Democratic Schooling: Toward a Renewed End-in-View

Matthew D. Davis
University of Texas

American political leaders and editorial pundits routinely decry the demise of democratic life in the nation. Voting, at all levels, remains at abysmally low levels. Public rhetoric routinely is shrill, often unseemly; it lacks civility. Political discourse in such an environment is clearly impoverished.[1] Combatants for public attention and approval war over visions of the public good. They stand entrenched and immobile, refusing to yield or shift positions. Their ground of disputation frequently is neither level nor common. These tortured circumstances of civic reality are viewed much too often and like so many past and present social problems, as the singular responsibility of the nation's schools. In this view, simply, critics scream their conclusion: schools have failed America. The American democratic fabric is unraveling, so goes the charge, and American schooling is responsible for the mess.[2]

Education professionals, too, recently have waded back into this inflamed rhetorical fray. These educators appear unwilling to accept as accurate the vicious allegations of schools' ruin and worthlessness. Moreover, they seek to contribute to the restoration of democracy in America. Only recently has the concept of democratic schooling reemerged in the educational dialogue after several decades of dormancy. The rhetoric of the profession now promotes if not lauds democratic administration, classroom teaching, and teacher and student decision making. Books and articles revealing this rhetoric appear with greater frequency. Why has this dialogue so recently reappeared in educational discourse?

Perhaps not coincidentally, schools and educators during the 1980s endured a withering attack of criticism. This "manufactured crisis," led mainly by conservative detractors of public schools, was exposed and illuminated earlier this year by David Berliner and Bruce Biddle.[3] In their report, they cogently analyzed most, if not all, of the significant charges leveled against the schools. They concluded that the bludgeoning criticisms have no merit and were strung together for a single political purpose: to discredit public schools. In concurrence, "Larry Cuban observe[d that] the American people are the victims of a skillfully concocted scam that diminishes public confidence in schools."[4] Educators, not unlike other professionals under siege, do not take kindly to unwarranted attacks and remain angered and cautious. Moreover, this crisis did more. It violated the American sense of fair play, even in a heated contest over important issues.

This recently alleged crisis of public schools, too, must be seen as another step in the "conservative restoration"[5] initiated in the late 1960s. Indeed, it properly may be traced to intense post-war (1950s) criticism of modernity, including public schools, and the political witch-hunts known as McCarthyism. This more recent movement has attempted, with more than reasonable success, to blunt if not overturn and reverse many of the school equity measures of the "Great Society" legislation.[6] Partisans of these changed positions hold strongly to a simple faith: through its intrusion, the federal government took away the very essence of change from local and state school constituencies. Democracy, to these "restorers" of the previously good life of the American past, continues to be lost and must be recaptured from the federal government.

Democratic schooling, against this warring background, serves as the standard under which many American educators wish to unite against this belligerent conservative backlash. The resulting political rhetoric echoes the sentiments of 1960s-era change proponents. Equity remains the defensive bulwark. Sensitivity to a numbers mentality envelopes most individuals pledged to the democratic schooling dialogue. At present, they seek a level playing field and distinguish their position as a moral high ground. However, Americans continue to be frustrated because they seem to be no closer to a common ground.[7] "With the public interest being constantly redefined to accommodate diversity, the core of common vision shrinks."[8] Democracy, ironically, is emblazoned on the banners waving over both sets of disputants.

Democratic schooling in the American past assuredly seldom included equity issues for all.[9] Common and progressive schools stand out prominently in the remembered recent past as supreme failures to include all American children at the societal table of learning. On the other hand, public schooling advocates from common school to post-sputnik times harbored an end-in-view for all pupils to become participating, deliberative citizens.[10] As evidenced in the present scene, the central American schooling purpose appears to have lost or abandoned this end-in-view.

