according to a specific design.
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IMPORTANT LESSONS FROM MOTHER: AUTHORING THE EDUCATED SELF

Virginia Worley, Oklahoma State University

Introduction

Although she apparently felt a mixture of love, hate, and hostility toward her own mother, Françoise, Simone de Beauvoir (1958/1959) writes about the relationship between her mother and her in Memoirs of a Dutiful Daughter. Whether consciously or not, de Beauvoir (1958/1959) simultaneously details her mother’s teachings, narrates her own educational experiences, and as a result exposes the patriarchal pins that link, separate, and stick mother and daughter throughout Simone’s childhood and adolescence. Their relationship evolves within the educational context her mother Françoise creates at home and later revolves around Simone’s demands for education. As Simone’s first teacher, Françoise teaches her all the delicacies of bourgeois manners, good taste, and breeding; teaches her the joy of reading, learning, and writing, teaches her responsibility for others less fortunate than she, and teaches her the value of frugality and hard work. In the process, she also teaches Simone to value and privilege the mind over the body and to create/author herself over and over again throughout her life. It is upon her mother’s teaching her to create herself that I want to focus, using the first volume of her memoirs, Memoirs of a Dutiful Daughter (1958/1959) as my primary source and Susan Franzosa’s (1992) “Authoring the Educated Self” as my guide. Although Susan Franzosa (1992) bases her theorizing upon Foucault’s analyses, especially those in Discipline and Punish (1977), I site Franzosa rather than Foucault because I emphasize the patterns she unveils as they apply to educational narratives in general and to Memoirs of a Dutiful Daughter (1958/1959) in particular.

According to Susan Franzosa (1992), authors of educational narratives often depict their childhood realization and subsequent accommodation and resistance to the school’s institutional power to normalize children to fit the institutional structure. Once at school, the children discover how they differ from others and whether the larger social culture beyond their respective families regards those differences as gifts or defects (Franzosa, 1992, p. 395). Because one object of schooling is to cause everyone to conform to a particular social and cultural ideal, children often experience self-alienation as a result of schooling. To contest and resist the school’s power to form identities and to reclaim the authority to create themselves as subjects, some children become adults whose narratives of educational experiences displace the school’s authority to form them thereby authoring their educated selves as they write their educational autobiographies (Franzosa, 1992, pp. 395-396).

Although in Memoirs of a Dutiful Daughter de Beauvoir (1958/1959) works through the process Franzosa (1992) describes, she does so in reverse; that is, rather than undergoing a process of normalization, accommodation, and resistance at school, upon adolescence (12-13) she works through this process at home. Because home has always been school, because its role as school intensifies as Simone’s father supplements her school assignments which seem to him shallow, silly, nonsensical religious propaganda, and because both home and school are powerful social institutions constructed according to patriarchal ideals, Simone’s movement toward displacing the authorities of these two institutions to form herself as her own “subject” is not only difficult but scarring. In this paper, I use Memoirs of a Dutiful Daughter (1958/1959) to trace the process of de Beauvoir’s creating herself during the first fourth of her life, beginning with her discovering that she is different from others both in her family group and in the larger social culture, her alienation from her peers, her contesting the school’s power to educate, and then her difficult transition, not from home to school, but from her mother’s teaching to her father’s and from her place of esteem in their hearts to the place of their disappointment and sometimes scorn.

When visiting her extended family in the country, Simone as a young child discovers that her gifts not only reveal her difference from others but that those differences are defects, first in the larger society of her extended family and later when that larger society includes school and the homes of classmates. She does not, however, identify that her gifts might not be defects had she been a boy. Perhaps because Simone had no brothers, she does not arrive at school with the knowledge that boys do different things at school than girls, or that girls are supposed to be silly and shallow. She sees her difference, wants to be liked, popular, and included, but doesn’t want to be like “them”—her silly classmates. In her first years at school, Simone does not experience the process of normalization and accommodation that Franzosa (1958/1959) maps as typical because from the beginning she dislikes the silly behavior of her fellow students and is unaware of what
“normal” means for girls. While recognizing her difference from others, Simone does not comply outwardly because she has desire to normalize neither to their behaviors nor the institution’s expectations. She dislikes what they are too much to want to accommodate and “normalize” and has had so little exposure to boys she can’t see that her peers are what girls are expected to be. She is the odd one—for a girl. Thus, although the process Franzosa (1958/1959) outlines results in the child’s alienation from his/her true self, his/her creating an “authentic private space” where he/she hides that true self while outwardly complying, Simone does not depict the school structure, curriculum or classroom setting as inciting self-alienation but alienation from her peers. She does, nevertheless, conceal an inner place—not where she hides her true self—but where she grieves her alienation from other girls because she has refused to comply.

