



Georgia Southern University
Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies, Jack N. Averitt College of

Spring 2011

The Curriculum of Capitalism: Schooled to Profit or Schooled to Educate

Douglas O. Carroll

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Carroll, Douglas O., "The Curriculum of Capitalism: Schooled to Profit or Schooled to Educate" (2011). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 528.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd/528>

This dissertation (open access) is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies, Jack N. Averitt College of at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

THE CURRICULUM OF CAPITALISM: SCHOOLED TO PROFIT OR SCHOOLED
TO EDUCATE?

by

DOUGLAS O. CARROLL

Under the Direction of Grigory Dmitriyev

ABSTRACT

Utilizing a critical pragmatist framework for analysis of the United States public school education, the research suggests the United States public education system perpetuates a curriculum of Capitalism linking with democracy; yet social Capitalism remains remarkably undemocratic as the experience of race, class, and gender contradict the curriculum of public schools. The consequence of these contradictions is perpetuation of racist or sexist stereotypes, a distinct class system delineated by financial, educational, and techno-wealth, a heightened if not profound sense that the American ideal is no longer within reach or a political sham. In sharp contrast to conservative theories of education and the move to standardize education, progressive educators do not believe in disassociating classroom experience from the sum of the accumulated experience of the individual. The research utilizes a number of tools of curriculum theorists including the incorporation of biographical material of Du Bois, Dewey, Lessing, Marcuse, and Feyerabend as the primary method for investigation.

INDEX WORDS: Capitalism, Critical pragmatism, Democratic capitalism, Social capitalism, Curriculum of capitalism, Racial economics, Gender economics, Education reform, Public schools

THE CURRICULUM OF CAPITALISM: SCHOOLED TO PROFIT OR SCHOOLED
TO EDUCATE?

by

DOUGLAS O. CARROLL

B.A., Armstrong State College, 1982

M. H.S., Georgia Southern University, 1993

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of Georgia Southern University in
Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirement for the
Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
in
CURRICULUM STUDIES

STATESBORO, GEORGIA

2011

© 2011

DOUGLAS O. CARROLL

All Rights Reserved

THE CURRICULUM OF CAPITALISM: SCHOOLED TO PROFIT OR
SCHOOLED TO EDUCATE?

by

DOUGLAS O. CARROLL

Major Professor: Grigory Dmitriyev
Committee: Ming Fang He
Patrick Novotny
Kent Rittschof

Electronic Version Approved:
May 2011

DEDICATION

Dedicated to Dr. Robert A. Burnett, Rebecca and Stephen,
and all of the public school educators investing their lives
in children as well as all the children under the care of
'caring' public school educators.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I – CURRICULUM, CAPITALISM, AND PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION	8
Conservative Conceptualization and Progressive Reconceptualization.....	8
Research Framework and Purpose	41
Theoretical Framework: Critical Pragmatism	52
Rationale for Critical Pragmatism as the Research Framework.....	64
Methodology.....	76
Preview and Organization of the Chapters.....	81
CHAPTER II – PRAGMATISM, MARXISM, AND THE CURRICULUM OF CAPITALISM.....	85
Pragmatism and the Curriculum of Capitalism	85
Evolution of Marxism in the United States	91
Reconceptualizing Marxist Theory: The Frankfurt School and Critical Theory	98
The Belief System of the Curriculum of Capitalism	108
Paradigms of the Curriculum of Capitalism.....	128
CHAPTER III - DU BOIS AND DEWEY: THE CURRICULUM OF CAPITALISM AND RACE	149
Du Bois Conception: Race, Education, and Democracy	149
Are Du Bois and Dewey Critical Pragmatists?	165
Racial Identity and Capitalism: Vestiges of the Slave Economy	181
Double Consciousness: Of Souls and Lived Experiences	189
Praxis	198
CHAPTER IV – DORIS LESSING: THE CURRICULUM OF CAPITALISM AND GENDER	201
Biography of a Critical Pragmatist Feminist	201

Identity, Critical Feminism, and the Curriculum of Capitalism	206
Colonialism, Feminist Identity, and the Curriculum of Capitalism	230
Praxis	240
CHAPTER V – MARCUSE AND FEYERABEND: THE RISE OF THE TECHNO- CLASS AND THE CURRICULUM OF CAPITALISM.....	247
Marcuse and Feyerabend: The Influence of Heidegger	247
Technology and the Curriculum of Capitalism	262
Marcuse and Feyerabend: The Curriculum of Techno-Capitalism and Education	277
Praxis	291
CHAPTER VI – RECLAIMING PUBLIC SCHOOL CURRICULUM	298
Current State of Public Education	298
Bureaucratic Totalitarianism: The Curriculum for Conformity	304
Reclaiming Education – Restoring Democracy	313
Altering Priorities: Reconceptualizing Education as System for Reform	333
Praxis: A Personal Reflection & Conclusion	338
References	353
Author Note	389

CHAPTER I – CURRICULUM, CAPITALISM, AND PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION

Conservative Conceptualization and Progressive Reconceptualization

Negotiation of meanings and purposes – itself the mark of a democratic society – is, for progressives, the means of developing the individual initiative, independence of judgment, and social commitment on which democracy in turn depends (Nicholls, 1989, p. 167).

If asked to define curriculum, many educators, parents, politicians will quote the all too familiar cliché, ‘the three-Rs’. Though simple, compact, and concise, in contemporary classrooms it is trite and at the very least an anachronism from colonial America. Curriculum is going through a revolutionary re-invention creating a schism between the orthodox conservative educational establishment and a resurgence of progressive oriented educators seeking to expand the field beyond the belief that curriculum is simply an integrated course of studies or a subject matter standardized for delivery by an educator (Pinar et al., 2002). Standardizing curriculum and the movement for national standardization reinforces the perception the nation’s public school system is in crisis and the solution to resolving the crisis is greater bureaucratic control and oversight. Progressive and conservative educators have in common the basic belief that public education as an institution is in need of modernization; the form of modernization is at the core of the debate. In reality, though with reluctance – conservative and progressive educators agree upon the idea of a national assessment and to some extent, the idea of a national curriculum. Agreeing to the concept of a nationalized curriculum is one thing. Finding common ground as to the content is a far different matter. The gulf

between the two positions and the subsequent argument goes beyond data collection, standardized testing, or allocation of funds. Bridging the gap between the two positions begins by creating a platform for dialogue, answering the fundamental question of what knowledge is necessary to function in a democracy, and determining who decides the content of curriculum.

Questions such as these are matters of implementation and execution whereas who decides the composition of the content of curriculum is the philosophical argument between progressive and conservative educators. Further complicating the content of curriculum is the fundamental difference in how progressive and conservative educators view the socio-economic structure of the United States, and to what extent socio-economic factors has upon the system for educating students. The manifestation of these arguments spill into the architecture of public education reform affecting every item in the classroom from the prospect of implementing a modernized institutional structure, financial model, curriculum, and ultimately what does public education mean in a democratic society. Exploring the fundamental philosophical positions of progressive and conservative educators is one starting point to begin the discussion of education reform and ultimately progressing towards reconceptualizing public school education as something larger than the place corporations find laborers.

Public education in the United States is political, economic, and social touching the lives of every person residing in the U.S. as well as many others across the globe. Conservative proponents for reform tend to believe the crisis in public education is the fault of progressive liberalization of curriculum defining curriculum in a broader context outside of that necessary for entering into the labor market (Pinar et al., 2002).

Conservative educators believe the inclusion of multicultural texts, de-emphasizing Judeo-Christian values, or substituting nonreligious character education undermines occupationally oriented curricula thereby undercutting the ability of U.S. corporations to develop a skilled labor pool.

Bennett, Cribb, and Finn (1999) represent the perspective of conflating political, economic, and social philosophy into a conservative orthodox educational philosophy, “Some schools do not focus enough on basic subjects. Judging by their students’ assignments, learning to cherish the rain forests, recognize ethnic foods, and feel good about oneself has become more important than mastering the three Rs” (Bennett, Cribb, and Finn, 1999, p.14). Though the authors tout the book as a ‘self-help manual’ for parents to evaluate their child’s school experience, it clearly promotes the conservative view that education is a process by which routine, standardization, and monitoring can produce an educated product. Hidden within this viewpoint is the capitalists’ notion of privatization and commercializing education to the point of referring to the constituencies of public education as ‘consumers’ (p. 628). Though critical of public school curriculum, Bennett¹, Cribb, and Finn (1999) to their credit acknowledge that parents, society, and government micro-management share blame in the negative perception and the poor condition of some public schools. However, the central theme of their work promotes the notion that there is a cultural shift in society realigning curriculum in public schools to replace the core values of the United States of ‘personal responsibility’ and ‘free enterprise’ with a culture of blame. Blame one’s family, society, educators, whoever – but do not take responsibility for your own actions and the consequence thereof. In conservative education literature, the term describing the perception of a cultural shift is

the ‘self-esteem’ movement in education or ‘behavioral modification’ philosophy of education (Finn et al., 2001).

Sowellⁱⁱ (1993) attacks what he terms as “psychological conditioning and psychotherapeutic curriculum (p. ix)” or behavioral model of instruction that according to Sowell, “... which not only take up time sorely needed for intellectual development, but also promote an emotionalized and *anti-intellectual* way of responding to the challenges facing every individual and every society” (p. ix). Sowell echoes Finn (2001), as well as other conservative educators complain that behavioral and self-esteem fads in education undermine good teaching and as a consequence undermines the ability of students to compete with students from foreign countries who spend the majority of their academic time in the core curriculums of reading and mathematics. Sowell (1993) argues behavioral oriented pedagogical practice does not serve minority populations. Rather than addressing academic proficiency as a pedagogical or methodology problem, the curriculum provides an opening to excuse poor academic performance as a societal issue, not the fault of the student or for that matter, the institution. One interpretation of Sowell that fits with a conservative perspective of education is that much of the focus of progressive education is towards social re-engineering and treats pedagogical practice as behavior modification, but ignores the critical academic competencies and excuses schools from providing rigor in the curriculum. Many educators take exception to Sowell’s view suggesting social problems are not serious obstacles to learning and teaching.

From the public perspective, emphasizing basic core competency in the curriculum of reading and mathematics is the main activity school systems should be

doing, not being concerned with psycho-dynamics of a student population or implementing a vision of a socially just society (Bennett et al., 1999). A survey of the research literature of public polls and surveys indicate the majority of the public believe public schools should integrate in the curriculum other subjects than the core subjects of reading, language arts, math, science, and history. In contradiction to the conservative belief that the focus of public school curriculum is solely for occupational purposes, there is little research demonstrating that the public believes other curriculum items should be excluded with the exception of religious (Creationism vs. Darwinism) or what is considered in the realm of morality (alternative lifestyles). Curriculum issues vary widely from location to location though it is safe to say local communities have less difficulty in comprehending the necessity of reading, math, and science as relevant components of public education while demonstrating less enthusiasm and support for other curriculum items. A large number of conservative educational researchers interpret historic trends as evidence that the objective of progressive public school education is to enact European style social reforms. Conservatives believe this is contradictory to preparing students for employment in a global competitive market driven economy.

Ravitch (2001) is an example of a researcher attempting to interpret parsed historic evidence to bolster the conservative position linking the progressive movement with many of the behavioral aspects of pedagogical practices that from her perspective undermine the ability of students to learn. Ravitch (2001) acknowledges that while progressives seek to replace orthodox educational pedagogy and curriculum with curriculums emphasizing a broader concern for global issues and creating a caring environment in classrooms, traditionalists over relying upon rote or as some educators

term, 'back to basics' education brings its own set of challenges. Ravitch (2001) says, "At their extremes, both sides can be faulted, the one for demeaning and undermining academic standards, the other for caring more about subject matter than children" (p. 462). Though remaining true to her conservative educational roots, recently, Ravitch is shifting towards a moderate position and critical of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation (she was one of the architects of NCLB). "We need a larger and more humane vision of what education is, to begin with" (R.M, para.13, 2010). Other conservative educators criticize NCLB as well, but it is too early to determine if the criticism is directed at the programmatic aspects of NCLB or if it is a an attack on the federal government's role in education as for the most part, conservatives believe government to be intrusive and the free market system superior. Conservatives believe the solution for improving public school education is less government, privatization, local control, or expansion of public\private partnerships such as charter schools and voucher programs in place of stricter government oversight.

In the mind of conservatives, the expansion of government is one part of a comprehensive plan by progressives to impose a social agenda contradicting traditional family values signaling the beginning of a 'culture war' between socially minded progressives and fiscally small government minded conservatives. Bennett (1999), Sowell (1993), and Ravitch (2001) as well as many other conservatives believe the public school system is a cultural battleground and progressive educators are attempting to socially re-engineer American ideals (i.e. – Capitalism, free enterprise, personal responsibility, etc.). Conservatives believe progressive and liberal curriculum conceals a social agenda that is not necessarily compatible with U.S. history, the founders of

American idealism, how schools function, and the core curriculum needed to be successful in a global economic sense. Anecdotal or formal research published by conservative think tanks indicates the philosophical position of conservative educators is that achievement gaps are not the result of social welfare or economic issues. Achievement gaps are curriculum and methodological issues best dealt with by focus on pedagogical methods, creation of competitive models, and rigid conformity to a standardized curriculum. Conservative educators desire to bridge achievement gaps by narrowing the focus of curriculum to improve the content areas of literacy, mathematics, and science. Other curriculums are by the conservative measure, are superfluous, as is the idea that pressures generated from socio economic conditions of students have little if any bearing upon achievement. The achievement gap between minorities and whites are a reflection of the failure of public schools to concentrate on the core curriculum sometimes referred in educational literature as 'basic core competencies'. It is not an entirely incorrect assumption that improving literacy and mathematical competency improves academic achievement. Critical examination of the position of conservatives regarding literacy improvement exposes a hidden agenda that is less altruistic.

Research by Hirsch (2006) concludes that for academic achievement between minority populations and whites to come to parity, it will be the result of an intense focus upon literacy skills. Hirsch's conclusion is consistent with research from many different fields associated with literacy. Improving rates of achievement on standardized assessments by intensifying literacy practice is not in dispute. Where Hirsch and many conservatives stray is in deciding the type of literature material that favorably affects academic achievement. Little credible research supports Hirsch's favor for classical

literature over other literary sources. In fact, from experience in the field as well as with support of a number of other credible sources such as the International Reading Association, literacy achievement correlates with student interest (Gunning, 2008, p. 13). Motivating students is a critical component in literacy development and to believe that all students can develop literacy proficiency by utilizing a discrete set of texts excluding other forms of high interest literature is a fallacious if not naive presumption. Yet, many conservatives believe public schools fail to focus on the canons of Western literature replacing classical texts with fluffy reading material requiring minimal effort to comprehend is at the heart of the problem of the literacy skills gap between minority and white students.

In tandem with the ‘content light’ reading material is the notion of the superiority of the classics over literary material addressing problems in contemporary society with how students experience race, class, and gender. Hirsch (2006) categorizes many of the current literary content and methodological theories as “demographic determinism” (p. 15), promoting the belief that social condition, primarily economic, discourages minority students from acquiring tools they need to learn to be proficient readers. Hirsch (2006) says, “The familiar argument runs this way: since the schools can’t remove poverty, it’s unfair to suggest that they can bring everyone to proficiency in reading. It is poverty that causes low reading scores. Only after greater social justice is attained can we make real gains in those scores” (p. 15). Hirsch argues the result of the clash between progressive and conservative pedagogical literacy practices is that public education is at standstill in the area of curriculum as the fear of promoting liberal progressive ideas is as repugnant to conservatives as promoting a universal standardized literacy curriculum is to liberals (p.

112). Hirsch suggests that the current public school curriculum in attempting to appease political constituencies is not effective; the environment in which the curriculum is delivered compounds the problem and the only foreseeable resolution is a nationwide core content oriented curriculum replacing the hodge-podge of U.S. public school literacy curriculums.

Hirsch and other conservative educators maintain an elitist position that assumes all students are equipped to learn the same way and curriculum need not adapt to the student; rather the student needs to adapt to the curriculum. While the premise that greater emphasis on fundamental literacy skills is critical to developing proficiency in literacy as well as other academic areas is a sound pedagogical practice, progressives dispute the notion that one form of reading material is superior to others. Progressive educators believe the problem with public school curriculum is that it lacks diversity and intensifying a focus on core knowledge does little to alleviate ‘who decides’ what knowledge is important or the negative experience many minorities bring to the classroom (Pinar et al.,2002). Literature that is irrelevant to the life experience of students and representative of their own demographic is not be read with the same intentionality as literature that is relevant. Diversity in other areas of the institutions of public schools is another concern for conservative and progressive educators.

Intellectual diversity among the ranks of educators is a target of conservatives as well as the curriculum. Defenders of Hirsch such as Stern (2009) are consistent with the beliefs of many conservative educators and are the foundation for many conservative educators arguing against progressive educational theories. Stern’s (2009) criticism is, “For that matter, future classroom teachers must search far in Ed-school syllabi to find a

single reference to any of Hirsch's work—yet required readings by radical education thinkers such as Paulo Freire, Jonathan Kozol, and ex-Weatherman Bill Ayers are common. From these texts, prospective teachers will learn that the purpose of schooling in America isn't to create knowledgeable, civic-minded citizens, loyal to the nation's democratic institutions, as Jefferson dreamed, but rather to undermine those institutions and turn children into champions of "social justice" as defined by today's America-hating far Left" (p. 1, para. 22). A consistent theme of conservative educators is that far left radical progressive educators have a social agenda (some term socialist) that they intend to foster through the public school system since the far left is unable to enact change through political channels. Steiner, Stotsky, and Finn (2001) suggest that public school systems seeking to improve academic proficiency may want to bypass university schools of education as sources for recruitment of educators. Steiner, Stotsky, and Finn (2001) believe universities overstress the teaching of socially oriented curriculum during the training of educators in place of practical methodology pedagogy. The result is educators not having the knowledge to deliver content in critical areas of literacy, mathematics, and science (pp. 49-54) and students not learning the foundational skills to be successful in the workplace.

Finn (2001) is a persistent critic of educator training programs at universities writing, "First, Ed schools typically do not teach teachers (or administrators) the things those people most need to know to be effective in their jobs. For teachers, what is most needed is deep knowledge of the content of the subjects they are responsible for imparting to their pupils, plus practical ways of delivering that knowledge in classroom settings and practical techniques of classroom management" (p. 63). Conservatives are

leery of university professors as well as skeptical as to the value of much the curriculum that falls under the category of education. Finn (2001) and other conservatives are tireless vocal critics of universities promoting the notion that much of the liberal arts inclusive of teacher training programs are liberal, radical, and not representative of society in the United States. In the opinion of many conservatives, radical university educators attempt to replicate in their students a singular Socialist worldview and curriculum perspective that contradicts democratic republic values. The public is on the side of conservatives believing that classrooms should be ‘value neutral environments’ meaning that the promotion of one political view over others is not permissible.

A value neutral curriculum is not possible and frankly, not desirable if public schools are to produce critical thinkers. Bloom (1987) acknowledges, “Every educational system has a moral goal that it tries to attain and informs its curriculum. It wants to produce a certain type of human being” (p. 26). Conservatives believe universities do not attempt to graduate educators that are value neutral and by limiting the education of future educators to a select group of progressive educators, classroom educators are shortchanged or unprepared to deliver content oriented lessons in the classroom. Bloom (1987) and Finn (et. al., 2001) point to university education departments as the culprit for the malaise in many public schools citing comparisons of scores on international assessments indicating U.S. students are not doing as well as their global counterparts as evidence of the failure of education programs at universities. Coulson (1999) is representative of this kind of criticism; “Across the curriculum there is damning evidence against many of the instructional methods advocated for and used in public schools – a smoking gun of pedagogical malpractice covered with the finger prints of the educational

establishment” (p. 160). Coulson and a growing cadre of conservative educators believe that public education contains too many flaws to fix. Their answer to improving education in the U.S. is to privatize the system, or at the very minimum, add the choice of privatized corporate academies, charter schools, and increase the number of private schools to compete with public schools. Coulson’s argument is consistent with many conservative educators who believe the answer to every social problem is to relieve the government of responsibility and transfer the responsibility to the corporate for-profit sector, subsidizing the transfer of services with taxpayer funds for economically disadvantaged citizens. The pedagogical approach by progressives emphasizes the notion that the best practices of educators are undermined by the unaccounted for influence of race, class, and gender in the curriculum. These issues are not issues of competitiveness or pedagogy. Rather than recognize the problems created by race, class, and gender in the world outside of the classroom manifest in the classroom, conservatives prefer to target university education programs for the less than stellar performance on international assessments by U.S. students.

Conservatives believe that for the most part, American students are ignorant of the roots shaping democracy in the United States and are less able (if unwilling or reluctant) to challenge educators perpetuating cultural revisions that contain anti-Western hidden agendas. For many conservative educators contemporary curriculum is heavily oriented towards social issues. More specifically, the design of a progressive curriculum contains aspects of multiculturalism and social justice undermining the purpose of education producing graduates who know little of the important concepts of how society works let alone, how the world operates. Disdain for the progressive ideal of

multiculturalism is a persistent theme in analyzing curriculum in the public schools by many conservative educators. Many conservative educators believe the intent of multicultural curriculum is to devalue contributions of the United States to world history (Bennett et al., 1999, Coulson, 1999, Bloom, 1987). The notion of a *hyphenate-American* is contradictory as the belief system of conservative educators is the idea multiculturalism is divisive as it categorizes U.S. citizens by ethnicity, sexual orientation, or religious beliefs. Curriculum containing multicultural references in the mind of the conservative is unnecessary, as the United States is a homogenous citizenry.

D'Souza (2005) refers to current multicultural curriculum and practice in education as, "...bogus multiculturalism. It is bogus because it views non-Western cultures through the ideological lens of Western Leftist politics" (p. 51). For many conservative educators, the notion of introducing ideas, philosophies, or historical content from other cultures opens the door to revisionist history. D'Souza, an immigrant from India, suggests that the content of multiculturalism in public school curriculum is harmful to the extent it promotes inaccuracies in the historical context of the American experience and is divisive as it pits different cultures against one another. D'Souza believes the portrait of the United States painted by multiculturalism is a nation populated by racist and bigoted citizens (p. 49). While examples of overt racism and bigotry are part of the U.S. social structure, D'Souza argues that there are far worse examples in the world than the United States and that current multicultural curriculum fosters a faux portrait of the experience of most citizens who reside here.

Consistent with the theme of many conservative educators is multicultural curriculums are part of a larger expansion of liberalism in public schools – or as some

have termed, the ‘culture war’ – the clash between right and left ideologues reconstructing democracy into one of two images. One image is of a strict interpretation of the Constitution (conservatives) contrasting with the image to reconstruct democracy into the image of a European social democracy (liberal or progressive). How the culture war influences curriculum choices, progressive or traditional, is the subject of many debates. Conservatives are unrelenting in attacking progressive curriculum as failing to produce better schools, proficient teachers, students prepared to operate in a global society, and competent employees in the global economy. Conservatives believe the progressive influence in education undermines the capitalist and free market system by educating students to accept Marxist style socialism and wealth redistribution as form of just treatment for disenfranchised peoples.

While there are numerous contemporary conservative educators, the aforementioned group is a representative sample of the basic philosophical tenets of orthodox traditional public school educators from a conservative point of view. The common strand between progressive and conservative educators is the belief public school systems are greatly in need of reform, modernization, and restructuring. To this extent, reform is to the institution of public schooling. Reform encompassing a wider purpose by reforming other public and private institutions differentiates progressive or conservative definitions for curriculum. Conservative educators define curriculum narrowly, from the perspective of skills needed to perform a specific occupation (Pinar, 2000), and from a dominant capitalist economic-social structure (McLaren, 2008, Novack, 1975, Kadlec, 2000). For conservatives, education is an economic enterprise, not a humanist endeavor. In this context, it becomes less difficult to comprehend public

school systems as factories, public schools as warehouses, students as products, and corporations as consumers of the product as sources for labor. Education is a capitalist enterprise for sorting labor from management. Novack (1975) writes the debate over the purposes of schooling...“exists since the days of Benjamin Franklin. The demands of the capitalist enterprise invaded the school system and posed the question of how soon children were to be segregated to become suitable recruits for industry” (p. 226). Little has changed in the public school system since the nineteenth-century in this regard. School curriculum reinforces the belief that any curriculum not directly occupationally related is of little value to the individual or society. Progressives wholeheartedly disagree with conservatives and though both claim Dewey as the root for their philosophical position, the theorists embodying Deweyism in its purest form are the neo-progressive offshoot, the reconceptualists.

Advocates of a reconceptualized study of curriculum embrace an expanded, if not unconventional notion, that curriculum is not easily defined, nor as easily quantifiable as knowledge one needs to perform their occupation (Pinar, 2000). Reconceptualists acknowledge that pedagogy and methodology are significant aspects of the education process. Schooling is only part of the daily of experience of students and curriculum is not exclusive from the context the daily experience provides for citizens, a position consistent with Dewey (1980). The measure for success of a system of education may very well be the same as that for a nation; it may well depend on the experience of the person seeking to make such a determination. This is not a new insight, rather one that bears repeating as the nation struggles with issues of inequality and public school systems grapple with the social re-engineering of the schools (society as well) utilizing principles

of scientific management as a blunt instrument for control. Nicholls (1989) says, “In the end we are unlikely to solve the problems of education without resorting to education – that form of experience that enables us to extract meaning from experience and promotes the desire for more such experience, and for modes of living that stimulate conjoint communicated experience” (p. 208). Nicholls (1989) argues the Deweyan position that structuring curriculum and education outside of the experience of the student leads to contradictory realities. Students and educators do not live in a bubble of isolation unintruded upon by the harsh economic realities of living in a capitalist social structure seemingly disconnected from providing the minimum economic needs for many citizens. Nicholls believes “students construct their own interpretations of economic reality” (p. 196), and these constructions in turn become inhibiting or de-inhibiting factors as to how students\citizens relate to a democratic society. Though Nicholls’ (1989) primary interest is student motivation towards achievement, his point is disconnected students lead to disconnected citizens, a dis-impassionate and dis-empowered citizenry.

Reconceptualists do not disconnect schooling from the experience of students as traditional conservative educators do. “We have all learned most of what we know outside of school,” writes Illich (1971). “Pupils do most of their learning without and often despite, their teachers” (p. 42). This statement may be a great shock to many educators, parents, or public officials. Illich (1971) observes the current educational system serves to maintain an industrial society that is quickly passing (p. 105) as the post-industrial social structure gives way to a new technologically advanced social structure. Electronic media may have a greater influence on a child’s education than educators may, which explains the rush to place technology into public school systems.