In these present times, in contrast, advocates emphasize a variety of schooling purposes for young Americans. As Robert Westbrook notes:

> Most adult Americans no longer live to any significant degree as citizens, and hence it is not surprising that few feel a compelling need to educate American children for public life [citizenship].[11]

Particularly prominent among these newer purposes is schooling for economically productive workers. This goal gained ascendancy by the exaggerated, nearly demagogic rhetoric of the "A Nation at Risk" document.[12] Following the publication of this federal government jeremiad, a host of initiatives have sought to reclaim the soul of public schools—or to abandon them. Among the least abusive programs are school-business partnerships; they flourish across the nation. On the other hand, increasing numbers of school boards entertain proposals for private management of public schools.[13] In sharp contrast, advocates of democratic schooling currently propose a refreshed and renewed emphasis: education of students for participatory, empowered lives in schools with a "melange of rank and of species, of inordinate juxtapositions."[14]

The proponents of a new democratic schooling enter the present context carrying a diminished vision of democracy. They have failed to connect their responsive claim to the more robust image of democratic schooling purpose commonly held earlier in this century. Equity and empowerment are worthy goals, to be sure; nevertheless they are insufficient. Participating, deliberative citizenship must carry with it a clutch of challenges. "Citizens are not born with the necessary traits; they are acquired through education."[15] This education, or "civic literacy" is constituted by

> the competence to participate in democratic communities, the ability to think critically and act with deliberation in a pluralistic world, and the empathy to identify sufficiently with others to live with them despite conflicts of interest and differences in character.[16]

In assertedly democratic schools, equity and empowerment unaccompanied by a concern for and attention to challenges inherent in citizenship can only fail. Democratic schooling understood only, or, even primarily by concerns for equity and empowerment emphasizes the technical nature of schooling imbued in the "cult of efficiency."[17] Such technicality violates essential dimensions of the democracy ethic. Particularly, democratic schooling requires a renewed end-in-view for future generations of Americans who can become both participating and deliberating citizens.

Democratic Schooling: Present Tense

Much of the current rhetoric about democratic schooling exhibits both a technical framework and underpinning. For example, equity has been reduced to a formula: x% of students, teachers, community members, and administrators must be represented in any school grouping or decision-making body.[18] Or, every cumulative group must include "representatives" or "chairs for" individuals from identifiable groups. This sensitivity for a formulaic numeracy divorced from attention to larger schooling purpose deals primarily with what may be labeled "inputs." These circumstances assume that equitable students will learn citizenship simply from their participation, without regard to the goal, contents, or nature of that participation. Undoubtedly, increased and even enhanced participation by students, as well as by teachers and community members, is a vital need in most American schools. However, simple participation is not sufficient.

Democratic administration, democratic classrooms, and democratic decision-making are worthy goals. Within the current "grammar of schooling,"[19] they exist superficially, at best. Democratic administration[20], for example, presumes to empower teachers through increased decision-making. In recent years, advocacy of increased teacher participation in school decisions has been encoded as site-based management. Ironically, this vision of bottom-up management appears widely to be mandated top-down. Consequently, decisions made by teachers routinely are of minor, even trivial consequence and consume valuable teacher time that is not compensated. Power easily granted by administrators can more easily be taken away. Current advocacy of "teacher empowerment," then, devalues and defrauds a central tenet of democracy.

Granting students increased voice and power in school matters that affect them appears to be an unassailable value. Many students exist in only a marginal state throughout their years in school. They are acted upon more commonly than they act volitionally. Mindlessly, they move from one classroom to another, from day to day. Their input on matters related to their involvement in schoolwork rarely is encouraged or even requested. In such circumstances, "discriminating minds" seem unlikely to develop.[21] Learner-centered instruction affords students some of the keys to the schools. Dewey understood students to be journeying toward citizenship. Further,

> (h)is confidence that children would develop a democratic character in the schools he envisioned was rooted less in a faith in the spontaneous and crude capacities of children than in *the*

> *ability of teachers* to create an environment in the classrooms in which they possessed the means to 'mediate these capacities' over into habits of social intelligence and responsiveness (italics added).[22]

Only respect for students should be read into Dewey's position. His reflections and proposals formed the intellectual basis for the learner-centered reforms advocated by progressive educators throughout this century. Teachers, in this view, as the adults who have been educated to lead students through their apprenticeship, merit an enlarged and truly significant role in curriculum development.

Dewey's "heavy demand on teachers" was predicated on the belief that teachers usher in "the true kingdom of God."[23] His profound faith in and respect of teachers appears to elude most contemporary Americans. On the other hand, the "pioneer of democratic administration,"[24] Jesse Newlon, understood well Dewey's dictum.

