JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY & HISTORY OF EDUCATION

Society of Philosophy & History of Education 2018 Officers

President, Adam David Roth, University of Rhode Island
President-Elect, Ralph Olliges, Webster University
Past President, Stacy Otto, Illinois State University
Secretary–Treasurer, John Covaleskie, University of Oklahoma
Program Chair, David Snelgrove, Oklahoma State University
Webmaster, Ralph Olliges, Webster University

Journal Editors

Stacy Otto, Illinois State University
Virginia Worley, Oklahoma State University

The *Journal of Philosophy and History of Education* is a publication of the Society of Philosophy & History of Education. Following the 2017 annual meeting of the Society of Philosophy and History of Education in San Antonio, Texas, a call for papers was issued and submissions subjected to the blind review process. The opinions expressed in the respective works are those of the individual authors and do not necessarily reflect the position of the Society, the editors, the Editorial Advisory Board, or the publishers.

Membership in the Society is open to anyone interested in the profession of education. Only members may present papers at the annual meeting. Dues vary in accordance with the vote of the membership and may be mailed to the Secretary-Treasurer or the current Program Chair. Other SoPHE information may be obtained from: http://sopheconference.com

Printed in the U.S.A.

Journal of Philosophy & History of Education

vol. 68, no. 1, 2018

Table of Contents

From the Editors

"A Few Bad Apples": Patriarchy, Misogyny, and the Persistent Myth of Aberration

Given the rapidly accumulating human-rights atrocities in the U.S. and around the world, it is difficult to know what to shout about. I have said this a number of times—maybe you have even heard me say it yourself—, "when the whole world is on fire, it's hard to know where to point the hose." What feels like just a couple of years ago I wrote about young Michael Brown, and as I began this essay it was in fact four years to the day after his unjust death: a death which still knows no justice. In that essay I decry the "ritualistic, destructive treatment of inner-city Black folk [I argue] amounts to nothing short of the manufacture and imposition of *abject terror*."[1] This ritualistic, destructive treatment—this rampant use of visible and invisible terrorism—is baked right into the cake of racism and into all other cultural metanarratives: big, human-created, overarching social systems all of which function as systems of domination. Effective domination *requires terrorism*, both to establish domination and to retain it, requires the constant threat of violence and suffering of the many at the hands of a few. This is most certainly how racism works, racism being "the need to ascribe bone-deep features to people and then humiliate, reduce, and destroy them" that innocently is positioned as emanating straight from "Mother Nature," so racism's naming of whites as "the people" can be "cast as beyond the handiwork of men:"[2] a malevolent project of hierarchy. While many people the world over lately seem to have come to awareness, to see—indeed to witness in real time—racist atrocities as unchecked racism grows visible, strong, and consequential (if only given the Black body count at the hands of law enforcement), what society seems far less wary of, and what often gets lumped under the far-tamer vestige of sexism, lurks another, uncivil grand narrative: patriarchy. And patriarchy may well be the "grandest" narrative of them all.

Patriarchy is a pervasive, insidious social system that not only counts among those social systems deemed "the natural order of things," but, maddeningly, its violent intent is softened by a veil of

paternalism: a sub-narrative alleged to be rooted in care, love, and protection. But neither care nor love are part of patriarchy, for patriarchy, simply put, is a system of violent domination. Indeed, I once heard bell hooks say, "there can be no love between a man and a woman so long as there is patriarchy."[3] Sit with this for a moment—"*there can be no love between a man and a woman so long as there is patriarchy*"—for this is a huge, deeply consequential claim, one I knew to be true the moment I heard it. As I navigate the world as a woman this grim truth is never distant, because as a white, cis-gendered woman I live every day with the threat and consequence of violent patriarchy—in my case a violence uncomplicated by race or queerness, each of which adds to women's day-to-day another thick layer of omnipresent violence. The violence of patriarchy is so well established, it deserves its own terminology: misogyny, a term originating in the late 16th century.[4] Misogyny ratchets up and finely focuses patriarchy's violent mission, toxically rooted in hatred and contempt of women.[5]

My reasoning behind likening the cultural metanarratives patriarchy and racism goes beyond similarities in the ways these narratives exercise domination through terrorism, though those parallels are many. I speak of patriarchy, racism, and, too, misogyny in the same breath because certain metanarratives spawn sub-narratives, systems of domination in their own right dependent upon larger-scale metanarratives to give them life, a violent lineage that spreads its poisonous domination through its fertile progeny, each offspring giving rise to new rules that center the magical qualities of the norm: male, white, heterosexual, English-speaking, able-bodied, Christian, first-world, and wealthy. Arguably, fittingly, patriarchy is the metanarrative that occupies the acme from which many sub-narratives spring, perhaps owing its hierarchical privilege to human history's culturally ingrained cosmologies such as the Ptolemic worldview, which orders every being and object into a great hierarchical chain and system of correspondences positioning man near the chain's beginning and therefore the creature closest to God.[6] Significantly this hierarchal system is predicated on and held together by love, for, in the Ptolemic worldview, without love there is tyranny. And certainly, centuries later, given the dominance of patriarchy, tyranny reigns.[7] But cosmologies and metanarratives are human creations, not celestial ones, and, though they are often touted as emerging from God's will, humans have built patriarchy, granted patriarchy its power, and are all complicit in its "manufacture and imposition of abject terror."[8]

Patriarchy proves to be the dominant metanarrative, provides the dominant system which scaffolds culture, the infrastructure that holds culture together. Indeed, patriarchy sires the great majority of violent

systems of domination: without patriarchy racism, homophobia, and facism cannot arise, without patriarchy misogyny has no meaning. Patriarchy's violent power is schooled and reinforced within social institutions[9]—the military, the church, patriotism, education, to name but a few. Patriarchy's privileged cultural power position is why feminism has not only been no match for patriarchy, but why it has never even remotely challenged patriarchy's power and influence despite feminists' many decades of doing battle, mounting challenge, and conducting critical analysis, protest, politics, and great good deeds. As McRobbie[10] argues, while female success has emerged, feminist success has failed to materialize, calling out dangerous logical error in holding up women's material gains and milestones as if such gains represent genuine challenges to patriarchy's privileged power position. Speaking of war in *Precarious Life*,[11] Judith Butler asks why some lives are worth more than others, revealing patriarchy's most deeply rooted tenet. Yet despite being devalued, hated, violated, and held in abject terror, "select women who are able to participate in the neoliberal global economy [nevertheless seem to] have [adopted or bought into] a subjective sense of [female] empowerment,"[12] even though white women still experience large gender pay gaps (to say nothing of the racialized gender pay gap women of color experience), greatly decreased financial quality of life as a result of divorce in comparison to men, violence and murder at the hands of partners and men generally at wildly disproportionate rates, and still bear the brunt of childrearing, homekeeping, and elder care.

Nestled next to the outright lie patriarchy is situated in the love and care of women and children, in responsibility and concern, one finds cheek by jowl firm, sanctimonious denial of patriarchy's violence. Society *writ large* instead chooses mostly to pretend patriarchy is nothing more than an innocuous way of organizing the social world, that human physiology dictates man's dominance over women, that the hierarchy of mankind is established by god. Just as violent, racist, murderous acts of law enforcement perpetrated upon Black bodies are claimed to be anomaly and aberration, so are violent acts against women. When the violence of patriarchy and racism bubbles to the surface either through acts so heinous they cannot escape public notice or omnipresent technology is used surreptitiously truthfully to reveal, for example, law enforcement's lies, society does not recognize racism and patriarchy as founded in violence, rather such acts are claimed as aberration, as anomaly. But when we consistently, systematically name terrible acts of violence aberration, we evoke persistent, pernicious myth and deeply delusional denial, for how can we call ours a modern world or a democratic society if we accept patriarchy and racism's terroristic foundation and intent? Instead white, male privilege is invoked to rationalize select violence as anomaly and aberration, claiming violence

as the action of a pathologized few rather than a systemic, systematic process of reinforcing patriarchy and racism through terrorism. Conveniently Western culture has an easily recalled, explanatory idiom at the ready: violent racism and violent, misogynistic patriarchy is the work of "a few bad apples." This dismissive idiom is adapted from the longer proverb, "a few bad apples spoils the bunch," a "reflexive defense [used] whenever misconduct surfaces,"[13] meaning a few bad folk reliably ruin or contaminate the good reputation of the many, situating the few rotten apples as an expected though anomalous phenomenon. From its agrarian past, this proverb's meaning has evolved to infer that "some misdeeds [are] an isolated incident—a couple of rogue cops, a handful of unprincipled loan officers, two or three sociopathic soldiers."[14] Maddeningly, proverbs "close down discussion"[15] and halt introspection of whether the atrocious phenomenon is indeed a rarity, for, as linguist Geoff Nunberg asserts, "proverbs fly too low to the ground to be examined or questioned,"[16] so "the commonly parroted belief [violent men] are limited to a few 'bad apples' remains both persistent, pernicious cultural myth"[17] and "deeply deluded, dismissive conclusion."[18]

Patriarchy's violence and misogyny's hatred and contempt are predicated on a particular notion of masculinism's qualities and virtues, as:

> …the ideology that justifies and naturalizes male domination. As such, [masculinism functions as]…*the ideology of patriarchy.* Masculinism takes it for granted that [1] there is a fundamental difference between men and women, [2] it assumes heterosexuality is normal, [3] it accepts without question the sexual division of labour, and [4] it sanctions the political and dominant role of men in the public and private spheres.[19]

And while

> …[m]asculinity is always local and subject to change…what does not easily change is the justification and naturalization of male power; that is, what remains relatively constant is the masculine ideology, masculinism or heterosexualism; …even when there is a great deal of gender and sexual experimentation…masculinism [has never been] under real attack because gender relations [remain] relatively constant."[20]

In this sense, masculinism becomes "a logic, discourse, impulse, and moral voice that maintains and naturalizes subtle and overt forms of domination, an 'interpretive coding not only limit[ing] what is said, but even…what is thought.'"[21] Indeed, modern masculinism and misogyny give rise to fascism[22] which historically understands women "as a threatening 'other,'" who "embod[y] men's fears…including female

sexuality and the fecund multiplicity of life itself."[23] Entwined completely within patriarchy and misogyny, "fascism derives its power from channeling the protean, potentially liberating force of human desire toward hatred…" and "is an exacerbation, a more militant extension, of the patriarchal relationships between men and women that have persisted for centuries. It is a worsening of the fantasies, the violence, the misshapen desires [of] the whole system of gender relationships…."[24] The travesty that women must acquiesce to the violence of patriarchy in order to be loved, cared for, and protected by men is nothing short of atrocity.

Historically, when metanarratives are challenged or attacked, systematic backlash enacted by the privileged few who dominate the many is swift, violent, and often legislated, attempting to limit dramatically both "what is said" and "what is thought"; I offer three such brief examples.

As our colleague Karen McKellips[25] succinctly reminds us in her 2017 Drake Lecture, in the U.S. the right of women to gain and exercise agency and autonomy in the new world and the patriarchal dogma and cultural constructions that prevented agency were strategically designed into the vision of the Republic, in the:

> …"Republican Mother" trap: the cultural construct wherein women were held responsible for maintaining morality…through their roles as wives and mothers, only possible if they were made "free" of almost all civil, legal, or even human rights and rendered totally subservient to fathers, brothers, husbands, and even grown sons. Women supplied morality for the family by their examples of selfless, humble, and dependent behavior, gentle examples which were believed to inspire moral behavior in men. The majority of the U.S.' "founding fathers" seem to have believed the fate of the Republic rested on women as they were responsible for raising sons who would not become despots.[26]

In this era women are positioned as devoid of legal rights and tightly constrained by culture under the specific guise they must reside outside the political in order competently to teach and model children's—notably boys'—moral development. When children are raised in a patriarchal culture they come to accept, take for granted, reify, and reenact patriarchy; boys are schooled in the expected entitlements of patriarchy (this not limited to white folks), and girls in its constraints, so consequently culturally we manufacture patriarchy's domination and violence, just as surely and efficiently as Ford trucks roll off an assembly line. Fascinatingly, the Republican Mother trope admits the difficulty of raising sons who will not become despots (or fascists, or serial rapists,

presumably), but when patriarchy holds the cultural sway it does, when a single cultural metanarrative's enactment guarantees violent domination of those who stray outside its established norms, how a patriarchal culture manages not to manufacture far more despots than it does frankly astonishes. Too, the Republican Mother is entrapped by this trope, expected to inspire moral behavior in men by her gentle example when her gentle example is the product of systematic, violent oppression, for there can be no morality within a culture organized around virulent systems of domination that commit acts of abject terror on those they, by design, dominate.

In my own family's educational history the advances of my grandmothers' pre-WWII generation, during which time all my great aunts went to college, worked as teachers, and earned master's degrees, were yanked backward to pre-WWI-era constructs of women's societal roles chiefly because returning WWII soldiers had to roust women out of "their" jobs at the war's conclusion. Women, whose labor was absolutely essential to the war effort, were expected happily to give up wartime responsibilities, employment, wages, and the freedom wages afforded when men returned home; their reluctance to do so created violent cultural backlash, the vestiges of which persist even today. In my own work in which I use sociologist Svetlana Boym's[27] theory on nostalgia to bring together the important historical work of Nancy West[28] and Stephanie Coontz[29] to talk about U.S. cultural nostalgia for the 1950s classroom (and which I presented at SOPHE way back in 2004) I recount how:

> "Tranquilizers were developed in the 1950s in response to a need that physicians explicitly saw as female" (Coontz, 1992, p. 36) and demand was extraordinary. …women's lives fell under the control of men in unprecedented ways. Shockingly, "women who could not walk the fine line between nurturing motherhood and castrating 'momism,' or who had trouble adjusting to 'creative homemaking,' were labeled neurotic, perverted, or schizophrenic. … Shock treatments…were recommended for women who sought abortion, on the assumption that failure to want a baby signified dangerous emotional disturbance. All women, even seemingly docile ones, were deeply mistrusted. They were frequently denied the right to serve on juries, convey property, make contracts, take out credit cards in their own name, or establish residence. … [In this era], "There were not many permissible alternatives to baking brownies, experimenting with new canned soups, and getting rid of [rings] around the collar" (p. 32).[30]

A product of patriarchy's crackdown (and a nostalgic past many in the U.S. seem still to long for and idealize),[31] far fewer women of the immediately post-WWII generation attended college than before the war,[32] and in a clever retooling of the Republican Mother, found themselves deposited, moreover trapped, within the newly invented, isolated nuclear family, oftentimes relocated geographically distant from their extended families since men's job mobility increased dramatically in this period: misogynistic backlash paradoxically reframed as "progress" for successful, newly middle-class (and chiefly white) women who now did not *have* to work. With the dawn of tranquilizers and electroconvulsive therapy used to "treat" women's reluctance to conform to patriarchy's dominant narrative, these forms of terror became all the more powerful since they were borne of science; first by medicalizing and then by pathologizing women's attempts to gain some vestige of equality, agency, and choice over their bodies, patriarchy as a system of domination gained an epistemological superpower by teaming up with the most powerful epistemic and ontological mechanism of truth- and knowledge-claim generation, positivism, which confidently delivers truth with a capital "T." Now, truth be told, this post-WWII dark age for women's rights inspired and led to a new, determined wave of feminism, searing criticism and conceptual deconstruction of patriarchy and its subnarratives of domination, and for a time yielded significant material, political, and corporeal gains for women, but just a few decades later women find ourselves under similar attack in the terroristic déjà vu ushered in by a U.S. President who brags of having "grabbed women by the pussy."

The Trump era seems not only to have revealed a fresh torrent of hatred against people of color, immigrants, and Muslim countries, but a withering wave of violent misogyny. In late April, 2018 a white man drove a van into a Toronto crowd killing eight women and two men, critically injuring 16 others.[33] This terrorist act, a mass murder engineered purposefully to kill women, drew into the mainstream media an underground group of men who claim to be "involuntary celibates," so-called extremists who use social media platforms to build their "community." Made up of men who self-identify as "incels" and who award members who successfully kill women the title "Supreme Gentleman,"[34] this group directs malevolence toward women, claiming violence against women as justified because incels are denied sex by women. In online forums their chatter is bald-faced, indignant, and seethes with entitlement.

Not the first incel murders, the Toronto killings generated widespread public outcry, condemnation, and shock, inspiring multiple op-ed responses. Ross Douthat,[35] op-ed columnist for *The New York*

Times, used his pulpit to pen a piece in which he considers whether incels' sexlessness is a form of "disability." Douthat flippantly proposes a "redistribution of sex," a plan suggesting society look backward to practices of chastity, monogamy, and permanence for ways to address his perceived failure of the sexual revolution, a plan which fails utterly to understand either the nature of patriarchy or its relationship to misogyny. He quotes an essay in which Anna Srinivasan opines, "in a patriarchal culture, who is desired and who isn't is a political question,"[36] yet Douthat fails to grasp the patriarchal "why" of desire, predicated on conquest, possession, and ownership. Douthat's pertly proposed "redistribution of sex" in which he demurs extremists, "see the world more clearly than the respectable and moderate and sane,"[37] gaslights women targeted and terrorized by patriarchy's boldest champions. His high-visibility column set off a swift maelstrom of debate and comment, Talia Lavin's[38] column in the recently shuttered *Village Voice* among those. Lavin lambasts Douthat, accusing him of "laundering this act of terror…under the cheeky, winking guise of 'provocation,'"[39] and ignoring the fact inceldom, "primarily white…virgins who claim to be victims of unimaginable oppression," is "premised in its entirety on a poisonous, irrational, and thoroughgoing hatred of women."[40] While Lavin schools Douthat on how the future "systemic control and torture of female bodies…is already present,"[41] she nevertheless short-sightedly positions incels as misogynistic extremists rather than recognizing and arguing how incel's violence against women, hatred of women, and the abject terror they plan and carry out is, by design, purposefully baked into the cake of patriarchy. Far from isolated or extremist, if patriarchy dictates culture's behavioral parameters and, if only occasionally, the bare bones of patriarchy show themselves as in the incel movement's poisonous treatise, one is left to wonder whether, perhaps, most men operating within patriarchy just have better manners than violent incels—and exercise the self-control to keep their "lizard brains" in check. Incel culture lays bare patriarchy's bones, shows starkly of what patriarchy is made.

Patriarchy is so culturally dominant, so much a part of the skeleton of culture, and so difficult to make fully visible—much less to challenge—when mainstream culture gets it right and succinctly calls out patriarchy's system of domination and the abject terror required to maintain its dominance, those words, images, and sounds shock. In a reference logically attributed to Margaret Atwood,[42] but which actually comes out of Gavin de Becker's[43] book on human survival strategies, musician Courtney Barnett[44] arranges the chorus of her recent song "Nameless, Faceless" around the oft-quoted adage, "Men are afraid women will laugh at them. Women are afraid men will kill them."[45] This

quotation is not about "incels," not about those who commit heinous crimes against women, not anomaly or aberration, but about *all* men trapped within patriarchy's system of domination; it is so chilling yet so familiar precisely because women recognize immediately it represents a truism, a generality that speaks truth to patriarchy's power, omnipotence, and terroristic threat of violence. This adage reveals men and women's power positions in patriarchy, reveals what each has to lose in the bargain: he his pride, she her life.

Revelations on the incel community's treatise bring into focus many violences to which women are regularly subjected: women treated as property, trolling women, stalking women, the belief women owe men sex, women as brood mares, women as caretakers, paying women less to do the same work, positioning women as hysterics and sluts and holes to be fucked. Indeed, "many accounts of incel subculture have treated it as a sharp deviation from the norm. It's not."[46]

> …it would be easier to go along with [the idea incels stand apart from other men] were it not for the fact that every day, women are subjected to violence for similar reasons to those that incels offer, but without similar media attention. Women who deny men sex are raped and killed without the involvement of any oddball internet forums. Women are also subjected to murder and abuse when men decide that they are *too* sexually available to other men. Women are killed because some man or another, who may not be known to them, decides that they will be held to account for his own inability to make lasting social connections, or to live the life to which he feels he is entitled.[47]

It is no wonder the incel movement's dogma keeps too-close company with reemerging misogynist cultural practices, burdens eerily reminiscent of the 1950s newly placed upon women: new, improved surveillance and control of women including but not limited to newfound public scrutiny and the criminalization of mothering;[48] the continued, rapid loss of women's rights to abortion, healthcare, and access to maternal hospital deliveries, made dramatically more dire should the woman be Black,[49] poor, or rural;[50] and everyday, virulent online threats to women in the form of trolling (which can equal thousands of messages threatening gang rape, stalking, death, torture, sexualized violence, and bestowing vulgar labels such as "whore"), made worse if that woman is perceived openly to threaten patriarchal rule such as female political candidates' social media feeds.[51]

These new patriarchal practices and scrutinies may well be the reaction of threatened, entitled white men to public, visible gains of women, the #metoo movement, etcetera, but as history shows us (many

times from men's own words which betray candid, bare misogyny, either historically recorded in private diaries and letters[52] or posted under the interwebs' cowardly protection of anonymity), it is dangerously short sighted to excuse or write off today's rapidly boiling, malevolent, violent misogyny as reactionary, incidental, "a few bad apples," or happenstance because today's pernicious patriarchal cameo provides but a glimpse of the systemic, systematic monster that patriarchy engineers, solidifies, and grows. Thus, to dismiss the current bilious eruption as "a few bad apples" is to wear the same kind of blinders doomed civilizations of the past donned happily, is patiently to hope for change when no change is coming, is, as another well-worn idiom goes, to "drink poison and expect the other person to die:" feeble logic indeed. Let me be clear. I argue neither this current "wave" of misogyny nor past waves—against women after WWII, during the Salem Witch Trials, or perhaps in response to Hilary Clinton's presidential campaign—represent a loss of ground either to female agency or patriarchy. Rather, these violent waves represent moments when patriarchy's terrorism rises to the surface, rises up above the level where its violence is regularly tolerated as normal. These waves of terror signal patriarchal backlash and a threatening call for resumption of the stasis patriarchy demands. These waves represent times when women were deemed out of line with patriarchy's narrow rule, and terrorism, tyranny, and swift and violent backlash against its challenge are the means by which threatened metanarratives re-establish domination.

If we—by which I mean all people—continue to accept patriarchy as a system of domination, prop it up with our complicity, herald it as accepted, "natural order" and social organizer, then all heinous acts against women we pretend as a culture are aberrations by "a few bad apples"—treating women as property, domestic abuse and murder at the hands of a male partner, rape, misogyny, gaslighting, stalking—are all actually "normal" outcomes of the ruling system patriarchy imposes: normalized and acceptable. Not only are these virulent, vicious violences against women rendered normal and expected rather than aberrant or anomaly, but retaining patriarchy actively creates a withering double bind for women: not only do patriarchy's many violences fall upon women, but the onus of challenging and educating against these violences also paradoxically falls completely upon women…just like confronting the onus and challenge of educating against racism's violence falls largely upon Black folks.

Australian comedian Hannah Gadsby,[53] in a "damning indictment"[54] of the ideology of patriarchy and "powerful plea…to our common humanity,"[55] boldly situates misogyny as mental illness, cutting to the core to reveal misogyny's paradox: heterosexual men hate the very

object they desire.[56] The paradox of which Gadsby speaks reveals, in part, how patriarchy does not just rule how women are in the world, it rules how we *all* are in the world; patriarchy is not simply misogynist or fascist or homophobic or sexist or racist, it goes against and prevents all that is needed for all humans to thrive, to belong, to be kind, to love. Put simply, patriarchy works actively and cripplingly against humanity.

So, what happens when patriarchy is challenged and dismantled; what happens when the culture's skeleton, its infrastructure, is broken? There will be a huge void and many—women included—will be tempted to grab for power, but we all must resist the temptation to exchange one form of domination for another, because exchanging one system of domination for another can never prove liberatory. Men will be loath to give up their power because they will have a difficult time understanding how dismantling patriarchy and its subnarratives benefit men, rather will see such a dismantling simply as taking away men's power. But French feminists in particular reveal just how bad, how destructive, violent patriarchy is for men. Perhaps most startlingly, even the "good man" is complicit—and potentially most dangerous—because the good, "evolved" man gives the myth of "a few bad apples" its believability, its power, for what is a good man, what is so-called "chivalry," but men somehow managing, whether out of manners or consciousness perhaps—or more sinisterly out of predation—to override patriarchy's normal, baked-in violences? Indeed, society's pivot to the example of the individual, good man manages to arrest the genuine critical work of even clear-eyedly regarding, much less challenging or attempting to dismantle, violent patriarchy. Consequently, although men and women alike have built this violent cultural skeleton, it must be men who challenge and dismantle patriarchy, men who make possible genuine love between women and men.

Stacy Otto
Illinois State University

Endnotes

[1] Stacy Otto, "Policing Terror: Reconsidering the Lives and Deaths of America's Michael Browns," *Journal of Philosophy and History of Education* 64, no. 1 (2014): vi, emphasis added.

[2] Ta-Nehisi Coates, *Between the World and Me* (New York, NY: Spiegel & Grau, 2015), 7.

[3] bell hooks, personal communication to author, March 29, 2005.

4 OED Online, *Misogyny* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2018), http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/119829?rskey=xWMH7k&result=1

5 Ibid.

6 Eustace M. W. Tillyard, *The Elizabethan World Picture: A Study of the Idea of Order in the Age of Shakespeare, Donne and Milton* (New York, NY: Vintage, 1959).

7 Ibid.

8 Otto, "Policing Terror," vi.

9 Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York, NY: Vintage, 1995).

10 Angela McRobbie, "Post-Feminism and Popular Culture," *Feminist Media Studies* 4, no. 3 (2004): 255–264.

11 Judith Butler, *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence* (London, UK: Verso, 2006).

12 Lucy Nicholas & Christine Agius, *The Persistence of Global Masculinism: Discourse, Gender and Neo-Colonial Re-Articulations of Violence* (London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), 4.

13 Geoff Nunberg (writer and contributor), "Bad Apple Proverbs: There's One in Every Bunch" [radio program], executive produced and hosted by Terry Gross, aired May 5, 2005, on *Fresh Air*, Philadelphia, PA: WHYY, https://www.npr.org/2011/05/09/136017612/bad-apple-proverbs-theres-one-in-every-bunch

14 Ibid.

15 Ibid.

16 Ibid.

17 Otto, 2011. Stacy Otto, "One Year On: Mourning, Protest, and the New Civil Rights Movement" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Philosophy and History of Education, St. Louis, MO, September, 2011).

18 Otto, "Policing Terror," viii.

19 Arthur Brittan, *Masculinity and Power* (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell, 1991), 4, quoted in Nicholas & Agius, *The Persistence of Global Masculinism*, 5, emphasis added.

20 Ibid.

21 Cohn quoted in Nicholas & Agius, *The Persistence of Global Masculinism*, 5.

[22] Jason Wilson, "What Do Incels, Fascists and Terrorists Have in Common? Violent Misogyny," *The Guardian*, https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/may/04/what-do-incels-fascists-and-terrorists-have-in-common-violent-misogyny

[23] Klaus Theweleit, *Male Fantasies*, vols. 1 & 2, trans. Chris Turner & Stephen Conway (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1987), paraphrased in Wilson, "What Do Incels, Fascists and Terrorists Have in Common?"