Post-industrialized United States is in an evolutionary process of constructing a new globally oriented model and structure of reform that will ultimately embody new social arrangements; this is a fact that is not in dispute. Conservatives comprehend industrialization is a global phenomenon and the economic ramifications of globalization, but not necessarily the social implications of a global society. Differentiating progressive from conservative educators is the issue of social re-structuring and the material affect social structures bear upon curriculum. Raising the conservative ire is the notion by reconceptualists that curriculum is not reflective of the contemporary economic condition materializing in issues relative to race, class, and gender. Contemporary curriculum ignores the changing demographic picture of the United States and is a personal affront to the multicultural population that previously did not hold standing with the majority white middle class. Conservatives reject the progressive notion of race, class, and gender as potential barriers to academic parity; a belief rooted in the idea of a monolithic U.S. culture – fully assimilated into the white majority standard. The Census Bureau (2009) projects demographic growth in minority populations will overtake and eventually surpass in numbers the current white majority. Public schools will need to make severe alterations with significant investment in restructuring curriculum to accommodate students of varying cultural backgrounds and continually reconceptualize education to keep pace with demographically driven social trends.

Greene (2000) and Rose (2009) suggest that substantively increasing investment in public education for disadvantaged populations is one part of a comprehensive net of social programs but should be a high-level priority in raising academic and economic achievement. Without adequate social welfare, educating disadvantaged students, or any

student regardless of economic standing, becomes near impossible as the economic strain consumes far too much intellectual capital. Public assistance will need to lose the negative connotation and the perception of assistance, as ‘a handout’ will need to reconceptualize as a ‘public investment’ as a starting point in revitalizing public schools. Rose (2009) believes that a ‘language of labeling’ and a singular focus upon external measures of achievement (though not without some merit) zaps aspirational vitality and decreases motivation for students to achieve at high levels in particular students with economic disadvantages. Rose (2009), “If we think whole categories of people – identified by class, by occupation – are not that bright, then we reinforce social separations and cripple our ability to talk across our cultural divides” (p. 86).

The problematic part of labeling is the assignment of labels is an inhibiting factor in motivation and creates an educational caste system. Rose (2009) explains how language can be a de-motivating factor. “We seemed trapped in a language of schooling that stresses economics, accountability, and compliance. These are important issues to be sure, but they are not the stuff of personal dreams, and democratic aspiration, not a language that inspires” (p. 25). The solution Rose advocates for is a liberalization of curriculum to include diverse voices, as democracy is dependent upon pluralism as a core value. The position of many reconceptualists such as Apple (1996), Cannella and Kincheloe (2002), Carlson (2002), and others is too much emphasis is placed upon the economic value of education and too little upon civic, intellectual, and ethical development of students. Committed educators do not need the stigma of a label applied to a student to identify students needing additional services and students do not need the added stigma of a label to access the services that will improve academic achievement.

Labeling is a code word for segregating students. Labeling is a barrier between educators and students interfering in the relationship between teacher and pupil.

Connecting to students on a personal level mandates educators plug into the power of the experience of students outside of school and reframe the language of schooling so as not to label students in negative frameworks. Giroux (1992) promotes the idea of a common language emphasizing the many positive aspects of diversity in race, class, and gender (*difference*) in attempting to reconcile a curriculum language with an authentic dialogue representative of how students interact with democracy. The notion of ‘difference’ is a common theme in the literature as well as the language of reconceptualists and progressives. Difference is a positive connotation recognizing the diverse set of circumstances can engage and empower, not disengage and disempower. Greene (2001) and Pinar (1992) envision an aspirational curriculum whereby cultural differences are accepted resulting in a similarly shared vision with Giroux (1992). Confusing the reconceptualist notion of difference with the conservative notion of multiculturalism is not possible as difference is a broad term encompassing race, class, and gender whereas the conservative notion of multiculturalism is a racial/ethnic denotation. One distinguishing example is how reconceptualists reconcile the constructed-self with the authentic-self (constructed identity versus personal identity in some literature) in the context of social structures. There is no similar analogous comparison in conservative literature and probably is what Sowell (1993) negatively refers to as “psychological conditioning and psychotherapeutic curriculum” (p. ix).

The link between personal identity and constructed identities with language is another aspect of the progressive reconceptualization of curriculum. “We use language,”

writes Huebner (1999), “to construct and manipulate things, events, phenomena, and people; we use it to predict what might happen and thus to determine events that become part of a cause and effect chain” (p. 216). The implication is that language creates a self-fulfilling prophecy. Language frames the construction of social identities and locks constructed identities into a predetermined pattern. Racial politics and the misrepresentation of minorities become mainstays in the pedagogical practice promoting a curriculum substantively void of diversity (Giroux 2000, 1992). Garrison (2001, 1997) suggests creating an environment of positive energy for academic achievement does not necessitate avoiding a professional practice rich in the recognition of diversity. Diversity enhances the environment and incorporating diversity is a part of the ‘artistry of teaching’ (Garrison, 1997). Reconceptualists have a deep appreciation and tolerance for an inclusive democracy as well as framing instruction within the context of the authentic social identities of students contrasting with the conservative notion of an exclusive democracy of monolithic citizenry. These are competing ideologies in public schools and are reflective of the polarization of the United States social structure in the public and private spheres.

Ideology has given way to the reality that while the promise of a new more enlightened democratic tradition emphasizing equality and social justice was one of the founding principles of the nation, the accumulation of wealth is the primary measure of success and priority emphasis of the curriculum. When Kozol (1991) describes “savage inequalities,” his description is an accurate account of the ideological war between progressive reconceptualist and orthodox conservative educators. Kozol (1991), “They pledge allegiance to ‘one nation indivisible’ and, in view of what we’ve seen of the

implacable divisions that exist and are so skillfully maintained, there is some irony in this. The nation is hardly ‘indivisible’ where education is concerned. It is at least two nations, quite methodically divided, with a fair amount of liberty for some, no liberty that justifies the word for many others, and justice – in the sense of playing on a nearly even field – only for the kids whose parents can afford to purchase it” (p. 212). Economic divisions are common experience for many students.

The socio-economic model for the curriculum of public schools is the curriculum of Capitalism. Standardization displaces diversity in the curriculum as a component of developing democratically oriented students. Public school systems are discordant with the contemporary times; a cold and rigid environment, lacking, and a less democratic public education system than the early founders envisioned. A close examination of the public education system reveals a startling truth; it is far from democratic. After a visit in a public school, Kozol (2005) observes, “Admittedly, economic needs of a society are bound to be reflected to some rational degree within the policies and purposes of public schools. But, even so, most of us are inclined to ask, there must be *something* more to life as it is lived by six-year-olds or ten-year-olds, or by teenagers for that matter, than concerns about successful global competition” (pp. 94-95). A profound and fundamental question is how can a nation so steeped in the ideology of liberty operate a public school curriculum singularly oriented towards technical-occupational training promoting a single world socio-economic view without introducing the prospect of alternatives?

Western culture, which is proportionally based upon historical ‘value myths’ and proportionally ‘Capitalism’ as the only path to democracy; promotes the notion that prosperity is the ultimate gauge of success. The instruction of students from an early age

is that U.S. nationalism anchors to noble principles such as pursuit of personal liberty, religious freedom, self-determination, and an ideology of free unfettered Capitalism. The instruction of children in public schools is these historic ideals are absolute truth without context or without unprejudiced teaching of alternatives. The contradiction, an ethical if not moral failure, is their personal experience and observation negates ideology as their economic condition shades their perspective often times contravening the curriculum. Having no alternative leaves students with more questions than answers, creates a negative perspective, and contributes to the culture of distrust.

The truth is that Capitalist socio-economic policy has a profound effect on the quality of instruction, the curriculum, national vision for governance, and the future prospects of many of the youth of the United States competing globally for employment. Rose (1990) in describing his own academic awareness as a student at Loyola, captures the essence of the contradiction: “It is an unfortunate fact of our psychic lives that the images that surround us as we grow up – no matter how much we may scorn them later – give shape to our deepest needs and longings” (p. 44). Is it no wonder that that the description of young is disconnected, alienated, or even hostile towards contemporary society when seemingly they spend much of their developmental lives in contradiction? Progressive educators practicing reconceptualist philosophy seek to mitigate the contradiction by adding context, acknowledging the experience of students, and by putting into practice Dewey’s (1980) experiential pedagogy. “From the standpoint of the child, the great waste in the school come from his inability to utilize the experiences he gets outside of school in any complete and freeway within the school itself; while, on the other hand, he is unable to apply in daily life what he is learning at school. That is the

isolation of the school, its isolation from life” (Dewey, 1980, p. 46). Dewey’s idea is school curriculum and experience need to blend seamlessly. Yet, contemporary public school curriculum continues to paint a false picture of the social structure of the United States as curricula seeks to separate the school classroom from the classroom of daily life and experience.

The prism for this faux separation is the predetermined decision of what knowledge is important and what knowledge is not. In the United States tradition of education, common core knowledge as well as instructional decisions is a nineteenth century remnant from pre-colonial days. Apple’s (2000) term describing this phenomenon is “official knowledge,” which serves as both theme and partial title of one of his works. Central to comprehending how common core knowledge as presented through the curriculum is ‘who’ makes the decisions as to ‘what’ is to be included and what is not necessary to develop functioning democratic citizens or consumers in a capitalist economic system. Apple (2000, 1996) explains curriculum decisions are parochial in the sense the decision makers are a select few empowered government authorities in collaboration with an equally small number of large corporate textbook manufacturers. Novack (1975) describes the appalling corruption of education by corporate interests in this way; “Business, big or little, directly or indirectly, has the economic, political, and propaganda power to exercise a veto over the whole realm of American education” (p. 234). Generally, corporate interests (profit) are contradictory to the interests of educators (humanistic) and are distinct in that the main constituencies (educators) have little or no input into the content. Apple believes the power in curriculum resides in conservative corporate boardrooms with the main thrust to expand

the market for sales of proprietary products. *Who decides* is a central question in contending that race, class, and gender are paramount issues, historically and contemporaneously. Conservatives believe limiting controversial issues from the curriculum focuses educators on instructing the students in the *right* kind of skills students need to be employable in a capitalist global economic system.

Conservatives and traditionalists, responsible for the design with the power to enforce the standardization and administration of curriculum fail to see the significance of race, class, and gender as primary issues impeding social progress and in need of a resolution prior to determining the substance comprising a balanced education. The orthodox approach of a conservative educator rarely acknowledges race, class, and gender at all. These terms are linguistic relics of the pre-Civil Rights Movement in the mind of the orthodox methodologically oriented educator. Minority complaints of inequality have been resolved through litigation, or fall into the categories as impolite, politically incorrect, and relics of the Jim Crow era in a democratically enlightened society. Constructed identities of marginalized peoples and collective cultural memories are taboo subjects in classrooms as well. Giroux (2000) counters this argument by examining the linguistic manipulations of the curriculum superficially portraying a racial, class, or gender perception; but reading between the lines, the language contains subtle code words signifying the opposite. Giroux and other reconceptualist oriented progressive educators believe that while the public curriculum may not directly condone and promote overtones denigrating race, class, or gender, the hidden curriculum linguistically codes language so as to signify acceptance of preconceived prejudicial notions.

Deconstructing language infuriates conservative educators who believe traditional sources of curriculum are factual accounts and apolitical whereas progressive sources are radical interpretations of fact and overtly political. Orthodox methodologically oriented educators discredit progressive notions as psychobabble or improvable myths rationalizing poor academic performance by minorities. Apple (2000) contextualizes the issue, "... the rightist coalition has decisively shown by their repeated focus on them, texts are not simply "delivery systems" of "facts." They are at once the results of political, economic, and cultural activities, battles, and compromises. Rather, what counts as legitimate knowledge is the result of complex power relations and struggles among identifiable class, race, gender, and religious groups. Thus, education and power are terms of an indissoluble couplet" (p. 44). The undercurrents of race, class, and gender continue to thwart progressive efforts for education and democratic reform.

In the United States, the issue of class conflates with race, but with a subtle distinct difference; class connotation carries with it the not so veiled reference to 'work ethic' implying that working class people are failing to take advantage of the education opportunities available. Working class people (immigrants and other minorities primarily) are cosigned to economic disparity by their own choice. Both Du Bois (2001) and Dewey (2005) attack this position with little success as immigrants and native populations are essentialized and stereotyped in the popular culture of the day (today is no different) as lazy, criminals, incompetent, drunkards, reprobates, morally without character, scheming, and untrustworthy. By failing to improve, the measure a 'white standard', these unfortunate citizens are self-condemned and damned to live as second-class citizens by their own volition. Conservative educators espouse the view that

education leads to greater class mobility. However, hypocritically, they will not acknowledge that race, class, and gender bars many citizens from acquiring resources to finance class mobility. Resources are not only economic, but include language, location, housing, health care, day care, transportation, and culture as well as many other subtle yet equally daunting barriers (Rose, 1995). Each resource component defines economic class and in the U.S. caste system, constructs personal identity, i.e. – relative social position and status.

Beyond the physical facility and competence of educators is the curriculum reflecting the amount of resources public, private, or individual allocates to education (Kozol, 1991). The research by Kozol (2005) and others validate the position of many progressive educators; the allocation of resources to education breaks along lines of race and class. Schools that educate low-income students are resource poor whereas schools with students of high-income earners are resource rich. “The specter of identity, how one regards race, class, and gender, haunt the classroom” writes Pinar (1992). “The category of identity organizes investigations of politics, race, gender, and experience around questions of self.” Later Pinar adds, “In studying the politics of identity, we find that who we are is invariably related to who others are, as well as to who we have been and want to become” (p. 232). The position of the progressive educator differs from that of their conservative counterpart in this very significant way. Progressives comprehend educators cannot create a faux environment differing from that of the lived experience of the students. This is the point of Dewey (2005) and is the foundation for the belief that education and democracy are inseparable intellectual pursuits.

The classroom is a microcosm of the world, or as the reconceptualists believe, the classroom can foster a more progressive idyllic future for social interaction and responsibility if social constructions are negated. Discourses including the topics of social constructions of racial and gender minorities are seldom topics for discussion within the curriculum. Ethnographic personal narratives unraveling the contradictory mystery of social construction versus that of social reality express the current reality of many disadvantaged and marginalized peoples throughout the world. When Andrews (2003) writes about the contradictory message of an African American living in two worlds, he follows the Du Boisian (1903/1989) notion of living a constructed life in a constructed society and how on a personal level – not a theoretical level – construction is a disempowering force in the lives of African Americans. Cash and Schwab, (2004) broaden the discourse to include all people of color and gender minorities encapsulating the denigration of identity through construction creates a tiered social structure whereby only certain privileged few exist and the others remain in the shadows. Freire (2006) explains why it is necessary for marginalized peoples to move from the shadow into the light; “Who are better prepared than the oppressed to understand the terrible significance of an oppressive society? Who suffer the effects of oppression more than the oppressed? Who can better understand the necessity of liberation” (p. 45)? Freire (2006) expresses the reconceptualists’ view socially constructed institutions control society, but revolutionary and liberating praxis is the energy of the lives of the citizens comprising the society. Autobiographical lives of students are equally important to developing the democratic orientation and democratic character of students, as is the prescribed curriculum.

Conservative educators believe history holds the key to comprehending the present social condition of society. Autobiography or other works in the humanities provide little if any discernable value outside of the context of history, and works that are not part of the canon of literature de-value the curriculum. Grumet (Pinar, Krall, Giroux, Grumet, & et. al, 1999) confront conservative educators such as Hirsch and Bloom with this argument; “Hirsch and Bloom fail to bring the reference of the world of teachers and their students into their critiques of curriculum. They do not understand a context that is not their own...” (p. 239). The problem is conservative educators contextualize curriculum to fit their narrow view of the world. By excluding other literary work, conservative educators discredit views that may be germane, prevalent, and relevant to contemporary students. The historical treatment of race, class, and gender as artifacts of democratic behavior is an indispensable starting point providing context to deconstruct for critical analysis of public education. Autobiography as well as contemporary literature is an authentic tool for research into discovering the impact of Capitalism as equivalent economic and a social system, and for analyzing public education in the U.S. and abroad. Steadfast and oblivious to the unequal playing field created by institutionalized racism, classism, and disregard for gender issues in determining curriculum policy, public education drifts further from democratic ideals of progressives and closer to becoming captive of corporate run governments subject to the changing winds of profit and loss. Apple (1996), Rose (2009), Kozol (2005), and other progressive educators echo similar themes that the direction of public education is privatization utilizing public funding, but essentially ignoring the inevitable demographic paradigm change to a ‘less white’ United States; one in which other cultures desire an equal voice in curriculum decisions.

Reconceptualists comprehend that race, class, and gender is an institutional problem manifesting in a diverse set of organizational structures. However, institutions do little to reconfigure organizational structures into democratic models more reflective of the new dynamics of a growing minority to majority constituency. The argument by conservatives is race, class, and gender are personal and conservatives negatively respond to incorporating into the curriculum a balanced approach that fosters awareness of the problems and how the problems are contrary to democracy. Conservatives abhor the thought that radical institutional change is necessary to create the environment for social change and social equity. Conservatives hold fast to the belief that only privatization, corporatization, or at minimum rapid injection of a corporate model into education will make public education efficient, competitive, and ultimately accountable. Evidence by the privatization movement demonstrates the deficit of trust between the private and public institutions. Public constituencies seldom question privatization or corporate philosophy may not be the best method for educating young citizens about democracy. The assumption the corporate business model is superior to a humanistic approach seldom is challenged and the public seems to be content to allow private organizations dictate public policy inclusive of issues of race, class, and gender though the corporate world is not free of discriminatory practice. Progressives do not share this perspective and seek to re-orient conservative educators in the direction of understanding that race, class, and gender manifest in the framework of the institution, the practice of educators, and in the design of educational curriculum.

Hypocrisy notwithstanding, the position of the conservative educational establishment leads to the broader question of public policy and public purpose for

sustaining a public system for education. What is the purpose of public education if not for the betterment of citizens and promotion of authentic democratic practice? Yet, if this in fact is the vision, will not the organizational structure be more diverse in terms of the ethnicity of the people managing the organization and in terms of the diversity of curriculum alternatives; in other words mirror the authentic democracy the organization seeks to achieve. Public education in the United States is not about promoting democratic citizenry, as many believe; rather the curriculum of public education is to teach students to become citizen-consumers within the framework of a capitalist social system. Whether it is Apple's (1993) notion of an "official knowledge" (i.e. – curriculum) or Novack's (1975) view that corporate interests supersede the public interests, clearly something has gone horribly awry since the conception of a public education system in the United States. Promoting Capitalism as an empowering force for individual liberty, social justice, and improving the social structures of global citizens is a farce. Novack (1975) says, "However, something more substantial than ignorance thwarts the expansion of democracy for the American people. That is the social, economic, political, and military supremacy of the monopoly capitalists" (p. 213). Promoting authentic democracy requires more than a vision of how democratic behavior should look.

Authentic democracy requires concerted sustainable action in support of the vision (in all institutions whether public or private) so that democratic behavior materializes the way envisioned. Dewey (1980) describes one vision of democracy that precludes the structural inequities present in contemporary public education. Dewey's vision, "A society is a number of people held together because they are working along common lines, in a common spirit, and with reference to common aims" (p. 10). Dewey's

description does not mean that citizens agree upon every issue that comes in front of the public. The implication is that every institution seeks to maximize the broadest perspective of citizens, place the interests of the citizen first, and behave in a manner that citizens can function without undue influence upon their lives. The public school system should be the shining example as the place where students learn to function cooperatively in a democratic society.

When curriculum theorists speak to democratic behavior within the school system, theorists are reaching out to an audience that believes that academic freedom supports democratic behavior in a free society. The classroom is the laboratory from which students may practice the basic elements of living in a free society without the constraints that exist outside the classroom imposed by constructions of identity related to race, class, and gender. Webber (2001) argues for a return to the Deweyan purpose for public education that she describes as education is for developing functioning democratic citizens, not proto-consumers, or laborers. Changing the system to a more democratic structure will alleviate the ever-rising tensions in the public schools that the research by Webber (2003) indicates may contribute to the climate of violence within the public school system. Sadly, the experience of many students in public schools is an experience of loss, the loss of personal identity, personal freedom, and purpose for learning. The general public duped by the drone of the constant negative attention focused on education or pre-conditioned by their own experience in the public education system, fails to comprehend how inflexibility leads to a less educated population and a less prepared citizen to cope with the demands of residing in a global society. The public does not comprehend the day-to-day toll that toiling in a system based upon a myth and a lie has

upon children and educators. Educators daily confront the reality that contained within the written standardized curriculum is a hidden curriculum; one that is counterproductive to democracy, social justice, and one that is designed to squash individuality (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 2002, Pinar, 2000).

Hidden curriculums marginalize and dis-empower minorities by sorting minorities by race, class, and gender, or an earlier term, 'labels students' pigeon holing them into counterproductive negating experiences. Disempowerment manifests as under achievement, academic gaps between white students and minorities, violence, and increases in the dropout rate. Resolving this problem is simplistic; create a rich curriculum recognizing the contribution of minorities providing an incentive to engage in education, not disconnect. Reconceptualists believe the experience of minorities are intentionally omitted from the curriculum creating a false identity (sometimes referred as the constructed identity), similar to the false consciousness in Marxism or the veil in W.E.B. Du Bois's (1976) work, *The Souls of Black Folk*. Pinar (2001) and others argue the curriculum attempts to reconstruct minorities in the image of the white-middle-class-heterosexual-male distorting their personal identity and self-worth. Identity is not a theoretical concept, but a concrete manifestation of the experience of citizens during the course of their day. When the design of the organizations is to undermine the value of individualism and the design is to 'mold' every culture into the image of one dominant culture, the result is to marginalize citizens who do not fit the image. Enormous inequities in the social structure will occur as well as an increase in race and class tensions potentially leading to violent behavior as a response. Educators are in an environment where much of their time is spent ameliorating tension generated by curriculum,

standardization, and a system dedicated to promoting Marcuse's (1991) notion of a 'one-dimensional society', a prefabricated human being technologically manipulated to interact as replaceable cog in the social structure.

Perceptions by educators are not theoretical, but are the reality of refereeing the social consequences of a contradictory message and the reality of the experience of a significant portion of the students in their classroom. Educators are not in control of the presentation of material, as they fear straying from the standardized version of the curriculum will lead to punitive action against them. In a perverse sense, educators share blame for the construction of racial, class, and gender identities by not challenging standardization and by not introducing broad aims of a diverse society into their instructional practice. Tools of standardization promote pre-conceived ends of a capitalist social structure to create cheap pools of labor. Democracy, or what remains of the theory of democracy, the *poiēsis* of democracy, and the *praxis* of democracy, functions despite Capitalism – not as the result. Are there more advanced forms of democracy other than those within the structure of Capitalism? Collaborative social structures with hybrid economic theories is an intriguing notion, but is not part of the discourse in the United States public school systems as the orthodox education establishment has pre-determined the curriculum will not include discussion of the merits of competing systems.

Greene (2001) underscores this point and brings to the forefront the notion that a social democracy is possible, but only if the educational establishment and classroom educators create within their classrooms the sense of the possibility of democracy thus encouraging children to seek new affirmations for self-worth within the context of a liberating social culture. The concept of the 'Deweyan citizen' as Webber (2001)

envisions is the manifestation of the local conception of democracy as Greene (2001) envisions expanding globally. The reconstruction of a new socio-economic order begins by tearing away the social construction of race, class, and gender as well as reconstructing the global economic system to commit to a framework of social justice outside of the contemporary cultural social structures constructed to benefit transnational corporate governments that are impeding equitable treatment of global citizens. The genesis of this change begins by reforming education from its current state of being the least democratic of institutions to that of the progressive ideals of Dewey and others as the exemplary example for democratic practice.

Research Framework and Purpose

Interest and aims, concern and purpose, are necessarily connected (Dewey, 2005, p. 137).

Marshall and Rossman (2006) make plain the objective of qualitative methodology is exploration, explanation, and description (p. 33). The Deweyan ideal of experience encompasses the simplicity of Marshall and Rossman's notion of purpose as well as situates the research within the reconceptualists' supporting structure of utilizing the tools of autobiography, biography, and fiction as legitimate instruments from which to analyze social structures. Dewey's (1980) idea that experience is the lens from which individuals seek to relate to the social structure and from which individuals learn to respond to challenges in a democratic society contradicts the contemporary pedagogical push by conservative educators to standardize curriculum as an occupational exercise, not an experience in learning to function in a democratic social structure. Progressive educators and reconceptualists argue comparing and contrasting the experience of race,

class, and gender within the framework of an organizational structure (in this instance public school system) is a methodologically sound practice to deconstruct contemporary social structures. Deconstruction allows researchers to comprehend from a historical perspective why social structures organize in certain ways and ultimately to derive equitability among constituencies in a democratic society. The design, framework, and presentation of this research incorporate the aforementioned tools of progressive educators and reconceptualists as well as meet the criterion for qualitative research in Marshall and Rossman's description.

Constructing a definition of curriculum should not preclude analyzing forces outside of behavioral theory and the processes associated with the delivery of instruction. Contemporary pedagogy emphasizes methodology and strict adherence to prescribed measurable standards; defining the curriculum narrowly to fit the preconceived notions of what a small group of educators believes is important knowledge every student should know, or the term Apple coins (2000), 'official knowledge'. Conservative educators believe that education is an input-output activity and underscores how narrow arguments can distract theorists exploring other avenues of curriculum such as art, literature, popular culture, and other forms of experience. The reconceptualists do not limit themselves to one special field of inquiry, as they tend to be generalists basing their understanding of curriculum as a broad endeavor encompassing many activities, fields, and experiences; if not all of the activities of humans. Reconceptualists believe that conversations about life such as those found in the humanities are extraordinarily important to understanding how people think and how they interact with others (Pinar, 2000).

As Dewey explains, “Apart from the thought of participation in social life, the school has neither end nor aim. As long as we confine ourselves to the school as an isolated institution we have no final directing ethical principles” (1993, p. 97). Expanding the definition of curriculum opens the discourse into broad avenues for discussion and challenges educators to engage on a personal level with students in thinking beyond the skills they need to be proficient in an occupation. The narrow confines of the public school system represent a fractional amount of person’s lifetime in comparison to the amount of time a person will spend interacting in a social structure. Not addressing the ability to function in a rapidly evolving global social structure is an incomprehensible failure of the public education system and educators. While the current aim of the curriculum of public schools is narrow, progressive educators seek to broaden curriculum beyond an occupational definition to include the humanist ideal of to ‘know oneself in relation to the larger social structure’.

There is nothing inherently wrong with an occupational curriculum except when it squeezes out the possibility that one aim of education is personal improvement or social benefit that may have nothing in common with improving a persons’ economic position. To deny or exclude the possibility that social structures impose higher demands upon the underclass and that identity issues are irrelevant to the current economic condition of many underprivileged citizens undermines democracy. The influence of the new paradigm for education as a corporate business model or education as a privatized concern is not a theoretical concern, rather one that affects pedagogical practice as well as does little to alleviate the negative impact of social construction as a hidden curriculum.