As Denver's superintendent of schools in the early 1920s, Newlon routinely invited teachers out of their classrooms for extended, paid duty as curriculum developers. Teachers deliberated and wrote the curriculum for Denver's classrooms.[25] These teachers also helped prepare their colleagues to teach the new curricula. Under Newlon's leadership, Denver's teachers' actions almost 80 years ago appear to be much closer to democratic curriculum making than that "encouraged" in today's site-based management councils. In fact, reports of curriculum development under site-based management is all but nonexistent.[26]

Community and parents' input into democratic decision-making, even when purported to be important and fulsome, currently lacks adequate democratic procedures. It also lacks substance. For example, the recent reforms in Chicago that intend to return school control to local school-based boards has yielded few gains. Critics of the plans more accurately predicted reality than did the advocates of change. Parents and other community members in the local school area have been "given" and have received little power. Also, students' scores on standardized tests have not risen appreciably.[27] The appearance and emotion of reform, even when clothed in appropriate democratic language, is not sufficient. Democracy requires something more.

In large measure, democratic schooling, in current rhetoric and practice, constitutes a sham perpetuated on students and teachers and the community. Administrators who lead the charges for reform and who legitimate reform as democratic action likely have not succeeded in deceiving themselves. For the most part, they know that they continue to hold and wield power, even as they suggest that another reality exists. Similar to the co-option of female teachers by male administrators in the first decades of the 20th century,[28] today's school administrators, men and women, are co-opting other school "stake-holders." The current advocacy of democratic schooling is blighted, in addition, by a presentist view which contains no end-in-view.

Democratic Schooling: Past Tense

Horace Mann and other champions of the common school movement, held a clear end-in-view for American schooling. Pupils of the young nation were to be prepared to "take their places as responsible citizens of the republic."[29] This civic education, moreover, was to be nonsectarian in nature (although, in fact, decidedly Protestant). Such a civic education, moreover, would foster intelligent minds which would provide all individuals so schooled with the means to "rise to competence and independence."[30] The nature and substance of the curriculum, therefore, was of vital importance. End-in-view joined with a rich substance base distinguishes these nascent schools for democracy.

Dewey's end-in-view resembled that of Mann's. Schooling acted as a civic apprenticeship. Through schooling, Dewey foresaw that students would learn "a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience."[31] Moreover, education should create "voluntary disposition and interest."[32] Dewey clearly believed that rich, substantive content contributed to an appropriate democratic schooling.

Certainly, the end-in-view of previous visions of democratic schooling, however, lacked attention to the equity and empowerment issues so prominent in today's views. To Mann, befitting a cosmopolitan gentleman of the early nineteenth century, public education was the province primarily for white males. To be sure, he included females in his educational proposals, but their inclusion represented a severely limited purpose: to be educated enough to bear and raise boys to be voting citizens.[33] Non-white Americans, always a minority, were accommodated in the nation's earliest common schools, but few minority children, for a host of reasons, seized the opportunity to attend school. Mann's and his generation's view of equity was severely limited.

Also, Mann appeared to possess little awareness of the potential of student empowerment. The school curriculum that he advocated allowed few opportunities for students to acquire a discerning mind. In history and civics, as well as other subjects, the lecture method without discussion reigned supreme.[34] Pupils' critical thinking, to use a presentist term, was eschewed. On the other hand,

> (w)hatever the limitations and shortcomings of the civic education these schools provided, as schools putatively dedicated

> to education for citizenship, they did furnish a setting in which a struggle for a more genuinely democratic civic education might be waged.[35]

Critical thinking, however, stands as only one of a number of shortcomings of common schools as revealed by historians. Refined speech certainly blinded Mann and other common school advocates.

Popular speech rarely was tolerated in early American common schools.[36] Kenneth Cmiel notes that

> (i)nto the 1850s, popular grammars were written with the same informing premises that had been at work in the mid-eighteenth century. Refined language continued to be the goal.[37]

This practice took long to abate. Refined speech gave way slightly to middling grammar by the 1880s. For example, a report of an 1881 New York classroom detailed the teaching of songs in slang (popular, not refined speech).[38] The "difference between sophistry and reasoned republic eloquence," Thomas Pangle asserts, must be learned by "young future citizens and leaders" in the classroom.[39] Common schools failed this task.