In Franzosa’s (1992) pattern, the next step is resistance, and Simone indeed resists. Simone sees her difference as good in part because her parents have always encouraged and supported her difference, a difference that had manifested itself as intelligence, quickness, vivacity, and independence. Her mother taught her to use that intelligence to question and then modeled that behavior by openly engaging the teacher’s and students’ reason, openly questioning the teacher’s judgment when the teacher criticizes Simone’s hard work, frugality, and self-imposed time schedule during and after WWI. She also notices how her parents carefully familiarize themselves with everything she does at school and then contest the school’s power to educate by supplementing the curriculum once Simone comes home from school. Internalizing such lessons, Simone then takes action, contests the school’s power and power to educate independently of her parents. She and her only friend ZaZa, for example, do this contesting by making fun of the simplistic, often religious school readings and the ignorance of the teachers who have their students memorize pages from books because they do not know enough to teach anything. Though discrete in their mockery, the fact that they mock the school, its teachers, and its curriculum itself acts to contest the school’s power and especially its power to educate.

What Franzosa (1992) describes as a difficult transition from home to school is instead an easy one for Simone in part because it aligns with the school-like atmosphere she has at home, is the discipline, routine, and many hours devoted to learning that she faces at school. Simone de Beauvoir (1958/1959) nevertheless describes a multifaceted and difficult transition comparable to that of beginning school: the transition from being a little girl to being an adolescent that results in a transition from her mother’s teaching and supervising her education to her father’s teaching and supervising her education and in the transition from her parents’ pride in her, her intelligence, quickness, and independence to their embarrassment, confusion, and ultimately their disappointment and sometimes scorn.

Upon Simone’s adolescence, her father takes away what has always belonged to Françoise—teaching Simone. Now that Simone is an adolescent, her father dismisses her, Françoise, indicating that he will now take on the job of discussing supplementary texts with Simone. Simone struggles to free herself from her mother’s control and watchful eye, transferring her affection to her father with whom she has a “love affair of the mind.” Françoise has taught her to stand up for herself, to sanctify books and learning, and to be proud of her difference and ability to transcend society’s objections to that difference. She has also taught her a sense of social conscience, to help other people in need, whether with her time or her material possessions. Now, in her adolescence, Simone does stand up for herself and the sanctity of books and learning by refusing to help her mother with the domestic tasks, first excusing herself because she must study for exams and later refusing to waste her time on such unimportant things that she hates, and wants never to associate herself. With her husband’s and father’s loss of money from bad investments, with family illnesses, and with the devastation that fell after World War I, Françoise has no household help, continues to attend school all day with Simone (as is expected of her), and must single-handedly take care of her nuclear and extended families. In this time of need, Françoise experiences first hand her failure to temper her teachings of her daughter’s mind by nourishing her emotional development and sensitivity to others. Although she taught her social conscience, although Simone read Little Women and identifies with the March sisters’ dislike of housework, and although she soon gives her time to a night school for working class girls, she will not help her mother who is physically and emotionally drained, and who is now left with no pleasures to help her experience the joy of living she so values and has taught Simone to value. Indeed, because Françoise continues to keep up with Simone’s school work, sneaking books that Simone must read in order to read them herself, the adolescent Simone not only refuses to help her mother with the many domestic tasks but accuses the intellectually curious Françoise of being nosy and trying to control her mind.
A more difficult transition than moving from her mother’s teaching and supervision to her father’s is the transition from her esteemed place in her parents’ hearts to their embarrassment and confusion upon Simone’s reaching adolescence. This change does not occur because Simone has changed who she is. Instead, her parents, who have fostered only her mind and who have never hinted that her female destiny required her to be something other than a mind, suddenly, become irritated at her failure to conform to the norm. Her father, for example, likes that she is smart, but doesn’t understand why she isn’t pretty and graciously pouring out cups of tea at tea parties like other girls her age. He accuses her of being ugly, shifts his attention to her pretty, lively sister Hélène, and excludes Simone from outings to the park and the theater.

Her mother also likes her intelligence, seems to find Simone much like herself, yet she too becomes disappointed not by her appearance but by her rejection of God and Catholicism, wishing her to conform to her previous religious zeal. For the first time, Françoise seems to realize that Simone’s behavior does not fit her destiny. Though Françoise has carefully helped to create and shape Simone’s identity through her own teaching, upon Simone’s adolescence, she doesn’t understand why Simone thinks so differently than she, why she doesn’t behave more like other girls. Once an adolescent, when her parents, representing the institution(s) of home-school, push her to normalize and accommodate society’s expectations of her, she refuses to comply, fights incessantly against their wishes, and always resists becoming the “jeune fille” (young girl) society has institutionalized. Though painful, resistance to the confines of these new expectations comes fairly easily, for it is her parents who are changing how they wish to characterize and form her after having successfully formed her identity as a mind and because she has always resisted behaving like other girls since she did not like their silliness.