A significant body of research literature, historical and contemporary, exist chronicling pedagogical practice and public school curriculum as a function of a growing economic realization by corporate business interests in developing an efficient (inexpensive) labor force. Equally significant is the body of research either extolling or excoriating the virtue and vice of Capitalism as an economic system. This comes as no surprise as Capitalism conflates with the Western ideal of the republic form for democracy, as a liberating force for oppressed peoples, and forms the basis for claims by the United States for authority to intervene unilaterally in the domestic affairs of sovereign nations. One obvious aim of public education is to promote the ideals of nationalism within the framework of replicating to each seceding generation the foundational principles of governance, economics, and social structure. Thereby public school curriculum serves two vital purposes. The first is to educate students to function as citizens within the political-governance framework of their respective nation. The second, to prepare students for life outside of school in the labor force. In the United State it is indisputable the second purpose supersedes all others and public school curriculum reflects the dominant ideals of Capitalism. For the purpose of this research, the term describing the dominant role of Capitalism in public school curriculum and in the U.S. social structure is ‘the curriculum of Capitalism’.

The purpose for this research is to explore the promotion of economic Capitalism in public school curriculum and the contradiction between the experiences of students outside of the classroom with Capitalism as a social system. The research will demonstrate the curriculum of Capitalism disenfranchises students, fosters negative competition between citizens, and divides citizens by race, class, and gender in a global

effort to maintain low cost labor. The curriculum of Capitalism has a negative impact on the social structure of the United States as well as upon the social structure of other global entities participating in the global economic system. A second purpose of this research is an explanation of how economic Capitalism undermines democratic practice and may in fact incentivize supporting less than democratic regimes in an effort to foster competition between nations to provide low cost resources to transnational corporations. The research describes how the teaching of the curriculum of economic Capitalism in public schools conflates Western economic Capitalism with democracy, liberty, and personal freedom though contemporary evidence does not support linking these ideals from one to the other. The design and framework of this research situates within the context of qualitative research utilizing biographical material as the method in which to communicate the experience of students\citizens within a social structure of Capitalism.

Borgatti (1999) in making the point that research is simultaneously a societal matter and a private concern, describes the necessity of revealing the character through the experiences of the researcher, "...no matter how little you think you know about a topic, and how unbiased you think you are, it is impossible for a human being not to have preconceived notions, even if they are of a very general nature" (p. 1). As researchers, we accept the fact that quantities of personal perspectives as well as pre-conceived notions channel through our research. Our work situates in who we are regardless of how much effort we exert to the contrary. A lifetime of experience and adherence to a personal set of cultural beliefs construct the dimensions of the research of the scholar. Belief systems need not alter the framework in which the research situates the research; rather the framework alters belief system by acknowledging the fundamental problem of

supposition without critical analysis. Borgatti (1999) believes “The framework tends to guide what you notice in an organization, and what you don’t notice. In other words, you don’t notice things that do not fit in your framework! We can never completely get around this problem, but we can reduce the problem considerably by simply making our implicit framework explicit. Once it is explicit, we can deliberately consider other frameworks, and try to see the organizations situation through different lenses” (p. 1).

Following Borgatti’s (1991) model, the next paragraphs reconcile the personal identity of the researcher with the selection of the research framework and situate the research within the parameters of progressive education thought. Fundamental beliefs are experiential and for this research, acknowledging that as a researcher, I experience Capitalism from the belief system of a white-middle-class-male inured by the habitual reinforcement of the myth of economic opportunity promoted by the curriculum of Capitalism is an aspect of this research bearing critical scrutiny. Prior to becoming an educator, I experienced first-hand Capitalism from employment in senior management positions in the industries of corporate banking, finance, investment, and healthcare. As an entrepreneur, I understand what it means to make a payroll, operate in a competitive corporate environment, and to function as an ‘insider’ in the capitalist marketplace.

The constructed identity of the researcher in relation to the subject is not unique, but ambiguous, having subconscious effect on the perceptions of subject for the research. The basic nature of careers in a corporate setting requires individuals maintain and project an image of conservatism. In speaking of Capitalism, the researcher maintains by experience a level of authority and authenticity. The same is true for my career in education. From an occupational perspective, the time spent as an educator may be less

than spent in careers outside of the field, but as an educator currently in professional practice I believe this experience is exactly what Dewey (1981) describes as ‘lived experience’. The personal identity of myself as a researcher does not disqualify the validity of the research and work in attempting to comprehend on a practical operational level the perniciousness of race, class, and gender economics as a hidden curricula muddled by the curriculum of Capitalism.

Being a fiscal conservative does not negate social progressiveness, as many scholars believe. These positions need not be adversarial aims in either research or public policy, but require disclosure as potentially biasing factors within the framework. The limitation of this research is the researcher’s experience as a white-middle-class- male capitalist entrepreneur turned educator, though progressive, nonetheless in the shadow of a position of privilege. Experiential inquiry as the theoretical framework falls short of the research goal of encouraging educators to reconceptualize educational practice within the scope of how marginalized citizens experience Capitalism and how the curriculum of Capitalism is a disingenuous representation of equality for a significant number of global citizens. I believe this to be true as most educators experience only the consumer side of Capitalism or approach the instruction of Capitalism with only superficial theoretical knowledge, not the practicing side that generates wealth for corporations and select individuals. Without functional operational experience in a corporate structure, educators have difficulty de-linking Capitalism as an economic system from Capitalism as a social system.

Historical inquiry as a theoretical framework to some extent mitigates the inherent problems with experiential inquiry; however, the vagary of history and subsequent

interpretation leads to the very mythic culture that sponsors the curriculum of Capitalism without constructive criticism. It is difficult to deconstruct the myths of United States history from the philosophical framework underpinning democracy as a pure function of capitalist economics from that of the architecture of public education. This is due in part because the promotion of cultural economic myths as facts. Public education does little to foster critical thinking to debunk myth or balance the inequities with differing perspectives. The social structure of the United States is unabashedly capitalist with every institution, public, or private, projecting some aspect of social Capitalism in its operations. Public education where the expectation is that critical analysis is a part of the culture is not free from the influence of Capitalism and as this research demonstrates, the system for public education may very well be the least democratic institution in the United States. The design of the curriculum is to foster the singular belief of a capitalist economic system as superior to all other economic and social systems. Public education is the main conduit in which teaching to the next generation of student-citizens the competitive ideals of the free market and principles guiding Capitalism is the primary objective.

Inequitable treatment of the disenfranchised by race, class, or gender seamlessly passes through the curriculum not by acknowledgement, rather by “diss” – acknowledgement, the ultimate act of marginalization of a particular culture. Numerous studies trumpet the relationship of education, social position, and wealth; all marks of success in a capitalist system. Citizens tend to measure their personal success by personal wealth and the accumulation of material goods. The historic metric of measurement is against that of the white-middle-class male (and property owner). The strength of the

commitment of nations to the principles of democracy utilizes a similar if not exact metric. Historic inquiry is a significant component to comprehension. However, the historians being mostly white and members of the privileged class interpret much of world history to fit their narrative for maintaining the status quo in economic relationships. Historical inquiry while useful for contextualization is insufficient for the purpose of critical analysis.

The remaining theoretical frameworks employ economic models from which to guide the analysis. Transnational corporations and globalization make the analogy between Capitalism and democracy a farce. There are 192 members of the United Nations (United Nations Dept. of Public Information, 2010). Differentiating member nations as democratic depends entirely on the definition of *democratic*. No member of the United Nations (U.N.) labels the governing structure of their country as undemocratic, which of course does not lead to the conclusion all nations are democratic. The composition of the U.N. membership consists of governments comprising of dictatorship, theocracy, communist, socialist, or some combination. Most nations attempt to project the image they govern from a centrist position of democracy. The majority participates in the global capitalist system although the internal social structure and economic frameworks of the respective countries are operationally alternatives to social Capitalism.

Defining democratic practice is a limitation of this research because the democratic experience of citizens limits the perspective of the definition and because nations promote their respective governing structures as democratic blurring a universally acceptable operational definition for democracy. Public schools in the United States educate students to believe democratic practice is a product of free market Capitalism and

the curriculum of Capitalism precludes a discourse for a global perspective of democratic social structures in other sovereign nations that may prefer other economic systems such as Socialism. It is a faulty notion to believe that a curriculum of Capitalism alters the path to non-democratic countries in the direction of greater liberty for citizens. Equally difficult to reconcile is the notion that Capitalism fosters positive changes to institutionalized race, class, and gender economics. Global models are far from conclusive on this point and if analysis derives conclusion, the opposite may actually be closer to truth. Citizens cannot isolate or insulate their experience from that of the remaining part of the world. Education needs to reflect a broader concern for all citizens of the world not just the provincial values of one nation or community. Race, class, and gender will remain pervasive obstacles to social justice as well as economic fairness unless information/knowledge based structures such as public school education systems change to reflect the new reality nations. Capitalism promotes an austere notion of education and that notion is that the only education of value is that which benefits an individual in their occupation or the corporation in earning profits. There is a conspicuous disparity between training citizens to be productive workers in an industrial-technology driven world and training citizens to seek social justice by democratic reform in a world besieged by poverty, environmental collapse, inadequate health care, repressive regimes, and prejudice. Education in the future needs to accommodate both roles.

The choice between theoretical frameworks should reflect the least amount of experiential bias as possible as well as respect previous philosophical tradition, (even unconventional theories), from the researcher's academic experience and training. Three significant operational themes are under consideration in selecting a philosophical

framework for this research. The first is the curriculum of Capitalism is an omnipresent force in all public school curriculums. The curriculum relies on historical cultural myths to dismiss the constructs of race, class, and gender as disempowering impediments to democratic progress. The second is within the framework of Western style constructed Capitalism, is the undercurrent of the philosophy of conformity and the tension to maintain control. Control is an overt element in the public school system. Public school educators are administered-beings with little or no hope of escaping oppression except to abandon their high calling and to change careers. The third is the notion of economic power (implicitly and explicitly observable through the empirical experience of citizens) fueling the curriculum of Capitalism, dictates the architecture of the public school system, and ultimately shapes the worldview of students. The institution of public education responsible for instructing students in democratic practice may be the least democratic model in practice of all the United States public institutions.

The significance of this research is that by bringing to the forefront the inequities the curriculum of Capitalism produces, classroom educators will develop a heightened sense of awareness and discontinue the practice of promoting critically unanalyzed ideas to their students. In view of this research cognizance of the hidden agenda of a capitalist curriculum opens the door for a broader discourse and is closer to what Dewey has in mind when he writes on the subject of democracy. By challenging the myths of Capitalism and developing within students critical skills to analyze alternative structures, it is my belief that when students assume positions of leadership in their respective community they will change the negative perception of public education. More importantly than changing the perception is to change the fundamental belief systems of

public education and ultimately influence national reform towards a humanistic approach away from the corporate model infecting school reform models. It follows teacher education programs will adapt to a new role for educators – educators as leaders and champions for democracy – not simply as facilitators of standardized curriculum.

Theoretical Framework: Critical Pragmatism

Is Marxism a viable theoretical framework for analysis of an essentially capitalist education system? It is fair to comment the vilification of Marxism by capitalists is responsible for the decline of scholars utilizing Marxism as a framework (Papastehpanou, 2006). Two major criticisms of Marxism are the association with specific personality cults and orthodox Marxism emphasis on class neglects the broader issues of race, class, and gender (Hollander, 2000). Hollander (2000) claims the association of Marxism with the negative aspects of the politics of Lenin, Stalin, Mao, Guevara, and the contemporary leaders Castro and Chavez limit the theoretical opportunity to utilize a pure Marxist theoretical framework. Conservatives will always take issue with Marxist frameworks and discredit by association sound research. The discourse inevitably turns to a discussion of the brutality or the eccentric personalities of the leadership and away from analysis of the social implications of a Marxist state. The second criticism explores social issues beyond essentializing class. Challenging the orthodox class oriented Marxists are the neo-Marxists' belief that Marx is fundamentally correct concerning economics, but is in need of revision, as modern scholars comprehend the pernicious nature of institutionalized race, class, and gender politics. The mediating position between orthodox and neo-Marxist is the position by the Frankfurt School, critical theory. Jay (1973) argues the design of critical theory by the Frankfurt School, while Marxist

oriented in theory, is intentionally not in nomenclature. Frankfurt School scholars operating on the shores of the United States intentionally disassociate critical theory from the negative aspects of leaders utilizing Marxism in a perverted action as well as expanding the theory to be more inclusive than simply making analyses from the position of class.

Often in history, nomenclatures change to new interpretations within the political context of the present. It is a fair observation that reconceptualizing, recalibrating, rebranding, and reconstruction of Marxism occurs to distance orthodox Marxists from that of the liberal neo-Marxists. Terms such as social democrats, progressives, critical theorists, secular progressives, social republics, liberals – ostensibly are Marxist in origin, but differentiate by expanding the notion of class to include race, gender, and other cultural categories as well as acknowledge aspects of Capitalism are beneficial to the reconstructed philosophical position. Papastephanou (2006) describes the reconceptualization of orthodox Marxism to a neo-Marxism or progressive position as a, “New social democratic theory and to a lesser extent market socialism seem to endorse managerialist objectives: competitiveness, success and economic growth, development of human capital, forms of inclusion so that all are productive and useful, and a neo-liberal humanism” (p. 250). The reconceptualization of orthodox Marxism opens the door to other scholarly inquiries by removing the rigid confines of economics and class. The present is ready to accept new forms of social theory and social criticism as Capitalism has yet to result in a social structure measurably equitable for all citizens. Acceptance of a new doctrine for change will not happen unless a wider audience joins the discourse and the language simplified so that the public can embrace the ideology. Finding new

nomenclatures and utilizing a less revolutionary language offers the prospect of broadening the discourse to new audiences outside of intellectual as well as the prospect for engaging the public into the discourse. Marxism is evolving into new social theories such as critical and cultural studies. Marxism, once thought completely dead, has found new life in hybridization of theories fusing Marxism with other philosophical frameworks.

Is there a philosophical framework incorporating the historical traditions of the United States? Many scholars consider pragmatism suited to the idealism associated with the building of continental America and later to the founding of the United States. Pragmatism is uniquely suited to the chore of nation building where none exists. As a philosophy, pragmatism and Capitalism are compatible. Novack (1975) describes the compatibility of pragmatism with Capitalism as seemingly inseparable, “Pragmatism will survive and even thrive so long as American Capitalism appears impregnable” (p. 268). Novack asserts that only the most severe of severe crisis will dislodge Capitalism as an economic and social system. How does pragmatism reconcile the social inequalities created by Capitalism?

Similar in respect to the two positions represented by Marxism, there are two perspectives representing pragmatism. In choosing to differentiate between seemingly identical theoretical frameworks, Koopman (2007) distinguishes between the James/Dewey pragmatism and the Rorty neo-pragmatism as a battle between “prima-pragmatists (classical pragmatism or experientialists) and the neo-pragmatists (experientialists as a study of linguistics). The James/Dewey conception of pragmatism follows humanist lines, substantively based upon experience, and emphasizes human

dignity above reducing all human behavior to a depiction of predictability and practical outcomes. Koopman is correct as to the different positions; however, Dewey's positions are far more fluid than Koopman attributes. This research as well as other demonstrates Dewey philosophically tends to incorporate both prima and neo positions simultaneously within his writing. Dewey is the bridge linking the two positions and is why conservatives and progressives are able to claim Dewey as their philosophical base. Similarly, a distinction is also possible between the dogmatic class oriented (classical) orthodox Marxism and a liberalized version of neo-Marxism as promoted primarily by Marcuse and the Frankfurt School that expands the notion of the social theory of Marx beyond class issues; i.e. critical theory. The Frankfurt School paves new ground by reintroducing Marxist theory and revising the language to contain less revolutionary or incendiary terminology resulting in a comprehensible product without losing the significant elements of class and criticism of economic Capitalism.

An aspect of research is in introducing the theory in a language comprehensible to the public. Giroux (1992) believes as far as linguistics relate to cultural studies applicable to critical theory as well, the success of some theories is the public can relate, decipher, adopt, and apply the theory. Pragmatism draws its success not necessarily as a superior philosophy to other philosophies; rather pragmatism's success is due to being a philosophy that is explicable in language the public understands. The term 'pragmatic' is a cultural-linguistic icon invoking the image of a factual approach to problem solving. It is common to encounter the words pragmatic or pragmatist at some point during the course of the day and for the most part, the words invoke positive images. Pragmatists are people taking a practical approach to problem solving and measuring success or failure in

terms of if the action taken resolves the problem. Though pragmatism is more complex of philosophy than ‘if it works, then it must be a success’, the public is familiar with the pragmatic approach, incorporates the term pragmatism, or refers to a person as ‘pragmatic in making decisions’ without thinking through what being pragmatic really entails.

Pragmatism connotes common sense in individual decision-making. The nature of pragmatism is a parochial philosophic position that emphasizes individuality over the collective (Prawat, 2001, Dewey, 1981, and Ryan, 1995). The association with pragmatism and Capitalism is easily understandable as Capitalism promotes similar notions of individualism and problem solving with one key difference. Pragmatism as envisioned by Peirce and James as well as contemporary philosophers as West and Rorty is not without reflection (James, 2000) and contemporary practitioners of pragmatism seem to promote the notion of the ‘shoot from the hip’ decision making is the hallmark of a pragmatist. James, Peirce, and Dewey contend equal intellectual rigor applies to the philosophy of pragmatism as does other philosophical positions. To believe pragmatism is ‘intellectually light’ is a fallacious understanding of pragmatism as a philosophy. From the perspective of public school systems, pragmatic capitalists dominate the conception of curriculum and administrative implementation in the classroom.

Pragmatic capitalists view the world of education as the system that manufactures the next generation of workers. The public school system organizes education activities around resolving occupational vacancies in the marketplace, not necessarily upon developing critical thinkers and critical problem solvers or learning to be citizens in democratic institutions. Pragmatic capitalists spend little time dwelling upon the

implications upon society of social issues as race, class, or gender. In contrast, neo-Marxists or progressive educators have a different perspective. The neo-Marxists argue the education system, the curriculum of Capitalism, and transnational corporations in an effort to produce laborers to function in a global economy fail to address race/gender discrimination progressively. The failure to take into account how race and gender affect the academic development of students undermines the academic environment to the extent public schools produce two distinct classes of graduates; labor/production and labor/info-technology. The neo-Marxists believe the failure is intentional and an element of the hidden curriculum of Capitalism. More significant is the belief by neo-Marxists and progressive educators that class distinctions disenfranchise minorities and ultimately undermine democratic practice.

Pragmatic capitalists counter by stating their belief that economic class distinctions are the function of two phenomena in the free market system. The first is the failure of individuals to take advantage of education resources and by under preparing limit individual choice to occupations requiring little skill. The second phenomenon is the competitive labor market weeds out labor that for whatever reason is unable to compete. For the pragmatic capitalist class is not a societal problem nor is it the result of the inequality of resources such as healthcare, housing, income, or transportation. Rather class is the result of a personal failure of an individual if you are in the lower socio-economic class and success if you are a member of the upper economic class. As to the argument by neo-Marxists class undermines democratic practice, pragmatic capitalists believe the macroeconomic policies of Capitalism forge a path to liberty, freedom, and democracy whereas Marxist economic policies lead to less liberty, freedom, and away

from democracy. Pragmatic capitalists believe Marxist economics is not a viable theory in the post industrial and pre info-technological age in progress today.

Public school educators and public policy makers make little distinction between production labor (manual or low skill), technology labor (a mix of technology and manual labor), and information driven technology (manipulating pools of data over global networks) as different curriculums. Yet there is considerable agreement by policy makers and the public for the need for preparing students to thrive in a global society integrated by technology. Occupational education emphasizing technology is a public good, but is not necessarily an enabling mechanism for a democratic social structure as pragmatic capitalists assert. McLaren (1999) describes the future of education in a technologically economic system. “Education has been reduced to a sub-sector of the economy designed to create cybercitizens within a teledemocracy of fast moving images, representations, and life-style choices. Capitalism has been naturalized as commonsense reality – even as part of nature itself – while the term *social class* has been replaced by the less antagonistic *socioeconomic status*” (p. 286). McLaren’s use of the term ‘commonsense’ indicates the pragmatic implementation of Capitalism as well as underscores the linguistic manipulation of class distinctions to redefine social inequality in a more positive term. Education has long been a sub-sector of the economy. Technology changes society, yet public education appears mired in an agrarian intellectual culture whereas other institutions are adopting technological innovation to progress. The inability of public education to keep pace leaves students susceptible to economic exploitation, not from lack of ability, but the inability of the system to prepare

adequately students to cope with change. In the vernacular of the educator, to problem solve utilizing the tools of critical thinking.

Change is a natural phenomenon from human growth in intellectual capacity. The notion of Capitalism as a natural phenomenon needs context to appreciate what McLaren is saying. In addressing McLaren's (1999) notion of the "naturalization of Capitalism as a commonsense reality" (p. 286), Sirota (2001) provides context by asserting the distinction between two types of Marxists, the first orthodox, and the second reform-minded. Sirota is particularly salient in distinguishing the techno-occupational class from the orthodox Marxist view of labor. Sirota (2001) bases the distinction upon the interpretation of production. "The two groups define the mode of production in different ways. For orthodox Marxists, relations of production are relations of cooperation (in the primitive commune and under socialism) or relations of domination and servitude (domination of the exploited by the exploiter). In the latter case the basis of relations of production is the dominating classes' ownership of the means of production" (p. 135). Neo-Marxists comprehend the difference between Capitalism as an economic system and Capitalism as a social system. The pragmatic capitalist conflates Marxist social reform and economics as a political question concluding without analysis a capitalist economic system is the key component to equitability in the social structure. The pragmatic capitalist does not view a Marxist economy as democratic, social, or viable economically. Pragmatic capitalists create competitive occupational classes culled by exploiting technology as part of the 'naturalization" (McLaren, 1999) process as well as forms the strategy to maintain wage and price advantage. Introducing a technology curriculum with a capitalist framework conceals the identity of a techno-class and allows capitalists to

continue exploiting race, class, or gender distinctions for economic advantage as technology has few 'antagonistic' connotations. Education is a 'sub-sector' of capitalist enterprises and technology is simply a resource or another form of capital to hoard in the hands of corporations.

McLaren's analysis is accurate in this respect. The prospect for developing the knowledge to be successful in a world where technology is valued over all other forms of skill diminishes when public education is in the hands of people who focus upon lowering cost for labor. It is fair to say McLaren's analysis applies to democracy as well. The prospect for democratic reform in countries that allow the exploitation of technological resources by capitalists is no better than the prospects for democratic reform in countries that capitalists brazenly exploit manual labor or natural resources. With respect to McLaren, where McLaren's argument fails is the expectation the hundreds of thousands of educators will lead a revolt against current conservative trends in public education towards standardization, de-skilling of educators, and corporatization resulting in a radical alteration of the public school system. Similar to all capitalist enterprises, labor in the form of educators is a commodity, inexpensive to produce, and simply by changing the rules¹ can dramatically reduce the resource for production. The best opportunity for an education revolution may be outside of the public sector and outside of control of educators. McLaren, not shy about his Marxist leanings, accurately portrays a public education dominated by Capitalism, but offers no viable alternative, as the intertwining of public policy defining the structure of public school system with

¹ Class size is an example. By increasing class size, fewer educators are necessary.

corporate influence upon the curriculum are too tight to untangle. Contemporary curriculum arguments in education and public policy blur the lines between the need for low skill labor to have a functioning understanding of technology and high skill labor that essentially falls into the class of high technology. In a capitalist system, characterizing labor by the varying degrees of technology to perform occupations is another way to subdivide the social structure into class.

Historically the three primary sources for labor are slave labor, immigrant labor, and indigenous labor providing the fuel to run the economic engines of the United States economy. Representing the indigenous labor is the white agriculturalists, industrialists, financiers, and merchants. Hidden within capitalist curriculum is a racial and ethnic economic culture that promotes the superiority of indigenous labor over other forms of labor. Racial economics promote specific occupations that are low skill and have little or no use for technology. Farm labor and migrant farm workers are an example. In the contemporary United States labor pool, the stereotypical farm worker is Hispanic, under-educated, possibly an illegal, or lacking in academic training for occupations outside of manual labor work. Often time the label for farm labor is ‘work that is beneath the education level for citizens of the United States’. Labor statistics indicate there are many vacancies in the fields of agriculture as well as many other occupations, yet many choose to remain unemployed rather than engage in meaningful labor that produces both income for the employee and as well as goods for the consumer.

The capitalist version of public education promotes the notion that lacking high skill technology knowledge, a person will never fulfill his or her own economic needs. This is in addition to the perverted idea of many citizens of the United States believe they

are 'too good' to engage in certain forms of manual labor. Within this distinction is the de-valuation of skills that are good for the consumer and good for the laborer.

Synonymous with the term de-valuing is standardization. Standardization assumes the position by creating repetitious and measurable tasks labor expense rapidly decelerates. Standardizing tasks result in a person needing less occupational intelligence to perform the task. It is difficult to find an educator working in the classroom that intuitively does not understand standardizing pedagogical practice and de-valuing or de-skilling of educators are implicit goals of the curriculum of Capitalism. Disconcerting but nonetheless evident is de-skilling intellectual capital undermines democracy and begins the process for eroding the social structure leading to acrimony between classes. Marx began his theoretical writing observing the standardization of industrial practices and the decline of social welfare during the industrial revolution of Europe. Marx intuitively understood the acceleration towards a technologically based industrial system would wreak havoc on the social structure if left to operate without restraint. The pragmatist derives the same conclusion leading to the question is Marxism and pragmatism complementary philosophies?

Searching the literature finds the answer is far from clear though orthodox Marxists tend to disassociate Marxism from pragmatism. Lloyd (1997) represents the orthodox Marxists position that pragmatism and Capitalism are inseparable, but incompatible with Marxism. For Lloyd and other orthodox Marxists adding pragmatism to the mix defiles the social and economic theory of Marx rendering the theory useless. On the opposite side of the debate, Westbrook (2005) believes the commonality between Marxism and pragmatism should come as no surprise as ideologically the disassociation

of Capitalism with pragmatism creates a synchronous social theory (p. 115). Ostensibly, this is one position of the neo-Marxists leaning in the direction of accepting the notion of a pragmatic Marxism and in some instances claiming James and Peirce as kindred socialists. Kadlec's (2007) research that is more recent attempts to link Dewey's ideal of pragmatism and education directly to the notions of critical theory in particular those first postulated by the Frankfurt school. Jay (1973) in a number of different locations in his book indicates some members of the Frankfurt School, "the Institute was careful to distinguish its approach from that of the pragmatists" (pp. 82-83). Kadlec (2007) acknowledges Jay's (1973) statement, but nonetheless contends Dewey pragmatism and neo-Marxism are the chemistry for critical theory. Ryder (1999) in review of Lloyd's (1997) work may have the best answer to question as to the complementary relationship between pragmatism and Marxism. In referring to Dewey's position, Ryder (1999) says, "...since descriptively one's answer will depend largely on one's sympathies concerning socialism and one's reading of pragmatism as liberal or progressive" (p. 202). My own conclusion is the incongruities of pragmatism with Marxism are far less significant of an issue to discard critical pragmatism as a theoretical framework for social research.