On the other hand, Mann and other common school advocates continually sought to provide a generalist curriculum for all who attended school. Several revisionist historians have asserted that common schools rose to prominence in order to provide workers for the new business owners riding the crest of the industrial revolution.[40] Edward Stevens Jr, however, concluded that this suggestion was a false critique.[41] Technical literacy, Stevens avers, never found its way into the common school curriculum, much to the dismay of many businessman. Mechanic arts institutes rose to fill the void. Common school students invariably were employed to man the new factories, but not because they had studied any specialized curriculum.

Progressive educators, like Mann and his successors, obviously failed on any presentist equity scale.[42] The great failure of the progressive era in general, judged by today's standards, was its record of the inclusion of non-whites into the post-millenialist vision of social good.[43] "Good for all" did not include individuals who looked too dissimilar to white people, and especially, Blacks.[44] Progressive educators appeared to take seriously the Americanization (education) of recent immigrants as one means by which these individuals might escape the life in city slums, and could gain full citizenship. This type of schooling purpose clearly represents a severely limited sense of equity.

On the other hand, progressives score high on presentist scales of student empowerment. Learner-centered classrooms, with experientially-based curriculums modeled civic life for young students. However, little connection can be found between even relevant experiences for pupils and any comprehensive end-in-view. Only with the social reconstructionists (primarily working at Teachers College, and, thus, away from the practical worlds of classrooms) can larger purposes be identified during this period.[45] Student empowerment during this era, thus, represented a blighted end-in-view.

Alternative schools in the 1960s, like a few others in the past, primarily intended to empower students. Particularly, curriculum content was of much less importance. The concept of school subjects in these alternative schools diminished. These alternative schools, like many past school reforms, died noiselessly and simply disappeared.

Democratic schooling in the past exhibited a variety of serious flaws as does the current crop of proposals. Democratic schooling in the future must combine visions of equity and empowerment with a curriculum designed to challenge young citizens. Students in democratic schools of the future must be both participative and deliberative citizens.

Democratic Schooling: Future Tense

Democratic schooling routinely will elude efforts to grasp it, especially if grasping it is the goal. Simply, democratic schooling always is a willful pursuit, never a destination. Americans, as essayist Lewis Lapham has noted,

> were always about becoming, not being; about the prospects for the future, not about the inheritance of the past.[46]

Democratic schooling, likewise, can only be about becoming. Student's becoming. The nation's becoming.

The journey toward democratic schooling primarily must emphasize both faithful participation and serious challenge. Process without the imperative of challenge can only be hollow. To be sure, challenges will differ for different people, but democratic citizenship demands a seriousness to match its possibility.[47] As Horace Mann wrote nearly 150 years ago,

> (e)ducation must prepare our citizens to become municipal officers, intelligent jurors, honest witnesses, legislators, or competent judges of legislation—in fine, to fill all the manifold relations of [civic] life.[48]

These sentiments, viewed in a post-O. J. society, appear stunningly appropriate.

In the beginning at least, civic deliberation must be rekindled.[49] This refreshed process of democratic valuing and decision making cannot begin in schools. That beginning must be fostered throughout the body politic. Nevertheless, schools within this renewed context surely have prominent roles. One, certainly, calls for schooling deliberation to be taken up by the professionals within the schools.

Schooling or curriculum deliberation, as William Reid patiently explains in *The Pursuit of Curriculum*, must center on questions of what ought to be taught.[50] Curriculum development is a moral endeavor for teachers and others who plan for students' school experiences.[51] Human relationships, like those in classrooms between teachers and students, are supremely moral endeavors. Thus, moral issues, must be intertwined and course significantly throughout democratic schooling. To pretend in lieu of real presence, for which some spokespeople appear willing to settle, can only disfigure and diminish the impulses for truly democratic schooling.[52]

Likewise, curriculum which lacks a robust, fulsome, intellectual content cannot be understood to constitute democratic schooling. This "public education," Benjamin Barber avers, should be "general, common, and thus in the original sense 'liberal'."[53] Intellectual content is necessary on a journey toward educational, and democratic excellence.[54] Richard Gibboney, in his "story of practical school reform, 1960-1990," differentiates reforms by their democratic and intellectual impulses.[55] While helpful as an analytical framework, segregating out the intellectual impoverishes the concept of democratic schooling. Further, the recent dispute over "political correctness" misses an intellectual dictum. As Elizabeth Kelly noted, education should neither neglect western canon nor autobiographical multiculturalism.[56] The pursuit of schooling demands both emphases in rich abundance.