[24] Ibid.

[25] Karen McKellips, "Too Many Biographies, Too Little Time: Good Books to "Think With" [The 2017 Drake Lecture], *Journal of Philosophy and History of Education* 68, no. 1 (2018).

[26] Ibid., xxiii.

[27] Svetlana Boym, *The Future of Nostalgia* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 2002).

[28] Nancy Martha West, *Kodak and the Lens of Nostalgia* (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 2000).

[29] Stephanie Coontz, *The Way We Never Were: American Families and the Nostalgia Trap* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 1993).

[30] Coontz, *The Way We Never Were*, paraphrased and quoted in Stacy Otto, "Nostalgic for What?: The Epidemic of Images of the Mid 20th Century Classroom in American Media Culture and What it Means," *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 26, no. 4 (2005): 469–470.

[31] See Otto, "Nostalgic for What?"

[32] Coontz, *The Way We Never Were*.

[33] Wilson, "What Do Incels, Facists and Terrorists Have in Common?"

[34] Ibid.

[35] Ross Douthat, "The Redistribution of Sex," *The New York Times*, May 2, 2018, https://www.nytimes.com/2018/05/02/opinion/incels-sex-robots-redistribution.html

[36] Anna Srinivasan quoted in Douthat, "The Redistribution of Sex."

[37] Douthat, "The Redistribution of Sex."

[38] Talia Lavin, "The Harpy: Someone Please Tell the *Times* that Incels are Terrorists," *The Village Voice*, May 3, 2018, https://www.villagevoice.com/2018/05/03/the-harpy-someone-please-tell-the-times-that-incels-are-terrorists/

[39] Ibid.

[40] Ibid.

41 Ibid.

42 Margaret Atwood, "Writing the Male Character," in *Second Words: Selected Critical Prose* [The Hagey Lecture, February 9, 1982, University of Waterloo] (Toronto, ON: House of Anansi, 2004), 412–432.

43 Gavin de Becker, *The Gift of Fear: And Other Survival Signals that Protect Us from Violence* (New York, NY: Dell, 1999), 77.

44 Courtney Barnett, "Nameless, Faceless," on *Tell Me How You Really Feel* [LP] (Melbourne, AU: Milk Records, 2018).

45 de Becker, *The Gift of Fear*, paraphrased on Barnett, "Nameless, Faceless."

46 Wilson, "What Do Incels, Facists and Terrorists Have in Common?"

47 Ibid., emphasis in original.

48 Kim Brooks, *Small Animals: Parenthood in the Age of Fear* (New York, NY: Flatiron Books, 2018).

49 Linda Villarosa, "Why America's Black Mothers and Babies Are in a Life-or-Death Crisis," *The New York Times*, April 11, 2018, https://www.nytimes.com/2018/04/11/magazine/black-mothers-babies-death-maternal-mortality.html

50 Katy B. Kozhimannil & Austin Frakt, "Rural America's Disappearing Maternity Care," *The Washington Post*, November 8, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/rural-americas-disappearing-maternity-care/2017/11/08/11a664d6-97e6-11e7-b569-3360011663b4_story.html?noredirect=on&utm_term=.407c0f267938

51 Maggie Astor, "For Female Candidates, Harassment and Threats Come Every Day," *The New York Times*, August 24, 2018, https://www.nytimes.com/2018/08/24/us/politics/women-harassment-elections.html?nytapp=true&smid=nytcore-ios-share

52 Wilson, "What Do Incels, Facists and Terrorists Have in Common?"

53 Hannah Gadsby (writer and performer), in *Nanette* [television program], John Olb & Madeleine Parry (directors), 2018, Los Gatos, CA: Netflix.

54 Sebastian Smee, "How Hannah Gadsby's Evisceration of Picasso Helped Her Change Stand-Up Comedy," *The Washington Post*, July 26, 2018, https://www.washingtonpost.com/entertainment/museums/how-hannah-gadsbys-evisceration-of-picasso-helped-her-change-stand-up-comedy/2018/07/26/ea3ad0f0-8eaa-11e8-8322-b5482bf5e0f5_story.html?utm_term=.99652f8e6998

55 Ibid.

56 Gadsby, *Nanette*.

The 2017 Drake Lecture

Too Many Biographies, Too Little Time: Good Books to "Think With"

Karen McKellips, Cameron University

Introduction

Last year I so much enjoyed participating in a panel discussing use of biography in our work—at least what used to be my work before I retired—that I decided to see if anyone would come to hear me tell you about a new biography I recommend highly. I have even worn the same clothes I wore last year to enhance the "continued" experience.

Old retired people on the wrong side of 70 have freedom to read what we want, for enjoyment, not what we must because of our profession. I am still reading the same sort of stuff I read before, but have no one to tell about the jewels I find. Therefore, I am subjecting you to a review of a book that makes me regret I have no class in which to *require* it be read, and I supplement my review with information gleaned from personal family history research and my views regarding "Republican Mother" ideology.

Laurel Thatcher Ulrich is author of the Pulitzer-Prize-winning *The Midwife's Tale*, 300th Anniversary Professor at Harvard University, and former president of the American Historical Association. Furthermore, *A House Full of Females* was endorsed heartily eight days ago by *my* feminist book club. Reading this book, I discovered a trove of misconceptions and gaps in my knowledge I suspect many of my fellow feminists share. (Is it correct to say *fellow* feminists? My book club friends claim this as an oxymoron.) Ulrich relies heavily on letters and diaries of both female and male early Mormons, sometimes writing about the same events from both female and male perspectives. As well she draws from Mormon women's poetry and minutes and agendas from early Mormon women's meetings. I use the term "Mormon" because Ulrich does, and because it is far shorter than The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints.

Ulrich compares *A House Full of Females* to a real antique Mormon quilt composed of blocks made by many women which later was cut

apart to share the blocks. Still later, the pieces were reunited, yet some were missing, some had faded so they could not be read, and some were, by then, impossible to attribute. Ulrich explains, "The sundering and reuniting of the quilt offers a metaphor for the losses and recoveries that characterize women's history."[1] She also points out that the many verbatim quotations in the book were *nearly all* recorded when they were uttered, and not later built upon the contributor's recollections and reflections of time past, as is commonly the practice with memoirs and oral history interviews. *A House Full of Females* is meticulously endnoted.

I knew the basics about early Mormon life: where they lived and about several times during a brief span when Mormons were viciously persecuted, tortured, and driven out of the states where they were settled. What I did not understand before reading Ulrich's book is the nuance of Mormon practice's impact, including that of plural marriage, on the lives, restrictions, and opportunities of Mormon women as compared to other U.S. women of the time.

In the interest of full disclosure, I tell you my husband has direct ancestors who were Mormon from the first months of the faith's founding by Joseph Smith in New York. His great-great-grandmother, the child of a plural marriage, came to Oklahoma Territory as an elderly woman with her son's family. My father-in-law knew her and actually lived with her. My husband's great-great-great-grandfather, Samuel McKellips, was a contemporary of Joseph Smith. Samuel's son Dennis and grandson Abner Terral were members of the main group of Mormons who moved from New York to Missouri, then to Nauvoo, Illinois, which served as Mormon headquarters for seven years and where all three are buried. The female lines were also Mormon. Some Mormon ancestor women of my husband's went to Salt Lake, Utah.

Abner Terral McKellips' son, Orlando Daniel, brought his family to Blaine, then to Custer Counties, Oklahoma during the Territorial period. This branch of the family, including my father-in-law, said some earlier family members were Mormon and somehow related to Brigham Young. My husband recalls no Mormon religious customs or behavior among the Oklahoma McKellipses, but we nevertheless read a lot about Mormonism because of my father-in-law's recollection of family history and its roots in Mormonism. The family connections to the story Ulrich recounts do not end there; I, too, have connections to people in this book. Three of my great-great-grandmother's sisters joined the group, became plural wives, and moved to Salt Lake.

Joseph Smith founded Mormonism while in upstate New York, publishing *The Book of Mormon* in 1830. Over the next decade he established communities in Ohio, Missouri, and Illinois, and other

groups in New England, Pennsylvania, and Iowa, as well as other locales. A group of 10,000 Mormons was viciously persecuted and driven from their Missouri property in 1838–1839. They fled to Illinois, bought the small town of Commerce, and renamed it Nauvoo, a word derived from the Hebrew word for "beautiful."[2] These refugees started over, building homes, businesses, and a temple, only to have part of Nauvoo burned to the ground. Joseph Smith and others were murdered, their property stolen or burned. Some were tortured with the complicity of U.S. government officials and local law enforcement in 1844. By the winter of 1847, 14,000 Nauvoo survivors had fled from Illinois to other states.[3]

Regrouped under Brigham Young's leadership, they established a base for moving west in a place they named "Winter Camp," also called "Camp of Israel," now Omaha, Nebraska. This was Indian land, part of the Omaha Nation, which the federal government allowed the Mormon refugees briefly to occupy. Young led the first group to Salt Lake in 1847: 142 men, two women, and three children—a 1,031-mile journey in 111 days. He then returned to Winter Camp. The Salt Lake group was joined by the "Mormon Battalion," the only religiously based unit in the history of the U.S. military, comprised of over 500 men who volunteered to fight in the Mexican War, doing so from July 1846 through July 1847 in order to earn money to facilitate the Mormon's move to Utah.[4] After the Battalion's stint in Mexico, they disembarked in California, spent a brief time helping build Sutter's Mill, but soon were helping Young's first group lay out Salt Lake City's grid of streets, plant huge gardens, and construct buildings.[5] There were 1,500 in Young's next group; over 50% were female.

Larger groups from the east began to arrive, supplemented by Americans and Europeans recruited by missionary men. The Birmingham, Manchester, and Lancashire areas of England proved fertile areas for converting and transporting people to Utah. I am of course familiar with these areas because of travel with The Beatrix Potter Society and my research related to the U.K.'s Industrial Revolution. Women made up the majority of American and European converts.

In 1860 only 40% of Salt Lake Mormons lived in polygamous families, and in two of three of polygamous families there were only two wives. Fifteen percent of the 1846 group of Mormons never went to Utah, mostly resettling in Missouri, Illinois, and Indiana.[6] Joseph Smith's first wife, Emma Hale Smith, and one of their sons did not go west, rather became prominent among founders of the

Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, whose members practiced much of the theology of the original group but did not endorse or practice polygamy.[7] Emma's father had been a Justice of the Peace and she his clerk. Before Joseph Smith was assassinated, Emma edited the first Mormon hymn book and founded a Women's Society just two days after the men of Nauvoo established a Masonic Lodge.[8] A man observing one of these women's meetings remarked, "There was more intelligence in the hearts of the sisters that afternoon than in the hearts of all the crown'd heads of Europe."[9]

In July, 1842 only two men had plural wives. Smith may have had a dozen and Young had just taken his first wife. In January 1844, 20 men and 76 women, including five first wives, practiced polygamy.[10] When Smith was assassinated, many of his wives were then "sealed," or married, to Brigham Young. Emma rejected Young's offer and raised her children to believe their father never had other wives.[11] While married, from 1827 to his death in 1844, she bore him eight children and they adopted twins. Five children survived childhood.[12]

A number of Joseph Smith's wives did accept Young's offer. In 1870, Eliza Snow Smith Young was living with a dozen wives in Salt Lake's "the Lion house" and was a powerful leader among Utah women.[13] Most Mormon men had no more than three wives, and some had only one. The number of wives a man had paralleled status in the Mormon religious hierarchy and largely reflected monetary wealth.[14]

Plural marriage was first practiced secretly and only among a few leaders, becoming known to the general group of Mormons slowly. Many men were shocked when the practice of plural marriage became known and resisted polygamy even after it became official Mormon doctrine and men were pressured to take plural wives.[15] One man with only one wife, promoted to the inner circle of church leadership as Brigham Young's clerk, was taken aside when Young saw the man was attracted to a new English convert and told, "It is your privilege to have as many as you want."[16] Young offered to loan the man money for her passage from England.

Joseph Smith revealed Mormon doctrine on polygamy to a select few in 1843. It was finally published in 1852 and distributed the world over, from Liverpool, to Hong Kong, to Calcutta, to the Sandwich Isles (Hawai'i,), and many other locations.[17] By this time there were over 3,000 Mormons in 33 congregations in the Manchester England Conference, all working to get as many English Mormons as possible to Salt Lake.[18]

The most startling thing I learned from this book is that the political climate, treatment, and respect of women in polygamous Utah can be

seen as far better than that of non-Mormon American women of the time. Ulrich does not offer this interpretation, but *I* do; these women, to a surprising extent, broke out of the "Republican Mother" trap: the cultural construct wherein women were held responsible for maintaining morality in our Republic through their roles as wives and mothers, only possible if they were made "free" of almost all civil, legal, or even human rights and rendered totally subservient to fathers, brothers, husbands, and even grown sons. Women supplied morality for the family by their examples of selfless, humble, and dependent behavior, gentle examples which were believed to inspire moral behavior in men. The majority of the U.S.' "founding fathers" seem to have believed the fate of the Republic rested on women as they were responsible for raising sons who would not become despots. Even John Adams ignored Abigail's plea to "Remember the ladies…. Do not put such unlimited power into the hands of husbands."[19]

Joseph Smith had 53 plural wives when he was assassinated. Other than Emma's, he is alleged to have had eight children. DNA recently revealed three of those eight were not his biological children.[20] The birthrate among plural wives was lower than the general U.S. birthrate and may have contributed to Mormon women's longevity.[21] Some think this is due to men's frequent long absences from home on church business. Others postulate men were not sharing their favors equally, women had more opportunity to reject husband's advances, or they were practicing some form of birth control.[22] Some advantages of being a Mormon wife, even a "plural" one, included suffrage; divorce and the right to choose one's own spouse; the opportunity to work outside the home and to earn and keep wages; and an opportunity to act as religious leaders.

Women's Suffrage

Hoping to attract women settlers, Wyoming Territory passed the first woman's suffrage bill in 1869. Wyoming had only 9,118 white citizens, and 6 times as many men as women. In 1870, Utah gave women the right to vote. There were 86,000 white citizens in Utah Territory, over half of them female.[23] U.S. anti-polygamist forces thought women would vote out polygamy if they had suffrage; they did not. In 1887 Congress revoked Utah Territory women's right to vote, but women's suffrage was restored when written into the new state's constitution in 1895.[24]

Divorce for Women and Her Right to Choose Her Spouse

Nothing in the U.S. Constitution contributed to the improvement of women's political and legal rights. *Coverture* was the legal doctrine which allowed that, when a woman married she no longer existed as a singular entity, but only as a legal extension of her husband.

Furthermore, once married the woman's husband controlled all decisions regarding her life, causing her status as an independent entity to disappear. Everything she brought to the marriage, including the clothes on her back, thereafter belonged to him. Women could not sue or be sued. Early U.S. courts ruled the traditional English one third widow's dowry abolished since, unlike earlier English law, Republican law was intended to prevent governments or any other entity *including female dowries* from challenging or removing a man's right to do whatever he wished with his property. Men who killed their wives were charged with murder, wives who killed husbands with murder and *petit treason*—treason against the state.[25]

Two generations later in 1848 as the Mormons began their move to Utah, women in Seneca Falls were using the U.S. Constitution's wording to demand relief from *coverture*. As for the right of a woman to sue for divorce, there was variety across states, but in some a married woman had no such right. In some states for a woman to divorce required legislative action only granted through an individual bill specific to her case, introduced into and passed by the state's legislature.[26]

My great-great-great aunt got one of the rare divorces granted women in Virginia under these conditions. Nancy Rowland bill of divorce resulted from her proving to the legislature that her husband squandered her dowry (which consisted of money, enslaved people, land, jewelry, and household goods she brought to the marriage) on fine horses, fine wine, other women, and land speculation, and then sent her back home to get more of her father's enslaved people. For over 20 years, beginning long before he married her, he had not been sharing a wife's bed, but that of a mistress, an enslaved woman. Nancy's 80-year-old father feared he would die, his daughter inherit, and the son-in-law's creditors get the inheritance. Adultery and desertion were also charged. Adultery required two eyewitnesses be produced and her father found two neighbors willing to so testify. Twenty-seven neighbors signed a petition supporting the divorce, with several giving sworn statements as to how she had been treated.[27]

In 1861, Elizabeth Cady Stanton testified in New York court about the need for desperate women to obtain a divorce. These women, Stanton argued, were trapped in brutal marriages with husbands who beat them and their children, and in marriages where husbands failed to supply women's and children's basic needs while squandering dowry property brought by the woman to the marriage. But Mormon women had no trouble getting a divorce. How did they do that? They petitioned Joseph Smith and, after his death, Brigham Young to grant Mormon women the right to divorce. When Smith died, about 20% of plural

wives had living husbands.[28] If a woman told Young she did not love the man to whom she was married, he gave her a divorce.[29] The Mormon Utah legislature abolished use of common law, making marriage matters church-only matters.[30]

According to a summary of Young's sermons made in the diary of Wilford Woodruff, the most prolific of all the diarists whose writings Ulrich discusses, in an 1851 sermon Young claimed an unloving marriage is a form of adultery.[31] He maintained marriage should be founded in mutual happiness and that a father does not "give" his daughter in marriage.[32] Young's divorces dissolved marriages by "mutual consent" with no judgment of guilt. Former husbands were required to continue to support their children. In time, Young granted at least 1,645 divorces.[33] Ulrich writes, "some scholars believe ¼ of polygamous wives divorced their husbands and most re-married, often [to] another polygamist.[34] Mormon women and Mormon patriarchs believed women had both the right and the obligation to choose their own husbands,[35] since both parties should be happy in marriage.[36]

Occasionally divorce worked in men's favor. One Mormon took as plural wives two teenaged girls he employed as household helpers. They began spending the night with "certain wicked young men camped across the river," and they "manifested a disposition to live els whare [*sic*]." These plural marriages lasted less than a month.[37]

My great-great-grandmother had three sisters—Mary, Electa, and Laura Beal—and lived near an Ohio Mormon group preparing to head west to Utah. One sister was blind and unmarried, the other two were widowed with several young children and only a few acres of poor farm land. When the second husband dropped dead, these women moved to the Mormon settlement. The sighted ones volunteered to become plural wives to men leaving for Utah to save their children from starvation. Two men took them as wives. After arriving in Utah, the blind woman was married in the Salt Lake Temple. Two sisters divorced these husbands within a few years. All stayed and died many years later in Utah: one remarried, one not. I did not learn this from Mormon records, rather doing family research in the 1990s in a small Ohio county library, I found a local history book in which a descendant of these women's brother, not a Mormon, contributed my first hint of my family's Mormon connection in that book's history section. Until I read Ulrich's book, I did not realize my great-great-great aunts' stories were not unusual.[38]

Ulrich reports women who obtained divorces had deserted, or been deserted by, living husbands. Some had been brutaly abused and, had they stayed, had no hope of divorce or support.[39] Some just did not like their legal husband or were only in plural marriages because they had

been convinced by Mormon missionaries plural marriage was in keeping with God's plan.[40]

Womens' Opportunity to Work Outside the Home and to Earn and Keep Wages

In 1871, Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony visited Salt Lake City. Stanton told the press that outsiders attacking polygamy on the basis of women's rights,

> …missed the point…polygamy and monogamy were both oppressive systems…. The condition of women today is slavery and must be so as long as they are shut out of the world of work—helpless dependents on man for bread.[41]

Anthony was annoyed by babies some women brought to the suffragists' five-hour speech. She said, "The church should appoint some bishops to dish out soothing syrup for anyone under three…for the comfort of those who wanted to hear the speaker."[42]

One of Brigham Young's plural wives wrote to him saying, since she did not get to see him very often she would write him letters advising him on women's issues, once writing, "Is there such a thing as an independent woman in the *economy* of God? If there is, I want to be that woman."[43] Another wife wrote Young to tell him she wished to bear children and if he did not "wish to further this goal, [he should] supply a proxy."[44]

Missionary men in Europe often lived comfortably with converts. Those women "washed his shirts, cooked his meals, and lifted his spirits at the end of the day,"[45] and the missionary men's wives in the U.S. knew that. American Mormon women often struggled to do these same tasks for themselves, their children, and elderly family members while also producing the income a non-Mormon family man is expected to provide. Some women thrived on this challenge and were very successful, accumulating land, operating dairies, running boarding houses, publishing books that were "best sellers" in Mormon circles, practicing midwifery, serving as doctors, serving as dressmakers, and developing spinning, weaving, and similar businesses.[46] There was a Council of Health which operated like a Medical Association that both men and women could attend and another council exclusively for women.[47] Once, when a man came to unlock the women's council room, the woman presiding asked him to stay and take minutes so no woman would have to. He did.[48]

When Amelia Bloomer was first wearing her bloomers, Utah women were designing and making comfortable women's dresses, reducing the length and breadth of their skirts and removing

uncomfortable boning.[49] They taught in their own or others' schools. They often generated enough income to do a great deal of charity work, sometimes working among the area's Native people. From the beginning, in New York women had charitable societies which men sometimes criticized as not being enough devoted to religious matters and too much to charitable matters, but most men approved of women's charity work. A Mormon newspaper printed a letter saying women were "getting out of control" and needed to spend more time reading scripture to understand God's plan for them. The editor responded by saying he should stop worrying about the women and read the scriptures for "admonitions directed to himself."[50] Young maintained women had "the same variety of taste and character" as men and "should be allowed to follow their own interests, whether they choose to become artists, musicians, mathematicians, naturalists, or bookkeepers."[51]

Women's Opportunity to Act as Religious Leaders[52]

Mormon women voted in church meetings;[53] they wrote and delivered sermons, counseled, prophesied, healed the sick,[54] participated in foot washing,[55] and even "spoke in tongues," an important religious practice for both men and women of the time.[56] Male missionaries in England consulted a Manchester woman convert they called "Katherine Bates the Prophetess," who told them her visions of troubles ahead.[57]

Sometimes one woman would sing "in tongues" (also known as glossolalia) and another sing the translation in English. They did this in both women-only meetings, and in meetings of women and men. In Winter Camp the year before the first group went to Utah, women's diaries record 14 meetings attended by at least 50 women, most plural wives of two prominent Mormon leaders, Brigham Young and Heber Kimball, and their relatives. Glossolalia was the main attraction and Eliza Snow Smith Young its chief promoter, writing in her published book of poetry, "We must redeem the gift from long abuse / when by the gentiles shared."[58] Learning a neighbor woman was ill, three of the most powerful Mormon women of the time went to her bedside and sang as a trio in tongues. They were then joined in song by the woman's husband and his other wife.[59] Dances, religious and non-religious, attended by both women and men, would sometimes go on until 2:00 a.m. Women visiting each other in Winter Camp entertained themselves and their guests with poetry-writing contests.[60]

Women and men could receive "endowments," from Mormon leaders. Those chosen participated in an elaborate, lengthy ceremony, a sort of reenactment of God's dealings with his offspring since the time of Adam, followed by anointing with oil. Once they arrived in heaven, the endowed would be among the elite and have a better afterlife than others, communicating that all Mormons would definitely not find

themselves in equal circumstances once they arrived and not everyone was chosen to become a member of the "Quorum of the Anointed."[61] Women who did not accept the doctrine of plural marriage did not receive endowments.

Has Ulrich anything specifically to say about schools and teachers and opportunities for female education? I want all of you to read this book so I am not telling you all Ulrich includes on this topic. Ulrich finds clues to the role of Mormon women in education and schooling through analysis of, for instance, women's use of language in written work more commonly found in literature than in everyday speech and writing, spelling, penmanship, and grammar. She does include some direct references to schooling. For example, she reveals The University of Deseret became co-ed in its second year.[62]

One of Brigham Young's wives lived in a two-room house her brother owned. One 16-foot-square room she used as a school. There were 56 pupils at the beginning of the term and 69 at the end. After the regular school day, for an extra fee, she gave spelling and writing lessons. Later she taught a smaller group, some of whom were Young's children.[63]

To further whet your educator's historical appetite, you should know Ulrich reounts a visit to the school attended by those Africans who took over the *Amistad*.[64] Justin Morrill, responsible for the bill which funded U.S. A&M colleges, led the anti-Mormon forces.[65] The man in charge of New England congregations lived in Cambridge, near Harvard.[66] Mormon women ran Boston boarding houses, recruiting converts at the time Margaret Fuller, Horace Mann, and the Peabody sisters with their bookstore and publishing house lived nearby. The Alcotts' school was also near.[67] There is still a Mormon boarding house in the vicinity, Bowdoin Boarding House, near my favorite Boston boarding house, The Parker House hotel. I found many surprises and learned much from this book. I hope, if I have motivated you to read *A House Full of Females*, you will enjoy the experience as much as I did.

Endnotes

1   Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, *A House Full of Females: Plural Marriage and Women's Rights in Early Mormonism, 1835–1870* (New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 2017), xx.

2   Ibid., 31.

3 Ibid., 135.

4 Ibid., 185. Ulrich's endnotes refer the reader to Kenneth N. Owens, *Gold Rush Saints: California Mormons and the Great Rush for Riches* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2004). I was also surprised to learn from Ulrich's book and others to which she refers her readers of the scope and impact of early Mormons in California.

5 Ibid., 186–187.

6 Ibid., xix, xvii.

7 Ibid., xvii, 362, 376–377. In 1859 a group of dissenters in Iowa formed what they claimed was the "true" Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints led by Joseph Smith's first wife and one of his sons. In 1863 missionaries they sent to Utah called plural marriage, "slavery." Brigham Young's response called Emma Smith a "damned liar." See page 377.

8 Ibid., 63–64.

9 Ibid., 195.

10 Ibid., 84.

11 Ibid., xvii.

12 Ibid., 63.

13 Ibid., xvii.

14 Ibid., 441.

15 Ibid,. 113–114.

16 Ibid., 88. Ulrich attributes this quotation to William Clayton's *Affidavit* in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, Church History Library, Salt Lake City, and to William Clayton's *Journal, 1842–1846*, also housed in this library.

17 Ibid., 239–241. The announcement was prepared in advance and 100 missionaries left Salt Lake instructed to reveal the doctrine on the same day in many locations. Only 1/3 of these men had more than one wife. Determining how many men had plural wives and how many wives each had is difficult before the doctrine's public announcement. Ulrich reveals her sources in an endnote on page 415.

18 Ibid., 251.

19 Abigail Adams to John Adams, March 31, 1776, Massachusetts Historical Society, https://www.masshist.org/digitaladams/archive/doc?id=L17760331aa

20 Carrie A. Moore, "DNA Tests Rule Out 2 as Smith Descendants," *Deseret News,* November 10, 2007.

21 Ulrich, *A House Full of Females*, 386.

22 Ibid., 95, 269–271.

23 Ibid., xii–xiii.

24 Ibid., 386. The Utah Constitution also gave women the right to hold office.

25 I have been gathering the information I summarize in this paragraph for several years and for the sake of brevity have chosen not to endnote my sources for this lecture. Most of it is readily available online, especially through various law journals and women's history sites.