For the purposes of this research, the theoretical framework will incorporate the central ideas of social/economic Marxism with the uniquely Deweyan model of humanistic pragmatism as an analytical tool to comprehend the United States perspective of Capitalism. The theoretical framework is critical pragmatism and this line of investigation and school of thought situates the research within the Deweyan parameters that the purpose of education is to prepare citizens to be discerning members of society, critical thinkers, and to participate in the democratization of the world. The fluidity of the

theoretical framework fusing two philosophical methods into one is consistent with the basic notion of the curriculum theorists who believe that a broad range of discourse and research activities are the best approach to opening an inclusive dialogue on the critical issues of race, class, and gender. Pinar (2000) writes, “When curriculum theory is conceived as primarily non-normative discipline concerned with creating education environments that enhance the quality of experience, the narrow limits of behavioristic education is left behind” (p. 440). The ideal of a Deweyan approach to pragmatism forges a path to better understanding of how the experience of humans engages the world in a discourse of democratic behavior.

Rationale for Critical Pragmatism as the Research Framework

We have imported our language, our laws, our institutions, our morals, and our religion from Europe, and we had adapted them to the new conditions of our life. The same is true of our ideas (Dewey, p.55, 1981).

Scatamburlo-D and McLaren (2004) believe, “Marxism is considered to be theoretically bankrupt and intellectually passé, and class analysis is often savagely lampooned as a rusty weapon wielded clumsily by those mind-locked in the jejune factories of the nineteenth and twentieth century. When Marxist class analysis has not been distorted or equated with some crude version of ‘economic determinism,’ it has been attacked for diverting attention away from the categories of ‘difference’ – including ‘race’” (p. 191). The notion of reclaiming Marxism by reconceptualizing class as race and gender is sometimes known as post-Marxism, neo-Marxism, neo-socialism, or liberalism; all pejorative terms used in an effort to discredit scholars who find a useful function in the philosophy of social Marxism and to disparage social democracies as

inferior to democratic capitalists. It is difficult to conceive Marxism sharing the context of class with race and gender, which is the criticism by orthodox Marxist – class, is discrete – and by the dogmatic theology of orthodox Marx is the only attribute of the discourse. Capitalism is the global exploiter and class represents the globally exploited as well as oppressed. “It is remarkable,” writes Scatamburlo-D and McLaren (2004), “in our opinion, that so much of contemporary social theory has largely abandoned the problems of labor, capitalist exploitation, and class analysis at a time when capitalism is becoming more universal, more ruthless and more deadly” (p. 191).

Hollander (2000) believes that the disinterest in Marxism by some intellectuals is due to a number of differing factors. One explanation for the lack of interest in classical or orthodox Marxism by scholars is due to an economic collapse of the Soviet Union. The counter argument is the economic rejuvenation of Russia and the rise of China are evidence that a pure Marxist economic system may be difficult to sustain, but a Marxist social structure may be viable. The new *evolution of the revolution* may very well reconstitute social Marxist theory as a liberalized version that seeks to ride the wave of Capitalism to fund respective global power structures, but retains the social elements of deconstruction of a class system. In the research literature, the term ‘state capitalism’ is characterizes the fusing of Marxist social theory with Capitalism as an economic theory. Global economies organized by transnational corporations disdain nations that are functionally unable to relate to the capitalist model and necessitate that all countries that desire super power status compete within the playing field of the capitalist economic structure. Hollander (2000) asks, “Has the collapse helped Western intellectuals to reconsider their relationship to Marxism? Or, as some argue, is this the time to solidify

their attachment to Marxist theory, no longer tainted by unseemly association with political systems which were not “truly” Marxist” (p. 22)? The research suggests many scholars are reluctant to pursue Marxist style frameworks, as many research institutions receive funding and support from conservative capitalist corporations.

A second possible explanation for the abandonment of Marxist philosophy as a platform of theoretical inquiry is that some of the leaders that Marxism attracts are too revolutionary by contemporary standards. This point bears repeating, as much of the economic education of students in the United States is from the perspective of the curriculum of Capitalism. The curriculum focuses less upon the implications on the social structure of Capitalism and shifts the focus upon the tactics of the political leadership conflating the negative aspects of the personalities of the leadership (Lenin, Stalin, Mao, Castro, Guevara, and Chavez are examples.) with that of economic and social theory. The counter argument is there are an equal number of leaders in capitalist oriented nations that commit a wide range of offenses, but seldom do you hear the call for abandoning Capitalism because of poor leadership. The design of the context of this analogy is an obvious attempt to differentiate Marxism as evil and Capitalism as good. Simplistic, but effective as Hollander (2000) and others describe Marxist ‘personality cults’ (p. 22), overshadow the theory and the reformative aspects of Marxism.

The third and I believe the most plausible explanation is the inflexibility of Marxist economic theory in adapting to a technological based global economy. Papastephanou (2006) argues Socialism as it relates to Marxism fails to keep pace with its rival Capitalism in adapting to the new world realities of globalization. Papastephanou (2006) says, “The main strands of twentieth-century socialism have been discredited

since orthodox Marxism was led to dogmatism, revolutionary Marxism degenerated into Stalinism, and social democracy succumbed to managerialism” (p.241). Papastephanou supports the notion by some scholars believing orthodox theoretical social Marxism aligns too closely with economics and as a theory, is too easy to disparage. There are many readily apparent examples of the economic failure by the leadership of Marxism in comparison to Capitalism leading to economic collapse. Yet these explanations may not be as relevant today than during the period of the Cold War.

China as example, governs by an eastern Marxist philosophy, but has a robust global oriented Capitalist economic system (Hui, 1998 & Morgan, 2004). Epstein (2001) contextualizes the marriage of global capitalist economic theory with Marxist social theory by describing the arrangement through the lenses of global anarchists, “The main target of anti-globalization movement is corporate power, not capitalism, but these perspectives do not necessarily preclude one another” (p. 11). The perspective of Epstein is that Capitalism and Marxism are tools of the relationships between transnational corporations and governments, with the role of government to protect corporate interest first. Protests against globalization highlight the loss of power of governments to govern and the rise of corporate organizations in their stead. Supporting Epstein is Bieler and Morton (2004) in describing the progress of globalization as a hegemonic system situated within an economic framework of Capitalism. Globalization requires governments to re-situate social reforms within the political boundaries of their own countries to facilitate better relations with economic like-minded governments. Governments cannot ignore the economic structure funding the social structure and must yield to the desires of transnational corporations to avert financial and economic sanction. Citizens assume the

position of second priority as governments seek to maintain and fund power structures by corporate benefactors.

In a world dominated by Capitalism, democratization is a rare phenomenon as transnational corporations have the ability to shift capital resources to less developed nations within a matter of a few months. Citizens once denied resources in which to sustain them, quickly abandon revolutionary movements in favor of the status-quo. Neo-Marxists understand that economics is a powerful force of control and seek to mitigate the negative aspects of the force of a shift of capital to other nations, creating competition between nations as well as having the potential for destabilizing a region. Unlike orthodox Marxists, neo-Marxists believe that change is not revolutionary, but *evolutionary* – incremental change is far more agreeable to global financiers than economic insurrection. Unlike orthodox capitalistic minded pragmatists, Neo-Marxists straddle the line between capitalist orientation of economics and democratic reform, preferring that social change be a function of the society, less reliant upon economics. Neo-Marxists are not economic Marxists in the sense they are in opposition to Capitalism, but social Marxists and neo-progressives (In the U.S.) hailing their origin as progressives from the Dewey school (Ryan, 1995, and Novack, 1975). While critical of the inequality found in Capitalism, they are reluctant to suggest replacing capitalist economies with Marxist economies.

Neo-Marxist scholars are committed social democrats who believe that economic policies alone are incapable of addressing race, class, and gender. Social Marxists are reflective social democrats with diverse strategies for achieving social justice and social equitability (Novack, 1975). How this philosophical shift plays in determining policy for

public education is an indirect reflection of the changing notion of the perception of Capitalism, the dominance of economic Capitalism, and the re-evaluation of Capitalism as a social system. Conservative educators promoting the curriculum of Capitalism will continue to maintain the power position in the field of education and will continue to revise history in support of the curriculum linking Capitalism as a function of democracy. Scholars continue to search for an ideal social structure and economic structure somewhere between orthodox Capitalism and orthodox Marxism. Contemporary curriculum theorists and scholars work in diverse fields such as critical race theory, critical feminism, critical ecology, or popular culture. These philosophical positions are part of the curriculum discourse in the fields of health, social science, and other liberal arts education representing the shift in the thinking of scholars about Capitalism and Marxism.

Sirota, (2001) describes the neo-philosophical hybrid position this way; “The ‘Western type’ of society that is arising before our eyes in place of the capitalism of Marx’s day and has yet to receive a generally recognized ‘formational’ definition includes among individuals constituting a *three element* mode of production, besides workers and capitalists, a new middle class” (p. 44). Sirota and other critical theorists envision a new society utilizing analytical tools, data driven decision-making, and reconceptualization within the context of globalization. Critical theories retain the best attributes of the analytical power of orthodox Marxism while ramping up the neo-Marxist emphasis upon social justice. Lipset (2001) summarizes this position, “The consequent changes in class and political relations within the industrially developed societies, much like the shifts in left-wing politics in the United States and Europe, may be analyzed

within the framework of an ‘apolitical’ Marxism – that is, by accepting the proposition that technological advances and the distribution of economic classes determining the political and cultural ‘superstructures,’ but without assuming socialism will succeed capitalism” (p. 77). Analytical frameworks using neo-Marxism or critical theories need not result in revolutionary calls to sacrifice Capitalism and replace it with Marxist Socialism or Communism. Pragmatism is useful if the pragmatism of Dewey (progressive) replaces pragmatic Capitalism as global economic theory. The implication is the potential for economic\social theory that lies somewhere between the idealism of Dewey and the idealism of Marx. The position of a critical pragmatist advances the ideal analyzing the implications of an economic system upon the social structure and linking economic policy with other institutions such as public schools curriculum.

An important distinction is neo-Marxist theorists identify with the progressive movement of Dewey by embracing the philosophy of pragmatism, but not necessarily that of the orthodox pragmatism of James and Peirce. Complementing the social goals of the progressive movement, contemporary curriculum theorists and curriculum scholars seek to redress inequalities by acknowledging historic and present day the poor treatment of the underclass and their experience, and by prospective change in improving the educational experience of the marginalized as a methodology for pushing the agenda of democracy and social justice. The perspective of Campbell (2007) is consistent with the notion a middle ground, “From early advocates of the Pragmatic perspective like Benjamin Franklin, through its great trio of Peirce, James, and Dewey, to contemporary proponents like John J. McDermott, Pragmatism has provided a uniquely powerful way for Americans to understand and to try to improve the human condition” (p.3). Fusing

critical theory by way of a neo-Marxist reading with pragmatism offers a strong theoretical foundation from which to analyze the curriculum of Capitalism and the public school system.

One aim of critical theory is to provide a rational basis from which to document the pernicious nature of institutional racism, classism, and genderism. One aim of pragmatism is to bring to praxis democratic reform. Synchronizing these positions is complementary. Simich and Tilman (1980) use the term “doctrinal core” (p. 644) when referring to the fusion of pragmatism with critical theory. “We see no reason why an indigenous critical theory cannot be properly attuned to the political and cultural realities of American life while not forsaking a strong structural change orientation” (Sept., 1980, p. 645). Does the complementary position of critical theory and pragmatism remain whole from the perspective of race? Johnson (2001) in his critique of Cornel West and the *Property of Deliverance* writes, “The second intellectual tradition upon which African American critical thought must draw, according to West, is American pragmatism” (p. 548). Is the position valid for gender as well? Seigfried (1996) one of the few female scholars who has examined pragmatism from the feminist perspective writes, “I am convinced that pragmatist theory has resources for feminist theory untapped by other approaches and that feminism, in turn, can uniquely reinvigorate pragmatism” (p. 17). Tarver (2007) expresses the view that pragmatic feminists look beyond parity with males and create their own standard. Tarver (2007) writes, “Those of us of a Jamesian sentiment, then, ought not only to *hope* for the end of sexist oppression or the ultimate prevailing of a nonmisogynist Truth: we ought also, whenever possible, to look for ways of creating that truth, of realizing that demand” (p. 290). Progressive social theory looks

beyond the emphasis on class by orthodox Marxism and seeks to unite differing frameworks into new workable arrangements for opening new dialogues of social theory.

It is a curious if not confusing how Dewey social theory and pragmatism aligns with early proponents of Socialism as pragmatism closely aligns to Capitalism. Working associations between progressives and anarchists, labor unions, Communists, and other political activists that hold contrarian views to the conservative politics of the time would seem to prohibit cross-fertilization of ideas. Any hope that Socialists or Marxists may harbor towards legitimizing their social-political movement or theories by hitching it to respected academics such as Dewey simply never finds traction with the public or with contemporary academics. Progressives manage to avoid the same fate by reconstituting under the banner of neo-pragmatism, liberalism, or as critical pragmatists. Outside of the academic world, few persons grasp the significance of relating to a particular philosophical position. The key question for researchers to answer is how much influence a philosophical position has on the outcome of the type of research or upon the conclusions by the researcher. As with Marxism, there are differing strands of pragmatism. For pragmatists within their own ranks are variations of pragmatic philosophy and pragmatic applications.

There are three identifiable strands of American style pragmatism and each strand originates in the works of James, Peirce, and Dewey (Prawat, 2001). Prawat (2001) claims the disenchantment with some part of the philosophy of pragmatism of James by Dewey leads Dewey to pursue a different course of inquiry closer to the position of pragmatism articulated by Peirce's emphasis on the experiential aspects of the philosophy (pp. 667–668). Dewey emphasizes progressive democratic thought, inclusiveness,

pluralism, and a hopeful sense of optimism; all components of the American ideal and the curriculum of Capitalism; but always within the context of experience. McDermott (1981) describes Peirce as a logician, mathematician, (p. 46), and Peirce's (1997) writing style reflects the characteristics of an orthodox scientific lingual vocabulary. On the opposite extreme of Peirce is James (1948) the educator and psychologist and the characterization of his writing style is humanist, humorous, and a free flow of concepts that contradict one another. If Prawat's assertions are correct and Prawat provides convincing historical arguments that favor his interpretation, it is of interest that Dewey finds an affinity with Peirce even though James on a superficial level appears to have more in common with Dewey. Dewey incorporates some of the scientific approach of Peirce, but even in his incorporation Dewey never fails to return to experience and the humanist approach that characterize the progressives view of society.

Pragmatism is a philosophy that has the ability to retain central core elements while simultaneously reconfiguring its exterior to fit the stresses of the current environment. Campbell (2007) affirms the position of Prawat in describing pragmatism as: "Pragmatism is acutely concerned with a number of values. One is our place within nature, and our role as experimenters who are attempting to understand the limits and possibilities of our natural situation. A second is Pragmatism's concern with experience as our criterion of belief and action, as the means of directing ourselves to a better future. Pragmatism also presents a world of possibility in which our melioristic efforts make sense. Finally, pragmatism emphasizes community as the source of our well-being and the focus of our efforts to enact long-term improvements" (p. 3). Pragmatism embraces many different variations of its central themes without compromising its core values of

progressive democratic thought and social action. Critical pragmatism is one variation of pragmatism that does not preclude the theoretical aspects of neo-Marxism and provides the necessary framework from which to analyze the curriculum of Capitalism as well as the globalization of Capitalism. Neo-pragmatists in the same mold as neo-Marxists are reconceptualizing their respective philosophical positions to fit with the contemporary global developments.

Contemporary philosophers such as Rorty, West, and Seigfried continue the tradition of Dewey, Du Bois, and Addams promotion of pragmatism with each bringing a new critical perspective. The reconceptualization of pragmatism, specifically the placing the prefix *critical* before pragmatism, has generated less than enthusiastic support from orthodox philosophical scholars. Rorty as example is under intense scrutiny for his criticism of contemporary philosophy and his contempt for contemporary philosophers who advocate traditional positions grounded in classic Greek philosophy (Ramberg, 2009). The criticism of West is for linking black liberation theology with orthodox Marxism. “The upshot of my argument against West is twofold,” writes Johnson (2001). First, even as his crypto-Marxian position is an amalgamation of the virtues of black prophetic, Christianity, and traditional Marxist social theory, it cannot escape certain conceptual and empirical difficulties. Second, West need not call for the abolition of private ownership of the means production and institute a collectivist system as he does in order to achieve black liberation” (p. 569). Du Bois insists upon pursuing non-traditional sources of support to enhance African American economic positions and receives the same criticism as contemporary pragmatist of West and Rorty. Orthodox feminists, for her reluctance to endorse patriarchal oppression, and instead preferring to

navigate a new course of feminist action calling for a greater emphasis on empowering individualism and personal action criticize Seigfried (1996). Lessing does not escape criticism from feminists when she makes comments that male oppression is not the issue; the result of females not being able to cobble economic parity with their male counterparts is a function of not being free of or on equitable terms with partners in child rearing. Lessing believes investing in quality daycare is far easier to achieve and greater importance than a continuous rehash of arguments over the patriarch society (Clark, 2001).

It is conceivable to posit a philosophical position of critical pragmatism in light of globalization and transnational corporations. Widmaier's research (2001) supports this notion, "In IR [international relations] theory debates, there exists a recurring tendency to draw a distinction between problem-solving and critical theory. Whereas problem-solving theory ostensibly pertains to the short term, critical theory purportedly examines the evolution of more enduring social structures over the long term" (p. 127). Widmaier suggests that in the field of international relations there is compatibility between the position of the critical theorists and pragmatism. Widmaier appears to advocate a similar position to the reconceptualists' notion of *theoria* and *praxis* – that is translating an idea into an action; turning the theory of Capitalism into the manifestation of the reality of democratic practice and social justice. Reconstructing critical pragmatism to address the inequality of the Capitalism to address matters of race, class, and gender as well as lead to the fulfillment of democracy as socially just world is on firm ground and finds wide support among numerous scholars. Margonis (2007) in a review of the book *Pragmatism and Race* writes; "For my part, I would prefer a polyglot cosmopolitan philosophical

discussion, committed to neither national borders or national projects, but responsive to a multiplicity of people and conditions in the world and plethora of philosophical ideas that arise. Such an endeavour would embrace Enrique Dussel'sⁱⁱⁱ (1996) arguments to engage discussions across the centuries-long divides of Europe, Latin America, Africa, and Asia, seeking the true, the good, and the beautiful in all their manifestations and opposing all works to dehumanize and oppress people. Pragmatism would indeed be one helpful perspective in this project... ” (p. 148). The theoretical framework (critical pragmatism) is consistent with both subject and with that of the reconceptualist notion that multiplicity of theories and practice are required to reconstruct education as democratic institutions educating students to function in a global society.

Methodology

Marshall and Rossman (2006) provide context in determining a theoretical framework for research, “An interdisciplinary approach with many guises, *narrative analysis*, seeks to describe the meaning of experience for those who frequently are socially marginalized or oppressed, as they construct stories [narratives] about their lives” (p. 6). The experience of Capitalism is from different perspectives wholly dependent upon the attainment and level of wealth of a citizen. In a capitalist social structure, citizens experience the concept of democracy through the lenses of race, class, or gender economics. In a capitalist economy for many citizens, liberty is in direct proportion to their value in the production of goods and services. These two seemingly different concepts merge into one conceptual notion of democratic Capitalism. Ironically, the citizens producing the goods readily available in many countries are themselves unable to afford the good they produce. In terms of proportion, laborers earn proportionally less

income over their lifetimes, have access to proportionally less health resources, and have proportionally shorter life spans than investor owners have. The methodology of this research while grounded in the theoretical framework of critical pragmatism, proposes that to comprehend the pernicious influence on a global scale of the curriculum of Capitalism the methodology reflect the experience of the citizens not benefiting from global Capitalism. These student/citizens are under the tutelage of a public school system promoting a curriculum counterintuitive to their authentic experience.

In referring to different methodologies and research approaches, Marshall and Rossman (2006) write, “They [qualitative researchers] are intrigued by the complexity of social interactions as expressed in daily life and by meanings that the participants themselves attribute to these interactions. These interests take qualitative researchers into natural settings, rather than laboratories, and foster pragmatism in using multiple methods for exploring a topic. Thus, qualitative research is pragmatic, interpretive, and grounded in the live experiences of people” (p. 2). The research methodology while framed by the theory of critical pragmatism utilizes as a methodology a compare/contrast of representative of race, class, and gender through autobiographical texts from the perspective of the working class and situated in the political construct of Capitalism. This research method is consistent with the belief by contemporary curriculum researchers (Pinar, 2000) who believe that the definition of curriculum is the cumulative experiences in the daily lives of citizens – not only that of the public school system – but any process that influences an individual to act collectively, singularly, or behave in an observable fashion. Admittedly, this is a broad definition with a multiplicity of directions too numerable to count and in addition, complex to calculate meaningfully unless

essentialized to be too vague for anyone to construct a valid interpretation. However, this is the field or as Pinar (2002) says, “This field is very much a conversation, despite the efforts of some to pretend others do not exist. It is a conversation that invites your participation (p. 867).” Partly because of the formality that is associated with this being a dissertation and partly out of necessity, the need for an explanation of the methodology is in order to invite the participation by readers.

Why do Du Bois, Dewey, Lessing, Marcuse, and Feyerabend become the subject matter of this research? Contemporary thinking by many curriculum theorists is that a person learns as much about the intent of the researcher from the people they choose to include as part of the research (Pinar, 1999). A method of curriculum theorists is to search for ‘relationships’ and to interpret the relationships within a cohesive framework from which to draw a conclusion relative to a contemporary problem the research attempts to resolve. Though history provides some clues as to why things are the way they are today, history without the context – personalization through biography – may yield false conclusions, as the tendency is to believe the outcome of historical events yield the same result. Dufour’s theme (Fullan, 2009) in making the point that a drastic change needs to occur in the school reform movement and educator\reformers need to look at the historical realignment of curriculum as a pathway to avoid the trap of re-implementing a method, which produces counterproductive results to achievement. The difficulty with the position of Dufour and other conservative educators is agreeing to a definition of what constitutes ‘achievement’ and what are the metrics for the results. On this point, scholars may agree; possibly grudgingly as scholars argue the definition of both words ‘results’ and ‘achievement’, have multiple meanings depending on the life

experience of the person making the definition. Dufour (Fullan, 2009) quotes Soren Kierkegaard to make this point: “Life can only be understood backwards; but it must be lived forwards” (p. 102). Pinar (2002) suggests, “A field is rooted in the world, of course, in that world it chooses to examine. It is influenced also by the entire world: history, politics, life, and death” (p.7). Dufour and Pinar taken at face value do not appear to be in disagreement, yet there is a universe of difference. The modern day progressive or curriculum reconceptualist will not accept the notion that curriculum theory and by association, the curriculum of public schools so easily boils down to a few essential ingredients that comprise the recipe for achievement in or out of the classroom.

As suggested by many, a new discourse with a different language, one that has clarity, clear purpose, and sheds the baggage of intra-academia theoretical squabbles and focuses the discourse back in the direction of the practical creates a new discourse that encompasses the broad issues of race, class, and gender so that they become the conversation of the mainstream. Pinar (2002) cites Huebner as example of reorienting language to clarify the intent of curricular theorists. “It is suggested from this that curriculum theory is much in need of historical study, with the goal of untangling what Huebner referred to as the different uses of curricular language” (p. 7). Reorientation begins with the experience and experiential language. Giroux (1992) reinforces the notion of a language that is expressive of the authentic experience or a coded language that conceals and denigrates experience. The ‘fact’ of experience is less important in many ways than the ‘perception’ of experience from which critical conclusions are drawn from the majority. Garrison (1997) hints at the possibility of both the aesthetic (art of teaching) and the scientific (pedagogical method) are characteristics of exceptional educators and

in a broad based curriculum, that emphasizes core characteristics of democracy such as inclusiveness or liberal discourse. The experience for many educators and by proxy students, the Garrison ideal of education is lacking. No human endeavor may be more over-studied than education and no subject as under-studied as curriculum theory. The goal of the curriculum theorist is to simultaneously move in the abstract and in a concrete manner that leads to understanding and meaning; to be less conventional and anarchical in thought and action, and to observe the commonplace as not as uncommon as observed. No different from that of the life many people live and what Dewey (1981) repeatedly terms, “lived experience.”

“In the spirit of traditional critical theory, interdisciplinary investigation is a vital need and, at present, is sorely lacking” (Kadlec, 2007, p. 135). This research argues that the interdisciplinary approach of the critical theorist begins at the point of self-reflection and answering the question why we chose the field of education over all others. The critical question is *what knowledge is important* because educators in their hearts know the answer; what is important to the individual. Core values, beliefs, and loyalty are of little interest to the administered system of education. It is the curriculum of Capitalism that implicitly decides social relations among classes of U.S. citizens. The system of promoting and educating students to a one-world view of the superiority of Capitalism poisons the notion Capitalism may need revision to move progressively in the direction of a socially just society. Just as social Capitalism has failed society, so have the schools failed to materialize a socially democratic responsible world (Apple, 1996, Kozol, 1991, and Rose, 2009). Race, class, and gender matter. Schools fail precisely for the same reason society makes Lilliputian advances in coming to resolution of social ills plaguing

not only the United States, but also the world. The public school system may be the most hostile institutional system to democratic practice in the United States. Yet, the public holds fast to the belief that everyone has equal opportunity to obtain economic parity through education (Rose, 2009). Various qualitative studies measuring the progress of public schools continue to fall short of the goals set for achievement and rather than reorient the discourse to something different, the same stale methods of standardization, standardized testing, standardized pedagogy are prescribed; ironically even in the face of failure (Rose, 1995). While public schools continue to churn and mass-produce citizens for the global capitalist workforce with the same curriculum, researchers discover the gap between the haves and have-nots widening at an alarming pace. There is no greater need in history for a democratic oriented public education system challenging the inequitable treatment of minority citizens in a capitalist social structure.

Preview and Organization of the Chapters

In summary of chapter one, the first chapter opens with a discussion of how conservative educators narrowly conceptualize education within a capitalist economic and social framework. The narrowness of the conservative position contrasts with how progressive educators seek to broaden education to be more inclusive and to evolve beyond simply an exercise in occupational training. The research explores the idea that race, class, and gender are economic constructs. The conservative establishment for public education builds specific constructs within the public education system curriculum in order to perpetuate a parochial form of global Capitalism. The objective is to foster racial\ethnic\cultural agitation between sovereignties to maintain low cost labor and create a firewall between social Capitalism with other forms of social democracies. Du

Bois (1997) describes the curriculum of Capitalism and its impact students in public schools. “Without education or deliberate propaganda there is no race feeling at all. Children have no race prejudice. Race feeling and race repulsion only come because of persistent teaching and because scoundrels can profit by it” (1997, p. 351). The chapter concludes with the selection of critical pragmatism as the theoretical framework for the research.