Curriculum deliberation in the pursuit of democratic schooling must center on teachers. Positive change in schools can only begin with and by teachers as they engage the truly practical.[57] David Tyack and Larry Cuban, in their analysis of school reform over the past century, conclude that most school reforms fail because reform advocates do not listen to teachers.[58] This conclusion seems too simple. Still, teachers, many who respond to a calling to teach after their initial education,[59] are not just adults who spend countless hours with pupils in the classrooms. Many teachers struggle daily through personal, intense negotiation and resistance to stated or personally understood positions about the official curriculum.[60] Recognition of the routine resistance of teachers to curriculum guidelines should lie close to the heart of any democratic administration. This awareness, as well, seems likely to heighten long overdue professional status and community respect for teachers. Schools, therefore, must be communities, constructed slowly and carefully, to nourish individuals' senses of self.[61] As Donna Kerr noted, this nurture requires

> a safe, shared place to play with life as one actually experiences it; a place where *others recognize, acknowledge, and respect one's experiences*—the self requires these and is constituted in them (italics added).[62]

Therefore, as many individuals within and outside schools commonly misunderstand or forget, empowerment comes from within; it cannot be given.

Democratic schooling in "new common schools"[63] is not simply possible. It is necessary to the survival of the American dream. Its pursuit includes an enlarged schooling purpose which includes equity and empowerment. As Benjamin Barber asserted,

> (t)here will be no liberty, no equality, no social justice without democracy, and there will be no democracy without citizens and the *schools that forge civic identity and democratic responsibility* (italics added). [64]

Also, this pursuit continues an interrupted journey for American educators and their compatriots. To re-establish democratic schooling in the replacement of popularly advocated schooling purposes (e.g., jobs or economic betterment), teachers and administrators must join together to make democratic life, this renewed end-in-view, increasingly visible and viable.

Notes

1. Donna H. Kerr, "Democracy, Nurturance, and Community," in Roger Soder, ed. *Democracy, Education and the Schools* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1996): 56.
2. Political scientist Robert D. Putnam, in disputing this claim, asserts that "(e)ducation is by far the strongest correlate that I have discovered of civic engagement in all its forms..." See his "Tuning In, Tuning Out: The Strange Disappearance of Social Capital in America," *Political Science & Politics* 28 (December 1995): 667.
3. David C. Berliner and Bruce J. Biddle, *The Manufactured Crisis: Myths, Fraud, and the Attack on America's Public Schools* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1995).
4. Larry Cuban is paraphrased in John I. Goodlad, "Democracy, Education, and Community," in Soder, *Democracy, Education and the Schools*, 117.
5. Ira Shor, *Culture Wars: School and Society in the Conservative Restoration 1969-1984* (Boston: Routledge and K. Paul, 1986).