26 Ancestry's "Roots Web" has good information about women's legal status relating to divorce, property rights, child custody, etc., https://home.rootsweb.com/

27 My great-great-grandfather, Washington Rowland, Wade Hampton Rowland's brother, is the man described in this divorce example which occurred in Henry County, Virginia. A descendant of Washington Rowland's only child of this marriage researched the various archives as well as Virginia and Henry County records on this case and obtained copies of sworn statements and actions taken leading to the passage of the bill of divorcement for Nancy Clark Bouldin Rowland. This descendant of Washington Rowland's only child later published an account for the family. Both Nancy and Washington were born in Henry County: he in 1783, she in 1793. They were married there in 1815 and the divorce procedure began in 1820. The "neighbors" (they had to be residents of the county) signed sworn statements and petitions before a Henry County Justice of the Peace. These statements and petitions were addressed to "the honorable, the general assembly of Virginia." Washington disappears from Henry County records after the divorce until 1827 when he reappears regarding the estate of his father armed with his siblings' powers of attorney. His widowed mother and siblings had migrated to Kentucky, so I assume he did, too. Even later there is a lawsuit filed among this group of siblings, regarding his mother's estate. My ancestor, Wade Hampton Rowland, is on one side and Washington Rowland on the other.

28 Ulrich, A House Full of Females, 105.

29 Ibid., 214, 350.

30 Ibid., 212.

31 Ibid. Woodruff kept a "meticulous record (over 5,000 pages in typescript)." He wrote in what he called his Journal almost daily beginning in 1835 and continuing until 1875. This activity was very important to him, and he encouraged others to do the same. He also

composed "end-of-year summaries." See page xxi, the chart on page xxii, and the index for many references to Woodruff's Journal.

[32] Ibid., 16, 280. During the early Mormon period, Smith's and Young's wedding ceremonies had no rings, veil, or promise to obey, with both husband and wife making the same pledge. Later there was some change in the ceremony. Before his death Smith introduced the notion that one must be married for salvation, and required belief that plural marriage was "divine order." See page 16.

[33] Ibid., 279–280. A pre-printed form is described here. Young issued, but did not sign, the certificate. It established what the couple were doing and to what their witnesses attested, which the couple mutually agreed upon.

[34] Ibid., 435.

[35] Ibid., xv, xiv, 131.

[36] Ibid., 212, 282.

[37] Ibid., 157.

[38] In the Urbana, Illinois public library I found the following in a book published by Urbana's Champaign County Genealogy Society (1991). It is the last paragraph of a long Beal family history beginning several generations before, but follows the descendants of these women's brother into the generation contributing the article. It reads, "Electa Beal married Alexander Westover and had two children. After Alex died, Electa, the children and Laura adopted the Mormon religion and moved to Salt Lake City. Hannah may have done the same. We know nothing further about Polly [Mary]." I am descended from Polly who earlier moved to Illinois. Using this bit of information added to appropriate sources listed in the Ulrich book, I have found these women in Mormon records and now know some about their lives in Salt Lake.

[39] Ulrich, *A House Full of Females*, 105, 352, 419. Ulrich's Mormon History Association Presidential Address, published as "Runaway Wives, 1830–1860," is found in *The Journal of Mormon History* 42 (April 2016): 126.

[40] Ibid., 14–15, 105, 187, 267–268, 285, 350.

[41] Ibid., xiii, 375. In 1868, Sarah Kimball, an important and powerful Salt Lake Mormon woman, while dedicating a Women's Relief Society Hall building said something very similar to what Anthony later says: "Woman's allotted sphere of labor is not sufficiently extensive, and varied to enable her to exercise all her God-given powers and faculties…. Nor are her labors made sufficiently remunerative to afford her that independence compatible with true womanly dignity." See page 375.

42 Ibid., 383.

43 Ibid., 212, 221.

44 Ibid., 229. She suggested Apostle Ezra Taft Benson with the proviso *she* would decide when the relationship began and ended. Benson was selected for the powerful Quorum of Twelve Apostles soon after the death of Joseph Smith. His great-grandson of the same name was Secretary of Agriculture during Eisenhower's presidency, and also a long-time member of the Quorum, serving as its president from 1985 to 1994.

45 Ibid., 38.

46 Ibid., 234–235. The George Smith family women are described on these pages as "prodigies in economic production." They certainly were. It makes one tired just to read what they accomplished. They also produced a small number of children which may have contributed to their ability to do all they did.

47 Ibid., 218–219, 290–291. One of Young's wives shared with him a dislike of doctors and preference for herbalists and midwives. When he spoke disparagingly of doctors attending childbirth by using animals and Native American women as examples of nature's way of bearing children, his plural wife Augusta Cobb Young was angry he would use such examples. She told him she "was committed to ascending, not descending…happy to have an Indian chop her wood, but she did not want to live like a squaw." She also told him women should be sent on missions just as men.

48 Ibid., 290.

49 Ibid., 291, 293.

50 Ibid., 40.

51 Ibid., 376.

52 Ibid., 372.

53 Ibid., 378.

54 Ibid., 193, 369–370.

55 Ibid., 110.

56 Ibid., 41, 175, 179–182, 291.

57 Ibid., 41–42.

58 Ibid., 179.

59 Ibid., 181.

60 Ibid,. 172.

61 Ibid., 109.

[62] Ibid., 212.

[63] Ibid., 222–223, 437. Today's standards for an elementary class with 20 students recommends four times as much space as this teacher had for her 69.

[64] Ibid., 55.

[65] Ibid., xi. Many other instances of government office holders and government documents attacking Mormon polygamy are referenced in Ulrich's footnote to this quotation. See page 399, note 2.

[66] Ibid., 185, 198.

[67] Ibid., 23. Ulrich lists sources for information on the lives of Boston Mormon women in her endnotes. See page 405.

John Dewey and the American Civil War

Samuel F. Stack, Jr., University of West Virginia

Introduction

As a southerner and first-grader during the centennial celebration of the Civil War's onset, I grew up with a fascination of that war. Although no significant battles occurred in western South Carolina, I held re-enactments of great battles in my backyard. William Faulkner fully captures my emotions in his book, *Intruder in the Dust*:

> For every Southern boy fourteen years old, not once but whenever he wants it, there is the instant when it's still not yet two o'clock on the July afternoon in 1863, the brigades are in position behind the rail fence, the guns are laid and ready in the woods and the furled flags are already loosened to break out and Pickett himself with his long oiled ringlets and his hat in one hand probably and his sword in the other looking up the hill waiting for Longstreet to give the word and it's all in the balance.[1]

It does not take much for a fourteen-year-old to think, "*This time. Maybe this time*.[2] The Civil War centennial took place at a time of racial unrest in the south due largely to the 1954 *Brown* decision and attempts to integrate schools exemplified by Little Rock and resulting in actual occupation by federal troops not seen in the south since 1876.

So my familiarity with the Civil War began as a child coming of age in the 1960s and the early 1970s. I recall my grandmother often speaking of that dastardly Sherman and his march to the sea, carving a 60-mile-wide path through Georgia and South Carolina, the seat of secession. Her recollections were at least two generations from the actual events, but these stories had been passed down to her clearly: a type of southern collective memory. My maternal (North Carolina origin) and paternal (South Carolina origin) ancestors fought for the Confederacy, one serving as a cook in the 21st South Carolina as a young teenager, and the other in the respected 25th North Carolina (NC) Infantry that participated in the major battles of the Seven Days, Sharpsburg (Antietam), Fredericksburg, and the Petersburg Campaign.

Charles Fraser's book *Cold Mountain* is based on the unit history of my maternal ancestor's unit, the 25th NC. The U.S. was never the same after 1859; the war changed this country. Perceptions and collective memories of the Civil War shaped my sense of identity over a hundred years later, but also shaped many other lives associated with U.S. intellectual thought and educational practice, including Colonel Francis Parker, William James, and John Dewey through the experiences of his father, Archibald Sprague Dewey. Biographers and historians often speculate on the influence the Civil War had on Dewey. Dewey often mentions and seems proud of his father's service, noting that during his youth his father shared his experiences with the Dewey boys.[3] Sidney Hook maintains the Civil War was always a part of Dewey's thought. Hook writes:

> There is one theme related to violence that Dewey never wrote about in length, so far as I know, but nonetheless lay close to his heart; for in conversation with me over a quarter of a century he would raise it and return to it whenever some event or movement gave it relevance. This was the American Civil War, in whose shadow he came to self-consciousness.[4]

According to Hook, Dewey saw no historical necessity for the Civil War but, after the raid of John Brown on Harper's Ferry, believed Lincoln's solution to purchase slaves from the slave holders came too late. According to Hook, Dewey felt Brown was an extremist and Emerson's portrayal of Brown (Dewey greatly admired Emerson) was "out of character in his extravagant defense of Brown."[5] Never a friend of extremism, there is no question Dewey is concerned with the impact of the war on social, political, and economic forces and that his work is an attempt to deal with the country's changing social and moral fabric following the war and the war's stimulation of U.S. capital and industrialization. My purpose in this paper is briefly to explore the impact of the Civil War on Dewey, and its impact on his moral consciousness and his view of intelligence as being the best means to solve problems rather than resorting to forms of violence such as war. For Dewey the process of education was a key component in how to make use of one's intelligence. While Dewey never wrote about his father's experience in the war there is little doubt his father, Archibald, shared his experiences with John. Dewey has many intellectual influences; two of the most important are Francis Wayland Parker, to whom Dewey refers as the father of progressive education, and William James, one of the founders of philosophical pragmatism. Parker was a Civil War veteran and often spoke of how the war affected his life and, although James served only briefly, the war affected his life through his family's experiences.

Colonel Francis W. Parker

Colonel Frank. W. Parker, as he is listed on the muster roll, joined the 4th New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry in August 1861 and was commissioned a Second Lieutenant in Company E. During the Civil War officers were often elected and by 1865 Parker had been promoted to Lieutenant Colonel serving a short time as prisoner of war in North Carolina. The 4th New Hampshire spent the war's early years off the coasts of South Carolina, North Carolina, and Georgia as the Union attempted to form a blockade to capture southern coastal islands. In 1863, the regiment was active in the battle of Fort Wagner on Morris Island. Serving with Grant in the Army of the Potomac in May 1864, the 4th participated in the battle of Drewy's Bluff, followed by Cold Harbor, and the prolonged Petersburg siege. On July 30, 1864 Parker witnessed the famed Battle of the Crater when coal miners from Pennsylvania dug a tunnel under Confederate entrenchments and placed explosives.[6] The detonation created a huge gap in Confederate lines, the violence of the explosion stunning both Confederate and Union troops, but the Union failed to exploit its opportunity. Chronicled in the movie *Cold Mountain*, Union troops, accompanied by many African-American soldiers, entered the crater and failed to advance. This failure led to angered Confederate troops pouring fire into the crater and heavy hand-to-hand combat. Parker personally evaded the crater's violence but was wounded on August 16, 1864 in an engagement near Malvern Hill, Virginia and was back in New England by September 1864 for recuperation. While in New Hampshire, Parker campaigned for Lincoln, eventually being recalled for service with Sherman's army near Goldsboro, North Carolina. Unfortunately, Lieutenant Colonel Parker and a squad of men were captured by Confederate cavalry when they made a detour near Goldsboro. Parker was captured on the same day—April 9, 1865—that Robert E. Lee surrendered the Army of Northern Virginia. Eventually paroled, Parker spent the last months of the war on occupation duty in Raleigh, North Carolina. Parker was once asked what part of his education he valued most. He notes "his five years on the farm and his four years in the army."[7] The unit was mustered out in August 23, 1865, having suffered a total of 234 causalities. Parker experienced considerable violence as a soldier; he fought to restore the Union and for the freedom and emancipation of the slave. His war experiences taught him the "value of each life as a factor in building up and maintaining the social well-being of any community."[8] Challenging the autocracy of the formal school, Parker's goal was to "emancipate the child and the teacher both."[9] Dewey notes Parker inspired "the teacher and the child in the schoolroom with his own affectionate and sympathetic personality."[10] Parker needed all his skills as an educator

and leader as he began to battle the formal school's formalism and autocracy to emancipate both child and teacher.

William James

Shortly after the firing on Fort Sumter by Confederate forces on April 12, 1861, President Lincoln called for 75,000 volunteers to subdue to revolt. On April 17, William James and a friend, Tom Perry, watched the Rhode Island militia march off to war. Caught up in the fervor, William signed up for a 90-day enlistment with the Newport Artillery Company, spending his time rolling bandages and making bullets.[11] Other than this short stint in the militia William James never served in the Union army; no one is sure why not. Some suggest his father's opposition to his service, others suggest his poor eyesight. Rather than joining Union forces James entered Harvard in 1861, although William, Sr. did not support his sons going to college. At the time Harvard was described as "small, sparsely attended, poorly equipped and thinly staffed,"[12] yet seemed to be able to attract excellent students such as William James.

James' brother Wilky joined the 44th Massachusetts in 1862 and by 1863 was recommended by his regimental colonel for a place in the newly forming Black regiment, the 54th Massachusetts, chronicled in the movie *Glory*. The 54th was under the command of twenty-five-year-old Colonel Robert Gould Shaw, the regiment composed of roughly 1,000 soldiers including two sons of Frederick Douglass. William James was in the crowd watching the 54th march off to war and pondered his own choice not to serve as had his brothers, Wilky and Bob. James recalls the regimental march through Boston:

> I looked back and saw their faces and figures against the evening sky, and they looked so young and victorious, that I, much gnawed by questions as to my own duty of enlisting or not, shrank back—they had not seen me—from being recognized. I shall never forget the impressions they made.[13]

Bob was serving in the 45th Massachusetts and eventually the second all-Black regiment, the 55th Massachusetts, which found itself in the middle of the Boston draft riots in July, 1863. The James brothers did not participate in the Battle of Gettysburg, however, shortly after the end of Gettysburg, on July 10, 1863, Wilky' s regiment was shipped to James Island just outside of Charleston, South Carolina where he participated in the battle of Fort Wagner, the culminating scene in the movie *Glory*. In this virtual suicide mission 50% of the regiment was killed, including Robert Gould Shaw and 23 officers. Wilky was shot in the side and foot, dragged himself to the ocean and was picked up by stretcher bearers; one bearer was struck in the head as he carried Wilky. Like many Civil War wounds, Wilky's became infected and required recuperation. After

healing he was mustered in again, participating Sherman's attack on Charleston. Wilky survived the war and attempted to create a profitable plantation in Florida with the help of freed slaves. A poor manager of money, he declared bankruptcy in 1877, began to suffer from his war wounds, and died in 1883. He was 38 years old.[14]

While James' experience of the war is very different from Parker's, he too experiences a kind of violence as he watches his brother gradually wither and die from his wounds. James knew the role of race in the war, that his brother died believing in a cause focused on ending slavery, and that slavery was a major cause of the violence. Apparently, James regretted not enlisting beyond his short stint with the Rhode Island militia and "chalked it up to his own pusillanimity with respect to the defining moment of his generation."[15] In his speech dedicating the St. Gauden's monument in Boston Common honoring Robert Gould Shaw and the 54th Massachusetts, James states, "Every war leaves such miserable legacies, future war and revolution, unless the civic virtues of the people save the State in time."[16] Scholars insist that of all the primary pragmatists, including James, Charles Sanders Pierce, and Dewey, it was James who stresses most the emphasis on moral choice and how to weigh those choices. Perhaps he saw his "enlistment in a civilian form of service opposite to war in the form of a moral equivalent."[17] In the next section I address the participation of John Dewey's father, Archibald Sprague Dewey, in the war, followed by a discussion of the potential impact of the war on Dewey and how it shaped his view of violence as an immoral means to solve human problems.

Archibald Sprague Dewey and John Dewey

Archibald Sprague Dewey, John Dewey's father, was 50 when the Civil War began in 1861. Lucina was pregnant, raising two boys at home, and helping to run a successful business. We do not know what precipitates Archibald's enlistment in the 1st Vermont Cavalry, the only cavalry regiment supplied by Vermont during the war. Was it patriotism, support of abolitionism, escape from dealing with the loss of a child, or was he just seeking adventure? We simply do not know, but we do know Archibald was a staunch Republican and remained one throughout his life. Archibald sold his grocery store, enlisted in the summer of 1861, and when funds ran out Lucina sold the family home and moved in with relatives.[18] Archibald had little formal schooling but was well-read and a keen observer of events and detail as I shall demonstrate.[19]

Archibald Dewey's unit, the 1st Vermont Cavalry, was a respected cavalry unit during the Civil War. The unit participated in over 72 battles and skirmishes including Gettysburg, the Wilderness, Yellow Tavern, Cold Harbor, Five Forks, Dinwiddie Court House, and finally the Appomattox Campaigns, eventually leading to the surrender of Lee's Army of Northern Virginia. During the war the regiment lost 10 officers

and 124 enlisted men in battle and 4 officers and 200 enlisted men to disease. During the Civil War far more soldiers died from disease, exposure, and lack of immunities than from war wounds.[20] During the war the cavalry was used mostly for intelligence gathering, reconnaissance, skirmishing, and feigning movements to confuse the enemy, but by 1863 was participating more in larger engagements such as Gettysburg and Brandy Station, the largest U.S. cavalry battle ever fought. A cavalry regiment was generally composed of around 1,000 soldiers, or troopers as they were called, 5 squadrons to a regiment.[21] The 1st Vermont was composed of 10 companies of around 100 men per company making close to 1,000 troopers in the regiment. Archibald Dewey initially enlisted as a 1st Sergeant but served most of the war as a staff officer, also serving as regimental quartermaster with an enlisted quartermaster sergeant under him. Archibald, sporting a gray beard at the time, was considered a "good and competent man of high character."[22] As a former storekeeper, the role of the regimental quartermaster was an ideal assignment. With the assistance of the quartermaster sergeant, Archibald was in charge of company wagons and their contents which typically included tents, mess gear, company desk and library, ordnance, food, and tools. This responsibility could also include forage, food for horses, and the distributing of items to troopers. His role during combat was to keep wagons and stores secure—not a simple task.[23]

During the Shenandoah Valley Campaign, which made Stonewall Jackson even more famous, the 1st Vermont Cavalry was ordered by commanding Union General Nathaniel Banks to seek out and find Jackson who was eluding and harassing federal troops. Fearing a threat to Washington, Lincoln pressured Banks to act and challenge Jackson's 17,000 men. Jackson was trying to tie up Union forces under George McClelland who were pressuring Lee's forces around Richmond. Historians refer to the conflict between Banks and Jackson as the first Battle of Winchester. Fearing Jackson and his reputation, Banks ordered the federal stores in Strasburg, Virginia burned. "As the 1st Vermont abandoned Strasburg," writes unit historian Joseph Collea, "the regiments own train, consisting of nineteen wagons and two ambulances, waited up ahead commanded by Archibald Dewey."[24] Archibald Dewey reports in detail his participation in the event and certainly conveys this experience to an attentive young John and his brothers Davis and Charles. Archibald, known for his sense of humor, also knew how to tell a story and one can easily visualize the event.

> The baggage train was taken across Cedar Creek early in the morning of May 24th by orders from headquarters, [Archibald writes,] "…about ten o'clock word came that the trains in front

were cut off and we should soon be attacked; this caused a slight flurry, which a word from my wagon master C. P. Stone of Company F instantly quieted. About 4 o'clock a battery of 4 guns, followed by our regiment under Col. Tompkins as a support, came up and took a position a short distance to the right and front of our train. The firing was brisk for over half an hour, when the battery, being threatened by a flank movement of the enemy…was forced to limber up and retire…the train was put in motion, each driver taking his proper place in the line in the most perfect order. We had no sooner commenced to move that the enemy's sharpshooters showed themselves emerging from the timber within half rifle range, and the hiss of bullets soon became familiar; but not even then did confusion arise—in proof of which I will say that three drivers dismounted to chain their wheels in descending a steep hill…. Four teams crossed the stream unhurt, the others got into the water, several horses fell by the fire which was poured in by largely increased numbers; there being now from 7 to 100 within 20 to 25 rods. Still not a man left his seat while his horses kept their legs. When one horse fell, another was cut loose, the driver would mount and be off. In this way seventeen horses out of seventy-six were saved. When the passage through the water was obstructed by dead or disabled horses the order was given to the drivers to save themselves by cutting out each a horse for himself; and I have reason to hope that all are alive, though two were wounded and four are prisoners. I have written nothing on hearsay; the whole movement was made under my own observation and directions.[25]

In attempting to protect the wagons, Archibald Dewey's men held their ground as long as they could. Attempting to retreat to Williamsport, the wagon train found itself under attack; attempts to burn the wagons failed.[26] Tired and hungry Confederates swarmed over the 1st Vermont's possessions. Confederates gave General Banks the derogatory nickname "Commissary Banks" and the regiment lost all its regimental flags to the enemy. Regardless of this significant loss, Archibald Dewey was noted by 1st Vermont Colonel Charles Tomkins for his "faithful and meritorious service and received a promotion to Captain."[27] Chaplain Woodward of the 1st Vermont recalls, "Our retreat from Virginia was rapid, our disasters considerable, and our escape wonderful considering the circumstances. Every hour lessened our calamities by bringing in men who we feared were hopelessly cut off."[28]

Archibald participated as quartermaster throughout the war and, as mentioned, took part in some of the war's most significant battles. The 1st Vermont served the later years of the war under Judson Kilpatrick, Phil Sheridan, and the notorious George Armstrong Custer whom the 1st Vermont respected due to his bravery and aggressiveness. Custer often asked for the 1st Vermont to serve with him and the regiment sought retention under his command.

Lucina Dewey, missing her husband and, according to Jane Dewey, "Weary of the long separation from her husband brought about by his service in the Union army moved the family to his headquarters in northern Virginia for the last winter of the war."[29] Probably sensing the need for her boys to see their father, Lucina sold the house on Willard Street in Burlington on April 1, 1864 and began planning to move the family closer to Archibald. Jane Dewey notes the family moved to Cumberland, Virginia in 1863 and did not return as an intact family to Burlington until 1867. Cumberland was considered Union and Union-sympathetic territory. There is no doubt the family was together around Christmas, 1864 and around Moorefield, Virginia, now located within West Virginia in what today is termed the eastern panhandle. During the winter camp of 1864, a time when both armies tended to go into winter quarters, there was a lull in the fighting. With the war going against the Confederacy it was deemed safe for families to visit loved ones in camp, although the 1st Vermont had been engaged at Lacy Springs as late as December 21, 1864. The region the Deweys lived in includes Harpers Ferry, Shepherdstown, and Martinsburg with Shepherdstown, only a few miles from the Antietam battlefield. We do not know if young Dewey visited any of these areas. According to Charles Cowles of Company I, 1st Vermont Cavalry who kept a diary at the time, the weather was mild and comfortable for the time of the year. On Christmas Eve, 1864, he notes a "lot of galvanized Yankees were sent back to prison," and on Christmas day they received their "Christmas rations meal and some sweet potatoes."[30] Dewey was four years old when he joined his father and recalls the first Christmas spent with his father in 1864.

> The Xmas I remember best was the one when I was four-years-old I think; my father was stationed in West Virginia in the war and mother took us down to spend a winter there, and one of the few things I remember is waking up and seeing their bed across the room, it seemed a mile, and then getting some things; one of them was a little wooden churn. Afterwards my mother told me, it must have been many years later that they thought we would be so disappointed because it was so impossible to get things there and how happy we were with what we got.[31]

John Dewey also mentions spending some time in Charles Town, West Virginia, where John Brown was tried and hanged.[32]

The 1st Vermont was not engaged again until a conflict at Waynesboro, Virginia on March 2, 1865. Present at Appomattox one month later, the 1st Vermont was witness to the Army of Northern Virginia's surrender on April 9, 1865, reported in *The Burlington Free Press.*

> So the principal army of the Confederacy under immediate command of its commander and chief and greatest general, has gone down with its capital. So the rebel confederacy has crashed down in golden ruin: Praise be to God who has given us the victory![33]

It is not known whether Archibald was present at the Grand Review of the Union armies held in Washington. Apparently, he remained behind and spent time in North Carolina and then was involved in a business in southern Illinois, near Cairo. Following the close of the war Archibald did not return to Burlington until 1867. Archibald Dewey never wavered from the party of Lincoln although the party was transforming away from Lincoln's vision of a republic by the people, for the people, and of the people. In 1876, John recalls Archibald's anger at first reports Democrat Samuel Tilden had won the presidential election. "In 1876 when the first reports were that Tilden was elected," Dewey writes, "my father said the civil war was fought in vain and that it would have been better to let the southern states go."[34]

Prodded by biographers interested in chronicling his life, John Dewey wrote in 1933 about his father's service and seems the proud son. "My father was in the army most of the civil war period and I and my mother and brother lived with other members of the family."[35] George Dykhuizen notes Archibald "delighted his sons with anecdotes of his youth and with accounts of his experiences during the Civil War."[36] Dewey also recalls his father's dry wit and geniality and Jay Martin emphasizes he "yearned to be affected by his father" and "hungered for his father's affection."[37] As a young child, Dewey grew up without his father and was already eight years old when the family was reunited in Burlington. Archibald was absent during the formative years of Dewey's life, but through their correspondence a closer relationship built over the years.

Archibald's letters to John show his wit, compassion, and affection for his son. Archibald often commented on the weather. On October 16, 1882 Archibald writes to John,

> …the weather is magnificent, not a cloud to be sure…morn to dewy eve, and then we have a new moon which stands straight up on its tail, or hangs down by the nose, not being a

> moonologist I can't say which way to put it, but there it is, and
> if it stays there till you come home you may see it for
> yourself….[38]

Archibald also warns John to watch out for the "southern cannibals,"
referring to mosquitoes, when young Dewey was in Baltimore studying
at Johns Hopkins.[39] Although Archibald often attended the First
Congregational Church with Lucina he often poked fun at her in his
letters to John noting in one letter her religious fervor in attending a
temperance meeting and her frequent illnesses.[40]

Archibald wrote John on his 26th birthday (October 20, 1889) and
seemed to write most often when prodded by Lucina.

> Haven't I let you alone pretty well this time, [writes Archibald,]
> "I didn't forget yesterday, the anniversary of your burglarious
> entrance to the family circle, but the weather was so fine that I
> did not lay aside the spade for the pen, as the garden is more
> than half unawakened from its summer sleep…. I was too tired
> to do more than think of John and pray, God bless him.[41]

That same year Archibald and John had a political argument over
the election of Grover Cleveland. Dewey told his father he would vote
for Cleveland, a Democrat and the first Democrat to be elected after the
Civil War. Dewey tells Sidney Hook it was the second emotional crisis in
his life when his father, still a Lincoln Republican, feels John is betraying
the "cause for which he had fought."[42] The first crisis is the religious
struggle Dewey deals with as a young man, heavily influenced by his
mother.