The objective of the second chapter is to introduce the historical perspective of pragmatic Capitalism, critical theory, and critical pragmatism as a component of United States socio-economic history. Marxism looked upon unfavorably by the majority of citizens in the United States, has roots and positive implications as a mechanism for social reflection and social reform. The narrative of Marxism and neo-Marxism situates in the history of progressive reform and progressive educators. The search to alternatives to Capitalism as a social system does not necessarily lead to revolution and the deconstruction of Capitalism as an economic system. This section illustrates the negative influence transnational corporations have on social structures and emerging democracies. The belief system and the paradigms of the curriculum of Capitalism expose the hidden elements of the curriculum, suggest to readers the need for re-evaluation of Capitalism as a dynamic for social reform, and suggest to readers that the promotion of the curriculum of Capitalism in public schools fails to produce democratically functioning citizens.

The third, fourth, and fifth chapters are the heart of the dissertation. Greene (2001) writes, “A new kind of dialogue with the past may be needed, the kind of dialogue that clarifies vision, and pushes back the boundaries of thought. It may be a dialogue founded in recognition of that the past is multivocal – that there are and have always been

diverse perspectives on the valuable, and the real” (p. 18). To create Greene’s dialogue and in the tradition of the reconceptualists’ approach to research of broadening the dialogue to include more of the experience and voice of disenfranchised, this research utilizes biographical material as the catalyst to critically analyze how the curriculum of Capitalism manifests in the daily experience of citizens. The origin for the selection of Du Bois and Dewey for third chapter is the result of their historical relation to one another, commitment to democracy, representations for a contrast of race, philosophy of pragmatism, and their philosophical position regarding Capitalism and Marxism. The fourth chapter is a transitional chapter in that Du Bois and Dewey need a conduit to transition to contemporary times. The autobiographical and fictional work of Lessing transcends international borders in shape and format. Lessing links the progressive era to the contemporary work found in the fifth chapter as well as provides analysis from the perspective of an international critical feminist. Lessing’s literary work in the area of fiction is another useful tool from the reconceptualists’ toolbox; fictional work is ripe for analysis and insight into aspects of research. The fifth chapter contrasts the social scientist Marcuse with the scientist philosopher Feyerabend whose interest primarily revolves around debunking the notion of the infallibility of science. We live in the world of rapid technological advancement. Marcuse and Feyerabend have much to say how technology, science, and economic policy influence democracy. Public school systems rabid appetite for promoting technology and technological skill without examining the consequence on the social structure is the primary theme of this chapter.

The last chapter examines the issues raised in the previous chapters on two levels. The first is the macro-level of public school education and curriculum. In this chapter, the

research examines the broad issues of reform, economic policies, and the vision of public school education in the United States. The second is the micro-level, a person narrative from my experience as an educator of what the school day looks like to a teacher and a student. One final note, readers will discover at the end of the third through sixth chapter is a section title 'Praxis'. The objective of these sections is to synthesize the key lesson from each chapter into an action. The notion of praxis is consistent with the belief by critical pragmatists that the ultimate aim of research is to move from theory into practice.

CHAPTER II – PRAGMATISM, MARXISM, AND THE CURRICULUM OF CAPITALISM

Pragmatism and the Curriculum of Capitalism

De Tocqueville (1841) is correct in asserting, “The Americans have no philosophical school of their own; they care little for all the schools into which Europe is divided, the very names of which are scarcely known to them” (p. 1). The philosophy of pragmatism in the United States develops partly from historical indifference to other European philosophies and partly from the early founders emphasizing experiential inquiry as a plausible alternative to earlier philosophies. Pragmatism functions within the framework of the curriculum of Capitalism as a complementary philosophy. De Tocqueville (2004) in traveling the American continent observes that colonists have few interests outside of economic. De Tocqueville’s (2004) observations of the colonial experience links education, pragmatism, and Capitalism; “In the United States as soon as a man has acquired some education and pecuniary resources, he either endeavors to get rich by commerce or industry, or he buys land in the bush and turns pioneer” (p. 305). Menand (2001) traces philosophies across American history and ties the unique situation on the American continent with the construction of a philosophical tradition fitting the social culture of the pre-revolution colonists. Menand (2001) and Novack (1975) share a common notion that the continent began pre-capitalist and due to a unique set of circumstances (isolation, raw materials, etc.), evolves into the premier capitalist nation on the planet. The reference to the evolution of pragmatism with Capitalism in scholarly journals sometimes known as ‘American exceptionalism’, or the belief the unusual circumstances of colonization, isolation, and lack of outside influence from other

governments allow the American colonists to establish a unique governing system.

American exceptionalism also refers to other cultural traditions such as the references to religious freedom, manifest destiny, and the peculiar notion of U.S. superiority over other nations. American exceptionalism covers an expansive number of topics beyond the scope of this research, but some commentary is necessary as American exceptionalism has bearing on the ideals constructing the curriculum of Capitalism and public school education.

Public school curriculum does not include the theory that many scholars promote which is the physicality of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans separating the Europe and Asia from American shores facilitates the extraordinary events that lead to revolution and the creation of the unique structure of western style Capitalism and democratic governance. The Atlantic Ocean is a barrier to the influence of the peculiar church-state religion of the English monarchy, parliamentary politics, and the religious politics of Europeans. The omission of this theory from most history texts as well as from the curriculum is intentional as it undermines the cultural myth of religious freedom as the prime motivator for exploration, and debunks the notion that settlers had no interest in profit, but only in advocating their religious beliefs (Loewen, 1996). De Tocqueville may have been the first to advance this theory when recording his observations from his travels on the continent he writes, "Separated from the rest of the world by the Atlantic Ocean and still too weak to seek to rule the sea, it has no enemies, and only rarely do its interests intersect with those of other nations of the globe" (p. 142).

The influence of religion upon the mindset of the first European explorers to settle on the continent and ultimately on the formation of the democratic practices in

continental America is subject to much debate by historians and other scholars. Public school curriculum promotes the notion that the first pilgrims driven by the desire for *religious* freedom are noble, above reproach, and their arrival on the shore of North America is an honorable natural process of exploration and expansion of civilization (Loewen, 1996). The same curriculum ignores the truth that diseases transmitted by Europeans obliterate Native American tribes in the northeast colonies. Settlers pushing westward forcibly relocate Native Americans from their homelands and force Native Americans to abandon their cultural traditions. Simultaneously in the southern colonies, slave traders hunt, capture, and involuntarily uproot Africans as well as other dark skinned humans from their homelands to work the fields. In most instances, females work the fields next to their spouses and children, and yet are have no reward for their labor outside of that which their male spouse allows. The curriculum of Capitalism relies on a number of cultural myths to bind religion with economics and to rationalize the barbaric repatriation of Native Americans, justify slavery, and deny females equal standing with males in society.

As part of the curriculum of public schools, the notion of religion is omnipresent part of the curriculum just as the notion that democracy does not exist outside of a capitalist economic framework. The instruction of students in public schools contains references to the Puritan work ethic, reinforcing in the minds of impressionable students that the capitalist system is socially responsible, an economic system sanctioned by religion, and the only path to democracy. The same dogmatic Puritan religious belief system also generates hatred towards populations that does not fit the Puritan ideal, rationalizes treatment of non-white populations as inferior human beings, and maintains

an absolute dictatorial position in the relationships between males and females. These truths are not part of the curriculum as the portrayal of the sordid side of Capitalism is not a topic for analysis or discussion in contemporary public education classrooms. Students learn that religion provides settlers with a set of laws, hope in the future, and a desire to shape society differently from that they had left behind in Europe. Classroom educators teach students that religion forms the basis for democratic governance and confidence in the settlers they can meet the challenges of a new life in a new land. Ostensibly, true, but this unbalanced approach to curriculum develops in students a sense of moral superiority over non-western style cultures.

Though European immigrants settle the continent, the immigrants who settle the continent have little need of a philosophic tradition for survival. It is fair assumption to believe pragmatism as a philosophy takes root in early American continental history from the need for survival. The fuel for pragmatism comes from the need for a rapidly developing nation to expend intellectual capital on the practical elements of an orientation towards occupational education, an economy based upon agriculture, and forming governing entities with limited authority except in the area of settling property disputes. Strands of the Puritan work ethic such as the emphasis upon individual action are also in the philosophy of pragmatism and it is not too difficult to comprehend how the Puritan work ethic, pragmatism, and Capitalism tie together. Having no philosophical tradition or philosophers to mediate meaning has social consequences. Campbell (2007), in writing about the role of philosophers in contemporary society says, “Philosophy’s job is to address our problems of living – whether the metaphysical ones that tormented James, or the scientific ones that challenge Peirce, or the social ones that invigorated

Dewey – and to be ever vigilant in challenging the purely intellectual solutions to which philosophers too often acquiesce” (p. 5). Pragmatism reflects an aspect of dealing with domestic, vocational, and provincial concerns in contrast to metaphysical philosophical concepts more common in the socially advanced countries of Europe (Swett, 1900 and Woodbridge, 1907). The Puritan work ethic evolves into a pragmatic economic secularism, belief in a supreme being as creator, belief that a spiritual relationship is a private affair, and that religion should separate from the public enterprises of business or government. How much of the success of the early Capitalist economy is the result of the mythical Puritan work ethic, adherence to orthodox religious practice, or plain luck is debatable. The answer is probably a little of each. Clearly, the curriculum of the contemporary public school system retains many of the components of the cultural myths of the Puritan work ethic and disregard for other theoretical suppositions providing context and balance to the education of public school students.

It is not an overstatement that curriculum steeped in religious tradition and dogmatic practices are justifiably the brunt of criticism. The other side of the narrative is without the financial support and the early zeal from the religious clergy to provide education to a broader base of constituencies, public education in the early years of the continent does not exist. The local church frequently serves a dual purpose as the local schoolhouse and community center. When not attending to matters of religion, the local minister, or his wife work as the headmaster/teacher of the school. In all probability, the local minister is the best educated and most qualified to teach as seminary or religious training focus pedagogical practice. Churches organize local social functions and the community uses the church building for a variety of civic. It bears noting that for all the

negative perceptions of religion there is an equally compelling narrative validating the positive contributions that religious organizations have upon public education.

In describing the fusion of religion with pragmatism and Capitalism, public school curriculum takes a decidedly capitalistic orientation as the social structure in the United States constitutes through the prism of commerce (Novack, 1975). In one sense the fusion of religion, pragmatism, and Capitalism are extraordinarily compatible as each promotes a similar philosophical position, the first religious, the second philosophical, and the third socio-economic. The myth of colonization by noble religious pilgrims remains steadfast as a pillar of the public education system. The popularization of this myth as well as others permeates the curriculum found in public school systems. The repatriation of Native Americans, disenfranchisement of females, and slavery demonstrate cultural myths can have disastrous implications when left uncritically challenged particularly when intertwining with economics.

Cultural myths foster a particular national or worldview, in this case Capitalism. If left undisputed, cultural myths become part of the learning experience (collective cultural memory) and form the character of the individual (personal identity) as they relate to society. The notion of a collective consciousness works in two directions, the consciousness of the oppressed, and the consciousness that rationalizes the behavior of the oppressor. Cultural myths are a dangerous part of the curriculum of public schools and assume an air of truth, just as peculiar religious beliefs regarding race and gender became norms for society.

Evolution of Marxism in the United States

Why is the United States not a Socialist state? This question vexes political scientists, historians, and other socially oriented citizens. “Distinctive elements of American culture – antistatism and individualism – negated the appeal of Socialism for the mass of American workers for much of the twentieth century. Socialism, with its emphasis on statism, socialization of the means of production, and equality through taxation, was at odds with the dominant values of the American culture” (Lipset, 2001, p. 266). Lipset (2001) believes the primary reason for the United States not adopting a socialist governing and economic structure is due to an inherent desire for individuality beginning with the first settlers on the American continent. The dogmatism of the orthodox Marxist prevents the establishment of a permanent socialist culture. This does not preclude the U.S. evolving into a socialist state in the future and contrary to the curriculum in public schools, the U.S. has gone through periods (such as directly after the Great Depression) where progressives, liberals, and Socialists initiated attempts at restructuring Capitalism into a socially responsive economic system.

Students of American history in public schools will not learn that Marxist theory circulates in the mid-eighteen hundreds on the continent and there is a thread of a Socialist tradition in the history of the United States. There is considerable amount of material attributed to Marx from the period of 1861 to 1862 relating to the American Civil War (Marx & Engels, 2008). The archives of the New York Daily Tribune contain articles authored by Marx beginning in August of 1852 with the last column appearing in February of 1861 (Archive files - NY Daily Tribune, Marx, 2008). The editor of the New York Daily Tribune the most influential newspaper on the east coast at the time is Horace

Greeley. Greeley is very familiar with the efforts of Robert Owen,² the British socialist (Sometimes in historical literature called the father of cooperative living.) who migrates to the U.S. and attempts to build a communal society on the border between Illinois and Indiana in 1825. Marx (1999) says of Owen, “From the factory system budded, as Robert Owen has shown us in detail, the germ of education of the future, an education that will, in the case of every child over a given age, combine productive labor with instruction and gymnastics, not only as one of the methods of adding to the efficiency of production, but as the only method of producing fully developed human beings” (pp. 289-290).

Though few are acquainted with theoretical Marx in the U.S., the demand for social reform brought about by the industrialization of cities results in a number of political leaders to search for an alternative to social Capitalism. This search begins a new era of progressive thought about the role of government in a democratic society, rethinking Capitalism, and reconfiguring public school curriculum as a catalyst for social reform movements (Kliebard, 2004). Re-evaluation of the capitalist social structure and the cozy relationship corporations have with the government opens the door for the possibility of implementing a progressive style of governance. The traction for progressive movement slows, as progressives are uneasy ceding too much authority to governments. In the mind of the progressives, the U.S. government seems to favor large corporate interests over citizens. Progressives meet with a great deal of resistance from conservatives who believe the leaders of social reform intend to re-distribute wealth,

² Marx cites Owen numerous times in *Capital, a critique of political economy*. Source: Marx, K. (1906). *Capital, a critique of political economy* (S. Moore & E. Aveling, Trans.) (F. Engels, Ed.). New York: Modern Library.

deregulate labor relations, and disassemble the corporate structure of the United States. Conservatives begin a slur campaign to associate progressive ideals with misperceptions of Socialism, Communism, and Marxism by associating violent acts of anarchists with Marx. Despite the best attempts by conservatives to undermine the progressive movement, progressives make gains in convincing government leaders to re-evaluate the role of government in protecting citizens. A subtle shift in the philosophy of governance begins to coalesce around the view that governing authorities given sufficient oversight and accountability can be fashioned into an objective and a reliable instrument for distributing capital resources more equitably than relying upon wealth trickling down from capital investment. Throughout the early 1900s, the failure of government to respond to a number of catastrophic events in the world and the collapse of the world economic system empowers leaders to adopt aggressive governmental interventional strategies in order to create a social safety net and to regulate corporations into adopting humane social\labor policies. An aggressive campaign by organized labor with the assistance of progressives lead to geometric expansions of government at federal, state, and local levels.

Marxists seize upon this moment of economic failure and social unrest as the opportune moment in history to validate their claim that Capitalism will fail from implosion once the balance of production, labor, and capital becomes too large a burden for the laborer to continue to bear (Novack, 1975). Within the field of academics, a new field of research develops. Social research appeals to many different facets of society acknowledging the weariness of the continuous struggle to earn living wages, failures of large institutions, and belief in socially just democracy. This new field of research

provides the vehicle for progressives and other liberal thinkers to express a competing vision to the curriculum of Capitalism (Friedman, 1981). Not all progressives are convinced of the advantages of Marxism, but many are willing to concede that Capitalism needs radical overhaul (Novack, 1975, Ryan, 1995). Many progressives profess the difficulty with Marxist philosophical framework is in explaining the concept to the average person and the association of Marxism with violent anarchists (Jensen, 2004, Spring).

Early in 1930, Europe (as well as the rest of the world) is in shambles from oppressive international debt, scars from world war, growing civil unrest, and worldwide economic collapse first emanating on the European continent and then spreading across the Atlantic to the United States. Economic uncertainty creates the impetus for rethinking the role of government and in particular, redistribution of geopolitical power. Models of differing governing structures exist, but few citizens are able to adjudicate the progressive nature, social system, and the commitment to democracy as governments maintain a shroud of propaganda disguising their true nature. Removing the shroud reveals orthodox Capitalism and orthodox Communism prove equally inept in protecting citizens from the economic ravages of depression, war, and financial collapse. Progressives searching to mediate the extreme positions of Capitalism and Communism settle on the prospect of social reform utilizing the economic and social theory of Marx to begin the reconciliation, but first have to find a credible spokesperson to initiate the dialogue.

The period between 1925 and 1940 is a time for reconstruction and reframing global relations within the economic and political spheres. The catastrophic consequence

of worldwide economic failure and results of world wars culminate into realignment of global relationships and demands for radical changes in the social welfare systems of the United States and Europe. Progressives looking for a champion to promote the notion of a new world order, find in the scientific community a person of stature and credibility. Earning respect on both sides of the Atlantic, Albert Einstein (2004) becomes a prominent spokesperson in support of a new world governing system. He writes in the *Monthly Review*, May 1949, an endorsement for Socialism. “The economic anarchy of capitalist society as it exists today is, in my opinion, the real source of evil” (p. 47, 1949/2004). An underlying theme of his essay is the notion of betrayal by systems trusted to stabilize as well as improve the welfare of citizens. Einstein’s essay helps to explain the thinking of progressives operating on a heightened level of distrust of organizations. The negative experience progressives have with corporations and governments leads progressives to adopt a strategy of passive resistance and to search for an institution that progressives can reconfigure to be the agent to implement progressive change.

Leaders in the progressive movement settle upon the institution of public education as the instrument to train leaders and to facilitate the progressive vision of democracy. The progressives set about uniting other reform-minded citizens in persuading others that education is the structure by which progressives can facilitate positive change. Optimism lacking a framework is of little use and the progressives find the framework for change in the theoretical work of the scholars of the Frankfurt School (Jay, 1973). The arrival of members of the Frankfurt School at Columbia signify the prospect for reform of the capitalist social structure in that for the first time in United States history a credible challenge to the orthodoxy of Capitalism appears (Wheatland,

2004, Fall). Marxist economic theory and social theory find receptive audiences in the public and in the academic world (Wheatland, 2004, Winter). The Frankfurt School locates at Columbia University in New York and on the campus at Berkley California, earning favorable plaudits from the new left as the incubators for progressive ideas (Wheatland, 2004, Fall). Both locations publish social research utilizing the philosophical framework of Marxism (Jay, 1973). The social research appeals to many different facets of society acknowledging the weariness of the continuous struggle to earn living wages, failures of large institutions, and belief in socially just democracy. The stigma of the exaggeration and exploitation by conservatives of the interpretation of Marx's use of the word 'revolution' is less prevalent in the work of members of the Frankfurt School blunting the controversial aspects of association with Marxism and creating a socially oriented framework from which to promote progressive ideals of social reform (Jay, 1973, Kadlec, 2007).

Intellectuals from Europe are willing to engage in the process of dislodging Fascist regimes from their homelands while alerting progressive thinking Americans that the path that United States society is traveling can very easily follow a similar direction (Jay, 1973). The dogmatic ideology of Marxism gives way to a less confrontational and less class focus, applicable theory for consumption by audiences in the United States. Representative of this style is the scholarly work by members of the Frankfurt School and leading progressives as Dewey, Addams, Du Bois, as well as many others. The members of the Frankfurt School attempt to redress the problems created by social Capitalism through the promotion of their progressive ideas and experience with differing social structures utilizing a new framework of critical theory (Marcuse, 1998).

The Frankfurt School's notion of critical theory has roots in Marxism, but manages to re-orient the discourse from the controversial aspects of the interpretation of Marx towards a less confrontational pragmatic social theory. Citizens of the United States abhor the violence of anarchists misrepresenting Marx and reject the Marxian notion of revolution (interpreted as violent overthrow) as the path to social change. The term 'revolution' as Marx writes has many connotations other than the call for a violent overthrow of the government. Though the teaching of public school students is to equate Marxism, Socialism, and Communism as illegitimate systems for governing, as their authority to govern is the result of violent overthrow of existing democratically elected governments, revolution does not necessarily have to carry negative connotations. The image of the mild mannered academics of the Frankfurt School is a stark contrast to the burly radical picture of anarchical Marx, promoted by capitalistic minded organizations in a propaganda campaign designed to slander social democrats so that their voice will not take hold in the consciousness of United States.

The scholars of the Frankfurt School choose to continue their work in relative obscurity from the public, but are able to make substantial contributions to social theory in a number of fields by publishing their work and circulating it to other similarly minded reformers. Scholars in the United States seeking to discredit the Frankfurt School because of their work utilizing the theoretical framework of Marxism, question the motives of Frankfurt School members, isolate them from society, and treat them as if they are enemies of the United States. According to Jay (1973), the members tend to isolate themselves from the faculty believing that the motives of their group are always under suspicion. Outside of their scholarly research, Frankfurt School members seldom venture

beyond the confines of their residence or the campus. They live a self-imposed confinement preferring to be low key and hermitic (Jay, 1973). Being from Germany and some members Jewish, they live a shadow existence of isolation and alienation (Jay, 1973). In stark contradiction to the treatment Frankfurt School members receive, they make a conscious effort to share their insight to protect the United States from becoming the next Fascist battleground, though their acts of patriotism is seldom heard outside of a limited few academic circles (Marcuse, 1998).³ The members of the Frankfurt School choose not to return to Germany after the war.

The work of the Frankfurt School reflects an important aspect of exile, flight, alienation, isolation, and disenfranchisement; themes found in critical theory. Though its roots are Marxist, critical theory as a philosophical position makes no claim as to adjudication of the moral aspects of race, class, and gender politics through an economic model. Critical theory provides context from which to examine the curriculum of Capitalism from the progressive ideal of democracy. Marxism has a tradition in U.S. history pre-dating the Civil War and continuing through the Second World War when the members of the Frankfurt School reconfigure orthodox Marxism (critical theory) to adapt evolving power structures.

Reconceptualizing Marxist Theory: The Frankfurt School and Critical Theory

By the end of the Second World War, the entire world looks for respite from the savagery unleashed upon the world by the worst kind of imperialistic behavior arguably

³ Marcuse worked for the U.S. government intelligence service. *Source*: Marcuse, H. (1998). *Technology, war, and fascism: Collected papers of Herbert Marcuse (Vol. 1)* (D. Kellner, Ed.). New York: Routledge.

in the entire history of the world. In *Walking in the Shade, 1949 – 1962*, Lessing (1996) summarizes the period between 1930 and 1949; “The children of the soldiers of the First World War were brought up not only bitter disillusionment, and loss of respect for their own governments, but a feeling of being participants in an understanding denied to an unheeding, ignorant majority” (p. 327). Decrying the loss of human life, jaded by her own past dealings with Communists and left wing politics, Lessing seeks to place in perspective the flavor of the time. War ends and the prospects for world war ever reoccurring seem impossibility if governments reflect upon the devastation of the past. Lessing remains the cynic and with good reason. “There are times in life when the question of knowing if one can think differently than one thinks and perceive differently than one see is absolutely necessary if one is to on looking and reflecting at all” (Duncker, 1996, p. 30).⁴

By the 1950s, economic issues in the United States replace war as the major concern. The United States and much of the world experience an economic upswing as production formerly supplying the war effort switches into producing consumer goods. The U.S. is in an economic boom, an economic and social renaissance by comparison to the preceding years where the specter of war is everyone’s constant companion. The post ‘war economy’ creates a demand for consumer products that manufacturers discontinued producing during the war years – replacing war machines with washing machines – buying binges by consumers fuel the switch to domestic commodities. Production retools

⁴ Foucault, M., *Preface to La Valonte' de Savior*. Date unknown. See page 30, Duncker, (1996) *Hallucinating Foucault*. Hopewell,

to meet the demand when government military contracts end and begin producing consumer products. The new patriotism is to become mega-consumers. The world at least for short time, takes a break from killing, destruction, and instead turns its attention to reconstruction of infrastructure and social structure. For many, minorities and the disenfranchised, a different economic experience emerges.

African Americans returning from war receive little recognition or recompense for their contribution to the war effort here and abroad. This is true of millions of citizens' contributions to the war effort by ramping up production and providing support at home. Yet, the economic boom does not extend to African American populations who find racial inequities especially burdensome. To counter the racial economy, groups such as the NAACP begin to globalize their local struggle by associating civil rights with human rights issues (Plummer et al., 2003, p. 107). Initially, the marriage of civil rights to human rights as a global struggle has success as the internationalization of racial, class, and gender politics embarrasses as well as interrupts trade between the dominant nations (Plummer et al., 2003). To counter the argument that racial economics is a global issue, the far right resurrects the memory of Lenin and Stalin, in an effort to paint the Civil Rights movement as the right arm of radical Communism. "In McCarthyist America economic equality quickly became linked with communism" (Plummer et al., 2003, p. 107). The tactic of the right is familiar to the progressive and liberal movement as progressives continue to be unfairly targeted as radical anarchists during the early portion of the twentieth century. Progressives are unsuccessful in shaking the anti-American label.

As in the case of the labor movement, coalitions form vowing to change the race, class, and gender biased economic structure by bringing the issues to the forefront of public debate and by working through the legislative process. Public education and the disparities between African American and white schools dramatically illustrate the influence of racial politics upon critical functions of governance influencing the economic futures of citizens. Like the generation before them, the issues garner little attention and less action towards equality. In the late 1950s and throughout the next three decades, the liberal left adopts tactics of the early anarchists of the 1900 period (Herf, 2004). They begin with peaceful protest and civil disobedience, which accelerates to violence against property and violence against people. Different from past protests television plays a major role in portraying civil rights protests as anti-American. Nightly newscasts transmit vivid images of the protests and white male commentators provide the context with little or no actual firsthand knowledge of the events or free of bias analysis. No doubt, some of the early protesters felt that the peaceful demonstrations did not result in changes to society rapidly enough and a few of the zealous demonstrators believe that violence is the only course of action (Herf, 1999).

Vocal and well-known proponents of orthodox Marxism hide in the shadows of middle class of America and to some extent, prefer a less public profile afforded by employment with large universities or private research organizations. A low profile is an advantage as the next generation of Marxists, neo-Marxists, build support for progressive changes, influence public policy, and train new leaders to begin the process of social change through the education system. Television images of violence perpetrated by law enforcement officials reinforce the need for change, as many are unable to reconcile

personal political beliefs with a government that will use violence against its own citizens. How these images influence public policy and public perception is represented by the struggle to create an equitable system of public education for all students.