6. Author's interview with Deborah P. Wolfe, October 1995, Oral History Collection, College of Education, The University of Texas at Austin. Dr. Wolfe served as the Education Chief of the U. S. House of Representatives from 1962-1965.
7. For a recent call for the pursuit of a common ground in the school curriculum, see C. C. Haynes and O. Thomas, eds. *Finding Common Ground: A First Amendment Guide to Religion and Public Education* (Nashville: Freedom Forum First Amendment Center, 1994).
8. Goodlad, "Democracy, Education, and Community," 92.
9. Many progressives espoused inclusionary practice, but classrooms of the period seldom mirrored this rhetoric. For a compelling reappraisal of progressives' rhetoric, see Peter S. Hlebowitsh and William G. Wraga, "Social Class Analysis in the Early Progressive Tradition," *Curriculum Inquiry* 25 (Spring 1995): 7-21.
10. See, for example, Alice Miel, *Democracy in School Administration* (New York, D. Appleton-Century Co., Inc., 1943), and Jesse H. Newlon, *Education for Democracy in our Time* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1939).
11. Robert B. Westbrook, "Public Schooling and American Democracy," in Soder, *Democracy, Education, and the Schools*, 127.
12. National Commission on Excellence in Education, *A Nation at Risk* (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1983).
13. The bloom, however, may be off the rose. Baltimore recently ended a $180 million privatization experiment; one of the nation's earliest and largest of such projects. See "A Better Idea," *The Economist* 337 (December 2, 1995): 23-24.
14. Willie Morris, *New York Days* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1993): 62.
15. Goodlad, "Democracy, Education, and Community," 89.
16. Benjamin R. Barber, "America Skips School," *Harper's Magazine* 286 (November 1993): 44.
17. Raymond Callahan, *Education and the Cult of Efficiency: A Study of the Social Forces That Have Shaped the Administration of the Public Schools* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962). For another critique of the often technical nature of schooling, see Philip W. Jackson, *The Teacher and The Machine* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1968).
18. See, for example, Bruce Kanze, "Democratic Classrooms, Democratic Schools," in William Ayers, ed. *To Become A Teacher: Making A Difference in Children's Lives* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1995): 162-170; also R.W. Connell, *Schools and Social Justice* (Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 1993); and Ann Bastian, Norm Fruchter, Marilyn Gittell, Colin Greer, and Kenneth Haskins, *Choosing Equality: The Case for Democratic Schooling* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986).
19. David Tyack and William Tobin, "The 'Grammar' of Schooling: Why Has it Been So Hard to Change?," *American Educational Research Journal* 31 (3, 1994): 453-79.
20. See, for example, Joseph Blase, *Democratic Principals in Action: Eight Pioneers* (Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press, 1995).
21. Robert B. Westbrook, *John Dewey and American Democracy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991): 313.
22. Westbrook, *John Dewey*, 108-109.
23. Ibid.
24. David B. Tyack and Elizabeth Hansot, *Managers of Virtue* (New York: Basic Books, 1981): 203.
25. O. L. Davis Jr., "The Theoretical Meets the Practical: The Practical Wins," Unpublished paper presented at the conference, "Curriculum and Didaktik," University of Oslo, August, 1995: 5.
26. See, for example, Sue Johnston, "Curriculum Decision Making at the School Level: Is It Just a Case of Teachers Learning to Act Like Administrators?," *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 10 (Winter 1995): 136-154.
27. Michael B. Katz, *Improving Poor People: The Welfare State, The "Underclass," and Urban Schools as History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995).
28. Tyack and Hansot, *Managers of Virtue*, 187.
29. Gerald L. Gutek, *Education in the United States: An Historical Perspective* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1986): 95.
30. Edward Stevens Jr. and George H. Wood, *Justice, Ideology, and Education: An Introduction to the Social Foundations of Education* (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1995).
31. Parker, *Educating the Democratic Mind*, 5.
32. Ibid.
33. This restricted purpose for girl's education, unsurprisingly, carries into the present. See Jane Bernard-Powers, "The 'Woman Question' in Citizenship Education," in Parker, *Educating the Democratic Mind*, 287-308. Not desiring to offer too blanket an indictment of men, she suggests that John Dewey "can be characterized as more gender friendly than others" (p. 288).
34. Christopher Lasch, "The Common Schools: Horace Mann and the Assault on Imagination," *The Revolt of the Elites and the Betrayal of Democracy* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1995): 141-160.
35. Westbrook, "Public Schooling and American Democracy," 131.
36. Similar struggles in current classrooms are seen over "black english" and "spanglish."
37. Kenneth Cmiel, *Democratic Eloquence: The Fight over Popular Speech in Nineteenth-Century America* (New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1990): 74.
38. Ibid, 136.
39. Thomas L. Pangle, *The Ennobling of Democracy: The Challenge of the Postmodern Era* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992): 170.
40. See, for example, Michael B. Katz, *The Irony of Early School Reform: Educational Innovation in Mid-Nineteenth Century Massachusetts* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968). For a compelling direct rebuttal to Katz's conclusion, see Maris A. Vinovskis, *The Origins of Public High Schools: A Reexamination of the Beverly High School Controversy* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1985).
41. Edward W. Stevens Jr., *The Grammar of the Machine: Technical Literacy and Early Industrial Expansion in the United States* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).
42. Ellwood P. Cubberley's writings commonly are viewed most critically in this light. For example, see his "The Organization of School Boards," in Stevens and Wood, *Justice, Ideology and Education*, 224-228.