Important to the themes of normalization, accommodation, and resistance and especially interesting and significant to the process of authoring the self is Simone’s change in how she views her parents and her ultimately associating her mother with the spiritual and her father with the intellectual. Specifically, Simone links her rejection of God with her father’s rejection of her. “You are ugly.” Simone “keeps” her father, associated with intellect, after he rejects her, but she gives up God. She disengages from the spiritual as she rejects Françoise. While someone on the outside might say that Simone was confused about the masculine and the feminine, she was not confused until now. Now what she identifies as masculine and feminine becomes muddled since God and the spiritual go together for her and she rejects both, yet associates her father’s maleness with the maleness of God the Father. Ultimately, she chooses the masculine over the feminine, the male over the female, her father over her mother. She, within this context, does conform, for though she may not conform to society’s expectations of her as a young woman, she does conform to her father’s allocating her mind to the masculine: “you have the mind of a man,” something she would say of herself for years to come. He, whom she associates with intelligence, rejects Françoise as having a lesser mind, the mind of a woman who is now out of her league when it comes to directing Simone’s education. Thus, Simone too rejects Françoise as lesser, resents her reading her school books, scoffs, like her father, at her religion and spirituality (though Françoise doesn’t force it down anyone’s throat). Simone has fallen perfectly into the oppressor’s hands where in many ways she remains even as she writes and works against oppression as an adult. The master-slave relationship, which never really existed between her and her mother since Françoise was not only her teacher but fellow learner and study companion, reverses. Now Françoise resembles the slave girl, forbidden to read, who sneaks the forbidden book she identifies with pleasure and happiness, a transgression for which her master, Simone punishes her severely. Simone’s aversion to associating with intelligent, attractive women and more poignantly her hostility toward any intelligent woman’s association, however casual, with Sartre seems to have its roots here. Françoise will not, if Simone can prevent it, have access to the same knowledge she has and shares with her father in their love affair of the mind.

Simone too sneaks the forbidden, for she has a “man’s mind,” something for which she too may be punished, for despite her obsession to understand herself through writing and reading, she does not succeed, even through telling the tale of her education in doing what Franzosa (1958/1959) and other philosophers of educational narrative have discerned most educational autobiographers do. First, she never transforms and overthrows the home-school’s control in spite of the external appearance of rebellion and resistance (Franzosa, 1992, p. 411). Her mother’s moral values, love of reading, life, and learning, her mother’s sacrosanct respect for books, her social conscience, her discrete unobtrusive help of others, her financial generosity even when she herself is without, her high, often prudish moral standards, her belief in hard work, her efficient use of time, and her belief in action
perfectly describe the adult Simone de Beauvoir. Second, Simone never seems to understand the relations of power she experienced in her childhood and adolescent home-school even after her extensive research in psychology, women’s history, and man-made myths of the feminine and after her reading and listening to thousands of stories women recounted of their own experiences with oppression (Franzosa, 1992, p. 411). Even as her mother lies dying, de Beauvoir blames her mother for everything bad in her life and praises her father for everything good. Nevertheless, she rarely includes a father in her works and doesn’t write much about her own father who becomes increasingly invisible even in *Memories of a Dutiful Daughter* (1958/1959). In contrast, she writes repeatedly about mothers and daughters and writes books in which her mother appears as a primary character. Third, Simone de Beauvoir never understands the significant factors in her own development as an educated person, for even in her interviews with her biographer, D. Baird (1990), she continued to state that she got everything from her father and nothing from her mother (Franzosa, 1992, p. 411).

*Memoirs of a Dutiful Daughter* (1958/1959) is an important contribution by a philosopher who criticized and rejected all things maternal and whom one seldom perceives as addressing education. This work is nevertheless educational philosophy: a writing of the educated self, the educated self in community, and the educated selves/identities of women in their early years. De Beauvoir (1958/1959) teaches that one’s schooling and home schooling, whether the means of educating or *miseducating,* structures one’s life, influences one’s thinking, one’s actions, one’s self-education, one’s attitudes throughout life, and one’s relationships with men and women. She also demonstrates that school teachers and parent-teachers must engage more than a student’s reason in order to avoid alienating one’s mind from one’s body, family, friends, and community. Such alienation became a loss Simone mourned throughout her life.

* While I am aware that *miseducating* does not appear in the dictionary, it is a word that increasingly appears in education scholarship and that transmits the meaning I wish to communicate here.
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