Early in 1891, due to health and age Archibald and Lucina moved in
with John and Alice in Ann Arbor where Dewey was a professor at the
University of Michigan. Archibald was 80 years old when he passed away
on April 10, 1891. There is no known reaction of John Dewey to his
father's death, however, the First Congregational Church in Ann Arbor
refers to his death as, "our brother Mr. Archibald S. Dewey, who even
his short sojourn among us we have learned greatly to esteem and
love."[43]

The Civil War and John Dewey

When Dewey and his brothers Davis and Charles visited their father
in northern Virginia they entered a world "damaged and scarred by
massive destruction, starvation, and corpses."[44] Scholars note the
experience as "an important reference point for [Dewey's] later
reflections on the futility of violence in the achievement of human
purposes."[45] There is little doubt Dewey was affected by changes in
social, political, and intellectual thought that followed the Civil War, yet
he writes virtually nothing that specifically connects his thought to the

war. The war stimulates the U.S.' own industrial revolution and the power and exploitation of capital. This change does not go unnoticed by Dewey and in many ways forms the genesis of his thought and concerns about the disruption of community life and the threat it posed to democracy. For Dewey the school plays an instrumental role in the restoration of community life, where people work together for self-satisfaction but also for the common good. Dewey's concept of community restoration is well-formed prior to the turn of the 20ᵗʰ century, evidenced in his works *The School and Society* and *The Child and the Curriculum*, and thematic throughout his work.[46]

While never an absolute pacifist, Dewey always champions the use of intelligence over force to solve human problems and conflict. In his support of the U.S.' entry into World War I, Dewey seems to see intelligence as a means to an end eventually to make the world safe for democracy. Dewey's oldest son Fred, a commissioned officer during World War I, and Dewey supported Wilson's war aims in the construction of a post-war world of peace. Dewey envisioned the U.S.' entry into war as a means to force its allies to move the new world toward an U.S.-shaped democracy. Dewey's progressive allies were outraged by his stance, most notably Randolph Bourne and Jane Addams, and contemporary historians note Dewey's naïveté in the use of war as an instrument for peace.[47] Dewey was in essence "keeping with his understanding of the importance of community, moreover, he backed the concept of a global order for the larger society to emulate."[48]

Dewey learned from his naïveté and optimism in the use of war as an instrument of peace, evident through his participation in the outlawry of the war movement "using the method of intelligence to build the requisite moral and political awareness for the realization—conceptually and in application—that the system of war is detrimental to the demands of any situation."[49] Dewey's conceptualization of outlawry is based on an educated public "cognizant of morality as justice formulated through standards of societal consciousness."[50] "The considerations that moved him with respect to war," writes Sidney Hook, "were all the more weighty in his judgment on civil war—which is the fiercest and most inhuman of all wars—as an instrument of social change in a democracy where other modes of affecting change albeit more slowly, are available."[51]

Throughout Dewey's work he emphasizes education is key to the creation and maintenance of democratic society. Education is the process by which we "learn to live together peacefully as well as a practical application of life's everyday experiences to the body of knowledge already acquired. Education was the key to social cooperation

and peace."[52] Education is the process by which society learns and practices this civil virtue.

The American Civil War forms the foundation of Dewey's understanding of war. As a child he witnesses devastation and suffering brought on by the war, but also experiences the impact of war on his family as he endured separation from his father. The war has an impact on his father and his future colleagues Colonel Francis Parker and William James. In a note of caution—and one that is contemporary—James says it best: "Democracy is still upon its trial."[53] James notes in his oration honoring Robert Shaw:

> The civic genius of our people is its only bulwark, and neither laws nor monuments, neither battleships nor public libraries, nor great newspapers nor booming stocks; neither mechanical invention nor political adroitness, nor churches nor universities nor civil-service examinations can save us from degeneration if the inner mystery be lost.[54]

In a world characterized by civil war, ethnic genocide, religious war, and growing nationalism, Dewey's desire to create "a global culture that is socially, economically, and culturally based on the concept of justice"[55] becomes a moral imperative for society's virtual survival.

Endnotes

[1] William Faulkner, *Intruder in the Dust* (New York, NY: Signet Books, 1948), 12.

[2] Ibid. Of course Faulkner is referring to what became known as Pickett's Charge which failed to break the Union lines at Gettysburg and is considered to be a major turning point in the war.

[3] John Dewey to Joseph Ratner, September 9, 1949. *The Correspondence of John Dewey 1871–2007*, electronic edition. (Charlottesville, VA: Intelex), http://www.nlx.com/collections/132. At the time Ratner was planning a biography of Dewey.

[4] Sidney Hook, *Education and the Taming of Power* (LaSalle, IL: Open Court, 1973), 141–142. Hook mentions Dewey's support of the Outlawry of War movement. He does not mention Dewey's support of World War I and his attempt to make Europe an U.S.-style democracy.

[5] Ibid., 141.

[6] Jack Campbell, *Colonel Francis W. Parker: The Children's Crusader* (New York, NY: Teachers College Press, 1967), 23–24. In 1862 while serving in Florida, Parker was brought up on charges by 79 men in

Company E, 4th New Hampshire for "striking and choking them." Parker was arrested and tried but the charges were dropped on a technicality. Parker had a strong reputation for discipline and was apparently fond of occasional strong drink. See Campbell, *Colonel Francis W. Parker: The Children's Crusader,* 28.

7 Ibid.

8 William R. Harper, Albert G. Lane, John Dewey, and Emil G. Hirsch, "In Memoriam: Colonel Francis Wayland Parker, Late Director of the School of Education, University of Chicago," *The Elementary School Teacher and Course of Study* 2, no. 10 (1902), 699–715. See specifically page 702.

9 Ibid., 705.

10 Ibid., 714.

11 Robert Richardson, *William James: In the Maelstrom of American Modernism: A Biography* (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 2006), 40. In his study of the roots of pragmatism, Louis Menand, in *The Metaphysical Club* (New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2001), also looks at the life of Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., also a Civil War veteran.

12 Richardson, *William James*, 43.

13 Louis Menand, *The Metaphysical Club* (New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2001), 74. This quotation is from a letter James writes to Carlotta Lowell in Ferris Greenslet's, *The Lowells and Their Seven Worlds* (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1946), 289. Carlotta was the daughter of Colonel Charles Russell Lowell of the 54th Massachusetts who died from his wounds at Cedar Creek in 1864 and who was nephew to poet James Russell Lowell. Colonel Lowell was observed by James during the regimental march and presented the "young and victorious" figure James describes. Williams James gave the dedication address for the August St. Gaudens monument dedicated to Robert Gould Shaw and the 54th Massachusetts. Menand refers to it as one of James' greatest speeches. See Menand, *The Metaphysical Club*, 147.

14 Ibid., 230. Henry James, Sr. supported Wilky's plantation experiment in Florida with $40,000, a substantial amount, felt Wilky had received his inheritance, and subsequently left Wilky out of his will. William James supported his brother's inclusion in the will yet was concerned Wilky's wife "had a good deal of money." At the time the estate of Henry, Sr. was about $1.5 million in modern currency.

15 Charles F. Howlett and Audrey Cohan, *John Dewey, America's Peace-Minded Educator* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2016), 19.

[16] William James, *Essays in Religion and Morality* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982), 73. The essay within which this quotation appears is entitled, "Robert Gould Shaw: Oration by William James."

[17] Ibid.

[18] Jay Martin, *The Education of John Dewey* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2002), 10. See also John Dewey to George Dykhuisen, October 15, 1949, *The Correspondence of John Dewey.*

[19] Jane Dewey notes in her "Biography of John Dewey," [in Paul Schlipp's *The Philosophy of John Dewey* (LaSalle: IL, Open Court, 1939/1989), 6,], that Archibald is fond of Shakespeare, Milton, Carlyle, and Thackeray, but not fond of Emerson or Thoreau.

[20] See https://www.nps.gov/civilwar/facts.htm

[21] See http://www.civilwar.com/overview/315weapons/148532-calvary-62478.html

[22] Joseph Collier, *The First Vermont Cavalry in the Civil War: A History* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, 2010). This is the most comprehensive study of the 1st Vermont Cavalry. Archibald was commissioned quartermaster on 14 November 1861. See *Burlington Free Press*, November 15, 1861, http://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn84023127/1861-11-15/ed-1/seq-1/. Archibald's muster record only records his service through 1862. Another book, G. G. Benedict, *Vermont in the Civil War: A History of the Part Taken by the Vermont Soldiers and Sailors in the War for the Union, 1861–1865*, vols. 1 and 2 (Burlington, VT: Free Press Association, 1886) contains information only on Vermont infantry, not cavalry.

[23] See www.civilwar.com/overview/315weapons/148532-calvary-62478.html

[24] Joseph Collea, *The First Vermont Cavalry in the Civil War: A History* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, 2010), 61.This is the most comprehensive study of the 1st Vermont Cavalry. Archibald was commissioned quartermaster on 14 November 1861.

[25] Ibid.

[26] Ibid., 71.

[27] Ibid. Originally published in *The Burlington Free Press*, June 13, 1862, 2. Colonel Tompkins credits A. S. Dewey for his valuable service and efficiency in the affair.

[28] *The Burlington Free Press*, June 6, 1862, 2. This issue also reports Archibald Dewey as safe.

[29] Jane Dewey, "Biography of John Dewey," 7.

30 *Diary of Charles C. Cowles*, Company I, 1ˢᵗ First Vermont Cavalry, 1864. Burlington, University of Vermont Library.

31 Martin, *The Education of John Dewey*, 12.

32 John Dewey to Mrs. Porter, July 29, 1933, *The Correspondence of John Dewey.*

33 *The Burlington Free Press*, April 14, 1865, 1.

34 John Dewey to Salmon Levinson, January 1, 1932, *The Correspondence of John Dewey.* Samuel Tilden won the popular vote but due to irregularities the election was thrown to Congress where Republicans compromised with Democrats to remove Union troops from the south if Democrats would support putting Republican Rutherford B. Hayes in the White House. The only other candidates to win the popular vote and not be elected are Al Gore and Hilary Clinton.

35 Martin, *The Education of John Dewey*, 10.

36 George Dykhuizen, *The Life and Mind of John Dewey* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1973), 6.

37 Martin, *The Education of John Dewey*, 19.

38 Archibald Dewey to John Dewey, October 16, 1882, *The Correspondence of John Dewey.*

39 Archibald Dewey to John Dewey, September 22, 1882, *The Correspondence of John Dewey.*

40 Archibald Dewey to John Dewey, October 21, 1885, *The Correspondence of John Dewey.* There is no further documented correspondence between John and his father following this date.

41 Ibid.

42 Hook, *Education and the Taming of Power*, 141.

43 Dykhuizen, *The Life and Mind of John Dewey,* 342.

44 Howlett and Cohan*, John Dewey*, 16–17. See also Robert B. Westbrook, *John Dewey and American Democracy* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991), 1–2.

45 Ibid.

46 John Dewey, *The School and Society*, rev. ed. (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1915), and *The Child and the Curriculum* (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1902).

47 For an extensive discussion of critique on Dewey's stance see Westbrook, *John Dewey and American Democracy*, 195–230.

48 Howlett and Cohan*, John Dewey,* 72.

49 Ibid., 132.

50 Ibid., 133.

51 Hook, *Education and the Taming of Power*, 142.

52 Howlett and Cohan*, John Dewey,* 34.

53 James, *Essays in Religion and Morality,* 74.

54 Ibid.

55 Ibid., xvi. For support of Dewey's understanding of a global public see
    John Narayan, *John Dewey : The Global Public and Its Problems*
    (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2016).

Embracing a New Paradigm in Higher Education

Aria Mia Loberti & Adam David Roth,
University of Rhode Island

Introduction

According to a 2017 survey (Jaschik & Lederman, 2017) of 706 college and university presidents, only 12% of respondents think a majority of those in the U.S. understand the nature and intent of higher education. College and university presidents' perceived disconnect between public perception and institutional objectives stems from a decades-long reconfiguring of both perceptions and practices of higher education—the "esoteric" knowledge it has historically produced and protected, and the rise of consumer- and neoliberal-market-driven demand for career education, development, and training. Consequently, now more than ever both the public and government officials focus upon and hold higher education institutions accountable to produce graduates well-prepared for the workforce (Tandberg & Ness, 2011). As a result, the philosophy and practice of U.S. higher education are undergoing radical change, in large part fueled by the disintegration of both the financial model and the states' commitment to fund higher education that historically have sustained it; state appropriations to higher education are far below pre-recession levels in 48 of 50 states (Berman, 2016), and few predict a dramatic increase in state appropriations in the coming years (Weeden, 2015). Concurrently, the volatility of college enrollments—primarily the result of birth-rate-based demographic shifts that forecast an overall decline in the number of high-school graduates entering college—is leading many institutions to initiate aggressive recruitment and fundraising initiatives.[1] To make matters worse, two of every three institutions have experienced a decline in number of donors since 2007, even though the average-sized college and university donor's gift is on the rise (Ruffalo, 2017). Given the changing context of U.S. higher education the task falls upon those of us in higher education to decide whether and how to heed the call of public officials and private individuals to reinvent higher education so it continues to serve its dual purpose as public and private good (Weeden, 2015.).

We argue the model for higher education institutions of the near future will need to emphasize civic responsibility *and* career mobility if institutions are to accommodate and adapt to an industry-friendly higher education model focused upon increasing public support, tuition dollars, and corporate partnerships (Hart Research Associates, 2011). Current financial conditions, coupled with the introduction of new curriculum delivery modes, skill- and competency-based learning, low-cost education providers, and the disproportionate rise and governmental support of for-profit and technical institutions signal a potential paradigm shift in many higher-education institutions. This emerging paradigm prescribes organizational structures and an institutional mission that encourage industry-need-focused education and job placement, sometimes at the expense of, or at least in combination with, the exploration and accumulation of knowledge for knowledge's sake. As higher education's constituents—students, their families, and the citizens who partially fund public higher education (Harnisch & Opalich, 2017)—call upon institutions to justify the ever-growing cost of a college education, institutions are asked to heed constituents' calls for degrees that "get students jobs."

While many faculty members and administrators profess their reluctance to respond to these perceived exigencies and embrace so-called market-driven motivations and objectives, we argue these current perceptions of higher education might yield critical opportunities for pedagogical discovery, curricular diversity, and financial sustainability. By creating curricular opportunities that cater to the diverse needs and desires of learners and managing expenses effectively to produce revenue streams to support ambitious educational missions, higher education institutions might arrive at a sustainable, practical, and more inclusive model of higher education that serves the educational needs of twenty-first-century learners. We argue that, in the process, faculty need not sacrifice their ethos as academics or their intellectual mission as professionals in order to operate within higher education's current clime. Faculty will, however, need to rethink and reinvent the ways they frame and deliver twenty-first-century higher education so as to prepare students for future life and work few of us anticipate or imagine. In the following sections, we lay out and describe three main disruptions we see as instigating the paradigm shift we describe in higher education. In our paper's final section we offer recommendations for curriculum innovation that emphasize holistic learning and experiential development as essential components to producing graduates both well-equipped for citizenship and ready to reap the rewards of satisfying work.

Three Sources of Disruption

If the 2000s brought with them a startling rise in online and for-profit educational institutions and diverse modes of curriculum development and delivery (Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbley, 2009), the current decade places a spotlight on the financial (in)stability and volatility of such outfits and approaches, ushering in a new era of public accountability and institutional assessment of public higher education institutions which echoes past decades' changes to PK–12 public education. Due primarily to significant decreases in state funding support, a majority of public institutions now pay closer attention to measures of organizational effectiveness and efficiency, and most colleges and universities work actively to improve graduation rates, emphasize student employability, and introduce experience-based education, all backlit by a higher-education marketplace that encourages fiscal responsibility and consumer- and industry-driven priorities. In such a climate institutions are forced to justify their educational mission and practices, assess how close institutions come to meeting stated learning outcomes, and publicize performance metrics on student job placement, average starting salaries, and student-loan-debt levels. In the following section we explore how the changing nature of institutional revenue, system-wide accountability, and calls for educational reform by industry and students alike are three forces (among others) that disrupt so-called traditional models of U.S. higher education.

Disruption 1: Financial (In)stability

Reductions (or, in some cases, lack of increases) in state appropriations to higher education are primarily responsible for many of the financial challenges public institutions have faced over the past decade. As Lacy, Tandberg, and Hu (2017) find, there is a direct correlation between state support for public higher education and the success of the institutions they help to sustain. Despite a few negligible exceptions,[2] in most states appropriations to higher education remain significantly below pre-2008-recession levels.[3] Furthermore, the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education reports that, post-2012, many state legislatures have increased allocations to two-year institutions, community colleges, and vocational schools, while reducing support to four-year institutions and research universities (Brown, 2016). Consequently, four-year institutions and research universities are increasingly reliant on alternative sources of funding: gifts from private donors; operating revenue generated by grants; profits from extension programs like post-baccalaureate certificates; and monetization of existing resources and capital assets. Dramatically shifting sources of institutional revenue have some members of the university

community—faculty members, especially—questioning whether outside influences are threatening academic freedom and turning universities into corporate entities driven by ever-increasing revenue demands (Lazerson, 1997).

Certainly some institutions find themselves in better positions than others to attract donors and monetize assets and resources. Reductions in state funding coupled with enrollment declines and decreases in donor support are leaving fiscally unstable institutions vulnerable to practices often relegated to the business world: merger, closure, or even declaring financial exigency.[4] Smaller, nonprofit, and rural and regional colleges and universities are in greater danger of closure than their larger, publicly funded counterparts because of their heavy dependence on shrinking state support, tuition dollars, and donor funding.[5] Merger with a larger, more financially secure institution is often the only feasible alternative to closing campuses (Henking, 2017); recent examples from institutions in Georgia, discussions taking place in Pennsylvania, Connecticut, and Oregon, and the "One University" system project in Maine all center on maximizing efficiency, creating economies of scale, and restructuring statewide higher-education systems to adapt to a rapidly changing and a more-competitive-than-ever academic marketplace as high-school-graduate streams slow.[6] Many institutions have been forced to make difficult cuts to operational costs and curricular programs, sometimes at the expense of much-needed academic and student services vital to student success yet not deemed essential to staying open for business (Mitchell, Leachman, & Masterson, 2016). Correspondingly, many institutions have seen high-paid administrative positions proliferate which can bloat an institution's budget, drain its financial resources, and keep an institution from hiring faculty and bolstering academic program offerings.[7]

Disruption 2: Accountability

Cuts to public, higher-education spending coupled with increased scrutiny of student-loan-debt levels, graduation rates, and student job prospects post-graduation have encouraged greater financial responsibility among many institutions, therefore encouraging streamlined processes, improved efficiency, and creation of more accessible, affordable curricula that emphasize job mobility and lifelong, application-based learning. Now more than ever at the mercy of dwindling public financial support,[8] colleges and universities are forced to exercise more financial discipline, wary that continued tuition increases will negatively affect enrollment rates and the financial health of students post-graduation (Eagan, Stolzenberg, Bates, Aragon, Suchard, & Rios-Aguilar, 2015). At the same time, President Barack

Obama's call for publicly available college report cards and public oversight of students' overall post-graduation preparedness continues to redefine curricula in ways that respond to a neoliberal, consumerist higher education model in which the marketplace becomes the arbiter of an institution's success. Similar to the influence of the last two decades' radical healthcare industry reforms initiated by federal legislation, higher education is being refashioned from the outside in.

While constituents and legislators criticize ballooning tuition rates, in reality most students do not pay sticker price. In fact, the tuition and fees most students pay are lowered significantly by substantial financial aid packages. As Ho and Slavov (2014) contend, "much of the increase in sticker prices merely reflects an improvement in the ability of schools to price discriminate, or charge different prices to different students for the same educational services." The authors positively characterize price discrimination as a way to make higher education more affordable and accessible to a larger number of people, with wealthier and international students footing the bill and subsidizing those with greater need who receive a larger share of an institution's available financial aid. While the most visible sign of higher profit margins may controversially be lazy rivers and amusement-park-like campuses (Stripling, 2017), higher tuitions also support generous financial-aid packages used strategically to recruit and enroll students with financial need. As Ho and Slavov (2014) argue, "generous financial aid is crucial for making higher education accessible to talented individuals who might not otherwise be able to afford it."

Disruption 3: Addressing the Needs of Industry

Industry and alumni remain among the most vocal, external proponents of change (NACE, 2016). Employers who hire graduates now influence university curriculum because they argue they are in the best position to inform institutions of the skills and abilities graduates must have in order to perform jobs effectively. For instance, across industries employers maintain they seek graduates with well-developed oral and written communication skills, the ability to think critically and solve complex problems, and the desire to work collaboratively in groups and teams. The National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE) has consistently, for more than a decade, ranked these skills at the top of a list of skills employers seek in new graduates. NACE (2016) lists these too as abilities employers claim students most lack.

One firm claims employers place less emphasis on a student's college major than they place on job-related skills, abilities, and experiences (Hart Research Associates, 2013). In particular, some argue employers often prefer liberal-arts-educated graduates who typically

display both academic knowledge and field experience (O'Shaughnessy, 2016), quality e-portfolios, and résumés listing a breadth and depth of experience, rendering them well-equipped to contribute to a growing economy (Hart Research Associates, 2013). Others claim more important than a higher education institution's reputation (Hart Research Associates, 2013) or the student's major, employers now seek graduates with internship and job experience,[9] a commitment to volunteerism, and a diverse skill set with a willingness to learn (Thompson, 2014). Graduates who possess these skills may be perceived as better-rounded and able to think critically so they can self-educate themselves on new skills and abilities (Miller, 2014). Effectively, the traditional, college-level curriculum is not antithetical to the new neoliberal-market-driven demands of jobs-oriented learning, but we argue it will need to be sculpted so students make strong connections between the classroom and the workplace. So, for example, an active-learning-based approach to an English curriculum can (and should) still teach traditional content, but in a way that develops and highlights industry-valued skills.

Exposure to and an appreciation for diversity in the collegiate setting is another way higher education institutions can harness the curriculum to prepare students to be good citizens and model employees. The range of economic and demographic[10] backgrounds from which incoming college students come is expected to grow in variety, yet the number of students receiving high-school diplomas is decreasing due to long-range trends in birth rates (Seltzer, 2016). Research shows undergraduates' exposure to a diversity of people and ideas increases students' social development, prepares them for a globalized workforce, and enhances the multidisciplinary, humanistic experience of the traditional, liberal-arts degree (Hyman & Jacobs, 2009). Therefore, increasing appreciation for a diversity of people and ideas—a diversity of race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, ability, age, sexual orientation, gender identity, and religion—prepares graduates for responsible democratic citizenship and to enter a globalized workforce in which they will be expected competently and thoughtfully to interact with colleagues from a diversity of backgrounds.

In the final section of this paper, we suggest adaptive approaches to reinventing pedagogy, accelerating inclusion of a diversity of people and ideas for cultural competency, and enhancing institutional sustainability, all while respecting an institution's ethos as academic and holding true to the "spirit" of higher education. We recommend innovative approaches toward active, engaged learning that prepare students for democratic citizenship, including the pursuit of happiness through meaningful relationships, rewarding work, and service to society.

A Sustainable Model: Reinventing Higher Education

The changing demographic of high-school graduates, the professed needs of the marketplace, and the restructuring of funding models that historically sustained and guided higher-education practices make reimagining higher education's philosophy and practice more urgent. For example, some students and families embrace entitlement and instant gratification so openly they challenge the traditional model of a four-year degree. For such constituents four years seems an eternity and they wonder, "Why should a bachelor's degree take four years to complete?" In fact, while there have always been a few gifted and precocious students who complete degrees in less time, some schools like Purdue (which recently entered into a deal with for-profit Kaplan to deliver its online courses) have formalized three-year tracks to bachelor's degrees, just one of many signs higher education is rethinking its traditional approach to the degrees and services it provides—and bowing to parental and legislative pressure to reduce student-loan debt. While this expedited, high-velocity, but untried curricular model may not be suitable for all students, it is one way of reducing the cost of a college education that does not require additional state funding or a change to state funding formulas, while offering options to suit consumers.

A three-year degree, however, is only one of several means to deliver high-velocity education. As the number of adult learners will soon triple the number of college-age students, higher education institutions turn to educating adults seeking non-traditional paths to degree or credential, or who seek post-baccalaureate certificates to advance in jobs. For example, a new program at the University of Rhode Island helps registered nurses who do not yet have a bachelor's degree attain a degree online in a series of 7-week courses designed to work with their 12-hour-shift work schedules. Similarly, while universities have long offered summer courses in condensed formats, many now capitalize on short-form, one-to-three-week, winter-recess-intersession courses to help students catch up or condense time to degree; many such courses are "experience-based." Of course intersession courses are a way for universities to access revenue streams and monetize resources unused during winter recess, so the initiative is calculated to serve the dual purpose of supporting condensed time to degree and institutional revenue streams.

Blended curricula and online formats can offer possibilities outside the confines of a traditional 12-, 14-, or 16-week semester, and can include more than just a mix of face-to-face and online instruction.[11] For instance, faculty in the Harrington School of Communication and Media at the University of Rhode Island developed a "Career Road Trip" during the winter recess that meets online and face-to-face for one week, then goes on the road for a week meeting corporate executives across

three states for an intensive professional-development experience that includes traditional classroom time, online meetings, and discussions, as well as assignments, career networking, executive seminars, and workshops. A current, profitable national trend at universities offers such credit-earning, study-abroad opportunities as travel to Cuba to study architecture, study abroad experiences in Belize to film Mayan culture and explore ancient ruins, or alternative spring breaks to build school libraries in Tanzania, a trend toward emphasizing experience-based curricula with active forms of learning and a blend of instructional approaches and formats, most often in what are typically perceived and marketed as vacation destinations. One challenge going forward is to move such programs within reach of all students, not just middle- and upper-class white students who have traditionally been beneficiaries (Salisbury, Paulsen, & Pascarella, 2011).

Many potential students may not have (or desire) the luxury of participating in a traditional degree program, yet there is an institutional obligation to help students achieve the kind of education they desire and deserve. If higher education institutions firmly believe in this obligation, then they need to meet students where students are, and often that means outside the traditional 14-week semester or even the standard bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degrees. The escalating cost of college tuition and the workforce demands of industry present opportunities for higher education institutions to offer skill- and competency-based programs that develop students' capacities for embarking on rewarding work. Not all students are prepared financially (or academically) for the demands of college, and institutions can still facilitate intellectual and professional growth through microcredentials, nanodegrees, and other certifications that allow students to develop expertise and specialized skills either in lieu of or in addition to a college education. Time will tell whether the market will truly favor and reward such credentials; as of now, the financial burden one bears in registering for such non-traditional programs may or may not produce the kind of salary and return on investment one would hope to obtain upon completion.