The criteria of race, class, and gender to determine eligibility for schooling remains substantively unchanged until 1954, *Brown v. Board of Education*, when the impoverished family of a female African American third grade student challenges the notion of the Constitutionality of dual racially segregated divided school systems. Making the case archetypal of how race, class, and gender are significant barriers in the publicly funded education system, according to the Brown Foundation, attorneys for the NAACP chose Oliver Brown because he is a male and employed as a welder. In step with the religious majority, Mr. Brown is a part-time associate pastor of a church, married, and symbolic of the mainstream values of America in the 1950s (Wisneski, 2009). The symbolic archetypal presence of a working class male in a traditional nuclear family is not lost on the attorneys representing the NAACP. Although Brown is an African American male, the underprivileged working class Christian male in a traditional marital relationship counterbalances the argument of the white conservative majority rationale for racially segregated schools resulting in an extraordinary contrast between white schools with those of color. The prevailing wisdom of a system for public education limited to segregating white students from students of color begins to crack. The historical paradigm shift will not occur until more than ninety years of U.S. history passes after the Civil War, but was a precursor to the Civil Rights Movement fifteen years later.

Conservatives remain successful in labeling progressive reforms as anti-American. Capitalists find little reason to alter the degrading social conditions of social

Capitalism as the strife in society keeps the major purveyors in the dominant majority. The public's attention does not focus on the critical issues of race, class, and gender. Many citizens in the United States operate on the false notion that the struggles for racial, class, and gender equality ended in the nineteen seventies or eighties after passage of major civil rights law, the fall of apartheid in South Africa, and human rights initiatives begin in the United Nations. The association of progressives and liberals with radical anarchists alienates the progressive movement from mainstream citizens who may be sympathetic to the need for social change and to the calls for social reform by progressives. The public is turned off by the continuous stream of violent protests seen on television and by seemingly unending chaos of the government's inability to stop violent protests (Jensen & Dodge, 2001). Inside public school classrooms, progressive educators steadily work to create the next generation of citizens to be cognizant of the social conditions surrounding them and to begin the move towards creating socially responsible public policies. Dewey's notion that social change begins with democratic reform in the classroom began to take root. Educators take the lead in repudiating policies that clearly favored one class, gender, or race over others (Dewey, 1980). Whether from continuous assault by right wing leaders, the belief the U.S. was not graduating students with skills not equal to their foreign competitors, or for other reasons, the progressive education movement loses momentum.

In the minds of many progressives, the progressive movement 'sells out' and integrates into the conservative educational establishment leaving innovation, Dewey ideals, and the prospect for a social reform curriculum unfinished. Progressive educators become the next generation of 'orthodox mainstream' rather than remain separate and

agitate for meaningful democratic reforms. The merger leaves critical theorists as lone soldiers in continuing the public battle while other educators signal retreat by immersing within the system. Herf (1999) describes the problem of becoming the object that you are most critical in this way, “On the one hand, critical theory meant that the vision of a better society should be prefigured in the way a social movement behaves, and that social change requires individual autonomy and rationality (p. 281). Both of these assertions precluded any return to Marxism-Leninism and certainly to Stalinism or a new cult of personality” (p. 281). Herf (1999) is speaking to the legacy of the New Left or liberal movement in 1960s and the impact the movement has upon capitalist social structures. He sums the contributions radical groups such as Students for Democratic Society make to contemporary America when he writes, “I think we did have something to do with making this a more just and tolerant and less racist society. The second wave of feminism and the gay movement both gained impetus from 1968 and they have fought a great fight to change this society immeasurably for the better. The values of economic and social equality and of more equal distribution of wealth and income that we advocated are especially necessary in our gilded and, as ‘welfare reform’ are indicating, often cruel age” (p. 289). Herf credits the commitment by the Frankfurt School to give life to critical theory. “The New Left generation,” writes Herf (1999) “is a historical reproduction of Dewey’s progressive philosophy and of anarchical theory fused to neo-Marxist idealism transported from Europe by members of the Frankfurt School. Marcuse and other German philosophers who influence the idealism of many of his generation as well as American society” (p. 281). The question not answered by Herf and progressives is why public education continues to mire in a curriculum of Capitalism. One possible answer is

progressive educators are not public champions. The curriculum of Capitalism is too dominant of a force against educators. Progressive educators will not win the battle without meaningful public support for reform of social Capitalism.

Progressive educators and progressive social reformers are not without blame for the present situation. Progressives fail to recognize the limits of the real world of public school educators by the orthodoxy, authoritative control, and corporate culture perniciously invading the classroom. By not tempering idealism with realism, progressives are losing the battle to orthodox educators favoring standardization and greater control over curriculum decisions. Progressives and non- progressives agree that race, class, and gender undermine efforts for democratic reform. Even colleagues working in the traditional mode of teacher education programs agree on this point. Progressive educators can be at the forefront of democratic change by nudging their colleagues into thinking more progressively and then model actions that achieve a greater democratic influence on education. Progressive educators can expand their sphere of influence into new frontiers of community the outliers of education and curriculum. 'Educator' is powerless as an agent for change; 'Educators' as members of a larger community empower others to change. Progressive educators cannot sit idly and expect the situation to improve. We must become anarchical practitioners of providing context and truth to curriculum.

The curriculum of Capitalism and standardization steals from educators the most valued tools of intellect and voice. Garrison (2000) reminds educators that while the experience of students outside of the classroom may be contradictory to democratic ideals, inside the classroom is in control of the educator. Educators have the power to

model the democratic ideals in the micro-cosmopolitan environment of an intimate classroom and explore how to put those ideals to practice in the larger macro-society. To reorient to a new discourse means that the language of the educator must be the language of the student; language of their race, the language of their class, and the language of their gender. Thomas and Schubert (1997) say, “Despite the language of winners and losers, none of the curriculum theories developed in this century have effectively “won over” the practice of schooling for any period of time, although elements of their proposal may have had influence in educational artifacts. Thus, the age of “progressive schools” is as much fiction as the age of social efficiency or the age of the “reconceptualist schools,” if by this is meant a pervasive influence on American schooling” (p. 4). Who can argue with the conclusion of Thomas and Schubert when one considers the current state of education in public schools?

Possibly Pinar (2001) is correct when he writes, “Repressed, does not mean gone, of course, only out of view” (p. 2). One possible explanation for the disappearance of progressive educators committed to anarchical change is that they intertwine too deep in the American fabric to make a difference. Chomsky writes (1999), “American liberalism and the corporate media will defend themselves against attack. But, their spirited acts of self-defense are not to be construed as a commitment to civil liberties or democratic principle, despite noble and self-serving rhetoric. Quite the contrary. They demonstrate a commitment to the principle that power must not be threatened or injured” (p. 305). The progressive education movement is under an avalanche of standardization foisted upon the system by a conservative education establishment, robbing it of democratic practice. The organized assault on educators and progressives is very effective in characterizing

progressive educators as undermining national interests, unpatriotic, and to blame for moral decline. Educators are unable to mount any significant dissent to the politics and policies of the empowered right leaving anarchists as the only voice willing to address the needs of disenfranchised peoples or causes.

To be an anarchist in a capitalist democratic social structure has very different meaning than that of history represented by Haymarket Riots or yearly protests against the WTO and globalization. “Anarchism as an ideology and anarchy as a lifestyle is not the same thing. Yet there is a sentimental connection between the two which tends to be very attractive to upper-class intellectuals” (von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, p. 656). Anarchist educators are committed to personal liberty, democratic processes, and protection of the disenfranchised. Anarchy curriculum is the antagonist to standardization and the nemesis of the curriculum of Capitalism. Commitment to personal freedom, concern for the disenfranchised, and a willingness to raise a voice of dissent irrespective of constructs of personal identity are authentic displays of educational anarchical philosophy. Educational anarchical philosophy is the legitimate expression of an uncommon faith in individuals to settle the most intimate details of their lives without the shackles of oppression hobbling their efforts. Dissent takes many forms such as music, art, literature, or taking personal responsibility for making the world a more equitable planet on which to live. If there is to be a socially just world, then resurrecting the progressive movement in education will happen when educational anarchists promote a new social democracy reconfiguring the curriculum of Capitalism by incorporating neo-Marxist social theory. In order for this idyllic reconfiguration of Capitalism to become a reality, it is critical that educators comprehend the enemy in the classroom, the curriculum of Capitalism.

The Belief System of the Curriculum of Capitalism

From their earliest experience in school of children, educators in public school in the United State teach students to believe that because their economic fortunes are greater than much of the world, that Capitalism is the only road to democratic behavior. Citizens of the United States conflate democracy with Capitalism, and as a result, the perception of any other form of governance other than the U.S. republic form of democracy is an anomaly. Moreover, U.S. citizens believe they hold a superior position from which to promote globally the curriculum of Capitalism. Economic morality promotes Capitalism as a superior authority from which to promote corporate and political interests; daresay a contemporary provincial colonialism based upon economics. This is nothing new as education and the hidden curriculum have a history record of indoctrination and propagandizing to a particular worldview. Education is far more political than idealistic or altruistic. A student of the history of education is hard-pressed not to recognize the apparent paradox between reproduction of nationalistic ideals, originated and singularly native to United States, and the contradiction of how Capitalism as an economic system produces unequal distribution of wealth to poverty, class distinctions, and a society with equally skewed social priorities falling along the lines of class.

History is evidence of the power of Capitalism to weaken, undermine, or in some instances destroy burgeoning Marxist, Socialist, or Communist controlled economies; even those if given time, might be friendly to the policies of the United States. In terms of creating wealth as measured by GNP, Capitalism appears to have an upper hand. Scholars

as Dmitriyev (2010)⁵ believe the collapse of Marxists economies is due to the persistent challenge by Capitalists to destroy the governing structures of competing systems.

Dmitriyev suggests Marxist governments under increasing pressure and threat of invasion from hostile capitalists' governments, force Marxist oriented governments to allocate increasing amounts of capital away from creating democratic social systems and reallocate capital to the defense of the country. Dmitriyev cites examples from history such as the invasion by Hitler's Germany of Russia, Cold War politics of the United States, and the Vietnam War. His argument is that Capitalism has a longer historic presence as a global economic structure than Marxism and due to unprecedented attacks from foreign governments; a true Marxist democratic state has not had adequate time to organize.

Conservatives argue that the path to true democracy is paved with Capitalism reinforcing the notion that democracy and Capitalism are inseparable. Progressives and neo-Marxists counter that if this is true there will be greater attention paid to human rights, liberalization of the media, and a transition to open elections resulting in representative democratic governments. The two largest Communist countries in the world may participate in capitalist global markets, but clearly have no interest in U.S. style democratization. This does not preclude the notion that Russia or China may have a different design for democracy more in line with the cultural histories of the countries (Hui, 1998). The World Bank (Staff Editors & Reports, 2010) publishes numerous reports documenting economic status and standard of living of countries such as Russia

⁵ Revision to dissertation text suggested by Dr. Dmitriyev, Chair of the dissertation committee February 8, 2010.

or China. One conclusion from these reports as it relates to economic growth of a number of nations, not just Russia or China, is the exploitation of resources of fossil fuels (natural gas, oil, and coal) and cheap labor fuels economic expansion. The primary driver of economic growth is capitalist oriented transnational corporations in search of the commodities readily available in Russia and China. Various publications of the World Bank (2010) commend Russian and China for a commitment to poverty elimination programs. Improvement is occurring in these two socialist states whereas in the democratic republic of the United States, poverty is on the increase (United Nations Dept. of Public Information, 2010). Economic indicators are one part of story in defining democracy.

In contrast to these countries, U.S. citizens possess elements of freedom not available to citizens in social democracies, or even in some cases, parliamentary democracies. The perception is that citizens of many Latin American countries, China, or Russia have less personal liberty. This fact is the basis for how the curriculum of Capitalism lays claim to the notion of liberty is a function of capitalist economics. It is fair to make this claim, but it is equally fair to claim that democracy and social justice as framed through the economic model of Capitalism *does not* necessarily create socially just societies any more than other governing structures. How one defines the elements, standards, and measures of a democratic society is critical to comprehending the concept that a pure model of Capitalism taught by educators in classrooms across the United States is as utopian as pure Marxism. The concept of democratic behavior symbolized by U.S. Capitalism differs from that of equivalent European models.

The strength of the European model is the balance between economic and social welfare policy. The supposed weakness of the European model is the tax structure that by comparison with the United States is considerably higher than comparable European rates as reported by The World Bank (2010). Reliable statistics as to how citizens perceive taxation and the services taxes pay for is difficult to locate. Citizens of the United States believe they pay too much tax in exchange for the level of services the government provides. One unique feature of the culture of the curriculum of Capitalism is the basic distrust of government expressed by the belief that taxation is a less efficient system of investing in social-welfare programs than privatization and private capital investment. The Europeans fund social welfare programs with taxes and seem to have less of an aversion to paying for the benefits through public funds rather than private. In the U.S., citizens maintain a curious notion of equating democracy with levels of taxation rates – the perception is the lower the taxes the more democratic the country – leading students to the misperception that democracy and taxation policy are one in the same. Funding for social services such as public education is a critical element of the responsibility of citizens, but the relationship with democracy is less than clear.

The critical question is what is democratic *enough* to satisfy the proponents of the curriculum of Capitalism and still concede the possibility that social democracies such as the European Union behave democratically equal to the U.S. model? Is tax policy an equitable measure of democracy? In addressing issues of poverty, interpreting the World Bank reports imply the efforts of Russia and China appear to be more successful than the U.S. effort. If eliminating poverty is a measure of democracy, then U.S. efforts are moving backwards. The indirect costs of not funding adequately education, drug

intervention programs, health insurance, unemployment, and many other programs aimed at the economic underclass is paid for by transfers of wealth lost to criminal activity, donations to private charities, increase cost of products, or business enterprises no longer being competitive in global markets. U.S. citizens pay for social programs as well as for the consequences of not having a social safety net, just not through a system of taxation. Democracy by design is not efficient. The objective of democratic government is to slow the legislative process in order to give voice and protection to the largest number of citizens possible. It takes time to build consensus and consensus building is a messy enterprise at best.

Government run programs are not always the most efficient in comparison with private enterprise, but they place the human interest first, not the interest of the private investor seeking to maximize profits. Woodbridge (1907) believes promoters of the curriculum of Capitalism assume limited government is good government and this belief remains an integral part of the social system and culture. The curriculum of Capitalism operates on the assumption that government will never achieve the same level of efficiency as the private sector. This assumption may be true for the delivery of mail or the construction of a road system, but may not be accurate for social welfare services, as these do not have competitive elements as integral parts of their systems. Investigating and comprehending the elements of the curriculum of Capitalism is essential to restructuring the curriculum and setting a course for reformation.

Other assumptions of the curriculum of Capitalism include but are not limited:

- (1) Increasing public financing or public subsidy propels a government towards adopting socialism.

- (2) One measure of the success of democracy is low tax rates. Taxes are confiscatory and anti-liberty.
- (3) The primary objective for public education is to create new sources of labor and to respond to labor shortages in various industries. Education not related to labor and production is superfluous (i.e. – art, music, humanities).
- (4) Labor unions are unnecessary in free market capitalist systems. Labor unions are inherently corrupt and are fronts for socialism.
- (5) Government bailouts of financial markets and large industrial enterprises are antithetical responses to market systems and undermine the Capitalist philosophy of free market systems.
- (6) Corporate tax subsidies (labeled corporate welfare by progressives.) are less pernicious rational investments than nationalization of selected commercial enterprises.
- (7) The global free market system is free from international interference – operating by consensus and international cooperation.
- (8) Social welfare systems operate more efficiently and have measurably higher rates of achievement through privatization, funding is by private investment, and accountable to competition in the market place.
- (9) The measure of efficiency is by cost effectiveness and the measure of effectiveness is by the positive impact of a policy resolving a social problem; these concepts are the same (pragmatic reactive approach). Seldom do solutions to social problems resolve inexpensively and without a degree of ineffectiveness, as they tend to be generational as well as unique to the individual.

(10) Corporations are altruistic organizations creating wealth for workers.

Government is a confiscatory organization – consuming wealth through taxation.

The myth of the free market system is that it is neither free, nor is it market based as students are led to believe. The curriculum of Capitalism perpetuates the myth of the free market while simultaneously couching corporate welfare as an instrument to balance the unfair trade practices of other less democratic countries that supply U.S. consumers with an infinite number of cheap products. Without taxpayer funded government subsidy, many global commodities are not competitive with other similar products from other countries. How does the intrusion into the free market government subsidy square with the rabid advocates of Capitalism and free market systems? It seems proponents of the curriculum of Capitalism are very clever at obscuring the contradiction between free enterprise with government tax subsidy. It is not taxation, rather *investment* in U.S. manufacturing that fund jobs. Trade agreements such as NAFTA and CAFTA open foreign markets for U.S. manufacturers while supplying consumers with foreign products that we no longer manufacture on our shores. The reality is that “we the people” subsidize through tax transfers transnational corporations at the expense of increasing funds to education, healthcare, and social welfare systems.

Manufacturing occurs in cheap labor third world countries and corporate presence in the United States exist as shell corporations legally operating with the specific purpose of obtaining federal dollars to pay dividends to savvy corporate investors around the globe. Federal tax dollars enable corporations to play this shell game – find the low cost manufacturer – to perfection.

The transfer of wealth by taxation policies and conversion to government subsidies (progressives term – government investment) is a linguistic sleight of hand. Public investment is acceptable when corporate interests are not in competition for the market or the consumer. This linguistic twist of ‘public investment’ substituted for ‘tax subsidy’ becomes clear by comparing education to universal healthcare. How is the public financing of universal public education different from the public financing of universal healthcare? Americans socialize one part of government (education) without dissent and forgo socializing healthcare as antithetical to the free market and Capitalism. The contradiction is clear; the curriculum of Capitalism promotes the notion that corporations self-determine which social policies are beneficial. The ringing of cash registers and the cacophony of traders on world stock exchanges drown out the voices of citizens. The magnitude of the influence of corporations on public policy threatens democratic reform and undermines efforts by educators to produce students with a broad perspective of the world. The 2009 world economic crisis where the United States government and other governments infused trillions of dollars into failing financial institutions, tax subsidies, or capital infusions through transfers of tax dollars into various industries is evidence of where “corporate government” fails to protect the interests of public citizens. The irony is that transnational corporations and most of the leadership in government with a straight face simultaneously attempt to persuade that Capitalism in its present state is a credible economic system while putting generations of future citizens at risk by bankrolling poor investment decisions.

Citizens around the globe are financing the risk while transnational corporations and their investors continue to horde the profits. Democracy suffers as social welfare

systems designed to protect citizens from catastrophic economic disasters are underfunded all the while trillions of dollars of aid is diverted away from citizens in need in order to prop up transnational corporate-governments. Corporations are in charge of governing much of the world as the boardroom has more influence than citizens do. The curriculum of Capitalism promoted globally has no answer for the collapse of the global free market system. In truth, the curriculum of Capitalism makes no explanation or apology as in their view, the collapse is necessary to re-arrange the world's financial system in order to gain a greater stake in controlling production and increasing influence in the halls of governments. The proponents of the system continue to profit at the expense of global citizens and without regard to the consequences of years of neglect to the social welfare needs of human beings. Co-conspirator to these obscene acts is the promoters of the curriculum of Capitalism referring to themselves as 'educators' in the public education system.

The truth is that the public education system promotes a utopian Capitalism that singularly does not exist just as Communist countries promote a socialist agenda that has yet to produce the systemic changes to make global social justice and democracy a reality. Capitalist or Marxist economics will not work as efficiently as promoted, nor will either system obliterate the other – the world economic superstructure will not allow failure as virtually every economy is in a state of economic symbiosis with one another. Within the framework of democracy, socialism, theocracy, or dictatorship is the recognition that while governments may promote one governing system over others, economics will determine the relationships of power. Though governments accuse others of human rights violations, fraudulent democracies, and illegitimate organizations,

economic power is the real governing authority in the global society. Social justice is a delusion and the concept of an empowering democratic society is becoming as illusive. In reality, governments are co-conspirators with corporations manipulating economic systems in perpetuating policies that are not conducive to creating a socially just world. The shadowy world of corporations operating across national boundaries labeled *too big to fail* is evidence that something has gone awry in the world's social responsibilities and economic priorities. Government advisory boards, cabinets, and appointed positions are auctioned off to the highest corporate bidder providing unlimited access to highest levels of the decision making process. It is difficult to distinguish between government regulators and corporate board of directors. The republic is now comprised not of citizens and public servants, but citizen – consumers and private – corporate investors.

The current state of public education vividly demonstrates how corporatization of public spaces is captive to economic policy and how economics is the surrogate for social policy. Funding for education is clear example of how progressive policies towards social justice are captive to corporate influences on government, a skewed system of taxation, taxation policy, and distribution of taxes. This situation is not new as Veblen (1957) decries the loss of academic freedom, the ability to conduct research free of corporate interference, and the chase for funding by compromise with corporate donors. Dewey (2005) writes, “But the revolution is not complete. The idea still prevails that a truly cultural or liberal education cannot have anything in common, directly at least, with industrial affairs, and that the education which is fit for the masses must be a useful or practical education in a sense which opposes useful and practical to nurture of appreciation and liberation of thought” (p. 280).

In reference to the change in economics and the affect upon public education, Dewey (2005) claims that public financing of schools changes the monopoly of education to a few privileged families and cautions that public school education of the masses mires in occupational curriculum (p. 280). Dewey's theme of corporate corruption of public education echoes in Du Bois's attack upon corporate funding of universities.

Du Bois (2001) accuses Fisk University of selling the control of the institution to a select group of white investors, the consequence being a dramatic change in the mission and vision of Fisk University. "For a long time a powerful section of the white South has offered to give its consent and countenance to the higher learning of Negroes only on condition that the white South control and guide that education. And it is possible that for a million dollars the authorities of Fisk University have been asked either openly or by implication to sell to the white South control of the institution" (p. 80). A consistent theme of Marcuse (1991) and Feyerabend (2002) is the incursion by corporations utilizing large corporate grants to fund their political agenda and covertly hide the agenda from the public under the guise of the perception of credibility of institutions of higher learning. Lessing (1997) is not free from corporate pressure to revise her work to make racial relations between white females and black males more tawdry, salacious, and sexual so that her books are marketable to a racially curious audience. The curriculum of Capitalism fosters all of these perverse corporate philosophies by limiting the worldview of students and by not promoting critical thinking. The move towards standardization and a national curriculum is an example of assembly line social policy whereas the belief is that if it works on the assembly line of an industrial plant, the theoretical application will work on social policy as well.

The problem with this kind of thinking is that for the most part, assembly line production fled the shores of the United States and relocated to less developed countries many years ago. A short drive through any large urban city will easily confirm by observation the shells of a number of vacated and decaying industries as they abandon the U.S. for low cost labor countries. Many scholarly texts in a number of fields debate the merit of the benefit or loss of benefit to the U.S. economy and the decline of production capability to foreign transfer. White, Bloch, and Frosch (1985) describe the effects, "The primary long term-effect of international transfer of new technology is that it shifts the location of industrial activity. This had important political and economic impact both abroad and in the United States. A relocation of the site of production shifts many of the benefits of production and trade as well" (p. 79). The curriculum of Capitalism continues to support a curriculum based on an anachronistic paradigm and the nostalgic notion that the United States is the center for world manufacturing, which virtually any contemporary statistic of economic activity disproves. New technology and exporting labor costs to cheaper third world labor markets has a greater impact on manufacturing than a commitment to a free market system.

Moreover, the deconstruction of manufacturing in the United States creates a class system based on the capital of technology; technologically savvy citizens are able to compete in the world market whereas those who are skilled laborers have no options as skilled labor in manufacturing is considered a third world occupation. Outsourcing, better termed importation of 'intellectual capital and outsourcing of wealth', affects even the most technologically skilled and educated citizen in a detrimental fashion. Rather than improve upon the public system of education in this country to create the type of

technologically skilled positions needed to compete in the global economy, corporations import less expensive workers from foreign countries or export technology projects to other countries. Ironically, corporations are *unwilling to invest* in the public education system preferring instead to blame, attack, and demean graduates of public school systems for being under educated, lacking in critical thinking skills, lacking in commitment, and less skilled than their foreign counterparts are. The same corporations promote the philosophy of nationalization of education standards as a means to measure academic progress or as a cynic might assert, to have the ability to rationalize the importation of intellectual capital when students underperform against the artificial constructs of the standards.

The philosophy of standardization promoted by corporations does not produce any measurable improvements in fields outside of manufacturing. Standardization may lower production costs in many manufacturing plants, but the highest costs in production are labor and labor related benefits. Labor is a human activity and how humans react to different environments, stress, and acquisition of knowledge is not an activity that standardization is effective as it is in a repetitive item in production. Driving costs of production lower by standardization is only to a point— a low cost point that reductions from standardization cannot fall below without a drop in the quality of the finished product. Are the social ills plaguing society, the lower than expected academic performance of public school students, and the loss of competitiveness by U.S. corporations are the result of the emphasis of the curriculum of Capitalism on low costs? Has the public education system reached the tipping point where the quality of the educational experience is compromised? More importantly, is the cost to produce an

educated functioning citizen in a democratic society a rational measure for the success of a public education system. Creating functioning critical thinking democratic citizens is not cheap and the formula for deriving the calculation by corporate and government leaders is flawed.

The basis for comparison utilizes a corporate model of production whereby the average pupil expenditure in the public sector is equivalent in the private sector to capital investment. Return on investment is a function of comparing the amount expended to a standardized test scores, either by state or by nation.^{iv} Governments and corporations seize on the point that by this methodology the United States invests more dollars into education and receive a smaller return as public school students score lower on standardized academic assessments than other countries that spend less, but test higher. The curriculum of Capitalism capitalizes on a simplistic comparison to support the notion that public education system needs reform, but the reform should follow the same path as manufacturers utilizing the tools of standardization, competition, and other cost cutting strategies in order to improve the return on investment. Ironically, many of the corporations calling for reforms in educations are abandoning the United States for the cheaper costs of third world countries as they are unable to reduce their own costs and maintain quality. Does that mean that education soon will import educators from other countries as a source of less expensive labor to instruct students assuming the adoption of the corporate model for production? A 2006 CBS news program featured foreign educators recruited to the United States. “While the United States is working to keep some immigrants from coming to live here, it’s actively seeking others. CBS News correspondent Wyatt Andrews reports that thousands of teachers are recruited from

abroad each year.”⁶ The reality is educators now have to concern themselves with foreign competition and labor cost as a factor in determining if the field of education is their chosen career path. Recruiting foreign educators underscores how much influence corporations and the curriculum of Capitalism has upon public education.

The comparison of expenditures by country argument has many flaws notwithstanding the comparison does not take into account differences between cultures, currency exchange rates, length of the academic year, and number of children receiving education services. While corporations are quick to blame the public education system for the decline in manufacturing, in fact, the decline in U.S. manufacturing is in part the result of favorable tax treatment of transnational corporations by the federal government. Meanwhile the public education system remains steadfast instructing students in outmoded curriculum that reflects pre-Cold War production mentality (Fullan, 2009). The transfer of manufacturing wealth occurs despite all of the improvements and cost efficiencies from gains attributed to standardization. Labor remains the highest expense and no standardization beyond wage reductions can compensate for the lower cost of labor in other less developed countries. How many products that promote the “made in America stamp” are under production with products manufactured in the United States? How much intellectual capital do U.S. corporations recruit from foreign countries rather than invest in strengthening Math and Science curriculum in the public school system?