43. Many of the progressive reformers were white males who had common rural, Christian, and racially homogeneous backgrounds. See Robert M. Crunden, *Ministers of Reform: The Progressives'Achievement in American Civilization, 1889-1920* (New York: Basic Books, 1982).
44. For example, Hollis L. Caswell, the originator of the phrase "curriculum development" and who performed the bulk of his work in southern schools during the 1930s and 1940s, ruefully acknowledged late in life that Black teachers were not involved impressively in his renowned Virginia Curriculum Study. Interview with Hollis Caswell, October 17-18, 1977, Oral History Collection, College of Education, The University of Texas at Austin. Another illustrative example is the failure to include non-whites in Arthurdale, West Virginia, and its schools, a significant New Deal experiment in resettlement. See Daniel Perlstein, "Community and Democracy in Education: The Ambiguous Case of Arthurdale," paper presented at the History of Education Society, October, 1995.
45. Gerald A. Ponder, "Conflict, Collectivism and Consensus: A Historical Analysis of Social Reconstructionist Curriculum Theories (Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, 1974).
46. Lewis H. Lapham, "Who and What is American?," in Scott Walker, ed. *The Greywolf Annual Ten: Changing Community* (Saint Paul: Greywolf Press, 1993): 229.
47. See, for example, Nathan Tarcov, "The Meanings of Democracy," in Soder, *Democracy, Education, and the Schools*, 1-36.
48. As quoted in Westbrook, "Public Schooling and American Democracy," 130.
49. On civic deliberation, see J.T. Dillon, ed. *Deliberation in Education and Society* (Norwood: Ablex Publishing Company, 1994).
50. William A. Reid, *The Pursuit of Curriculum: Schooling and the Public Interest* (Norwood: Ablex Publishing Company, 1992). See also, Arthur W. Foshay, "The Curriculum Matrix: Transcendence and Mathematics." *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 6 (September 1991): 277-293.
51. See, for example, Bob Peterson, "La Escuela Fratney: A Journey Toward Democracy," in Michael W. Apple and James A. Beane, eds. *Democratic Schools* (Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1995): 58-82.
52. For a critique of Amy Gutman's democratic-moral dichotomy in her *Democratic Education*, see David T. Hansen, "Remembering What We Know: The Case for Democratic Education," *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 23 (no.5, 1991): 459-465.
53. Barber, *An Aristocracy of Everyone*, 15.
54. Ibid, 4-7.
55. Richard A. Gibboney, *The Stone Trumpet: A Story of Practical School Reform 1960-1990* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994): 17-24.
56. Elizabeth A. Kelley, *Education, Democracy, and Public Knowledge* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1995):121.
57. Walter Doyle and Gerald Ponder, "The Practicality Ethic in Teacher Decision Making," *Interchange* 8 (1977/1978): 1-12; see, also, Joseph J. Schwab, "The Practical: A Language for Curriculum," *School Review* 78 (1969): 1-23.
58. David Tyack and Larry Cuban, *Tinkering Toward Utopia: A Century of Public School Reform* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995): 135.
59. David T. Hansen, *The Call To Teach* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1995).
60. See, for example, Rebecca Killen Hawthorne, *Curriculum in the Making: Teacher Choice and the Curriculum Experience* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1992); and Cynthia L. Paris, *Teacher Agency and Curriculum Making in the Classroom* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1993).
61. For example, the steady decline in PTA memberships (down 39% from thirty years ago) might be reversed. Certainly, few will view these forums as sites for deliberation over schooling purposes. On the other hand, PTAs may be an optimal starting point for renewed sense of school community. See Putnam, "Tuning In, Tuning Out."
62. Donna H. Kerr, "Democracy, Nurturance, and Community," 47.
63. For one vision of "new common schools," see David C. Paris, *Ideology and Educational Reform: Themes and Theories in Public Education* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1995): 194-202.
64. Barber, "America Skips School," 46.