Certainly job advancement and mobility are driving factors in post-baccalaureate certificate programs and the desire for learners to gain stamps or badges in what Arthur Levine (2000), former president of Columbia University's Teachers College, refers to as one's "educational passport." In the future, he argues, degrees will become less important, emphasis will be placed more on outcomes, and the competition for delivering those outcomes will become even greater, as a plethora of educational providers enter the marketplace. Indeed, colleges and universities are just one kind of provider in a competitive educational

marketplace that will become more, and already is, populated by a wide variety of institutions offering a range of credentials. Additionally, the more industry claims universities are failing to develop specific, required skills in graduates, the more employers are beginning to develop their own academies to train (rather than educate) employees with skills they claim most benefit their company and industry. As higher-education professionals, we have an opportunity to increase revenue by partnering with corporations rather than allowing them to do their own training, but such a shift will require unbundling traditional degrees in favor of industry's demand for *à la carte* solutions to job-specific needs.

Even within a traditional higher-educational framework the opportunity to partner with industry can be seized in a variety of ways to increase institutional revenue, from corporate–partner curricula to executive- and professional-mentoring programs. In the former students and faculty team up with corporations to work on issues plaguing a company or industry. Helping to produce solutions and provide deliverables to industry, students actively define and create, experiment and analyze, develop and refine critical-thinking skills required for working in industry. Such partnerships most closely connect to the university's mission when collaboration benefits the greater good, whether it be a communication course collaborating with a soft-drink manufacturer to market the benefits of recycling, an engineering class working to produce lower-emission, hybrid, and alternative-fuel-source vehicles, or an intermediate Spanish course partnering with a local department of health to develop strategies and the language used to communicate issues related to diabetes and healthy living to Spanish-speaking populations, the approach and desired outcomes are the same—each of these examples encourage students to exercise knowledge and critical thinking through immersive and active-learning techniques.

While partnering with a company, not-for-profit, or government agency may help students understand the connection between academic curricula and the professional contexts in which their learning can be applied, executive and professional mentoring programs can produce a similar outcome. Some maintain (Bozionelos, Kostopoulos, Van der Heijden, Roussea, Bozionelos, Hoyland, Miao, Marzec, Jędrzejowicz, Epitropaki, Mikkelsen, & Scholarios, 2015) mentoring is one of the most important indicators of professional success. Although nothing could replace the important mentoring relationships faculty develop with students, executive mentoring offers a bridge from the academy into industry, and a potential pathway to networking opportunities for students to parlay into internships and job placement upon graduation. Alumni may be the first to volunteer for such an initiative, but many

community members and leaders readily will accept an invitation to share wisdom and experience with students. Some studies suggest (Livingstone & Naismith, 2018; Hall, Walkington, Shanahan, Ackley, & Stewart, 2018) students become successful in their careers largely as a result of the mentoring relationships they experience with faculty in college. The primary goal of a mentoring program might be to provide students with a clearer understanding of their professional goals, and also how their learning and skills relate to particular job paths.

We purposefully have left technology out of our discussion so far in favor of speaking to growing capacity to meet current challenges in higher education.[12] While technology are likely to replace some future jobs, personalized and adaptive learning systems have, to some extent, already done so (Kim, 2017). We argue there is no better way to solidify the future role faculty and administrators will play in colleges and universities than to define this paradigm shift to best benefit students. Miller (2014), in an article for *HuffPost,* envisions the campus of the now-nearly-here 2019 as a place not dependent upon technology, but rather well-versed in using technological means to enhance analysis and synthesis of knowledge. The ability immediately to look up facts and figures on a smartphone and the recent evolution of university libraries into electronically driven creators, not just repositories, of information, has already revolutionized the very nature of research and the essence of libraries (Miller, 2014). Humans are not very accurate at predicting future technological changes, but prior evidence suggests most change will drastically transform the ways faculty approach teaching practices. Consequently, we argue faculty must embrace new technologies as the most surefire way of remaining relevant.

One thing is certain, however: higher education institutions of the future will be very different than the ones with which we have become comfortable and familiar. As we explore in this paper, the changing nature of institutional revenue, frequent calls for system-wide accountability, and demands for educational reform by employers and students alike are three forces disrupting the traditional model of U.S. higher education and ushering in a new paradigm to which colleges and universities attempt to adapt. We argue, rather than resist the transformations now upon us, let institutions embrace change as a critical opportunity to reinvent pedagogy, increase instructional diversity, and promote financially sustainable models of higher education. By creating educational agendas that serve the needs and desires of a diverse set of learners, and producing revenue streams to support ambitious educational missions, higher education faculty and administrators can create a sustainable, practical, and more inclusive model of higher education that fits the educational needs of twenty-first-century learners and industry.

Endnotes

[1] While some states, like Texas, will experience an increase in the number of college-bound high-school students, many states, particularly in the Northeast region, will experience substantial declines over the coming decades. Overall, the number of college-bound U.S. high-school students will be lower in 2032 than today. Demographic shifts also mean fewer white students and higher rates of Latinx and Asian/Pacific Islander students (Bransberger & Michelau, 2016).

[2] Illinois is viewed as an anomaly here, with the current higher education budget showing a 29% increase since the 2008 economic recession (Brown, 2016).

[3] For example, *The Atlantic* reports the 3.4% overall increase in appropriations since the recession is modest compared to the declines witnessed since the 2008 recession; 39 states increased funding of varying denominations and 10 experienced between a 0.4% and 8.8% decrease (Brown, 2016).

[4] It is not the small size of the faculty or student body, or the often-isolated settings that cause institutions like Burlington College to shut their doors (Bernam, 2015). Rather, closures most often occur because these institutions have a lower tolerance for financial and administrative error than their public, land-grant, or elite counterparts (Wootton, 2016).

[5] This higher likelihood of closure for smaller, community-centered universities—many of which are local fixtures and cultural staples—diminishes the diversity and strength of the U.S. higher education system (Wootton, 2016).

[6] Creating equitable pay for faculty across two—and sometimes three or more—institutions and the impact of combining different campus cultures make mergers a challenge. Having faced these trials, Georgia's mergers saw eventual overall success and can act as a guide for other states seeking to initiate smoother mergers in the future (Gardner, 2017). On the "One University" system in Maine (Gardner, 2018), Marcus (2016) reports that according to "system officials," the One University "reorganization has resulted in a 37 percent decline in the number of administrators at the universities and will save about $6.1 million a year."

[7] For more on this, see Marcus (2016) and Zywicki and Koopman (2017). For an earlier, alarming look at the explosion of administrative positions, see Ginsberg (2011).

8 Public institutions also face restrictions on federal funding for research, reduced subsidies, and excessive media emphasis on student-debt rates (Ehrenberg, 2014).

9 Achieving these competitive and crucial internship opportunities, however, are usually contingent on a student's strong academic record.

10 However, there is concern the current U.S. presidential administration's anti-immigration stance might bring a decrease in international students and thus a decrease in overall racial, cultural, and ethnic diversity within institutions (Rudgers, 2017).

11 Clearly online courses are no panacea and they still have their critics. Edmundson (2012) suggests how a "real" course creates intellectual joy, at least in some, and how an internet course will never replicate that kind of intellectual engagement. Instead, he argues how "Internet learning promises to make intellectual life more sterile and abstract than it already is—and also, for teachers and students alike, far more lonely." While there is some truth to this, one need not go far to find examples of highly engaging online courses. Online education is still in its infancy.

12 For a discussion of technological disruptions, see Roth (2015).

References

Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. E. (2009). Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution. *The 2009 UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education.* http://www.cep.edu.rs/public/Altbach,_Reisberg,_Rumbley_Tracking_an_Academic_Revolution,_UNESCO_2009.pdf

Berman, J. (2015, March 28). Why more U.S. colleges will go under in the next few years. *Market Watch.* https://www.marketwatch.com/story/why-more-private-colleges-are-closing-2015-03-25

Berman, J. (2016, January 7). Why states are cutting back on higher education funding. *Market Watch.* https://www.marketwatch.com/story/why-states-are-cutting-back-on-higher-education-funding-2016-01-07

Bozionelos, N., Kostopoulos, K, Van der Heijden, B., Roussea, D. M., Bozionelos, G. Hoyland, T., Miao, R., Marzec, R., Jędrzejowicz, P., Epitropaki, O., Mikkelsen, A., & Scholarios, D. (2015). Employability and job performance as links in the relationship between mentoring receipt and career success. *Group and Organizational Management*, *41*(2), 135–171. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601115617086

Bransberger, P., & Michelau, D. K. (2016, December). Knocking at the college door. *Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education and The College Board*. https://knocking.wiche.edu

Brown, S. (2016, November 3). Plight of the public u: Bottom line: How state budget cuts affect your education. *The New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/06/education/edlife/college-budgets-affect-your-education-but-its-not-all-bad-news.html

Eagan, K., Stolzenberg, E. B., Bates, A. K., Aragon, M. C., Suchard, M. R., & Rios-Aguilar, C. (2015). *The American freshman: National norms fall 2015*. Los Angeles, CA: Cooperative Institution Research Program at the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA, University of California, Los Angeles.

Edmundson, M. (2012, July 19). The trouble with online education. *The New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/20/opinion/the-trouble-with-online-education.html

Ehrenberg, R. G. (2014, December). What's the future of public higher education?: A review essay on Gary C. Fethke and Andrew J. Policano's "Public no more: A new path to excellence for America's public universities." *Journal of Economic Literature, 52*(4), 1142–1150. http://www.jstor.org/stable/24434173

Gardner, L. (2017, June 19). Georgia's mergers offer lessons, and cautions, to other states. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. https://www.chronicle.com/article/Georgia-s-Mergers-Offer/240390

Gardner, L. (2018, February 25). How Maine became a laboratory for the future of public higher ed. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. https://www.chronicle.com/article/How-Maine-Became-a-Laboratory/242621

Ginsberg, B. (2011). *The fall of the faculty*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Hall, E. E., Walkington, H., Shanahan, J. O., Ackley, E., & Stewart, K. A. (2018). Mentor perspectives on the place of undergraduate research mentoring in academic identity and career development: An analysis of award winning mentors. *International Journal for Academic Development, 23*(1), 15–27. http://uri.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.uri.idm.oclc.org/docview/2013522665?accountid=28991

Hart Research Associates. (2011). *Key findings from recent focus groups on increasing support for civic learning in higher education* [memorandum from Hart Research Associates to the Association of American Colleges and Universities]. https://www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/LEAP/focus_civiclearning.pdf

Hart Research Associates. (2013). *It takes more than a major: Employer priorities for college learning and student success.* The Association of American Colleges and Universities. https://www.colorado.edu/odece/sites/default/files/attached-files/rba07-sb4converted_2.pdf

Harnisch, T. L., & Opalich, D. (2017). Top 10 higher education state policy issues for 2017. *PolicyMatters: A Higher Education Policy Brief.* American Association of State Colleges and Universities. http://www.aascu.org/policy/publications/policy-matters/Top10Issues2017.pdf

Henking, S. (2017, October 1). Lessons from a merger: A brighter future by expanding our vision. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* https://www.chronicle.com/article/Lessons-From-a-Merger-A/241336

Ho, B., & Slavov, S. (2014, March 20). Higher college tuition costs don't actually spell disaster. *U.S. News and World Report.* https://www.usnews.com/opinion/economic-intelligence/2014/03/20/higher-college-tuition-costs-dont-actually-spell-disaster-for-students

Hyman, J. S., & Jacobs, L. F. (2009, August 12). Why does diversity matter at college anyway? *U.S. News and World Report.* https://www.usnews.com/education/blogs/professors-guide/2009/08/12/why-does-diversity-matter-at-college-anyway

Jaschik, S., & Lederman, D. (2017). 2017 survey of college and university presidents. *Gallup Polls and Inside Higher Education.* https://www.insidehighered.com/booklet/2017-inside-higher-ed-survey-college-and-university-presidents

Kim, J. (2017, June 5). How the Amazon Echo Show will revolutionize higher education. *Inside Higher Ed.* https://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/technology-and-learning/how-amazon-echo-show-will-revolutionize-higher-education

Lacy, T. A., Tandberg, D. A., & Hu, S. (2017). U.S. state higher education appropriations: Assessing the relationships between agency politicization, centralization, and volatility. *Policy and Society, 36*(1), 16–33. doi: 10.1080/14494035.2017.1290201

Lazerson, M. (1997). Who owns higher education?: The changing face of governance. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 28*(2), 10–15. doi: 10.1080/00091389709603099

Levine, A. (2000). The future of higher education. *Teachers College Newsroom.* Teachers College, Columbia University (originally

appeared in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 27 October 2000). http://www.tc.columbia.edu/articles/2000/october/the-future-of-higher-education/

Livingstone, N., & Naismith, N. (2018). Faculty and undergraduate student perceptions of an integrated mentoring approach. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, *19*(1), 77–92. http://uri.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.uri.idm.oclc.org/docview/2024000778?accountid=28991

Marcus, J. (2016, October 6). The reasoning behind colleges' ballooning bureaucracies. *The Atlantic*. https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2016/10/ballooning-bureaucracies-shrinking-checkbooks/503066/

Miller, S. D. (2014, February 4). Welcome to the campus of 2019. *HuffPost: The Blog*. https://www.huffingtonpost.com/dr-scott-d-miller/welcome-to-the-campus-of-_b_4694887.html

Mitchell, M., Leachman, M., & Masterson, K. (2016). Funding down, tuition up: State cuts to higher education threaten quality and affordability at public colleges. *Center on Budget and Policy Priorities*. https://www.cbpp.org/research/state-budget-and-tax/funding-down-tuition-up

National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE). (2016). *Job outlook 2016: The attributes employers want to see on new college graduates' résumés*. http://www.naceweb.org/career-development/trends-and-predictions/job-outlook-2016-attributes-employers-want-to-see-on-new-college-graduates-resumes/

O'Shaughnessy, L. (2016, January 20). New college grads: Who employers want to hire. *CBS Money Watch*. https://www.cbsnews.com/news/new-college-grads-who-employers-want-to-hire/

Roth, A. D. (2015). Plato's educational foundations and the future of college teaching. *Journal of Philosophy and History of Education, 65*(1), 1–14.

Rudgers, L. M., & Peterson, J. A. (2017, January 13). Coming in 2017: Colleges and universities should prepare for seven trends in the new year, Lisa M. Rudgers and Julie A. Peterson advise. *Inside Higher Ed*. https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2017/01/13/upcoming-trends-2017-colleges-should-prepare-essay

Ruffalo, N. L. (2017). The high stakes development dilemma in higher education. *Ruffalo Noel Levitz* [weblog]. *RNL Insights: Senior Executive Analysis*. http://www.ruffalonl.com/fundraisingtrends

Salisbury, M. H., Paulsen, M. B., & Pascarella, E. (2011). Why do all the study abroad students look alike? Applying an integrated student choice model to explore differences in the factors that influence white and minority students' intent to study abroad. *Research in Higher Education*, *52*(2), 123–150. doi: 10.1007/s11162-010-9191-2

Stripling, J. (2017, October 15). The lure of the lazy river. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. https://www.chronicle.com/article/The-Lure-of-the-Lazy-River/241434

Tandberg, D. A., & Ness, E. C. (2011). State capital expenditures for higher education: Where the real politics happens. *Journal of Education Finance*, *36*(4), 294–423.

Thompson, D. (2014, August 19). The thing employers look for when hiring recent graduates. *The Atlantic*. https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2014/08/the-thing-employers-look-for-when-hiring-recent-graduates/378693/

Weeden, D. (2015, August 9). Higher education appropriations. *National Conference of State Legislatures*. http://www.ncsl.org/research/education/higher-education-appropriations.aspx

Wootton, W. (2016, June 8). The real reason small colleges fail. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. https://www.chronicle.com/article/The-Real-Reason-Small-Colleges/236732

Zemsky, R., Wegner, G. R., & Massy, W. F. (2005). *Remaking the American university: Market-smart and mission-centered*. Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Zywicki, T. J., & Koopman, C. (2017, March). The changing of the guard: The political economy of administrative bloat in American higher education. *George Mason University Law & Economics Research Paper Number 17–12*. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2939915

Reconceptualizing Libraries as Academic Spaces: A Postmodern Look at Library Organization

Ryan Litsey & Lee S. Duemer,
Texas Tech University

Introduction

Walk into any academic library in the U.S. or certain countries around the world and you find a familiar classification system for organizing and categorizing books. This system, known as the Library of Congress Classification System (LC), has been employed in academic libraries for the better part of a century. Originally created in 1897, the system is designed to give library users the perception of an epistemologically based library collection organization. When one looks at the way materials are classified, each item is classified by a subject heading. Given the predominance of the internet and alternative ways of seeking information, we argue the organization of library materials should be reconsidered since research in educational psychology and other fields demonstrates the changing ways contemporary information seekers, students in particular, locate information. Indeed, some researchers assert an individual's information-seeking behavior does not reflect subject or numerical classification processes and the classification system's physical manifestations do not match modern, web-based, information-seeking behavior. Furthermore, what on the surface appears to be a subject-based taxonomy in practice is revealed as merely a numerical order reflecting dates books are purchased for the collection amounting to a purely informational rather than epistemological system of categorization. In this paper we advocate for academic libraries rethinking how they organize library collections by taking into consideration changing ways students and library users find, organize, and utilize information in light of postmodernist theoretical tenets.

One early challenge for librarians was how to organize library holdings. Partly they needed to keep track of materials, but it became equally important patrons were able physically to locate materials (Harris, 1995). In the late nineteenth century, Melvil Dewey began work

on a systematic way of organizing library holdings in which subject matter was designated by a code, could be expanded in a linear manner to allow materials be added, and was assigned a specific location where it could be found and returned. The Dewey Decimal System, now in use for nearly a century, nevertheless has its detractors who argue some information is arbitrarily assigned to an area (Kaplan, 2012). The system has been criticized further for its heavily Anglo-American cultural bias (Fandino, 2008).

A second classification system, developed by the Library of Congress, is known as the Library of Congress Classification System. It was designed to replace an organizational system developed by Thomas Jefferson, whose collection served as the basis for the early Library of Congress. Like the Dewey Decimal System, the Library of Congress Classification System has been criticized for primarily serving the organizational needs of libraries and as disconnected from an epistemologically based rationale (Lyotard, 1984). In order to understand how the system no longer aligns with ways students and faculty locate information, it is important to highlight ways patrons of the modern library satisfy their information-seeking behavior. Next we illustrate how the system's inherent drawbacks run counter to an individual's information-seeking behavior. Based on this evidence we suggest alternatives which might help bring the library and use of library materials more in line with the patron's information-seeking behavior.

Literature Review

Information-Seeking Behavior

The Library of Congress Classification System is alphanumerical, meaning letters and numbers are used to organize physical books. However, these letters and numbers give patrons little indication as to the underlying organizational structure of the classification system or its meaning. As a result, libraries spend a great deal of time teaching students to understand this rigid system of classification. Belkin (1980) argues the efficient transmission of information from information generator to human user contains three problems: first, the user recognizes a need for information and presents a question to the information-retrieval mechanism; second, the information-retrieval mechanism presents its results to the user; and third, the user examines the results and is satisfied either completely, partially, or not at all. According to Belkin (1980), an anomalous state of knowledge (ASK) provides the user's foundation for seeking information. We agree, "the emphasis on the role of the user in the communication model and in IR (Information Retrieval) compels one to recognize explicitly that representing users' needs is at least as important as representing texts" (p. 136). The user's needs as well as ensuring concepts' need to be

represented in ways the user can understand should be paramount when reconsidering the utility of the Library of Congress Classification System and the concerns that emerge in the literature.

Constructivist Information-Seeking Behavior

Kuhlthau (1993) provides a constructivist theory of information-seeking behavior by building on theories of John Dewey, George Kelly, and Jerome Bruner. He argues the information-seeking processes these scholars theorize can be synthesized into six phases: initiation, selection, exploration, formulation, collection, and pre-sensation (p. 342). The information seeker experiences a progression of three core functions within these phases: feelings, thoughts, and actions. Each function becomes more crystallized as information processes move from step to step. This constructivist process centers on the needs of the user, so if a library fails to take into account the user's actions it potentially injects artificial barriers into information-seeking processes.

In the initiation phase Kuhlthau (1991) argues users lack confidence, this lack stemming from one's internal understanding of information lack and the associated uncertainty, similar to the anomalous information Belkin (1980) describes. In the exploration phase, the individual again feels uncertainty and doubt since thoughts in this phase rarely fit the user's previously held constructs (Kuhlthau, 1991). Information seeking in the exploration phase is disconnected and fluid, shifting between subjects and categories, which renders the rigid structure of the Dewey Decimal System problematic.

In a naturalistic qualitative study of 45 academics Foster (2004) illustrates nonlinear methods of information-seeking behavior, emphasizing the process reflects the user's experiences as well as his or her internal and external contexts for the search. Although a researcher might draw information from a variety of sources, he or she can be hindered by external factors such as a library's onsite organization. If external factors present too great a barrier, the information seeker is likely to return to the starting phase of the process. Contemporary research studies address the internet's effects on information-seeking behavior.

Contemporary Issues

An Online Computer Library Center-authored (OCLC, 2002) white paper examines the web-based behaviors of college students, concluding most college students rate as paramount the accuracy of web-based information, rating second, the most-used library web resource the online catalog. Indicating information seekers search the library's physical collection as well as electronic resources. Following the OCLC white paper a national study concerning the use of libraries, museums

and the internet conducted by Griffiths and King (2008) characterizes the library as a trusted source of information—more highly trusted than government or commercial websites. The authors also find adults tend to use the internet first when seeking information (83%) followed by libraries and museums (70%) (p. 8). These findings draw attention to a disconnect between a typical user's first information-seeking instinct and the trustworthiness and potential usefulness of information.

Perruso (2016) studies undergraduates' use of google vs. library resources in a longitudinal study, asking where information seekers are likely to start their research, whether they are more likely to use websites or library resources, and where students who receive library instruction start their research as well as the relationship between faculty source requirements for assignments and from where students draw the majority of information, finding 69% of students start their research process using google (p. 621). Interestingly, Perruso (2016) reports as users spend more time at the university their use of the library as their first source increases and use of google decreases. The key intermediating factor for this shift is credited to library instruction sessions. Perruso finds if students have a library instruction session, 55% of those students begin research using library resources by their eighth semester. Included in almost all library instruction is discussion of the Library of Congress Classification System. However, if that system can be changed there is a larger opportunity to use instruction sessions for more-pressing needs like information evaluation.

Bawden and Robinson (2009) consider overload and anxiety among information seekers, especially when using the internet as an information source. As the internet causes a proliferation of information sources it simultaneously homogenizes the delivery mechanism. For example, if a user wants to learn about quantum mechanics he or she likely initially finds a variety of sources ranging from Wikipedia, to newspaper articles, to video. However, each piece of information is moderated and filtered through the medium of the user's web browser, creating normative homogeneity. A challenge arises when that user moves outside the computer screen since navigating different classification systems could potentially cause insecurity or anxiousness and potentially lead to a failed effort to locate information.

Connaway, Dickey, and Radford (2011) examine the importance of convenience in information-seeking behavior as it relates to the proliferation of information sources. Convenience appears as a reason in 171 out of 307 respondents or 56%, and they find convenience a prevailing motivation for millennial subjects (p. 186). The researchers advocate for library materials to be reorganized to work more like the internet, particularly the ways in which information is presented. Web

browsers typically prioritize search results based on relevancy to the user's topic, and online library catalogs function similarly, but we argue a problem arises when the library's physical collection is organized not by relevancy but rather by subject.

Donald Case (2002) outlines five models for how individuals seek information. While it is not necessary to go into too much depth on each, it is important to highlight one model that connects most closely with information-seeking behavior. The Wilson Model focuses on user satisfaction as it relates to information returned. "Wilson suggests that the perceived need then leads the user into a cluster of activities, the most straightforward of which is to make direct demands on sources or systems of information" (p. 117). The search for information is not a structured activity rather it is a fluid activity that draws from multiple sources both formal and informal. For example, one may come across an unfamiliar idea or term and one's first first instinct may be to conduct a google search. Google then forms the foundation of not only where one begins but where one returns for additional information. Thereafter one's initial information source may branch into formal mechanisms like acquiring an article or asking a colleague as well as informal mechanisms such as contacting a friend.

At some point the researcher likely finds him or herself at the library seeking resources. Initial interactions with the library happen in a virtual space, mimicking google. It is only when the researcher enters the library's physical location that he or she is confronted with a classification system not reflected in their virtual information-seeking activities, namely a subject-based classification system organized by authors' last names. What this contemporary literature highlights is a disconnect in modern information seeking. When a researcher seeks information he or she has now been conditioned by use of web browsers to explore varied and diverse information-crossing subject barriers to connect with many types of resources. The physical manifestations of the current classification system do not match modern, web-based, information-seeking behavior.

Postmodern Knowledge Formation

Postmodernist theorists problematize society's creation, use, and acceptance of grand narratives and reject objectivist notions of truth, using theory to reveal the socially constructed nature of truth and knowledge (Jameson, 1991). While postmodernist theory has gained favor within some academic disciplines and is referenced frequently in popular culture contexts, its methodological use in revealing the power structures which underlie knowledge formation is a common, practical application (French & Ehrman, 2016) used to analyze such varied topics

as the nature of British football hooliganism (King, 1997) and the foundations of soldiering in Norwegian military training (Sookermany, 2011). More central to the purpose of this paper, postmodern theory has been used to theorize how users interact with information systems (Heelas, Lash, & Morris, 1996).

Discussion

The Library of Congress Classification System is the most widely used classification system in academic libraries, therefore the academic setting provides a logical site to understand the inadequacy to encapsulate modern information-seeking behaviors of the current system. We maintain if information-seeking behaviors have been altered by the use of web browsers, the most logical part of the library's classification and location system, librarians, should be enlisted to address the call-number-classification process. Since library databases are purchased from a third-party vendor and thus are controlled by the vendor's own internal design, the classification and call-number organization of a library's physical collection is the logical location for where librarians can reorder the ways library materials are presented and organized.

Two terms are most often used as part of the Library of Congress classification process: the Library of Congress Control Number (LCCN) and the Library of Congress Classification (LCC) System. The LCCN is a sequential number given to a book or material that is merely a number unique to each library resource. The LCCN does not organize or classify materials. The classification that is the focus of our paper is the Library of Congress Classification System: the commonly recognized system used by most academic libraries colloquially known as a library material's "call number." In this system the physical library location of a book or material is indicated, usually by one or two letters followed by a series of numbers. For example, the book *Education and Identity* by Arthur Chickering (1969) has the call number LB2322.C45; the call number's letters and numbers reveal the basic architecture for how the system is used physically to organize and house library materials. The first letter of a call number denotes its general subject area: A for general topics, L for education, M for music, etc., while the second letter denotes the material's subtopic area. Call numbers never have more than two letters at their start. The numbers following the letters denote where in the subject taxonomy the book is housed. Using the Chickering example (LB2322.C45), this book falls in the primary subject L (education), in subtopic B (theory and practice), and within the numerical range 2300–2430 (higher education). C45 is this book's Cutter number, named for Charles Cutter, which is a way to denote the book's author. By enacting a system of numerical designations, the Library of Congress

Classification System offers precise information where physically to place any book or material. Libraries are also free to add additional information to the end of the call number often used to denote to which campus library collection the material belongs, for instance. Using the Chickering example one notices the classification system forms a neat, efficient taxonomy, but the subject subtopic areas have come to be synonymous with knowledge organization rather than reflecting object organization. By the act of librarians designating materials into different subject headings, the classification system carries the impression of knowledge organized into discrete categories that have rigid meanings and physical locations, the result of which is a denial of the inherent interdisciplinarity of postmodern epistemological conventions. The current classification system also gives users the impression classifications are made objectively which again clashes with the tenets of postmodernist theory, whose authors posit such truths cannot in fact be known.