⁶ Source: CBS News Website. <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2006/06/06/eveningnews/main1689748.shtml>, *Filling the classroom void: U.S. schools are recruiting foreign teachers to fill shortage*, Retrieved February 19, 2009.

Veblen (1957) is right when he predicts the corporatization of education will lead to a less educated society and to the ultimate decline in social welfare of its citizens. The investment in the curriculum of Capitalism is 'too big to fail'; the notion that corporatization of education and standardization will cure the ills of education even though the world economy that practices a similar philosophy is at a point of collapse. The pedagogy of the curriculum of Capitalism is discordant with the current reality of a global economy and a weak social structure.

The pedagogical practices promoting the curriculum of Capitalism have little in common with the actual lives of many of the students and their families that are isolated by race, class, and gender (Garrison, 2000). The organizational hierarchy and pedagogical practices are hand-me-downs of past European tradition and philosophical ideology contradicting the reality of a social structure that is closer to pragmatic Capitalism than social Marxism. Public school educators will deny contained within these traditions is a hint of German Marxist leaning philosophical framework. Dewey (2004) refers to the influence of German philosophical ideology upon education and describes vividly the organizational structure of the German education system. Coincidentally or by design, the U.S. public school education system is eerily similar; "Now Germany is the modern state which provides the greatest facilities for general ideas to take effect through social inculcation. Its system of education is adapted to that end" (p.14-15). Dewey is describing the influence upon the social structure of the German education system with the influence of Capitalism on the social structure of the United States. Dewey's point is not to cast negative dispersion upon public education, rather to simply acknowledge public education is a vehicle for social change. Rather negative or a positive influence,

only the public can adjudicate the consequence of the influence. The contradiction in public education is the curriculum of Capitalism claims a naive idealistic notion that education is under *public control*.

The lack of freedom to teach beyond standardized curriculum; corporatization of the education system; the expansion of government supervision in the classroom; corporate advertising crowding virtually every blank nook in schools; autocratic unions protecting the spoils system, not the educator – are in direct contradiction with the notion of *public* schools and with *democratic* ideals. These operational frameworks help to sustain support for a specific worldview that dismisses the notion that other forms of democracy can co-exist with U.S. interests. The prescription to counter the prevailing-failing education system is renewing the commitment to the progressive agenda emphasizing improving the social welfare of students first and pedagogical promotion of critical thinking outside of a particular type of economic system. The failure of public education to promote democratic ideals such as the end of class, gender, and race as a determinant factor in the successful integration of all citizens into benefiting from the U.S. economic system is a consequence of the clash between organizational structures colliding with incompatible idealism.

United States citizens, of course, do not want to believe this to be true as we bury deep in the national collective consciousness the belief that American idealism, democracy, and Capitalism are inseparable components of freedom and the ultimate measure of social justice. We believe we are unique in the world and occupy a position of moral superiority in matters of government. We believe that anything other than the U.S. system of democratic republic government is an inferior system to promote democratic

behavior or social justice. We believe that a superior adversary, Capitalism, has eradicated all forms and derivatives of Marxism (communism, socialism, democratic-socialism, etc.). Citizens of the United States cannot overcome the sense of superiority or come to an understanding that much of global governance is cultural and historical as well as expressed through the political. The brevity of our history of democratic governing in comparison to the rest of the world does not influence the U.S. worldview to think differently and obscures the simple truth that many governments operate extraordinarily efficiently, even those in less than democratic countries. In this respect democracy takes many forms, some more liberal, some less, but functioning nonetheless.

To this end, our citizens find the nation frequently meddling or in a quagmire in the affairs of nations that pose no immediate threat to our own way of life. Blustering third world countries seeking recognition on the international stage preoccupy and distract citizens from achieving the promise of social reform as the utilization of too many financial assets go overseas to prop up governments friendly to the policy of the United States. If public education is a failure in a glaring way, it is in providing students a worldview less defined by egocentric (economic-centricity) economic views of Capitalism to the exclusion of other potential evolving economic systems whose foundations are built upon long historic cultural as well as political reality. These omissions in the curriculum lead public school students to conclude that every government flirting with derivative of neo-Marxist economic or social democracy as a social structure is the enemy and the United States has a moral obligation to undermine them through any means possible. In the same way Marx believes in the implosion of Capitalism due to a proletariat revolution, the U.S. education system is in danger of

collapse and is in need of peaceful anarchical change. It is time for revolution – *an educational revolution*. Is there a role for Marxist social theory as a method to re-energize and revive public education and retooling curriculum to acknowledge education is a broader concern than job creation? To believe that there may be a place in the international system for a neo-Marxist ally state, that U.S. foreign policy needs to adopt policies that have greater cultural understanding in particular with relationships with developing nations, is bold, controversial, and the perception is potentially anti-American. *It is the education system that should promote novel ideas, innovation, and progressive social agendas*; not politicians hamstrung by corporate donations and products of years of enslavement to the myths promoted by the curriculum of Capitalism.

This in no way suggests that there are not oppressive regimes who act in despicable manners. The present day dictator or military run government are evidence that when left unaccountable, fascist dictatorships will supplant weak democratic oriented governments who trace their origins to a belief in personal liberty lifting humanity. International bilateral cooperation, not unilateral militarism is the response to governments trampling on the rights of citizens. In a world more integrated by economics than by ideology, the thesis is that the public education system produces citizens who hold to an antiquated and pre-Cold War mentality contradictory to the global progressive movement. While the curriculum of Capitalism promotes globalization and the need for occupational curriculum –preparing students to compete in a global economy – the public schools mass-produce students with parochial perspectives who know less about the world and in many cases, less about their own government. Public school students the United States lack understanding of whom their competitors are or even if in a global

economic system, if cooperation can replace fierce economic competition resulting in a democratic world society. The system of public education is pedagogically apathetic as it relates to democracy, forged from antiquated industrial social welfare policies, promotes a curriculum of Capitalism that is not relevant to modern global economics, and promotes a contradictory if not contrarian antiquated worldview.

In truth, citizens of the United States should not be surprised when other governments educate their people to view the United States as the enemy. The education system continually reproduces anti-foreign views. Nearby are neighbor countries to the United States that are neo-Marxist governments and while worldwide movements for democracy evolve by historical, cultural, and political orientation public education continue to promote the egocentric view that U.S. Capitalism is the only path to authentic democracy. How much influence does the European philosophy have upon U.S. public education and pedagogy? Is the organization structure of the public schools contradictory to democratic practice? Has the public education system been co-opted by economic interests to the point that democracy is a sub-text, social justice is conflated with government handout/welfare, and stereotypes of race, gender, and class are preserved within the hidden curriculum of Capitalism? Can the curriculum of Capitalism be reconstructed to include diverse discourses of race, class, and gender? The belief system of the curriculum of Capitalism argues against a positive reaffirmation of democratic values and democratic ideals. Thus, we shift from the micro the values that comprise the curriculum of Capitalism to broader concerns of the model for influence.

Paradigms of the Curriculum of Capitalism

Making sense of the curriculum of Capitalism is no easy task. Since the youngest age of educational experience, educators teach public school students a singularly narrow interpretation of American and world history. Years of indoctrination and the teaching of quaint cultural myths as truth lead many students to believe that society is free of race, class, and gender distinctions. Public school students and citizens have not a “false consciousness” rather a “*faux* consciousness” that leads to an inability to confront issues of race, class, and gender on an intellectual level free of the shrill rhetoric characterizing public debate in the United States. In contemporary society the tendency to marginalize issues of race, class, and gender dominate the potential for maturation and understanding through civil discourse. The key element of a democratic and civil society is the commitment to equality for all citizens. Experiencing equality translates to citizens having commensurate value in the eyes of government, but most importantly in the minds of other citizens. The curriculum of Capitalism assigns value based upon production of wealth – the Wall Street broker has literally and figuratively a higher net worth than that of the migrant farm worker. Manual labor producing wealth has little value, but trading in the wealth that manual labor produces has greater value.

Perhaps a global example is more appropriate. Few global citizens identify with either Wall Street or the corporate agricultural practices in the United States. The experience of the migrant worker, which research supports comprises substantively of Latin American origination, provides clues underscoring the effectiveness of the curriculum of Capitalism hiding truths of social Capitalism and the depth of influence large transnational corporations have upon the educational experience of public school

students. For many leaders in Latin American countries as well as citizens, Che is an archetype from which leadership and socio-political expression originates. Che remains an icon for resistance of social Capitalism though his death was more than forty years ago. McLaren (1999) utilizes Che to add context to the curriculum of Capitalism and to emphasize the struggle progressive educators face in an orthodox conservative education system. “As progressive educators throughout the United States, having been pulled into the ferocious orbit of the current transnational phase of bargain basement Capitalism, remain bound up in the confusion among territoriality, class struggle, and the nation state, the spirit of Che Guevara continues to haunt the moral conscience of all those who refuse to dedicate themselves to the pursuit of freedom and justice” (McLaren, 1999, p. 276). Che ‘haunts the moral conscience’ is a hyperbolic overstatement by McLaren, but the archetypal Che⁷ represents a far broader constituency than Latin America. Che as the archetypal orthodox Marxist broadens the discourse beyond the immediate problems of Latin America to include global economics and the social implications of monopolistic ownership of the productive capabilities in a global economy. As a critic of Capitalism, Che advances the notion that Capitalism is a disempowering force for democracy. Critics include Che in the personality cult of Marxists pantheon of Lenin, Stalin, and Castro in an effort to discredit the social commentary aspects of this revolutionary leader (Papastehpanou, 2006 and D'Souza, 2005).

As was and still is the case with many Latin American and other countries, exporting agricultural products is the largest source for employment for unskilled labor.

⁷ ‘Che’ is the name that Ernesto Che Guevara is best known.

As an example, Cuba has limited manufacturing capabilities. Lack of production facilities result in the exportation of large quantities of raw unrefined sugar cane to outside production facilities. This is an attempt to satisfy the world market for inexpensive refined sugar. The imposition of the Cuban Embargo by Eisenhower, reauthorized by Kennedy, and subsequently reauthorized in one form or another by every president since, is marginally a politically effective economic sanction because export of Cuban sugar cane continues to find its way into U.S. products even though the embargo has been in place for nearly fifty years. In response to the embargo, Cuba shifts its exports to other countries avoiding U.S. regulation. As with most embargos, raw materials from the embargoed country continue to find its way onto the global market. New production or substitutes from new technology produces products (corn sugar and artificial sweeteners) reducing the need for Cuban sugar cane. The embargo does not reduce the global availability of products from sugar cane, the demand for sugar, or hurt the Cuban government as manufacturers replace sources for one raw material with another or purchase through third-party brokers Cuban sugar cane without interrupting production and sales of product.

Che (Guevara, 1987) writes, “But what is Cuba’s main problem if not the same as all of Latin America, the same as even enormous Brazil with its millions square kilometers and with its land of marvels that is a whole continent? The one-crop economy. In Cuba, we are slaves to sugarcane, the umbilical cord that binds us to the large northern market. We must diversify our agricultural production, stimulate the industry. And we must ensure our minerals and agricultural products, and – in the near future – our industrial production; go to the markets that are best suited for us and by means of our

own transport lines” (p. 70). As present day evidence suggests, Capitalism fails to move Cuba in the direction of a socially responsible democratic society. On a global scale, it bears noting Cuba is not the only country ‘one failure’ away from catastrophic disaster. Though the curriculum of Capitalism promotes the notion of stability, recent catastrophic global economic failures offer a contrasting view and evidence to the contrary. Moreover, while the curriculum of Capitalism promotes the quaint notion that international behavior is controllable by tweaking rogue nations thorough international economic sanctions or embargoes, this again proves to be a dubious claim.

One may go so far as to interpret existing evidence to conclude the embargo impedes not facilitates a Cuban embrace of a liberalizing democracy. The example Che does provide in reference to the curriculum of Capitalism is that revolutionary praxis is the function of leadership not by economic coercion so often prevalent in global affairs today. “The guerilla,” writes Guevara (1962), “provides ideology for social reform by personal example – by his ideas, his plans, and his lessons from experience” (p. 31). The revolutionary begins the revolution in the schoolhouse and it is with no small twist of irony, Guevara dies there. One of the last persons to see Guevara alive is a twenty-two year old teacher (Resnick, 1970). At the end of Guevara’s life, dying from wounds inflicted in a gun battle, lying in a corner of a rural schoolhouse in a remote area of Bolivia, Guevara summons the schoolteacher to his side. “You know that in Cuba there are no schools like this one,” Che added softly. We would call this a prison. How can the

children of the campesinos⁸ study here...it's antipedagogical" (p. 275). Can the same be said of the experience of U.S. students attending public schools trapped in a curriculum oblivious to the negation of poverty, race, class, and gender; it is antipedagogical.

To understand the curriculum of Capitalism is to probe experientially how a citizen interacts within an environment of democracy. The contrasting of natures of democracy as a function of economics results in numerous contradictions and differing interpretations. Guevara's example is not unique to how many global citizens experience Capitalism and how they relate to the notions of democracy by pro-western governments. Race, class, and gender shade a person's cognitive perception of democracy. In the previous example, common sense leads readers to conclude the experience of a migrant worker cannot compare with that of a Wall Street broker and that Capitalism does little to change oppressive governments. In some Latin American corners, Guevara holds the position of status identical to Thomas Paine in American culture.

Common sense may argue these examples extreme and the comparison unfair, but the counterargument is that general observations of citizens as they go about their daily activities yield a diverse set of examples that manifest strikingly similar conclusions concerning how citizens experience democracy. For example, what may an observer conclude from observing the experience of a Muslim Cleric's perception of democracy, racially profiled in United States airport, than that of a white middle class male businessman traveling through the same airport? Is the experience of a gay male in the

⁸ Campesinos translate to 'peasants or farm worker'. Campesinos have a negative connotation comparable to a poor sharecropper or tenant farmer in the English language. *Source:* <http://www.wordiq.com/definition/Campesino>

military different from the heterosexual soldier standing next to him? Can anyone honestly believe the experience of a single African American female is the same as the middle class white soccer mom? These scenarios are vastly different paradigms from which to experience democracy in action, yet all too common. The curriculum of Capitalism promotes the notion that in a democratic society all citizens are treated the same, equal treatment under the law. If this is the case then the courtroom experience of a young Hispanic male arrested for possession of drugs will be the same as for a drug possession charge against a white middle class male. Incarceration statistics prove otherwise. Race, class, and gender play a role in the experience of democracy and determine the perception of democracy.

The curriculum of Capitalism functions in different paradigms, the first a paradigm that disavows the experience of democracy is different by race, class, and gender as well as not acknowledging society does not treat citizens equally. The question arises how to best unravel the contradiction resulting from lived experience and the expectation of democracy projected by the curriculum of Capitalism. Responding to this question is critical to how public schools educate students in matters of race, class, gender, and social awareness. McLaren (1999) suggests a partnership between critical pedagogy and education can facilitate equitability leading to positive social change. "I want to emphasize that the renewal of a Marxist approach to critical pedagogy that I envision does not conceptualize race and gender antagonisms as a static, structural outcome of the capitalist social relations of advantage and disadvantage but rather locates such antagonisms within a theory of agency that acknowledges the importance of cultural politics and social difference" (p. 286). McLaren's notion of a partnership is similar to

the concept of a theoretical model between Marxism and Capitalism, or Marcuse's critical theory. The partnership also suggests that Capitalism, as a curriculum needs revision. McLaren's position also indicates the role for educators is to facilitate critical thinking and ultimately empower students to produce positive changes in the social structure. The power may take form as economic or socio-political, both conceived in a progressive system for education.

Socio-economic and purchasing power or consumption form a second paradigm of Capitalism. Numerous credible sources document the disparity between gross and disposable income when reported by race, class, and gender. Purchasing power is the ability to expend cash resources or obtain and assume credit obligations. Consumption drives the economy. Participating in the Capitalist model demands that every consumer purchase products, even those that they cannot afford nor have a need. The curriculum of Capitalism makes a unique connection with purchasing power and democracy. Capitalists are very efficient in convincing citizens that to show love for country citizens need to spend and borrow beyond what they can afford. Tied to this notion is the promotion of the idea that by being a consumer a person is performing a patriotic service to society. By purchasing products, citizens create jobs, pay social welfare programs through taxes, and participate in the American dream. Construing democracy through the experience of the patriotic consumer and the economics of consumption are the basis for the second paradigm. Demonstrating the verity of the paradigm is the low rate of savings, high debt, and the trade deficit of U.S. citizens.^v The federal government and many state governments actively promote the sale of debt instruments ironically as investments and

promote buy-American-campaigns as in the best interest of patriotic citizens. The curriculum of Capitalism is very effective at linking patriotism to hyper-consumerism.

Within the context of hyper-consumerism and patriotism is a racial and gender component. The narrative of the curriculum of Capitalism reconciles racial and gender economics by pointing to the historic advancement in economic terms of disadvantaged minorities. The reality and a number of credible research studies bear this point, racial and gender minorities with equivalent education lag economically behind their white counterparts – an inconvenient fact to be ignored (NEA Research, 2009).⁹ The narrative teaches that the government aggressively monitors market place behavior and minority progress thereby eradicating racial and gender economic bias. All minority citizens by law have equal access to capital, employment, affirmative action programs, and other safety net programs that ensure economic parity. The curriculum of Capitalism promotes the notion capitalists in the free market system are in constant mode of expanding their market share and that discrimination is ‘bad for businesses. This leaves in play the possibility of market segmentation by race and gender for an array of consumer products. By obfuscating and reinterpreting history to align with the myth of equal opportunity the curriculum of Capitalism circumvents the contradiction between the experience of citizens in the marketplace, students in the classroom, and the curriculum taught in public schools. Negative public reaction to racial profiling is increasing though economic-racial profiling generates little or no negative reaction; it is the norm to segment economic markets by race, class, or gender.

⁹ Census Data from the U.S. Census Department tracks this phenomenon on an annual basis.

Contemporary racial profiling has roots in Madison Avenue marketing where sophisticated models of demographical information combine with consumer preference products. Race, class, and gender comprise significant segments of the economy and when data mining is efficient produces profitable results. From politics to potato chips, complex economic models predicting human behavior have a race, class, and gender component that when in the hands of unscrupulous organizations may find useful as tools for identification, polarization, and propagandizing. Utilizing race and gender as an excuse to eliminate potential rivals, to quell civil unrest, and provide a convenient target to blame for economic problems is not an exclusive policy of repressive regimes. Democratic governments use the same tactic – recalling just a few examples from United States history – the internment of the Japanese prior to World War I, the treatment of Native Americans, and lynching of African Americans as examples. Ethnic and racial economic constructs facilitate ambitious nationalism playing a role in the rise of many dictators. What is true is that government will use racial stereotyping to achieve a national objective. It is hard to argue though much of the public purpose is for the good, that Census data is not a form of government profiling.

Governments routinely build profiles of suspected or prospective enemies and promote negative representations to the public to muster support for international action. Within the narrative of the curriculum of Capitalism is a curious moralist attitude that encourages U.S. government to act as agents for change in the internal affairs of sovereign nations through the guise of economic development and creation of wealth. The exchange of financial incentives for support of U.S. ventures is a common tactic in global geo-politics. These transactions are disingenuous attempts to maintain the high

moral ground politically while all the while continuing back door trade relationships and in some cases, strengthening the economic binds with countries that the United States publicly disagrees. The curriculum of Capitalism promotes the notion of unilateral action even in seemingly innocuous financial transactions, though those transactions may be nothing more than a sophisticated bribe.

Some intellectuals surmise the actions of pro-capitalist democracies provide the perception of an external enemy that facilitates the rise and consolidation of power by dictatorial governments (Chomsky, 1999). Certainly, the previous example of Cuba is an example of the lack of progressive change. Whether true or not is subject to debate. The curriculum of Capitalism has effectively countered Socialists' ideas by broadly painting Socialism as unstable, economically unsustainable, and antithesis to capitalist democracy. Cuba again is the closest example to the United States. Sirota (2001) characterizes the reconceptualized position of Marxism, "The idea of neo-Marxism is commonly associated with what has become known as the thesis of the relative-autonomy of the state. Instead of following Marx in seeing the state as the apparatus of class domination, neo-Marxists conceive of it as having its own dynamic which is at least relatively independent of class interest and direction, consequently they see it as possessing the potential to represent more general or universal interests" (p. 43). Sirota affirms the idea that in coming years, social systems will adapt to the new realities of globalization and begin to accommodate a broader concern for diversity in economic matters. Currently, racial and gender economics are worldwide phenomenon played globally on the field of class. Products not good enough for U.S. or European consumption are re-routed to unsuspecting third world economies where consumers have limited choice of goods

produced locally and the U.S. or European branding carries an elevated value in terms of social status. Seemingly, a capitalist contradiction, shipping consumer goods to nations with incomes barely capable of feeding their population, is a subterranean strategy to colonize new sources for labor and raw materials. The exchange is less about financial remuneration and more about acquiring sources of natural resources, mineral rights, cheap labor, and military outposts. The first encounter with capitalists and democracy conceals a hidden agenda of economic deceit partially based upon the constructs of race, class, and gender economics.

If race, class, and gender taint the experience of global citizens with democracy is the earliest experience of U.S. public school children any different? Acquiring the constructs of race, class, and gender occurs in three ways. These are personal experience, observation, or reinforcement by instruction. The movement toward national standardization of curriculum by the government institutionalizes aspects of the curriculum that are negating to the cultural experience of students. Negation of cultural heritage is the third paradigm. Within the standardized curriculum of the public school system is a hidden curriculum figuratively “white washing” the regular school curriculum of historical truth and covering evidence of racial, class, and gender bias. The earliest experience of democracy in action for most citizens is in the public school classroom where the educator delivers standardized curriculum with little or no debate and critical analysis. Educators have little choice, as they are required to teach the curriculum guidelines and within the timeframes set by the state. Attendance is involuntary; students have no voice in the selection of materials, and compulsion by the state requires students to respond to curriculum by standardized assessment, usually in the form of multiple

choices, thus eliminating creativity or innovation in the response. Blocks of pre-allocated time define the school day; allocation of time for each curriculum item is a maximum number of minutes each day for instruction – set and monitored by the state. School buildings are monolithic in design containing little if any public space where students assemble to converse, socialize, or share ideas. Public schools monitor students by video camera and by constant proximity control. The paradox is that students need to be educated to think as democratic world citizens, but their school day experience is authoritarian, almost theocratic; but for certain, contradictory to producing democratic citizens. Other than copies of the original documents of the founders of America, democracy is not a characteristic of a public school system.

Compounding the contradiction of the school day is the personal experience of the student outside of the classroom attempting to cope with the obstacles presented by race, class, and gender, but not given the skill-sets or the practice within the safe environment of a school classroom. For many public school students, the curriculum reinforces the message of consumerism and class difference by corporate sponsorship of school events, peer pressure, media, and by observation of how different they are from others. The curriculum of Capitalism promotes a production line mentality approach as the optimal pedagogy in which to educate children. The pedagogy is occupationally oriented, produces laborers with narrow skills, and reproduces the cultural myths that sustain the curriculum in each successive generation.

Contradictory to the position to the curriculum of Capitalism are groups of curriculum theorists holding to the belief that grounds their pedagogical practices, which is race, class, and gender, need voice found in the agency of democracy. The classroom,

while currently not a public space encouraging expressions of freedom, is in dire need of liberalization – *de-standardization* – to include a broader mix of opinion expanding the classroom as an extension of public space. De Lissovoy and McLaren (2003) describe the clash between educators being accountable and the influence Capitalism exerts in the course of the school day. The public square is one corner of public space as technology such as the internet extends public space to global proportions. The backdrop of the typical public school classroom provides a poor context from which students learn socially just decisions. Democratic praxis is not easily achievable in a public school system whereby its construct is to educate to one worldview, the superiority of Capitalism as an economic theory and as the only choice to authentic democracy. De Lissovoy and McLaren (2003) remain skeptics the public school system is capable of radical change to the reality of a global economy and basing global relations on mutual understanding, not if the relationship is singularly good for facilitating financial transactions.

One key to understanding the curriculum of Capitalism is to comprehend the linguistic manipulations democratic capitalists use to define democracy and social justice. If the first paradigm is experience, the second hyper-consumerism, and the third standardization, then the fourth is reconceptualizing the meaning of democracy and Marxism to reconcile with the current global economic narrative. Seen within this context, how a nation treats citizens, the rights of citizens, and how a nation governs is of less significance than how a nation participates in the capitalist global economy. The curriculum of Capitalism distinguishes democracy from Marxism as a political methodology for governance, but applies a different standard to how nations participate

in the global capitalist system from that of how their citizens fair economically within their local community. A possible explanation for the backlash against Western democracy is the double standard creates tension between social structures moving in the direction of authentic democratic practice, but find no incentive as the transnational corporate structure undermine the idealism associated with democracy. Epstein (2001) theorizes this contradiction leads to a backlash against globalization, even to the extent globalization may lead to some productive changes in the social structures of less than democratically oriented nations. There is a double standard applied to socialists, dictatorships, theocratic, or communist governments. Capitalists argue that by allowing entry into the capitalist global financial system they encourage countries to move from authoritarian regimes towards democratic reform. The curriculum of Capitalism supports this notion by reinterpreting history as a fight to contain Communism from spreading or building firewalls of democracy between political rivals. Again, recent history seems to dispute this notion as without military intervention, no recent government change has resulted from economic pressure or lack of access to capital.

The substance of this argument is without standing. Repressive regimes with large reserves of critical commodities such as oil or natural gas receive little punishment other than the occasional rhetoric or a short-term trade sanction for human rights violations. Some research suggest the effectiveness of trade sanctions as tools for reformation, ultimately damage the people, are ineffective, and have little impact on changing the conduct of a government towards citizens. The real hypocrisy is that democratic governments such as the United States provide military defense for brutal regimes such as the Saudi Arabians in order to protect the flow of oil commodities without which the

financial system of the United States has the potential for collapsing along with the economy addicted to fossil fuels. Investing capital from the U.S. into foreign governments while reducing capital allocations from domestic programs to provide military protection to countries that do not share our national values or interest seems an illogical transaction. Illogical may be just plain stupid when one considers that some of the capital flowing to some of these repressive regimes diverts to terrorist activities attempting to undermine democracies.

The point is the pre-post-Cold War definitions of democracy and communism/socialism is meaningless in contemporary global geopolitics. Pre-Cold War, the enemy is easy to identify, the contrast between capitalist economics and Marxist economics delineates clearly, and political alliances while having an economic component are less complex. The global financial market is to blame for disarray in geopolitical alignment. It is no longer so easy to paint a country red and another blue; many are somewhere between. Just as different governments label as Marxist, Communist, or Socialist, different iterations of democracy exist as well. United States republican form of democracy is different from parliamentary democracy or the socialist democratic republics. Defining democracy without the context of an economic system and exclusive to one political theory of governing is inadequate to understanding the curriculum of Capitalism. How is Capitalism synonymous with democracy?