There are additional implications for organizing library materials in such a rigid structure. Of significant concern, while topic area categories may seem broad, there is in fact neither ability to adapt the classification system to new concepts, ideas, or topics nor to accommodating changing disciplinary knowledges, for instance, to reduce the power bestowed upon Anglocentric knowledges and foreground underrepresented knowledges. These clashes seem already to be forcing the hand of librarians' categorizations, inspiring creep into the system of a kind of bootstrap interdisciplinarity. For instance, as queer theory and gender identity theory have developed Judith Butler's theory is found categorized in both B (philosophy) and H (sociology). Since the rigid subject classifications were set long before many topics existed there is little way to expand topic-heading classifications either to include new ideas or retire old ones, so we see the current call-number system serving merely as geographical waypoint and obstacle.

We now move to explore a radical, potential solution to library organization that could help alleviate the current conundrum occurring when library materials' physical location does not reflect ideological distance due to this significant disconnect between users' information-seeking behavior and the current classification system.

A Proposed Solution

We propose librarians remove call numbers from library materials altogether since we have established an individual's information-seeking behavior typically no longer corresponds to the classification system imposed on patrons physically locating a book. Removing call numbers, while seemingly creating organizational chaos could increase the

possibility of books being physically located along different philosophical or theoretical lines rather than along rigid, purely organizational lines. You may wonder how then can the library address the physical location of an item? By using a series of Remote Frequency Identification (RFID) sensors equipped both in each library stack and within the actual materials, materials can physically be located regardless of position in the stacks using an electronic device. In such a system patrons are free to move library materials around the library without heed of antiquated topic-area restrictions. For example, a patron studying gender searches online for library materials. The patron then goes to the stacks and grabs the first book; he or she then takes the first book to another floor where the patron finds second and third books. He or she then decides these books are not wanted and leaves the books on any shelf, thereby organizing and co-locating library materials in an open, organic "system." Removal of call numbers frees patrons from the disconnect between web-based information-seeking behavior and physically accessing library materials, inspiring librarians to learn from patrons ways to form a more organic taxonomy that reflects a particular university's research trends. Books that are in the old Library of Congress Classification System would not relate to or be housed next to each other are placed by patrons in unique proximity. Theoretically, the ability to shelf read, get lost in the stacks, or explore related ideas is now a freer process.

At first consideration many patrons and especially librarians are likely to gasp in horror at the idea of a free-for-all materials management system, but we argue a library free from the organizational tyranny of rigid call numbers opens opportunity for new associations. In the old classification system when library materials are shelved by call number there is an automatic way to find other, related books on shelves "nearby" that relate directly to the initial item a patron seeks. We argue, however, this can still be accomplished when call numbers are removed entirely, the reason being a patron's delight in serendipitously finding a related item on a nearby shelf is not interrupted but rather broadened by libraries technologically analyzing which books typically get checked out together or which book groupings are left on tables, shelving them together, and introducing new serendipity to patrons' stack-browsing.

Conclusion

In the postmodern library knowledge has been transformed into information through the use of technology (Lyotard, 1984). We argue because the creation of knowledge, along with emerging fields of knowledge are considered co-determinant, their current organizational separation imposes an unnatural sense of bifurcation on patrons' information-seeking behavior. While there remains a strong linkage

between fields of knowledge those connections are culturally based. The classification system we propose gives academic libraries the freedom to maintain materials' organization and location in a way that draws on patrons' epistemological connections between materials in a manner that is locally culturally relevant rather than drawing from a classification system developed for the purpose of easy materials location. Such a library can allow patrons to develop their own local connections across materials, loosening the traditional, linear classification system for organizing materials which constrains patrons against "open representations to contestation and scrutiny, bringing different forms of knowing to compete and clash in the public arena" (Jovchelovitch, 2008, p. 23).

The proposal we advance in this paper may best be framed in terms of a shift from collective to social representations. Collective representations are common across people and even cultures that hold a common definition of ideas, beliefs, or histories. Their power is significant in that they shape how individuals and groups understand the world and how they interact with each other. Furthermore, these are among the mechanisms used to maintain social order and hold societies together (Durkheim, 1897/1997). Collective representations may have common meaning to large groups of people; however, they are not necessarily developed by the people, do not represent them, and do not have their best interests in mind. They often are not developed in a collaborative or democratic manner and may instead be the product of authority bodies or elites seeking social control and the maintenance of privilege.

Our postmodernism-inspired classification system proposal is based on the notion of consensual social representation which involves individual members participating in localized materials organization in a way that represents a variety of perspectives and challenges previous assumptions and labels (Moscovici, 2000). By giving library patrons the freedom to organize information, librarians foster the integration of information into localized worldviews so it can be compared and assimilated (Höijer, 2011).

References

Bawden, D., & Robinson, L. (2009). The dark side of information: Overload, anxiety and other paradoxes and pathologies. *Journal of Information Science*, *35*(2), 180–191.

Belkin, N. J. (1980). Anomalous states of knowledge as a basis for information retrieval. *Canadian Journal of Information Science*, *5*(1), 133–143.

Case, D. O. (2002). *Looking for information: A survey of research on information seeking, needs, and behavior.* San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Durkheim, E. (1897/1997). *The division of labour in society.* New York, NY: Free Press.

Connaway, L. S., Dickey, T. J., & Radford, M. L. (2011). "If it is too inconvenient I'm not going after it": Convenience as a critical factor in information-seeking behaviors. *Library & Information Science Research, 33*(3), 179–190.

Foster, A. (2004). A nonlinear model of information-seeking behavior. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 55*(3), 228–237.

Fandino, M. (2008). UDC or DDC: A note about the suitable choice for the National Library of Liechtenstein. *Extensions and Corrections to the UDC, 30*, 45–47.

Griffiths, J. M., & King, D. W. (2008). *InterConnections: The IMLS national study on the use of libraries, museums, and the internet.* Washington, DC: Institute of Museum and Library Services. http://interconnectionsreport.org/

French, II, R. P., & Ehrman, J. E. (2016). Postmodernity as an epistemological shift: Kony 2012 as a case study for the global influence of postmodernity. *Journal of World Christianity, 6*(2), 237–249.

Harris, M. H. (1995). *History of libraries in the Western world* (3rd ed.). Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow.

Library of Congress. (n.d.). *Library of Congress classification outline.* https://www.loc.gov/aba/cataloging/classification/lcco/

Heelas, P., Lash, S., & Morris P. (1996). *Detraditionalization: Critical reflections on authority and identity.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Höijer, B. (2011). Social representations theory: A new theory for media research. *Nordicom Review, 32*(2), 3–16.

Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism, or, the cultural logic of late capitalism.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

King, A. (1997). The postmodernity of football hooliganism. *The British Journal of Sociology, 48*(4), 576–593.

Kuhlthau, C. C. (1991). Inside the search process: Information seeking from the user's perspective. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science, 42*(5), 361.

Kuhlthau, C. C. (1993). A principle of uncertainty for information seeking. *Journal of Documentation, 49*(4), 339–355.

Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge.* G. Bennington & B. Massumi (Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Moscovici, S. (2000). *Social representations: Explorations in social psychology.* Cambridge, MA: Polity.

Online Computer Library Center (OCLC) Research. (2002). *OCLC white paper on the information habits of college students: How academic librarians can influence students' web-based information choices.* https://www.oclc.org/research/news/2002/06-24.html

Perruso, C. (2016). Undergraduates' use of google vs. library resources: A four-year cohort study. *College & Research Libraries, 77*(5), 614–630.

Kaplan, T. B. (2012, April 17). Done with Dewey [weblog entry]. *Association for Library Service to Children (ALSC) Blog.* http://www.alsc.ala.org/blog/2012/04/done-with-dewey/

Sookermany, A. M. (2011). The embodied soldier: Towards a new epistemological foundation of soldiering skills in the (post) modernized Norwegian armed forces. *Armed Forces and Society, 37*(3), 469–493.

Dewey's Educational Heritage: The Influence of Pestalozzi

Randall Colvin & Kelley M. King,
University of North Texas

Introduction

Swiss educator Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi (1746–1827) is one of the most influential educational thinkers of the nineteenth century, exerting influence both internationally and in the U.S. Pestalozzi gained credibility with educators because of practical experience with and firsthand knowledge of schools and education. Abroad the Swiss educator's work influenced both the Prussian school system and pedagogical reformers Johann Herbart (1776–1841) and Friedrich Froebel (1782–1852). In the U.S. Pestalozzi's writings nurtured the work of early common-school movement leaders Horace Mann (1796–1859) and Henry Barnard (1811–1900). As Nakosteen observes (in his preface to Barlow, 1977), "Pestalozzi is unique in the fact that he tried out his educational doctrines experimentally in the Institutes which he built and financed" (p. 1). His experimental nature, not unlike that of Dewey, the prominent pedagogical reformer who followed Pestalozzi by about a century, is reflected in Pestalozzi espousing the benefits of a virtual "laboratory school," although he did not use the Deweyan term.

Despite earning renown for his pedagogical influence during the nineteenth century, little scholarship explores Pestalozzi's influence on educational thinkers who followed him. While it is no secret Dewey (1859–1952) was influenced by Pestalozzi, it is nevertheless difficult to find scholarly work that directly explores this connection. To remedy this lack, we trace some of the Pestalozzian ideas present in and critical to Dewey's educational thought. Pestalozzi and Dewey's work commonly endures through direct and indirect influences, particularly how educators through the years have sought pedagogically to engage students. We argue select themes of these educational thinkers—relating school to life, the idea of school as a community, the pedagogical power of concrete things and experiences, "universal" education, and student interest as a pedagogical building block—continue to hold promise to help a new generation of teachers better connect with students. As not all readers may be familiar with Pestalozzi's educational ideas and career,

we begin with a brief overview of his career and influence on nineteenth-century educational thought.

Pestalozzi's Influence on Early Mid-Nineteenth-Century Educational Thought

Pestalozzi began his career as an educator in 1774. For Pestalozzi, education was a socializing and civilizing force that helped to prepare people for future roles in society. Inspired by Rousseau's *Emile* (1762/1979), Pestalozzi came to believe in the power of natural education. For Pestalozzi, a "natural" approach to education meant teachers should find ways of teaching more in keeping both with what children are able to do and "naturally" inclined to do given their level of maturation. Teachers and curriculum that fail to look to nature for cues as to how children learn and develop become, in Pestalozzi's (1801/1900) words, "artificial stifling machines" (p. 28). Pestalozzi became a fierce advocate for educating poor children. Pestalozzi's devotion to the cause of educating the poor grew so great that he spent all the money he earned, in addition to the money his wife received through an inheritance, on his educational endeavors (Barlow, 1977).

During his lifetime Pestalozzi operated a series of schools that served as a well of practical knowledge and insight into how children learn—in Neuhof (1774–1779), Stans (1799), Burgdorf (1801–1804), and Yverdon (1805–1825). His firsthand experiences as an educator lent him credibility as an educational reformer not only in his time but throughout the nineteenth century. In 1781, Pestalozzi began to explore the lifelong theme of his educational writings—naturalistic education— with the publication of his successful novel, *Leonard and Gertrude* (1801/1906). Pestalozzi subsequently published *How Gertrude Teaches Her Children* (1801/1900), a guide for mothers on how to educate their children and an explanation of Pestalozzi's educational "method." In Yverdon, Pestalozzi's school enjoyed particular success and stability and became "an educational mecca" (Gutek, 1995, p. 227) where distinguished visitors and Pestalozzi's followers came to see his methods in action. Among these visitors were Friedrich Froebel, Johann Friedrich Herbart, Robert Owen (1771–1858), and William Maclure (1763–1840). While Pestalozzi's educational methods are influential, Trohler (2001) argues the "spirit" of his methods—the way he values and respects his students—are his most important educational legacy.

Through the influence of Pestalozzi's followers and former teaching assistants, such as Joseph Neef (1770–1854), Pestalozzi's educational ideas spread. Neef was especially important in helping to bring many of Pestalozzi's ideas to the U.S. Neef authored two books in which he attempts to explain Pestalozzi's method. Additionally Pestalozzi's educational ideas and methods were published in national and regional

education journals including, for instance, Mann's *Common School Journal* and Barnard's *American Journal of Education.* By the middle of the nineteenth century, Pestalozzian principles were becoming well-established teachings of normal schools. In 1865, the National Teachers' Association endorsed Pestolozzianism after visiting a training school in Oswego, New York, where principal Edward A. Sheldon was implementing Pestalozzian ideas, particularly the object method. Sheldon's version of Pestalozzi's ideas became known as the Oswego method (Lucas, 1997; Ogren, 2005). By the turn of the twentieth century Pestalozzi was well-known among trained teachers and his ideas were regularly discussed at regional and national teacher institutes and conferences (King, 2010).

Pestalozzi's influence on Dewey's ideas is evidenced by their many common themes. Dewey also occasionally made his connection with Pestalozzi's ideas explicit, such as in the book co-authored with his daughter Evelyn Dewey, *Schools of To-Morrow* (1915/2016). In *Schools of To-Morrow* Dewey and his daughter explore common themes of progressive education such as "natural development," a reorganized curriculum, and play, connecting these themes with the work of Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Froebel, and Maria Montessori (1870–1952). While it would be worthwhile to explore the influence between Dewey and each of these thinkers, we are especially interested in the Dewey–Pestalozzi connection because of the unique way these two thinkers approached education from an "experimental" point of view.

Pestalozzi and Dewey's Common Themes

At times during each of their lives, Pestalozzi and Dewey each ran schools that were considered "experimental" in nature. One significant aspect of Pestalozzi's educational approach is his belief education could be improved through trial and error, through experience and experimentation (Barlow, 1977). As a whole, Pestalozzi's educational career demonstrates his belief in this principle.

Likewise, Dewey maintained a devotion to the principles of experience and experimentation, the most notable example being Dewey's Laboratory School at The University of Chicago. A corollary to Pestalozzi's and Dewey's belief in the importance of laboratory schools was their belief educators can improve their craft through experience and study. Both Pestalozzi and Dewey devoted great time and effort to the task of training teachers. Both men taught a steady stream of teachers and observers who came to their respective "laboratory" schools to learn new pedagogical approaches because both men believed in the power of teacher training to improve teachers' craft. We now move to consider seveal specific similarities.

School Is for Life

The first theme we explore addresses the purpose of schooling. One phrase that became a motto of sorts for Pestalozzi and his followers was the phrase, "We must learn not for school but for life." The motto, which has origins in Seneca's *Letters on Ethics to Lucilius* (Graver & Long, 2015),[1] suggests school should not be disconnected from life but rather should be life itself, since Pestalozzi did not think a school's curriculum should be blind to the child's future needs (Green, 1912), but the main curricular focus should be on the life the child lives presently. An example of this motto in action is when, in 1799, the Helvetian government asked Pestalozzi to head an orphanage in Stans where many children had lost their families to war. It was with these children that Pestalozzi began to develop his method of teaching "heart, hands, and head" (Gutek, 1995, p. 225). Pestalozzi's teaching in Yverdon provides another example; students went on nature walks, learned to play music, swam, climbed mountains, and ice skated. He taught students to read, but he also taught them to draw, write, and do physical exercise. Pestalozzi's schools were unique for their time and stories of his schools changed the way many thought about teaching and pedagogy. Pestalozzi's pedagogy demonstrates his belief that experiences of life itself, especially experiences of childhood, could be educative.

Dewey later echoed Pestalozzi's ideas when he argued school should not merely be a preparation for life but should be life itself. In *School and Society* (1915) Dewey says,

> [School] has a chance to affiliate itself with life, to become the child's habitat, where he learns through directed living, instead of being a place to only learn lessons having an abstract and remote reference to some possible living to be done in the future. It gets a chance to be a miniature community, an embryonic society. (p. 15)

Later, in *Experience & Education*, Dewey (1938) clarifies he did not intend for school curriculum to be blind to the future needs of students. However, Dewey, like Pestalozzi, did not see this end as being incompatible with the need to make a student's school experience mirror real life and even to be life itself. The emphasis that school was and should be real living was an integral theme for Pestalozzi; this theme became a major component of education for Dewey and for the U.S. progressive education movement of the twentieth century.

The Family as a Model for School

The second Pestalozzi–Dewey theme we explore has to do with the school environment: namely the importance of school becoming its own community or family. Pestalozzi understood sooner than many other

educational thinkers the social dimension of schooling was a crucial part of a child's education. Pestalozzi "realized that natural development for a [hu]man means social development" (Dewey & Dewey, 1915/2016, p. 38). One of the means by which Pestalozzi sought socially to develop his pupils was through the type of school community he built. "In each of [Pestalozzi's] institutions he strove to develop a family atmosphere in which he served as a father to both pupils and teachers and in which teachers were big brothers, as it were, to the pupils" (Barlow, 1977, p. 17). Furthermore, Pestalozzi reacted against the harshness of school discipline often present in his day. While Pestalozzi does not disapprove of corporal punishment outright, he believes such punishment should be modelled after the corporal punishment provided by a loving parent (Green, 1912). Such punishment, Pestalozzi maintains, typically does not produce resentment in the child—nor should the discipline given by a teacher. Pestalozzi argues teaching should be motivated by a love and concern for one's pupils.

For Pestalozzi, the family forms the ideal place where education should occur. He theorizes that for political systems to succeed they need citizens who are educated morally (Trohler, 2001). However, for those children whose families are unwilling or unable to fulfil this need due to issues of poverty or other challenges, it makes sense for a school to step in and use some of the same approaches that a family might use intellectually and morally to educate children. Viewed in a contemporary context, one might note Pestalozzi's rationale for "moral education," which became commonplace in the early nineteenth century, is steeped in what Valencia (1997) refers to as "deficit thinking." Regardless of what families did or did not provide, two short quotations from Pestalozzi's *The Education of Man* (1951) help to show his emphasis on what educators should provide: Pestalozzi argues, "What [a teacher] really needs is a sense of love" (p. 33); he also maintains love is "the essential point from which the essentials of education flow" (p. 33). While such declarations may sound unsurprising today, in Pestalozzi's day and time during which teachers tended to be more authoritarian in their approach, stating such a philosophy of education was unusual. Indeed, Pestalozzi "sought to create an emotionally secure environment in his schools that was conducive to learning and made students feel like members of a loving family" (Murphy, 2006, p. 181), within which, instead of using fear as a main source of motivation, he attempted to appeal to a child's interests. Pestalozzi's coming to be known as a loving and caring teacher to his students is represented in art which depicts him as a teacher always among and involved actively with teaching students. One example is Konrad Grob's (1879) painting, *Pestalozzi with the Orphans in Stans.*

Konrad Grob (1879), Pestalozzi with the Orphans in Stans.

In *The School and Society*, Dewey (1899/1915) does not speak overtly as Pestalozzi does about the importance of a teacher's "love" for his or her pupils, yet Dewey implies love through his emphasis on the school as a community. He also emphasizes the school should, in many respects, be modeled after the family: not merely "a place set apart to learn lessons" (p. 11), but rather "a genuine form of active community life" (p. 11). In a later edition of *The School and Society*, he makes the school–family connection more explicit, describing how the family was the model for his own laboratory school: "we are attempting to keep a family spirit throughout the school, and not the feeling of isolated classes and grades" (p. 175). Dewey again echoes Pestalozzi when he writes, "…if the end in view is the development of a spirit of co-operation and community life, discipline must grow out of and be relative to such an aim" (p. 14).

The Use of Concrete Things and Experiences to Teach

The third theme we consider is the importance of using concrete things and experiences to teach as opposed to teaching abstract concepts and ideas. Pestalozzi stresses the importance of strengthening "the impressions of important objects by allowing them to affect you through different senses" (1801/1900, p. 202). In particular, Pestalozzi became known for his "object lessons" which use all the child's senses to help teach a particular concept (or to stimulate his or her senses). More broadly, Pestalozzi advocates for the use of "concrete" things to teach children whenever possible. In a 1774 diary entry, Pestalozzi advises teachers to, "Teach him absolutely nothing by words that you can teach him by the things themselves" (quoted in Murphy, 2006, p. 184). Concerning the teaching of numbers, Pestalozzi emphasizes how, "The various relations of the numerical system must be brought home to the sense-impression of the children by means of real objects" (1801/1900,

p. 248). He makes clear he believes concrete experiences and the use of real objects should, whenever possible, precede the use of words, seeming to fear that words, if not coupled with educative experiences, could fall on deaf ears and fail truly to communicate to children. In one example Pestalozzi describes his use of movable letters to teach children to spell and in another "…arithmetic was taught with pebbles and fractions were taught by cutting fruit into parts" (Murphy, 2006, p. 181). "Pestalozzi's theory called for an active pupil, for a pupil who did many things, who had many experiences…" (Barlow, 1977, p. 16).

This focus on concrete things and experiences as educative also is a central Deweyan theme seen in Dewey's (1899/1915) *The School and Society*. When Dewey writes on the "abstract," he refers to ideas remote from the child's mind and disconnected from real-life experience. For example, he tells how, when children are doing work in physics or chemistry, it "is not for the purpose of making technical generalizations or even arriving at abstract truths. Children simply like to do things and watch to see what will happen" (p. 43). Similarly, Dewey (1915) explains "[t]he child has not much instinct for abstract inquiry" (p. 53). For Dewey, children's minds are ready for concrete experiences but not necessarily for adult, "abstract" generalizations. Dewey, like Pestalozzi, favors the use of concrete, "real life" experiences:

> The child comes to the traditional school with a healthy body and a more or less unwilling mind, though, in fact, he does not bring both his body and his mind with him; he has to leave his mind behind, because there is no way to use it in the school. If he had a purely abstract mind, he could bring it to school with him, but his is a concrete one, interested in concrete things, and unless these things get over into school life he cannot take his mind with him. (p. 73)

Furthermore, Dewey connects to Pestalozzi's ideas when he writes how "This concrete logic of action long precedes the logic of pure speculation or abstract investigation…" (p. 134).

Universal Education

Pestalozzi's theory is rooted in "universal educability" (Adelman, 2000, p. 106), a principle on which the common school movement is built. Pestalozzi's importance to the thinking of nineteenth-century, common-school reformers is argued by Barnard (1906) in *Pestalozzi and His Educational System*. Pestalozzi's focus on educating the poor altered how his contemporaries viewed educational access. Similarly, Dewey rose to prominence by being a champion of universal education. While his *The School and Society* (1899/1915) does not explicitly address the topic of universal education, Dewey nevertheless creates a pedagogy rooted in the nature of children, in their interests and their inclinations. In this

way Dewey, like Pestalozzi, helped establish a theoretical and practical basis for universal education.

Student Interest and Individualization

Teachers have not always set out to make their curriculum interesting or relevant to students. This was particularly the case in Pestalozzi's day and, according to Dewey, in his day as well. However, each in their own way Pestalozzi and Dewey encouraged teachers of their day to appeal to students' individual interests and dispositions. For both Pestalozzi and Dewey, curriculum is not "one size fits all," rather they argue teachers should tailor teaching to students. Pestalozzi argues, "Each pupil must be allowed…wide latitude in the course his development takes" (Barlow, 1977, p. 17). Moreover, in an excerpt quoted by Horace Mann, Pestalozzi states, "Interest in study is the first thing which a teacher should endeavor to excite and keep alive" (Mann, 1846, p. 200). Pestalozzi used approaches not traditional in his day to appeal to the interests of his students (Barlow, 1977). His students often sang in the hallways between classes; his teachers sometimes took their classes outside into nature to allow children to see, experience, and be engaged in the scientific lessons they were studying. In other words, Pestalozzi's curricular and pedagogical approaches attempt to build on student interest and employ it in the educational process.

Similarly, Dewey seeks to use student interest as a building block in the educational process. At one point in *The School and Society* (1899/1915), Dewey speaks of four foundational student interests useful to the teaching process: interest in conversation/communication; interest in art; interest in making/building things; and student interest in finding out or discovering new things. Dewey refers to these four types of student interest as the "natural resources, the uninvested capital, upon the exercise of which depends the active growth of the child" (p. 45). In other words, for Dewey, student interest was a key that unlocked the learning process for students.

Conclusion

We contend Pestalozzi and Dewey's educational philosophies hold promise for present-day generations of educators who seek to engage students in a time when distractions from learning abound—perhaps most notably technological distractions. We argue that to appropriate properly an educational idea it is helpful to understand more about the origins of an idea, and this is one reason we argue it makes sense to reconsider the nexus of the educational ideas of Pestalozzi and Dewey.

In our study of Pestalozzi, we find the more we read Pestalozzi's texts, the more they inform our understanding of Dewey. In many respects we surmise Dewey's work continues a conversation Pestalozzi

began. At times Dewey's thought strongly echoes that of Pestalozzi as we demonstrate by the examples we briefly offer: the importance of school being in harmony with "real life"; conceptualizing school as a family (and using the family as a model for school); a focus on the educative power of concrete things and experiences; the importance of a universal education; and a focus on student interest as vital to the educational process. Understanding Pestalozzi's central ideas provides an additional lens through which to read and understand Dewey. For this reason, the Pestalozzi–Dewey connection is a line of inquiry that deserves greater attention and study.

Endnote

1 The original quotation from Seneca varies in wording and possibly in meaning. See p. 423.

References

Adelman, C. (2000). Over two years, what did Froebel say about Pestalozzi? *History of Education, 29*(2), 103–114.

Barlow, T. A. (1977). *Pestalozzi and American education.* Boulder, CO: Este Es.

Barnard, H. (1906). *Pestalozzi and his educational system.* Syracuse, NY: C. W. Bardeen.

De Guimps, R. (1890). *Pestalozzi: His life and work.* New York, NY: D. Appleton & Company.

Dewey, J., & Dewey, E. (1915/2016). *Schools of to-morrow.* Lago Vista, TX: Grindl.

Dewey, J. (1899/1915). *The school and society: Being three lectures.* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience & education.* New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Froebel, F. (1826/2005). *The education of man.* (W. N. Hailmann, Trans.). Mineola, NY: Dover.

Green, J. A., & Collie, F. A. (Eds.). (1912). *Educational writings of Pestalozzi.* London, UK: Edward Arnold.

Grob, K. (1879). *Pestalozzi with the orphans in Stans*, oil on canvas, *Öffentliche Kunstsammlung*, Basel, Switzerland. http://www.en.heinrich-pestalozzi.de/biography/stans/

Gutek, G. L. (1995). *A history of the Western educational experience* (2nd ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland.

King, K. M. (2010). *Call her a citizen: Progressive-era activist and educator Anna Pennybacker.* College Station, TX: Texas A&M Press.

Lucas, C. J. (1997). *Teacher education in America.* New York, NY: St. Martin's.

Mann, H. (1846). Ninth annual report of the secretary of the board of education. *The Common School Journal, 8*(13), 193–208.

Murphy, M. M. (2006). *The history and philosophy of education: Voices of educational pioneers.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Ogren, C. A. (2005). *The American state normal school: "An instrument of great good."* New York, NY: Palgrave McMillan.

Seneca, L. A. (2015). *Letters on Ethics to Lucilius.* (M. Graver & A. Long, Trans.). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Pestalozzi, J. H. (1801/1906). *Leonard and Gertrude.* (E. Channing, Trans.). Boston, MA: D. C. Heath & Co.

Pestalozzi, J. H. (1801/1900). *How Gertrude teaches her children: An attempt to help mothers teach their own children and an account of the method: A report to the Society of Friends of Education, Burgordf* (2nd ed.). (L. Holland & F. Turner, Trans.). Syracuse, NY: C. W. Bardeen.

Pestalozzi, J. H. (1951). *The education of man: Aphorisms.* New York, NY: Philosophical Library.

Rousseau, J. J. (1762/1979). *Emile, or on education.* (A. Bloom, Trans.). New York, NY: Basic Books.

Trohler, D. (2001). Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi. In J. Palmer, L. Bresler, & D. Cooper (Eds.), *Fifty major thinkers on education: From Confucius to Dewey* (pp. 233–238). New York, NY: Routledge.

Valencia, R. R. (Ed.). (1997). *The evolution of deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice* (The Stanford Series on Education and Public Policy). London, UK: Falmer.

The Price of Free Speech

John F. Covaleskie, University of Oklahoma

Introduction

This paper is less an argument than a reflection on the effects of how we balance democratic goods in the public square. Accordingly, I begin not with premises or an outline of an argument, but by recounting a story. On October 25, 2015, there was a forum on the campus of The University of Oklahoma, conducted in the aftermath of an incident of on-campus racial animus.[1] The incident involved a recording of fraternity members engaged in racist chants. Two of the participants were identifiable, and they were summarily expelled by the university president, David Boren. The fraternity was expelled from campus, and its house taken over for other university uses.

Now, since this was a significant event—because The University of Oklahoma is a state institution and such a response to the racist event could be seen as government violating the First Amendment—President Boren was in effect saying some forms of speech are intolerable and will not be tolerated. For this, he and the university were attacked by First Amendment fundamentalists who argued the university was in error, and students were being punished for "Constitutionally Protected Speech."[2] In an article in the online newsletter of the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE), Susan Kruth follows the common outline for protection of hate speech: (1) hate speech is protected by the First Amendment; (2) the public utterance of hate speech serves to remind us "something we need to know about the racial attitudes of at least some OU students;" (3) "censorship isn't necessary for those who are confident of the truth of their views"; and ends with the conclusion that (4) "[T]he University of Oklahoma's expulsion of two students…simply for their expression of racist sentiments is almost certainly unlawful and should be reversed." I will return to this argument shortly, but first a story of the aftermath.

In the wake of the previously described events, the university held a campus forum about the display of racist symbols and use of racist speech. The subject of the forum was the display of the Confederate Battle Flag (CBF) and focussed on whether the display of this flag was an act of "Heritage or Hate" (the title of the forum). Furthermore, the question was posed, even if meant as a statement of racial animus, is it constitutionally protected as an example of free speech?

The forum opened with a statement by my colleague Dr. Kirsten Edwards, a gifted, young, Black, female member of the College of Education faculty. Asked to speak first, she said:

I have to admit. This was a very difficult talk for me to compose. Honestly, I've had my fill of calm, rational discussions about the validity of white male supremacy and systemic injustice; all the oppressive elements of our society that we are forced to take up as logical conversations because they are clothed in whiteness. Quite frankly, I'm sick of debating the legitimacy of hate maintained through state-sanctioned and institutionalized violence. From the jovial chant "Boomer Sooner" that celebrates the theft of indigenous lands and the forced displacement of native peoples, to the lack of commonsense gun legislation that has left 20 kindergarteners, six of their teachers (all women), and nine Black church congregants dead and unatoned for. Also not forgetting the ever-increasing number of victims of mass gun violence whose lives have become lost in nonsensical rhetoric, to the virtues of police officers that kill Black 12-year-olds in parks, reminding our children, as my colleague T. Elon Dancy often remarks, that it is dangerous to be Black and outside, to the same system of law enforcement that permits those who are supposed to protect and serve to snatch and drag Black girls by their hair and arms, reminding them that they live in a nation that does not see them as human or worthy of care and gentleness, to the assumption that Donald Trump is a legitimate presidential candidate, which doesn't require explanation, to the Confederate Flag that flew as a declaration to states' rights to enslave other human beings: a system of forced labor that was maintained through branding, beating, whipping, lynching, mutilation, rape, and all manner of torture, physical and psychological, necessary to strip humans of their humanity.

All of these ridiculous debates, communities of color are forced to endure because the issue is connected to white male supremacy. And not only are we forced to consider, we are also forced to engage as if they were rational topics of conversation. And that is the ultimate power of systemic, white-supremacist, capitalist patriarchy, that we must remain calm and composed as we debate the morality of our slow deaths. Or as Mother Zora Neale Hurston reminded, "If you are silent about your pain, they'll kill you and say you enjoyed it." One of the primary goals of white, male supremacy is to convince the oppressed that there is something wrong with us if we respond honestly to the pain of injustice. That we are being irrational if fear wells in the pit of our stomachs when trucks bearing the confederate flag drive by, or when white fraternities wave the flag proudly on their large-looming houses, ostentatious reflections of their power and

influence on supposedly diverse campuses. Instead we should continue to have calm, collected discussions about the validity of the oppressor's methods of torture. Apparently it's unreasonable for me to assume that the Confederate flag is a silent threat, a reminder of all of the lynchings, and bombings, and arsons that flag has presided over. A reminder of a world where I am only three-fifths of a human. A reminder of fellow citizens that long for the days when I was unrecognized by the law….

When Dr. Edwards finished, I was in tears. Having made this opening statement, she put on her academic hat, and the rest of her talk was more analytic. But the remainder of her talk was not what stayed with me. What struck me then and has stayed with me since was the pain caused by legitimizing the question of whether the CBF is indeed a symbol of white supremacy. Of course it is, and as such it is an existential threat to people of color in the U.S., but by the alchemy of "civil discourse" within a Constitutional framework, this symbol of hate and oppression instead becomes elevated to sacralized and Constitutionally protected "free speech."

What Dr. Edwards made me viscerally experience is that by converting the discussion about the CBF from a discussion of white supremacy to a discussion of free speech as protected by the First Amendment, we already establish white supremacy as a legitimate normative system: a presumptive moral equivalence is established between an ideology of white supremacy and one of civic equality. Thus, the emphasis on the First Amendment and the right of free speech employs the full machinery of the U.S. Constitutional system and the weight given to the Bill of Rights against the civic membership of people of color. It turns what ought to be a rhetorical question—"Are people of color fully human and fully citizens?"—into a real question. This is a serious problem for a society with aspirations to be democratic.

To return to the argument developed by Kruth, we see here the falsity of her assumptions. Reaction to the assaultive speech of the fraternity was not shaped by a lack of confidence in the democratic ideology of civic equality. Rather, it was an affirmation of that ideology and a recognition that assaultive speech can and does serve to exclude and marginalize its targets. For these reasons alone, such speech ought not be tolerated on college campuses. Nor is tolerance of such assaultive speech justified by the fact it makes us aware of racial hatred on campus (and not just at OU, it goes without saying). To the contrary, our students and colleagues of color are all-too-frequently confronted with such assaultive speech, and if we really want to know about its pervasive and corrosive presence, all we need do is listen to the voices of its targets.

In this paper I first make a few comments on the nature of the Bill or Rights, the First Amendment in particular; briefly consider the nature and importance of civic norms and citizens who have acquired these norms; and then consider some of the implications of the situation in which we find ourselves. As a guide to the reader, I want to make clear my own positionality and developing perspective on this complex of issues. First of all, I am a 70-year-old, straight, white, cis male, which means that issues of white supremacy are very much my responsibility. I am inevitably part of the problem Dr. Edwards describes. This paper (as part of a larger project I have recently been working on) is part of my effort to come to terms with the responsibilities attendant to my privilege.

Second, there are some truths about the First Amendment that we have long ignored or forgotten.[3] The first of these is that freedom of speech was not what the First Amendment was protecting: the formulation "Congress shall pass no law…" clearly protects the right of states to regulate speech free from interference from the federal government. Nothing in the First Amendment confers, creates, or affirms any basic right of citizens to be free from such regulation. A second point is that, given what the First Amendment was designed to do, we should avoid talk of how the founders gave us this right as part of the bedrock of democratic life; they did not do so, and they did not see speech in that light. While the myth is that First Amendment freedom of speech is one of our foundational freedoms, the reality is that the First Amendment did not function to protect free speech as a civil right until the late 19th century, when the courts first began to apply the Fourteenth Amendment in concert with the First Amendment to deny the states' power to regulate speech as they had originally done with the federal government. It was only at this point in our history that we began to understand the First Amendment as we do today: as the guarantor of the civil right of free speech, as protecting citizens rather than states.

The next point to remember is that the Constitution in general and the Bill of Rights in particular (including the First Amendment) is a pact among slave-holding, white supremacists negotiating the terms by which they will share and distribute power in a white-supremacist patriarchy. This is explicit in the sections of the Constitution that recognize slavery and deny women citizenship, *but it is also implicitly and deeply true in the way it conceives of and protects free speech.* White men occupy positions of power and privilege in ways that create a purposefully and dramatically uneven playing field; the speech of white men is more powerful than that of women and people of color. The result is that what we think of as free

speech fundamentalism protects the speech of the powerful to the detriment of the civic membership of people of color.[4]

We need to take a moment here to understand for U.S. democracy the significance of being the particular and specific kind of liberal constitutional republic we in fact are: one designed by and for white patriarchs who were wealthy landowners, and particularly those enslavers. What this means today is that, despite tinkering at the margins of oppression by the amendment process, the social and political architecture within which laws are made and amendments are added is the political and structural architecture of the founders. To put it bluntly, we still live in a patriarchal, white-supremacist, aristocratic republic, and the standards of civil discourse presume that to be heard in the debates within this republic, one must belong (at least peripherally) to its privileged classes.

It is this fact that should remind us that the supposedly anomalous U.S. Supreme Court decision *People's United* is not an anomaly at all, but a reaffirmation that to be heard in the United States at the level of political discourse one must be rich. Money equals voice and voice equals influence. In this decision we see one of the senses in which free speech is anything but free; it charges by the minute for the right to be heard.

Tom Green analyzes in detail the difference between merely speaking in public and being heard,[5] exploring the fact that those who speak *but who are not heard* are in fact not able to engage in what he calls *public* speech. The implications of his insight are profound; the ability to speak in public can very much be protected, but if the speech of particular individuals or groups remains systematically unheard, or heard only in a certain way (i.e., unless it is heard *and attended to*), the speakers are *de facto* excluded from full civil, political, and social membership.

Furthermore, the Enlightenment origins of the Constitutional structure prioritize reason over emotion; if one can give a reasoned argument rooted in the First Amendment for why it is acceptable to display symbols of injustice and oppression like the Confederate Battle Flag, then the fact that people are hurt by the display does not count as a legitimate counterargument. To hone the point more precisely, diverting the discussion to a consideration of Constitutional rights rather than a consideration of human decency or democratic entailments means that display of the CBF assumes both legal and moral equivalence with the claim that the display of the CBF denies people of color full civic membership in the (supposedly) democratic polity. What we need to recognize if we are to transform the discourse (and practice) of our polity is that the marginalization of people of color in our polity is

neither defect nor anomaly; the marginalization of women and people of color is built into the constitutional framework and reinforced by the standards of civil discourse granted recognition in the formation of policy. The white-supremacist patriarchy in the U.S. may periodically have to reassert its control of the levers of power, but the instruments for doing this are purposefully built into the deepest architecture of the polity and society.

This is precisely the message Dr. Edwards imparts: to defend the display of symbols of white supremacy as a question about free speech is to grant the high ground to white supremacy and to further marginalize the targets of white supremacy's oppression. Again, note the core of Dr. Edwards' objection: the very terms of the discussion and the criteria for resolution of the conflict are dictated by the representatives of white supremacy. Worse, even those of us who believe we are opposing white supremacy by putting free speech as the primary and the foundational democratic good, we, too, force targets of oppression to voice their objections within a discourse that assumes fairness involves ratifying the right of white supremacists to express their commitment to white supremacy. If the issue is always the free speech rights of the white supremacist, then that point of view is implicitly endorsed equally with its opposite. To be precise, when we use the First Amendment frame to discuss issues like the display of the CBF, we put on equal footing the view that people of color are not worthy of full citizenship and the view that people of color are not fully human. We may not mean to, but that is beside the point.

This means that people of color are "forced to engage as if [slavery, police violence against people of color, the display of the CBF are] rational topics of conversation. And that is the ultimate power of systemic white supremacist capitalist patriarchy, that we must remain calm and composed as we debate the morality of our slow deaths." The effect (and my thesis) is the purpose of the standards of civil discourse and public reason is to silence—to efface the civil presence of—those whom white supremacy and patriarchy mean to dominate.

Before fully considering the implications of my thesis, I reflect briefly on the significance of norms for democratic life, for one of the realities of democratic life is that we are governed more by norms than by law; law is coercive, but norms are the means of self-government.

Primacy of Norms

We often hear the shibboleth that "we are a government of laws, not men." I want to suggest this is only partly true; more to the point we

are a government of *norms*. It is important, then, to understand what norms are, and how they operate. We often think of *norms* as connected to that which is "normal." In this view norms function as description of how people behave, but this is not the significance of social norms, which define not what people do so much as what we expect of ourselves and each other.

One overall error in the way we think about free speech is to think that it is law (the First Amendment) that protects us rather than norms. However, law only functions when norms bring their force to bear. It is worth remembering there was a time when people were comfortable with the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. being jailed, but then *norms* changed and southern sheriffs became pariahs. This led to a change in law. Similarly, there was a time when people could be put in jail for declaring themselves gay, but that is no longer the case; Norman Thomas spent a lot of time in jail for opposing World War I, but that was not the case by the time of Vietnam. The point is First Amendment protections are never absolute, they are always dependent on social norms that define the limits of acceptable free speech or expression (and there are always such limits).

This is an important point that society may well be on the verge of appreciating as we grapple with the presidency of Donald Trump. I am struck by the number of times political commentators have pointed out that the real threat presented by President Trump's presidency is the extent to which he violates—tramples, more accurately—the norms of the office and the glee he (and his followers) seem to derive from such iconoclasm. While President Trump may or may not have broken a law, if he has done so there are remedies in place: prosecution, impeachment, effective demands for resignation, and so on. But we now face the fact that law is only as effective as the norms that protect law are strong. It is arguably the case that the more dangerous actions of the President are things like chanting, "Lock her up!," which does not violate law, can be construed as protected free speech, but is shockingly contrary to the basic norms of participatory democracy. In our system we do not prosecute political opponents—until we do. And when our norms allow attacks on democracy, the law that might otherwise protect democracy is not likely to do so.

To what, then, do we refer when we speak of *norms*? In some uses, it simply means the behavior under discussion is taken to be "normal" in the sense that the majority of people do it, but this sense is inadequate to our consideration here. The more interesting and probably more important meaning of the term reflects what is strongly judged to be

proper (or improper) behavior. We know when norms exist both because we, (1) try very hard ourselves to live within them, and (2) we are offended when others break them. The current (as I work on this paper) focus on sexual abuse of women across many walks of life is an example of shifting norms: sexual predation is likely neither more nor less common today than when Bill Clinton was President despite his being very publicly and credibly accused of sexual assault, and it is likely neither more nor less common than a year ago when Donald Trump was elected President despite being recorded bragging about getting away with sexual assault. What we may be observing is the process of new norms being formed—new expectations about how men should behave.

In this contentious time, we hear much on the First Amendment's protection of free speech. As Dr. Edwards reminds us, "free" speech has a price, and it those on the margins of society who are far more likely to pay it. In this paper, I mostly take for granted that legal protection of political speech is an essential part of democratic life, and I want mostly also to take for granted that the First Amendment can and frequently does serve as a bulwark of such speech. But it is precisely for this reason that First Amendment fundamentalists like the ACLU or FIRE do democracy a great disservice. If our practice becomes to default to "protecting" free speech under virtually all conditions, we lose the ability to have a cogent public discussion about the content of the speech both in the granularity of its content and its effect on self governance. It is a mistake to concentrate on shaping the public square through law while ignoring the importance of fostering democratic norms.

Some Common Misunderstandings

There are three main arguments that are often used in discussing free speech in the U.S. political context: (1) First Amendment protections are foundational to the democratic polity: without the First Amendment's protection, democracy itself would be seriously threatened; (2) the First Amendment itself is a foundational principle of democratic governance, constructed by the founders to protect freedom of speech as a basic civil right; and (3) the exercise of free speech in the "marketplace of ideas" is the best way to sort out disagreements and arrive at either truth or compromise. All three of these claims are, I think, seriously problematic.

As for the first claim, we are one of a relatively small group of nations with a strict and explicit protection against government restriction of political speech, but many nations without such protection are functioning democracies (a group that no longer clearly includes us). In point of fact, at the moment this paper is being written, the U.S. experiment in democracy is something of a laughingstock on the international stage, largely because of the results of decades of systematic

and cumulative abuse of the First Amendment. Hiding behind the First Amendment's supposed guarantees, a propaganda network of white supremacists of various stripes has undermined the functionality of and our confidence in our institutions of government and civic life: Reagan's "Government is not the solution to the problem. It is the problem;" Fox News's dedication to the manufacture of alternative facts fitted into alternative narratives ("Benghazi," allegations of child prostitution rings run by Hillary Clinton); and Trump's assault on the rule of law ("so-called judges," attacks on the FBI) and the press ("fake news") are potent examples.

In short, while the First Amendment is an important tool in protecting free speech in the U.S. political context, it is also true democracy functions in places that have no such categorical protection. That democracy is not functioning very well in the U.S. right now is to a large extent due to abuses made inherently possible under the First Amendment (or at least under our current understanding of it).

As to the second shibboleth, the founders in fact had no idea they were protecting or creating some basic and absolute civil right to unrestricted free speech, and if they had been able to predict the future of the First Amendment, they would arguably have been appalled. The First Amendment was the founders' commitment to states' rights, not civil rights; the stipulation that "Congress shall make no law…" was not at the time a protection of the citizen's right to free speech. It was the stipulation that the limits to speech (and the other activities enumerated in the First Amendment) were to be set by the states, not the federal government; *the amendment does nothing to protect the right of free speech, it merely takes the power to regulate away from the federal government and reserves it to the states.* And, of course, the assumption was these men who created the government framework would always be in control of their states; their speech would be protected precisely because they and their heirs would determine what could be ruled out-of-bounds.

History has revised the role of the First Amendment, and that is almost certainly a good thing, but it is worth correcting the record: the First Amendment as a foundation of U.S. democracy is a myth. It has evolved in that direction, but that is a relatively recent development. Further, as pointed to previously, even under a supposedly absolutist interpretation of the First Amendment, norms matter, and the boundaries of acceptable speech—with or without a First Amendment—are decided by norms, not merely law.

The third error is perhaps the most significant. The argument is that speech is the coin of the realm in the marketplace of ideas, and that good ideas will triumph over bad ones, that truth will triumph over lies.

This seems to me to be seriously wrong, and obviously so. Consider a partial list of the disproofs of this claim: despite the clarity and overwhelming preponderance of evidence, we are still debating, among other absurdities, Barak Obama's citizenship as well as the existence of climate change and evolution. These are not, in any real sense, issues of debate, if by "debate" one means there are two defensible sides.

Note that these are not indefinite or disputable issues, they are not like debates about, say, the morality of abortion, or the most just rate of progressive taxation. Barak Obama was born in Hawai'i; evidence soundly settles that "dispute." Religious fundamentalists still insist that *in science class* teachers "teach the controversy" regarding evolution, despite the fact no such *scientific* controversy exists. Similarly, for ideological or economic reasons, public figures still deny the reality of human influence on the progress of climate change and its effects on human society. Put simply, none of these "disputes" would be discussed if good ideas drove bad ones out of public discourse, or if facts were dispositive in public discussion. What we lately have learned is that well-funded, widely distributed propaganda and misinformation can overcome—with great speed—well-evidenced fact and truth, and can do so quite powerfully, persistently, and pervasively.

Furthermore, this utilitarian defense of free speech has never been true. Were it true the Civil War would not have been fought, the ideology of emancipation being superior to that of slavery. World War II would have been unnecessary, since the racist ideology of Nazi Germany should have been easily vanquished by any number of superior alternatives.

One rapidly developing trope in public discourse is the idea that efforts to curtail hate and assaultive speech are unacceptable limitations of free speech as protected by the First Amendment and violations of academic freedom when applied in campus settings. Furthermore, the claim has been asserted (it would be overly generous and inaccurate to say that an argument has been advanced) that efforts to reduce such speech are actually harmful to the victims of the speech, producing delicate "snowflakes" unable to survive and compete in the rough-and-tumble arena of democratic life. This is an old narrative, spun and nurtured by professional hate-mongers like Rush Limbaugh, profiteering trolls like Milo Yiannopoulos, or insult-comedians like Bill Maher. The main strategy of those who advance this trope has been to depict efforts to curtail racist, sexist, homophobic, and other forms of assaultive speech as "political correctness," a term meant to disparage and demean efforts to promote social decency, but in recent years this point of view

has gained academic respectability thanks to a widely read, disseminated, and discussed article in *The Atlantic* by Greg Lukianoff and Jonathan Haidt.[6]

Their argument is that speech codes that oppose and delegitimize assaultive and hate speech, and the creation of "safe spaces" have no place on college campuses. For one thing, Lukianoff (who is the President of FIRE) and Haidt claim speech codes and safe spaces are interfering with free speech and academic freedom. In addition, they fear the protection these policies afford members of marginalized populations will weaken the character of today's young people. They appear to believe that unless women, members of the LGBTQ community, people of color, and individuals with handicapping conditions, among others, are subjected to assaultive speech in class and on campus, they will not develop the thickened skins they need to function in society—a society defined by misogyny, homonegativity, white supremacy, and ableism. Creating a climate of safety and acceptance on campus, Haidt and Lukianoff tell us, is actually contrary to the best interests of those the effort is meant to benefit.

However, we should note that either their sincerity or their understanding of consistency is suspect: at the same time, and without apparent irony, Lukianoff and Haidt express concern for the well-being of white, male, tenured professors who may be somehow harmed by criticism from their students for remarks and assignments that are insensitive (or outright insulting) to some students in their classes or on their campuses. Their argument is free speech means those in power can use racist and assaultive speech, but the targets of their attacks are politically correct "snowflakes" to point the fact out and seek redress. Surely campus leaders and administrators have not only the right, but a positive responsibility to make campuses safe places for all in an institution partly defined by its structure of power inequalities. So, if "free speech" means some students can verbally harass their peers, or that instructors need not consider the potentially oppressive effects of some curricular content and need not worry about protecting "snowflakes" with trigger warnings about potentially difficult material, if this what free speech and academic freedom entail, then I am concerned about its effect on our polity. I think the line of argument in Haidt's and Lukianoff's article is simply and badly confused—free speech is not what they are defending in their article, they are protecting power and privilege, both of which they have in abundance. As I argue previously, this seems neither anomaly nor defect, but rather a design feature of a Constitution meant to create and perpetuate a white-supremacist, patriarchal republic.

So, while common sense tells us there must indeed be SOME limits to speech and expression (pornography to children, yelling "fire" in a crowded theater, sedition?), common sense gives no guidance as to what those limits might be, and when we begin debating the text of the First Amendment to discern the proper limits on speech we: (1) are likely to come with no principled limits and; (2) we are arguing about the wrong question, which ought to be: *is this speech a threat to democratic governance itself?* If the answer is *yes,* then we ought to stop that speech.

Here the problem is clear: if evil ends are pursued without scruple, and with persistent propaganda, false equivalences, appeals to powerful emotions like fear and anger, and pervasive dishonesty, then decency is liable to lose in the discussion. If the ruling class exercises its power and control of media to shape public opinion, or even to confuse people about what is reliable and what is fake, then bad arguments are likely to drive out good ones. And in an environment of such discourse, democracy seems fragile indeed. It is not, as Kruth suggests, that defenders of democracy lack confidence in its ability to stand up to critical honest discourse, *it is the fear that truth is at a disadvantage in the face of repeated and widely disseminated lies by people with wealth, power, and influence.*

And we now understand how this works: our brains are apparently constructed so basic emotions like fear and anger are able to overwhelm and reshape what counts as rational thought. It seems implausible to argue Donald Trump is President today because of the force of his arguments or the quality of his policy proposals. Instead, it seems clear he won because he tapped into the fear and anger of the American people. And his victory, in turn, has empowered the angry fearful Americans that belong to or tacitly support the rise of a neo-nazi, white-supremacist ideology.

Finally, we face the fact that argument in the public square is not an equal contest, and the reasons for this are not benign. First of all, there is the tendency for manipulation of fear and anger to be exploited in the pursuit of dark purposes, purposes quite antithetical to democratic life. Further corrupting democratic decision-making is the fact not all speech is presumed to be equal to begin with, and here I am not considering the validity of the arguments themselves, but the social positioning of the speaker. That is, we live in a society structured by hierarchies of race, class, gender, sexual orientation, verbal facility, access to knowledge, and power among many other distorting hierarchies.

In short, the First Amendment was not intended to do what we think it was intended to do; it does what we would like it to do badly; there is good reason not to want it to do what we think we want it to do; and when we use it in the way we use it, we miss the opportunity to have serious political discourse.

Conclusion

Long ago, Aristotle reminded his fellow Athenians they could expect different degrees of precision and certainty from different kinds of practices. So, he tells his fellow citizens, mathematics gives a degree of precision and certitude that one cannot properly expect from philosophy, particularly from ethics. His caution is relevant to my discussion of free speech because too often we seek absolute rules and strict, clear principles about what is permissible. Specifically, there is a First Amendment-sort of absolutism that, explicitly or not, places freedom of speech above all other issues facing us. This is a concern because speech can be dangerous to democracy, and because by absolutizing the value of free speech, we may be losing the ability to use public discourse to reach wiser policies.

As I come to the end of this paper, the reader will no doubt notice I have not proposed a solution to the problem I describe. There is a reason for that: I have none. But at a minimum, I think it important to rethink our heedless and fundamentalist view of the First Amendment. As things are now, the prioritization of free speech over other democratic goods not only hurts individuals left vulnerable by this prioritization as the testimony of Dr. Edwards affirms, but it threatens democracy itself by distorting, corrupting, and poisoning public discourse.

Endnotes

[1] Manny Fernandez and Richard Perez-Pena, "As Two Oklahoma Students Are Expelled for Racist Chant, Sigma Alpha Epsilon Vows Wider Inquiry," *The New York Times*, March 10, 2015. http://www.nytimes.com/2015/03/11/us/university-of-oklahoma-sigma-alpha-epsilon-racist-fraternity-video.html

[2] Susan Kruth, "University of Oklahoma Expels Students for Constitutionally Protected Speech," Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE), March 10, 2015. https://www.thefire.org/university-of-oklahoma-expels-students-for-constitutionally-protected-speech/

[3] What follows is true of all elements of the First Amendment, though I refer here to free speech.

[4] Charles W. Mill, *Racial Contract* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997).

5 Thomas F. Green, "Public Speech," *Teachers College Record* 95, no. 3 (1994): 369–388.

6 Greg Lukianoff and Jonathan Haidt, "Coddling of the American Mind," The Atlantic 1101 (September 2015): 2–4. https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2015/09/the-coddling-of-the-american-mind/399356/

Book Review

Total Institutions, Leadership, and Management: Supplemental Thoughts on Sam Stack's *The Arthurdale Community School: Education and Reform in Depression Era Appalachia*[1]

David Snelgrove, Oklahoma State University

Introduction

Arthurdale, West Virginia was among the first of more than 100 projects implemented by the U.S. Department of the Interior's Subsistence Homestead program. Arthurdale was an application of subsistence homesteading and the creation of a community which centered as its nucleus a community school. Elsie Ripley Clapp (1879–1965), community leader, was appointed school superintendent. Clapp applied her unique conception of progressive education paired with John Dewey's (1859–1952) philosophy of schooling in a democratic society and his thoughts on the importance and role of the school community. Clapp's education, experience, leadership, and knowledge of progressive educational ideas led her to create a school-based community laboratory for democracy, the subject of Samuel F Stack, Jr.'s *The Arthurdale Community School: Education and Reform in Depression Era Appalachia*. In the first sections of this essay I focus on Stack's description and analysis of the Arthurdale experiment and the issues facing U.S. society in the late 1930s including economic conditions, the New Deal's position on the role of government, and government projects' bureaucratic structure. Stack also documents the importance of community, place, and identity; the possibility of democratic, community-based education; and variety across progressive models. Finally, he focuses on local issues with constructing school and community, the unification of school and community, the importance of community health, and provisions for welfare, jobs, and recreation. In the last sections of this essay I expand on some of the issues Stack raises in his thorough historical accounting:

the importance of and difficulties of schools' and communities' bureaucratic social planning, the nature and importance of leadership, and the use of the school as a total institution, all of which speak to lessons Arthurdale and other progressive projects teach.

During his career, Sam Stack has amassed a comprehensive body of work surrounding *The Arthurdale School*'s major themes. He has published work on the impact of individual educators on education as well as on the philosophy of John Dewey, progressive education, the rural education experience, issues in community education, the school as a social institution, and the impact of philosophy of education. He has conducted extensive research at the National Archives, the Roosevelt Library, the Center for Dewey Studies, among other collections. *The Arthurdale School* is Stack's third book, preceded by *Elsie Ripley Clapp (1879–1965): Her Life and the Community School* (2004) and *Teachers, Leaders, and Schools: Essays by John Dewey* (2010), edited with Douglas J. Simpson. With *The Arthurdale School* Stack applies his talents to the study of the Arthurdale Community School from several vantage points. He begins with an investigation of community and its importance to identity and place, later recounting efforts to use schools to improve or create place and community. Stack describes the origins of the New Deal's Homestead Subsistence programs that led to the Arthurdale project's creation and Eleanor Roosevelt's role. He explores the importance of the Arthurdale experiment and its place in the history of education, particularly progressive education. Stack acknowledges and honors the perspectives and experiences of Arthurdale project participants, governing committees, homesteaders, teachers, students, and the project's leader, Elsie Ripley Clapp.

Clapp studied at Vassar College (1899–1903) and Barnard College (1903–1908) where she earned a bachelor's degree. At Columbia University (1908) she studied philosophy and English, and served several terms as Dewey's teaching assistant and as secretary for the *Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Method*.[2] She was acquainted with philosophy department professors but showed great interest in the works and teaching of Dewey and William Heard Kilpatrick (1871–1965).[3]

Stack shows Arthurdale Schools were designed to be the community's centralizing institution. He recounts unplanned but clearly vital community participation as the school year's start approached. Without the community's labor and expertise opening the school would not have been possible. Exemplary was the Arthurdale nursery school which delivered a comprehensive set of community services for health and well-being. Community women prepared school meals and partook

of nursery school services which focused not only on infants but also on the unborn. The community's men refurbished buildings, built school furniture, organized a volunteer fire department, and participated in cultural events.

Community, Education, and Democracy

Stack's greatest contribution is arguably his examination of the Arthurdale school-community project as practical application of Deweyan ideas on democracy, community, and philosophy of education. Dewey's visit to Arthurdale left him impressed by Elsie Ripley Clapp and school educators' work to regain for Arthurdale's citizens their sense of identity, community, and place through the social process of education.

John Dewey (1859–1952) warns, "rejection of the philosophy and practice of traditional education sets a new type of difficult educational problem for those who believe in the new type of education."[4] To develop a philosophy of education simply to reject traditional and customary forms of education is insufficient. He suggests that:

> …those who are looking ahead to a new movement in education, adapted to the existing need for a new social order, should think in terms of Education itself rather than in terms of some 'ism about education, even such an 'ism as "progressivism." For in spite of itself any movement that thinks and acts in terms of an 'ism becomes so involved in reaction against other 'isms that it is unwittingly controlled by them.[5]

Elsie Ripley Clapp, a creative and experienced progressive educator, negotiated government intervention and inconsistent policies to create a homogeneous community school and school community.

The Great Depression and the New Deal

Stack sets the stage for his Arthurdale study by presenting immediate historical context. The economic boom of the 1920s with its stock-market speculation, growth, and seemingly unstoppable prosperity ended in October, 1929. Fortunes acquired in the post-World War I era were quickly lost, plunging the U.S. into the Great Depression. Bank failures, widespread unemployment, and lack of appropriate governmental response led to widespread despair and hopelessness among the U.S.' people. The economic situation's destructiveness resulted in a nationwide breakdown of community life. The 1933 election of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and the creation of New Deal programs and policies sought to lessen the effects of the economic crisis and the concomitant breakdown of community, especially in rural towns. For Stack the "concept of community is central to Dewey's

vision of democracy, and the building of community is what he perceived to be the ultimate goal of the school."[6] The development of the U.S. economy focused on "materialism and individualism" and, one might add, competition contributed to the "dissolution or loss of a sense of community."[7] To assuage the problem of a decreasing sense of community it is necessary for a social group's members to engage with others. "Shared action and common values form the basis for community," writes Stack, requiring "some form of communication…. [And while] communication and community help form the basis of democracy, they are also crucial to the educational process."[8] Stack posits the role of experience as a means to accomplish and learn all things. For Dewey the school, like the community, is experience-based. Experience is at the heart of progressive education and of progressive society. Dewey writes, "the progressive movement…seems more in accord with the democratic ideal to which our people is committed than do the procedures of the traditional school."[9]

Varieties of Progressive Education

As additional context, Stack provides an overview of progressive education's complex condition, the relationship of philosophy of education to school practice, and the Depression's dire consequences on schools. In analyzing progressive education of the mid-1930s, he finds a divided and divisive continuum of ideas situated within four schools of thought: social reconstructionists, community-school progressives, child-centered progressives, and administrative progressives. The extremists in this continuum were social reconstructionists and child-centered progressives. Stack explains, "the thrust in progressive education was [at first] a [child-centered] concern for the physical and emotional development of children." Subsequent ideas of social reconstruction "placed much more emphasis on the school as a tool of social reform."[10] Administrative progressives viewed school principals and superintendents as leaders responsible for training teachers and implementing progressive practices. Community-school progressives believed, as does Dewey, that:

> …the teacher should become intimately acquainted with the conditions of the local community, physical, historical, economic, occupational, etc., in order to utilize them as educational resources. A system of education based upon the necessary connection of education with experience must, on the contrary, if faithful to its principle, take these things constantly into account.[11]

Designed as a microcosm of society the progressive school was meant better to serve society than traditional schools focused on academic curriculum separate from community, separate from students' lived experience.

Subsistence Homesteading

Eleanor Roosevelt's visit to Scotts Run became the origin of the Arthurdale project. Stack's analysis of the project's development illuminates many problems encountered as the project progressed. Among the rural poor it was not uncommon for farmers, especially those with small amounts of land, to work to supplement farming with cash income. In the Appalachian Mountains this often meant mining. The closing of unprofitable mines eliminated that work and its income so government intervention sought to improve opportunities and recreate community and cultural pride. The school was to be the organizing feature emphasizing lifelong community education that recognized and sustained Arthurdale's unique cultural and social heritage. The goal of the Arthurdale community was to provide homes and land for about 200 families chosen from more than 600 families. Interviewers selected participants based on what they could bring to the community. The concept of subsistence farming and part-time or seasonal work as a supplement required suitable land and a local industry, cooperatives, folk art, and handicrafts. At first children were to attend local schools but area schools were unable to accommodate the influx of students so the Arthurdale School became a reality. Recommended by the executive secretary of the American Friends Service Committee, Elsie Ripley Clapp was engaged to lead the project.

Ultimately the success of Arthurdale was short and limited. Government planners, the unwise use or lack of funding, the patriarchal and off-site decision-making process won out over Dewey's idea of democracy arising from community. The effort to construct school-community when most important decisions were made outside the school and community was doomed by those with other agendas and fiscal interests.

What makes Arthurdale unique was the conscious design of a community with a school at its center. The concerted effort to meld the school and community into one grew from Elsie Ripley Clapp's progressive ideas and her understanding of John Dewey's educational philosophy. Clapp developed the school's focus and methods based on experience in progressive schools. She was chair of the Progressive Education Association (PEA) National Committee on Rural Education, and served on the PEA Advisory and Executive Board (1924–1936).[12] Through PEA she became acquainted with other progressive educators' ideas and methods. In Arthurdale she encountered the perfect opportunity to put a school-community model into practice. As a student, assistant, and disciple of Dewey and progressive education, Clapp had experience both in the progressive classroom and administration of progressive schools. Before her Arthurdale experience

Clapp served as administrator for a decade, developing and implementing her view of education at Rosemary Junior High in Greenwich, Connecticut and at Ballard School in Kentucky. Stack's biographical work on Elsie Ripley Clapp gives him extensive knowledge of her preparation for and application of her educational philosophy. Stack makes abundantly clear how Elsie Ripley Clapp developed her own take on progressive and community education in keeping with Dewey's admonition that:

> It is the business of an intelligent theory of education to ascertain the causes for the conflicts that exist and then, instead of taking one side or the other, to indicate a plan of operations proceeding from a level deeper and more inclusive than is represented by the practices and ideas of the contending parties.[13]

Clapp developed, during her teaching and administrative career, the necessary philosophy, skills, and teacher cadre to create a community school and Arthurdale provided the opportunity to put philosophy and skills into practice. Had the overseers given the school as prominent a place in the Arthurdale project as did Clapp, the project could have accomplished even more.

School and Reform

Stack documents problems existed from the beginning. Upon Clapp's arrival she found construction had not yet begun on the school buildings because of a disagreement over the school's budget. There were no teaching materials, no school furniture, and few books, but with a staff of dedicated progressive educators and a community willing to undertake the challenge the 1934 school year began in available, repurposed buildings filled with community-built furniture. If, as Stack says, "the two fundamental issues for progressive education in the 30s were the role of the school in the social order and the need for reform within the curriculum,"[14] health and nutrition were also key issues and Arthurdale school met those issues head-on. School began with teachers creating the curriculum using the place's and people's culture and history. Soon the nursery "became the heart of the school program."[15] The staff, school doctor, and nurse taught childcare, gave pre-natal and post-natal care, and operated a well-baby clinic. As the community came together, men and women organized into various service and recreational groups. Arthurdale women cooked and served meals at the school; men worked on the production of school furniture and transformation of buildings into the school. At the end of the first year, the Arthurdale music festival celebrated the community's feel and culture.

During the second year the Arthurdale community neared completion. The men finished construction of the last homes and agricultural projects began to yield. High school aid programs administered by the National Youth Administration (NYA) as part of the Works Progress Administration provided assistance that year. Stack notes, however, a persistent level of unease which took two forms. First was overall unease with the project; there was the question of home ownership: were community members' payments rent or mortgage payments? Second was concern for the school. Community members questioned the methods of progressive educators and the high school's lack of accreditation. Shortages of books and materials, departures partly caused by that shortage, and differences between the Arthurdale school and schools students' parents attended made some parents uneasy. Still, overall, students made progress. Children were in better overall physical condition to learn and the arrival of new students offered an opportunity to expand relationships.

The heart of Arthurdale school was its nursery school that provided preschool education and instructed parents and young women from the high school NYA program in child care, prenatal care, and practical nursing. An NYA project sought to provide trades training for boys and secretarial, medical, and domestic arts training for girls.

Despite its challenges, Arthurdale school largely succeeded in accomplishing a difficult task: creation of a school-based community. John Dewey served on the National Advisory Committee for Arthurdale and visited toward the end of the 1936 school year. In the introduction to Clapp's 1952 book, *The Use of Resources in Education*, he calls Arthurdale and Ballard "groundbreaking educational undertakings which are here reported by the one who was largely responsible for initiating them."[16]

Return to County Control

Elsie Ripley Clapp's leadership of Arthurdale school ended in July 1936. She had concentrated on finding manufacturers who would build factories in Arthurdale to provide much-needed jobs for residents. Without adequate employment, grants, and funding failures the school project became untenable. With her departure in August 1936, the experiment at Arthurdale was left to its own devices. Most progressive educators working with Clapp were forced to seek other employment since only the nursery school and its programs retained funding. Thereafter the county and state took control of Arthurdale school. Government grants and Eleanor Roosevelt partly funded the 1936–1937 and 1937–1938 school years but in the summer of 1938 the National Committee recommended the school become the county's sole responsibility. Nevertheless, the school retained vestiges of the progressive experiment. The 1939 published Arthurdale school

philosophy emphasizes local needs over a lockstep curriculum and "the importance of cooperative responsibility and democratic life…, opportunities for the child to think in scientific manner…, [and] the school must be life and education and must grow out of life experiences."[17] This philosophy seemingly follows Dewey who writes:

> A single course of studies for all progressive schools is out of the question; it would mean abandoning the fundamental principle of connection with life-experiences…. The other alternative is systematic utilization of scientific method as the pattern and ideal of intelligent exploration and exploitation of the potentialities inherent in experience.[18]

Economic problems continued to plague the Arthurdale school and community. Finally, the national economic upturn resulting from World War II spending made it possible for many residents to find jobs or enter military service. The federal support that had sustained Arthurdale school and community began to wither after 1936 and eventually inhabitants bought their Arthurdale homes. The county-administrated schools reverted to traditional formats. Arthurdale became just another community in central West Virginia and another of the subsistence homestead communities across the country. Arthurdale school moved from the community-school progressive into the administrative-progressive style, retaining a stated progressive philosophy but employing a more traditional practice.

Bureaucracy, Leadership, Planning, and the School as Total Institution

Stack's penetrating analysis of the Arthurdale school-community posits the pitfalls of planned social intervention, a convoluted bureaucratic administration, disagreement about the budget and its best use, uncoordinated and unfocused policies, and the inability to provide self-sustaining economic opportunities. The success of Arthurdale ultimately was due to Elsie Ripley Clapp's thoughtful, consistent application of progressive and democratic principles despite being forced to negotiate inconsistent bureaucratic policy while trying to build a sustainable school-community.

Throughout Stack explores several significant problems related to the application of education as a solution to social and economic woes. He identifies the variety of educational philosophies called progressive education and alludes to the nature of leadership, the application of rational planning, and the use of the school as a total institution. Arthurdale gives but one example of the perils that arise when intervening in complex social and economic processes.

Leadership, Power, and Authority

First is the nature of leadership, power, and authority. Following Max Weber's "sociology of domination,"[19] T. T. Paterson identifies five types of authority. First is structural authority that accrues to the person who occupies a position in the organization's hierarchy; a leader who has authority derived from superior knowledge, skill, and experience has sapiential authority. Charismatic authority is authority based on personality, charm, or the ability to persuade others to follow. Moral authority derives from an individual's desire to improve the social situation based on principles and the collective good. Personal authority is a willingness to speak out, to have one's ideas and opinions heard. Æsculpian authority combines the attributes of sapiential, charismatic, moral, and personal authority to greater or lesser degrees. Structural authority may or may not be present.[20] Negative connotations exist within all forms of authority: those who rise to lead an outlaw organization based on ruthlessness and violence, those who rise through bureaucracies through longevity, and those who might lead political or social organizations through bullying, hectoring, and intimidation, narrowly defining the collective good can all do a disservice to an organization or society. Societies and organizations need leadership but those solely based on charismatic or sapiential leaders have difficulty surviving a leader's absence.

Often a leader emerges who has experience, training, innovative ideas, and a creative view of what can be done to improve the subject of interest, or Æsculpian authority. Elsie Ripley Clapp's leadership fits this category. Clapp's training, experience, and personal qualities ensured progressive ideas and attitudes would be foregrounded and Arthurdale would embrace fully the school-community model. She was able to attract like-minded educators to participate in the Arthurdale Schools project and, initially, to convince those with bureaucratic responsibility of the value of the school-community ideals. At the end of Clapp's tenure, the process of regression began. After a time, all that was left was the school's philosophy that alluded to Clapp's progressive values.

Planning and Engineering

The second problem is the inadequacy of rational planning to meet the needs of an innovative activity. Project organizers conceived of the Arthurdale school-community as laboratory and model for building school-communities and for enacting social and political reform: a radical renovation. Such new thinking about education and its role in the community's life contrasts with the traditional, familiar school. In Dewey's view:

> …for radical renovation of the school system, a revision, almost a reversal, of wording would seem to be required.

> Instead of saying that we have thought so long about education—if thinking means anything intellectual—it would be closer to the realities of the situation to say we have only just begun to think about it. The school system represents not thinking but the domination of thought by the inertia of immemorial customs.[21]

In his view, "the science of education…only rationalizes old, customary education while improving it in minor details."[22] True reform requires a new education based on the common experience of teacher, student, and community.

Constraints on planning committees led to decisions that often hindered the possibility the project could be successful. The bureaucracy had its own vision of education based on tradition, inertia, and habit, and decisions made above the community level made the project's success impossible. Dewey calls these "new conceptions in education" but warns they "will not of themselves carry us far in modifying schools, for until the schools are modified the new conceptions will be themselves pale, remote, vague, formal."[23] One sees such vagaries repeatedly in the planning of so-called educational innovation, wherein everything from vouchers to charter schools are conceptualized to remedy perceived shortcomings of public education. The educational institution has been subjected to efficiency models, business models, testing models, and technological models that, given time, revert to tradition, inertia, and habit; these models do not survive their leaders.

The School as Total Institution

The third problem, school as total institution, arises from the dilemma of schooling as an institution of society and the primary institution for the creation of society, democratic or otherwise. At the continuum's progressive end, the school serves as exemplar of what is possible when governed by democratic and egalitarian structure and content. At the continuum's traditional end is the idea of schooling as preparation of students to take their place in the existing social structure. Both these conceptions of schools and all those in between conceptualize education as one societal institution among many. In opposition to the continuum's traditional end is the idea of school as the primary source or clearing house of a community's social services. Sociologist Erving Goffman describes the total institution based on work he did as a visiting member of the National Institute of Mental Health focusing on the social world of inmates, individuals sequestered for long periods of time. He defines a total institution as "a place of residence and work where a large number of like-situated individuals, cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time, together

lead an enclosed, formally administered round of life."[24] He differentiates between social establishments in which various functions of social institutions (family, government, economy, education, and religion) and total institutions provide the total environment for members. He identifies five types of total institutions: first, those that care for individuals incapable of caring for themselves but who are otherwise harmless to society; second, those who are incapable but might pose a risk to themselves or society; third, those that protect society from dangerous individuals; fourth, those that sequester individuals for particular activities; and fifth, those that provide a separate life for religious or personal lifestyle reasons.[25]

In the 1970s Thomas Wiggins and Michael Langenbach drew from Goffman's characteristics of total institutions: all aspects of life are pursued in the same place and under the same authority; life is carried on in the company of a large group of others, all of whom are generally treated similarly; activities are scheduled being imposed by a system of explicit rules and officials, and; all enforced activities make up a single, rational plan to fulfill institutional goals.[26] They examine the idea of total institutions in an actual institution, the elementary school, that serves as a locus for at least the secular institutions of society's "health, welfare, and recreation." They found a "proliferation of functions or aspects of life traditionally viewed as responsibilities of the family unit or the community are being assumed by the school."[27] Although Arthurdale succumbed to the lack of planners' foresight and disregard for their decisions' consequences, the Arthurdale school-community took on many characteristics of a total institution. The combination of functions of community plus functions of school made the school the community's focus. The school provided much of the community's social life.

John Dewey is skeptical of the efficacy of placing so many social burdens on the institution of education. He recognizes the variety of educational theories and practices educators called "progressive." Noting that:

> …our educational procedure is still accidental, and that all our pretensions in education will remain mere pretensions until we can analyze the products of home and school rearing, so as to assign with definiteness responsibility for the various conditions and forces which have brought about the various elements in the human product.[28]

He reasons the school should be a microcosm of society, and that the social structure, i.e., the pluralistic, democratic nature of society should be visible in schools. That does not mean, however, that schools should take a leadership role in defining community and society. He theorizes:

> Faith in the possibilities of education is enormous. But the notion that we cannot really direct the processes which lead actual living human beings to good and bad products is equally widespread…. For everywhere there is the same absence of insight into the means by which our professed ends are to be realized.[29]

Nevertheless, he surely applauded Clapp's effort to create a school-community relationship in which education could be different from the controlled content demanded by government "enlisting," "popular interest and sentiment; and the possibility of exciting and directing that interest by a judiciously selected supply of 'news.'"[30] He laments his is an era of:

> …bunk and hokum—there is more of it in quantity, its circulation is more rapid and ceaseless, it is swallowed more eagerly and more indiscriminately than ever before. The reasons…are external rather than in any inherent deterioration of intellect and character.[31]

Developing transportation and communication enlarges the social world and the worldviews of its members. His view is:

> …education means the creation of a discriminating mind, a mind that prefers not to dupe itself or to be the dupe of others…to cultivate the habit of suspended judgment, of scepticism, of desire for evidence, of appeal to observation rather than sentiment, discussion rather than bias, inquiry rather than conventional idealizations.[32]

The influence of such an education will require that "politics will have to be in fact what it now pretends to be, the intelligent management of social affairs."[33] Until that point chances are good the educational institution will reflect more of the same "systematic, almost deliberate, avoidance of the spirit of criticism in dealing with history, politics and economics."[34]

Conclusion

So philosophy, leadership, control, and total institution limited the success of the Arthurdale schools and community—and these same issues remain with us today. We tinker with philosophy (usually in the form of mission), method, governance, and social role without modifying too much the overall effect of the school on society and so tradition wins out over change. The nature of leadership, the problem of rational planning without a shared vision, the school's possible role as a total institution, and progressive educational philosophy all play a role in the broader social, historical, and philosophical context.

Stack's work presents a model of how, using biographical methods, a scholar may focus on a specific period. Only necessary details from Clapp's life inform her activities in the Arthurdale Schools' context. His use of autobiographical, biographical, and archival sources highlights the problems Clapp faced in leading the Arthurdale School experiment. Above all, it is Stack's masterful integration of the biographical, historical, social, and political research that makes Arthurdale Community Schools such important work. Stack's book is an important resource for courses in the history of education, philosophy of education, sociology of education, and educational historiography.

Endnotes

[1] Sam F. Stack, Jr., *The Arthurdale Community School: Education and Reform in Depression Era Appalachia* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2016), ISBN 978-0-813166889.

[2] Sam F. Stack, Jr., "Constructing a Life: Pragmatism and Elsie Ripley Clapp," *Journal of Philosophy and History of Education* 52, no. 1 (2002): 147–153.

[3] Sam F. Stack, Jr., *Elsie Ripley Clapp (1879–1965): Her Life and the Community School* (New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2004).

[4] John Dewey, *Experience and Education* (New York, NY: Collier Books and Kappa Delta Pi, 1938/1965), 25.

[6] Ibid., 6.

[7] Stack, *The Arthurdale Community School*, 3.

[8] Ibid., 4.

[9] Ibid., 4–5.

[10] Dewey, *Experience and Education*, 33.

[11] Stack, *The Arthurdale Community School*, 15.

[12] Dewey, *Experience and Education*, 40.

[13] Stack, *The Arthurdale Community School*, 43.

[14] Ibid., 5.

[15] Ibid., 62.

[16] Ibid., 83.

[17] John Dewey, introduction to *The Use of Resources in Education*, Elsie Ripley Clapp (New York, NY: Harper & Bros., 1952), http://www.nyu.edu/classes/gmoran/DEWEYSOURCES.pdf

[18] Stack, *The Arthurdale Community School*, 118.

19 Dewey, *Experience and Education*, 78, 86.

20 Max Weber, *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, eds. Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich, trans. Ephraim Fischoff, Hans Gerth, C. Wright Mills, Ferdinand Kolegar, A. M. Henderson, Talcott Parsons, Edward Shils, and Max Rheinstein (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1968/1978), https://ia800305.us.archive.org/25/items/MaxWeberEconomyAndSociety/MaxWeberEconomyAndSociety.pdf

21 Erik T. Paterson, "Æsculapian Authority and the Doctor-Patient Relationship," *Journal of Orthomolecular Medicine* 15, no. 1 (2000): 82–88, http://orthomolecular.org/library/jom/2000/pdf/2000-v15n02-p082.pdf

22 John Dewey, "Education as Engineering," *The Middle Works, 1899–1924*, vol. 13, ed. Jo Ann Boydston (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2008), 323.

23 Ibid., 326.

24 Erving Goffman, *Asylums* (New York, NY: Anchor Books, 1962), xiii.

25 Ibid., 4, 5.

26 Thomas Wiggins and Michael Langenbach, "The Elementary School as a Total Institution" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC, 1975), 6, https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED109817

27 Ibid.

28 John Dewey, "Education as Religion," The Middle Works, 1899–1924, vol. 13, ed. Jo Ann Boydston (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2008), 317.

29 Ibid., 318, 321.

30 John Dewey, "Education as Politics," *The Middle Works, 1899–1924*, vol. 13, ed. Jo Ann Boydston (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2008), 331.

31 Ibid., 329.

32 Ibid., 334.

33 Ibid.

34 Ibid., 332.