The curriculum of Capitalism defines the essential quality to leading a life in a democracy by how much property and wealth can an individual accumulate in the shortest period. In a perverse twist, the notion of the definition of democracy as the supreme power of the state ultimately lies in the hands of all the citizen is exchanged for

exchanges parsing the definition of democracy by the nomenclature of economics. Wealth equates to power and the greater wealth a person accumulates the greater amount of liberty a person earns. Freedom is an earned privilege of class and economic position, not a right of citizenship, as citizens naively believe. Just as upper middle class income families have greater choices, the opposite end of the spectrum has less choice. The poor have less freedom to choose and if liberties are proportional to wealth, poor people have less democratic freedom and less economic stature to have meaningful voice in correcting this misperception of allocating liberty using economic profiling. In the most repressive regimes, wealthy government officials maintain a far more libertine lifestyle than the impoverished citizens do. The measure of democracy is less a political orientation than it is a social position, an economic class system, elaborated by the narrative of the curriculum of Capitalism. The emphasis on accumulation of wealth, social position, and status in society by the media reinforces the experience of citizens and the curriculum taught in schools. The message of freedom is all about having choice, accretion, and economic gluttony.

If the lure of a lavish and debauched lifestyle is not convincing enough, the fourth paradigm relies upon the lack of critical analytical skills taught in public schools to mislead students to accept shallow characterizations as truth. Never too far away is the fall back position, define democracy by comparing Capitalism to what it is not, Marxism. Vilifying Marxism and various neo-Marxist positions constructs the fourth paradigm. Defining Marxism is an easier task than defining democracy. Democratic capitalists interpret the legacy of Marx by contextualizing personality cults of Stalin, Lenin, Guevara, Castro, Mao, and Chavez (to name a few) – viewing the measure of their

success upon the failure to implement working models of planned economies and their own personal failures to produce meaningful peaceful social change within the borders of their countries. Vilifying Marx and discrediting his theories is a much easier task than engaging in an intellectual discourse that may lead to a better understanding of Marxist theory. The fact is that the United States incorporates socialist style innovations such as public education, Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. Facts overlooked because the argument that government is inefficient is an incredulous argument when citizens ask if that is always the case then why privatization is unable to create a similar social safety net that government has.

The curriculum of Capitalism offers as proof that Marxist theory is inherently anti-democratic, promotes violence, and dangerous to freely elected societies by cataloging the failed attempts at communism around the world. Factually correct are historians who rightly come to this conclusion based upon the inability of corrupt governments to feed its people without assistance from foreigners. Scholars argue the events that allow personality cults to assume power is economic driven. The policies of the existing government's inability to sustain the economics of the country and revolution replace the existing power structures as the alternative. Key to understanding the fear mongering is the word invoking revulsion and rejection in the minds of conservatives, the term *revolution* implying violent overthrow is the only path to improve social welfare policies of government. The inconvenient truth is that American history celebrates revolution (the birth of the U.S. as example) when the outcome of revolution leads to a result that is more favorable to the narrative and narrow global view of the United States. Marx (2004) provides only the theoretical framework, not the guns and financial support

to reorganize societies into communal nations. Inaction or outright disregard for the inalienable rights of citizens leads to armed insurrection or revolution. The curriculum of Capitalism plays down the revolutionary aspects of our own country and ramps up the revolutionary aspects in others.

Governing is as much historical and cultural as it is choosing the right platform from which to govern. In the case of many of these countries, democratic government is impractical as civil war, military coup, tribal command structure, familial authorities, or imperial command remains part of the collective cultural heritage and the cultural history of some nations. Strong if not violent personalities are able to stabilize and to bring together nationalistic desire through consolidation of power ending civil war. By any measure of civilization the actions of men like Stalin after consolidating power is unconscionable. It simply demonstrates the historical perspective that there is a philosophical schism between leading a revolution and governing once the revolt has run its course. The narrative presented by the curriculum of Capitalism defines any association with Marxism, neo-Marxism, socialism, progressive movement, liberal, or secular progressive sentiment as evil and Capitalism as good. The construct of good and evil is also a useful tool in the hands of capitalists and as the research demonstrates, the connection between religion, morality, and Capitalism is a historical component of the U.S. economic system.

The fifth paradigm plays on notions of the concept of good and evil elevating economics to a moral position; Capitalism is of higher moral authority than Socialism. The conceptions of the economic construct of good and evil is through the ideal of competition, is a through line of the curriculum of Capitalism, and the experience of

students in public schools emphasizes the competitive aspects of academic progress. Everything needs a competitive element to be efficient and successful demeaning the notion of cooperation and collaboration as a possible antecedent to problem solving. The notion of cooperation and collaboration are semantic representations of communal or socialist leaning theories. By demeaning these terms or by the very least de-emphasizing the terms in the public school system, the curriculum of Capitalism denigrates systems of government that choose to operate in a consensus form. An element of the curriculum of Capitalism is the need to have competition to keep labor costs low, to be more efficient, and to eliminate as many competitors as possible in order to raise prices and increase profitability. Socialists believe competition ferments dissent and that cooperation and collaboration are higher moral value ideals leading to a democratic state.

If scholars define democracy as different from a political system, then scholars owe the same consideration in defining Marxism. It is a fair to comment that the neo-Marxist believe that their behavior is democratic in that it represents a broad view of social equity in many different areas of social policy. Stanfield's (1989) position relates to neo-Marxism seems representative of the field when he writes, "I use the term loosely to encompass a variety of scholars, more or less removed from classical Marxism, who share a common point of departure and subject matter in Marx's social theory and the social order of twentieth century capitalism" (p. 717). Many scholars believe that while Capitalism has proven to be a superior economic system, in the area of social reform it is difficult to make the case that Capitalism improves the lives of citizens in countries that are participating in the global financial market. The economic gains are not benefiting the

citizens who are in most need and social justice for these citizens is not part of the global discourse.

By definition, a paradigm is a systematic shift or rearrangement of the elements of a phenomenon to form a new entity. The democracy of *theoria* is not the democracy of *praxis*. The curriculum of Capitalism is a global economic curriculum practiced by democratic and non-democratic governments. It is a distinct departure from the vision by the Greeks of *demokratia*, from *demos* "common people," and useful for describing government of the equilibrium of consensus by all the citizens. Contemporary democracy is a convoluted machination of economics disguised as a governing strategy that promotes the ideal of liberty while leveraging the power of economics to maintain control over the lives of global citizens. The various forms of democracy fall short of being socially just – corrupted by a strategic alliance between corporations, government, and the wealthy – to sustain a system of race, class, and gender to maintain authoritarian control over the economies of third world countries as cheap sources for labor and natural resources. Public education system is the conduit by which the myth of Capitalism as the enabler for global democracy replicates into the next generation. The world cries out for a new revolution; not one based upon a personality cult, rather one that is a peaceful anarchical revolution with its foundation built upon social justice and a new structure that seeks to reconceptualize curriculum to restore to democracy to its origins. If citizens and scholars step away from parochial and provincial political/economic consciousness shaped by years of indoctrination by the curriculum of Capitalism, is it possible to conceive of the notion of a juxtaposition of a Capitalist economic system with Marxist theory as the foundation for the social relations.

It is within context of the beliefs and paradigms of the curriculum of Capitalism that social progressives need to look first to reconceptualize the public education system. Reconceptualization does not have to have the same negative connotation as the word revolution, but ostensibly, the result will be the same. If personal experience with democratic practice determines the perception and the practice of being democratic, then to consider the implications of race, class, and gender on students who are ultimately citizen-leaders is an exercise in folly. The next three chapters utilize another tool of progressive educators and that tool is to attempt to understand perception and reality of democracy through the lived experience, autobiographical material, and biographical material of Du Bois, Dewey, Lessing, Marcuse, and Feyerabend; each representing an aspect of race, class, gender, and critical pragmatism.

CHAPTER III - DU BOIS AND DEWEY: THE CURRICULUM OF CAPITALISM AND RACE

Du Bois Conception: Race, Education, and Democracy

From long thought, I am convinced that the solution to the present problem of the American Negro is a matter of organizing his power as a consumer and entering, through this path, employment as a middle-man and producer (Du Bois, 1976, p. 76).

A foundation of the belief system of reconceptualists and progressive educators is the notion that biography and autobiography are extraordinarily useful tools to assist researchers attempting to interpret the work of an individual. Understanding the lens in which a person constructs a perspective and from which springs a philosophical position is critical in analysis of their work in relation to applying their theoretical concepts to other forms of research. It is difficult to argue with Cremin's expanded notion of curriculum, "Philosophers since Plato have told us that education is more than a succession of units, courses, and programs, however excellent, and that serious considerations of curriculum must call into play the most fundamental questions of value, belief, and loyalty" (Pinar, 2000, p. 33). Any reconceptualized perspective of curriculum must extend beyond the syllabus and into the area of experience. Biography and autobiography are the gateways into comprehending how experience influences decisions we make as well as the rationale for decisions.

"Cambridge, Feb. 9th, 1819; Dear Mr. Du Bois, won't you come to a philosophical supper on Saturday, Feb. 14th, at half past seven o'clock? Yours truly, William James" (Du Bois, 1997, p. 9). Whether the invitation was accepted is not known.

Throughout the early career of Du Bois, William James is a friend and an early influential mentor. Later correspondences between the two men indicate that their relationship extends beyond the classroom. The iconic philosopher, scholar, and professor considers Du Bois a part of his extended family; so much, so that Du Bois enlists the aid of William to secure an invitation to meet his brother Henry James, the novelist during one of the trips Du Bois will make to England (Du Bois, 1997, p. 133). Sensing the need for a change of scenery for Du Bois, William James responds; “I am right glad to hear that you are going to have a good vacation in a country not as vexed as Georgia is by the “race question” (p. 133). William and his brother are keenly aware of the ‘race problem’ in the United States, though there is little documentation that either man lent their celebrity status to further the progress of the cause of equity for African Americans.^{vi}

In Henry’s book *The American Scene*, which is a narrative of his travel by train through the southern portion of the United States from 1904 -1905, James observes firsthand the condition of the African American. In a remarkable historical coincidence, the trip by James parallels a similar journey by Du Bois. Both men document similar observations of the social conditions of southern African Americans. James records this observation during a train trip from Richmond Virginia; “It was a monstrous thing, doubtless, to sit there in a cushioned and kitchened Pullman and to deny to so many groups of one’s fellow-creatures any claim to a ‘personality’; but this was in truth what one was perpetually doing” (1907, p. 398). Later, James pays a tribute to Du Bois by complimenting Du Bois’s book, *The Souls of Black Folk* (1903). James writes, “How can everything so have gone that the only ‘Southern’ book of any distinction published for many a year is *The Souls of Black Folk* by the most accomplished of members of the

Negro race, Mr. W.E.B. Du Bois” (p. 418)? A keen observer, Henry and William James incorporate the experience of others into their works. Although seemingly an abstract concept the social construction of race, James records the concrete effect of the construction of race and the belief that dual identity of African Americans is more than a theoretical conjecture, but a material fact in the cultural conception of the African American.

Andrews (2003) describes the cultural conception of African Americans measuring their cultural status through the prism of a dominant white social construction; “The social mirror is not solely our own construction; we reflect at any given moment our personal collective experiences, in addition to the experiences of other our group as told through stories. In addition, we reflect what we have heard other whites say and feel about us; in addition to what has been done to us over many years” (p.72). It is by no coincidence that many of the characters appearing in the work of James have duality or identity crises as part of their psychological profile. Henry and William James have been subjects of what best can be termed ‘scholarly gossip’ related to their personal relationship to one another as well as what some scholars believe are erotic homosexual references found in Henry’s work and personal correspondence. These historic rumors create salacious interest and appear to have no evidence to support them. They are of scholarly interest as they do lend credence to the notion that the James brothers will have certain empathy for a person whose identity carries the burden of race. However, Du Bois is invited to participate in some activities of white society; Du Bois never knows if the invitation may be out of curiosity than respect.

Cash and Schwab (2004) connect the sociological implications of race, class, and gender population from the perspective of the victim of marginalization and from the perspective of the majority group of non-victims. They believe the dominant social structure twists by social construction various relationships; promoting the notion that marginalization is the fault of the persons marginalized. Twisting is an obvious act to traumatize the targeted population and condition them to accept less financially, less medically, or less educationally becoming the acceptable norm. Public school systems perform similar twists by labeling students and assuming that disadvantaged students are unable to learn at the same pace as their white majority counterparts. The duality of Du Bois, social construction, and the cultural conception Andrews (2003) describes are part of the hidden curriculum of Capitalism. When Kozol (1991) or Apple (1996) describes in real terms the inequities of public education, their lens is a reflection of the social construction manifest through the physical and material reality of funding, textbooks, and pedagogical practice they observe in public schools.

The unintended consequence of social construction is to devalue human potential and contribution. In the lives of public school educators, the negating prospect of instructing students in curriculum that is irrelevant to their life experience may have tragic consequences in the immediate or future. Traumatic events such as Columbine or other violent acts perpetuated inside the confines of the school may well be the result of marginalization of students by peers and educators (Webber, 2003) and the de-humanization and de-valuing of personal identity. Cash and Schwab (2004) make the point the aggressors traumatize themselves as well by undermining society and creating conditions that can lead to acts of violence targeted back to the aggressors. One of the

many correspondences to Du Bois that underscores this point is from Metz Lochard, the editor of the Chicago Defender, an African American Publication. Lochard (Du Bois, 1976) writes, “Since the ribald attack by Westbrook Pegler¹⁰ last summer, it has become popular pastime to heap criticism on the Negro press. We have a strong suspicion that these outcries are not born out of honest desire to improve the quality of Negro journalism, but are rather issued from an organized plan to intimidate and eventually silence the Negro press. This, I believe is due to our militancy and critical attitude toward certain aspects of the war” (p. 355). Du Bois (2005) describes the duality as a color line, a term that he uses frequently to describe racial relations in the United States and globally (Du Bois, 2005). Du Bois often walks a fine line between encouraging non-violent agitation to gain equitable treatment while having to answer for instances when violence spills into the public sphere; though that violence may have no connection to Du Bois other than it occurs in the African American community.

Associations are significant to comprehending the direction of the work and provide context to framing the intent of scholar in their work. The earliest influencers of Du Bois outside of his parents are educators. Du Bois describes his early life in Barrington as rather non-descript, but frequently references his mother as an encourager. People who have little or no interest in racial issues (Aptheker, 1973 and Du Bois, 1988) populate the town the family of Du Bois resides. While in high school, Du Bois was the only African American to attend school and to graduate. His experience as he recounts

¹⁰ Aptheker refers to Pegler as a nineteen-thirty conservative who wrote a syndicated column containing a number of attacks against the Black press (footnote, Du Bois, 1976, p. 355).

again is rather innocuous lacking in the drama of previous African American leaders who are former slaves, abolitionists, or are targets of the blunt tactics from the Reconstruction period. The interesting double identity Du Bois will construct later from his experience reflects in an interesting recollection of an African American male student who for a short time attends high school with Du Bois. Du Bois writes (1988), “Once during my course another dark boy had attended the school for a short time, but I was very much ashamed of him because he did not excel the whites as I was quite used to doing” (p. 98). It was not until Du Bois travels south does he witness and feel the sting of racial injustice which was partly responsible for his decision to attend Harvard where Du Bois (1988) describes his academic life, “My salvation here was the type of teacher I met rather than the content of the courses” (p. 133). James is the connection between Du Bois and Dewey as the iconic professor mentors both men. James is a philosophical mentor of Du Bois and Dewey, but the two men are similar in many other significant aspects of their approach to economics, politics, race, and education.

For Du Bois to be successful in his quest for equality, he will straddle the color line, as he needs the support of a number of progressives who see beyond race and appreciate the diversity of perspective from intellect shaped by experience other than that of their own. The amount of correspondence by Du Bois with various members of progressive society such as James, Hart, Dewey, and other white citizens is notable as it establishes links that define the relation of Du Bois with predominant white educators, notably shaping his response to less understanding elements of society. Correspondence between Du Bois and the James brothers indicate they maintain cordial relations, share literature between each other, and keep abreast of each other’s work. Other

correspondence of Du Bois demonstrates empathy, patience, and recognition that Du Bois understands his role as a recognized leader in the African American community and comprehends his example is the example white America will judge other African Americans. The burden of example is one that Du Bois carries in each of his activities involving white citizens.

One particular piece written in 1939 represents the Du Boisian strategy to maintain good relations with whites is when Du Bois responds to a series of biographical questions from a person requesting Du Bois defend activities of the Niagara Movement. The response by Du Bois is demonstrative of Du Bois dealing with his quest to understand dual racial and class status in white America. The letter contains many references to race though much of the references appear written in a manner in which to have Du Bois contradict his public statements. Aptheker believes that a white male writes the letter based upon the last line of the letter in which Du Bois (1976) responds to a question about membership in the NAACP; "There is no color line in the NAACP. You can become a member" (p. 203). The body of the letter contains the response to the questions by Du Bois (1976) who writes, "I was extremely emotional on the race problem while I was a student at Harvard and my emotion was curbed by the philosophy of William James and the historical research under [Albert Bushnell] Hart. They did not quench; they directed it" (p. 203-204).

The significance of Du Bois relationship with James is crucial to understanding the maturation of the Du Bois as a scholar and the influence of James throughout the lives of both men. Broderick (1959) as well as other scholars point to the fact it is James that steers Du Bois away from his original course of studies in philosophy or science and

towards coursework in political science and sociology. Du Bois (1988) substantiates the claims by Broderick and others and describes his relationship with James; “I reveled in the keen analysis of William James, Josiah Royce, and young George Santayana. But it was James with his pragmatism and Albert Bushnell Hart with his research method, that turned me back from the lovely but sterile land of philosophic speculation, to the social sciences as the field for gathering and interpreting the body of fact which would apply to my program for the Negro” (p. 148).

Hart is a history/political science professor and there are a number of correspondences between the former student and Hart on a wide range of political subjects (Du Bois, 1976). The relationship Du Bois shares with his academic colleagues demonstrate the diversity of his interests and provide a catalyst to pursue a diverse set of subjects. Du Bois settles upon the field of sociology, a relatively new field during the early life of Du Bois. Du Bois (1976) says, “...after my work with Hart, in United States history, I conceived the idea of applying philosophy to a historical interpretation of race relations” (p. 49). Hart also provides the context to the connection between Du Bois, politics, and specifically the relationship to Du Bois to men such as the progressive leader Theodore Roosevelt. Hart and Roosevelt are close friends; but this friendship does not extend between Du Bois and Roosevelt based upon the letters written between the two. Aptheker (Du Bois, 1976) who serves as the curator of the correspondence of Du Bois as well as his biographer is a primary source for much of the personal information of the life and relationships of Du Bois. Aptheker, supported by other personal papers of Du Bois and public statements, rightly claims that Du Bois did not support Roosevelt as a politician due to Roosevelt’s lack of response to the race problem (Aptheker, 1973). Du

Bois supports the political candidacy of Wilson and suffers a similar disappointment from Wilson as Roosevelt; Wilson does little to assist African Americans.¹¹

Dewey does not share the same heightened level of disdain for political figures such as Roosevelt as Du Bois; however, it is a mistake to categorize Dewey as demure when political figures do not perform to level of expectation of the progressive movement. Dewey (1985) in his criticism of political parties writes, “If anyone can point to any permanent things Theodore Roosevelt or the Republican Party has done he has better political insight than I have. Where is any impress he left on the permanent policies of the Republican Party? And what goes for Theodore Roosevelt goes also for any other Roosevelt” (p. 229). Beyond sharing similar political views and academic mentors, Du Bois and Dewey share similar views on race and racial economics. Dewey (1985) writes, “In short, the real political issues of the day are economic, industrial, and financial, and both of the old parties are engaged in the game of hide-and-seek, hiding their own attitude from the masses of the people; seeking constantly favors and campaign contributions and the backing of business and financial institutions that really control our public life. Certainly if any group should know that the economic, industrial issue is the dominant one in politics it is the colored people” (p. 229). Dewey goes on to say that

¹¹ The text is from a copy of the October 1956, *The Nation* (Du Bois, 2010), where Du Bois explains why he stops voting in elections and is critical of Roosevelt and Wilson. *Source: Why I won't vote*. Retrieved November 22, 2010, from Black Economic Development Web site: <http://blackeconomicdevelopment.com/why-i-wont-vote-by-web-du-bois-the-nation-20-october-1956/>

slavery and economic disparity was the result of a capitalist system that is determined to keep wages low and competitive nations in turmoil for private gain. This quote is one of very few by Dewey concerning racial relations furthering the criticism of Dewey for his lack of vociferous protest on the subject of racial inequality.

The lack of political support for African Americans is one reason that Du Bois dissociates himself from U.S. democratic politics, as it seems political action as an endless journey to nowhere. By not associating with Du Bois, one interpretation is the lack of effort in the area of racial relations by Roosevelt and Wilson indicate they have no interest in erasing the color line, though both men have aggressive progressive political agendas. Despite this, Du Bois has progressive allies, many who hold important government offices and who are close friends with U.S. presidents, Du Bois concludes that grass roots action will lead to recognition of equality for African Americans not the association with leading political figures. Regardless, for Harvard professors to take personal interest in an African American student in the nineteenth hundreds and for as African American to be welcome in the home of a prominent white educator is a testament to Du Bois' extraordinary academic acumen. Credit goes to James and Hart who place a high value on the intellect over popular opinion. Segregation is a cold fact of reality in the United States during the time of James, and even among academia, this relationship is unusual.

Relationships with progressive whites generate some animosity from African American circles who believe that relationships with whites is futile and that change in society for African Americans will only come as the result of a revolutionary uprising against white America. As an example, historians have more than sufficiently

documented the debates of Du Bois with Booker T. Washington; mostly siding with the position of Washington as his thinking aligns closer with Capitalism than that of Du Bois. The correspondence between the two men, while spirited, is not as vindictive or filled with ire as portrayed by the white owned media as well as that portrayed by historians. Washington and Du Bois have a dispute, there is no denying that; but it is no different from two academic colleagues arguing the merits of one philosophy over another, and agreeing in the end to agree to disagree (Moore, 2003). There is no hint in the autobiography of Du Bois of any harboring personal animosity or ill will in the direction of Washington though both men have a record of negative comments about each other. Their dispute is probably an over exaggeration for political purposes and to keep the African American community from uniting in opposition to racial economic disparity as well as other racial issues. The notion of a festering blood feud or dislike between the two men is still in the literary texts of public school students. Scholars such as Moore (2003) describe their relationship as complex; “What historians have long viewed as a philosophical debate between Washington and Du Bois was far more complex. In many ways, the debate was more of a personal conflict than a true disagreement. Their public arguments were often not true depictions of their views, and their actual views were not completely incompatible” (p. 86).

The correspondence of Du Bois contains a number of other equally intriguing clashes, explanations, and philosophical debate that illustrate that Du Bois is not dogmatic in his positions, respects the opinions of others even those he may have been in opposition always with remembering that his ultimate goal of equality generates multiple strategies that are not necessarily of his own design. The multiplicity of strategic tactics

that Du Bois employs is a neglected part of the conversation regarding Du Bois. The portrayal of Du Bois by white media and in textbooks is Du Bois is a hard-core radical socialist bereft of any consideration outside of the context of his pro-Marxist leanings. Du Bois is strategic in his thinking and strategic in his approach to addressing racial and social equalities. His correspondence demonstrates a desire to promote racial equality to a broad audience and to educate citizens who may not share the personal experience or perspective of Du Bois regardless of ethnicity. Du Bois is one of a handful of progressives who expand the notion of racial equity as a global battle.

In many respects, personal correspondences contain the most intimate details of a person's thinking and philosophical position. The relationship with Streater begins with Streater contacting Du Bois concerning issues of the treatment of students by Fisk University administration (Aptheker, 1973). Aptheker writes (1973), "The student discipline at Fisk had retrograded so as to resemble in some respects a reform school" (p. 41). Though no longer affiliated with Fisk, the correspondence prompts Du Bois to action and to accuse Fisk University of 'selling out to southern conservatism' to raise funds (p.45). In these exchanges between the younger Streater and Du Bois, a different picture of Du Bois emerges; one in which a thoughtful, mentor-like, encouraging, and as a pragmatic individual wrestling with the macro issues of race and class globally, as well as in the personal micro manner. Written exchanges between Du Bois and literally hundreds of different people in society representing different strata of class and different race are indicators of the depth and width of the social relations that Du Bois establishes and maintains over his lifetime.

Seldom in his correspondence is there a statement not carefully crafted by Du Bois to be read and interpreted exactly as he intends. Reading the correspondence of Du Bois leaves the impression that he was not as radical or out of step with the mainstream as some historians attempt to construct him. One of a stream of correspondence between Du Bois and George Streater, an African American activist and a union organizer, illustrates this point. Streater questions the lack of commitment by Du Bois (at least in the mind of Streater) to social change for African Americans by way of a more aggressive approach utilizing confrontation as the main instrument for change. Streater ridicules Du Bois for his notions of creating an African American middle class as a form of economic passive resistance to facilitate change. Streater denigrates the Du Boisian position, "You count on the Negro middle class to usher in this cooperation. What you need to do, Dr. Du Bois, is to cease dulling your vision to the fact that the Negro middle class is after all, a lousy minority bourgeoisie of which your late associates at the NAACP have given you ample proof" (Du Bois, 1976, p. 86). Streater openly criticizes Du Bois and advocates organizing African Americans to challenge directly economic inequities through work stoppages or strikes, and if necessary, violence. Du Bois maintains that a more effective tactic is to organize consumer boycotts of businesses and shift as much consumer spending away from uncooperative white enterprises. Du Bois (1976) promotes the notion of creating African American laborers and consumers economic system in parallel with the existing white economic system resulting in the construction of an African American middle class on parity with whites (pp. 86-97). Du Bois may have been thinking of the economic model of Harlem during the period in

which many historians refer as the Harlem Renaissance or may be reiterating the position of Washington.

Streator, junior in age to Du Bois, avidly promotes his own view of society that is somewhere between the position of a radical socialism, but less than full-fledged Communism. Streator and Du Bois have this in common; they reject Communism based upon what they observe in the transition from Lenin to Stalin as well as other European nations. Both are enthusiastic about the prospect of Socialism for creating a new economic social structure that brings African Americans in parity with white Americans. Where Streator and Du Bois differ is Streator represents the next generation of African American leadership that promotes a public strategy of aggressive dissent ushering in the utilization of protests as a way to publicize the cause for racial social justice. Du Bois has a preferred strategy of attacking social and racial injustice on multiple fronts and not relying on one tactic or one strategy to dominate others. In his response to Streator who believes that racial situation in the United States is not improving rapidly enough, Du Bois (1976) notes that the pace of change is not always a fair gauge to measure change. “When I was your age (Du Bois), I did not expect race prejudice suddenly to disappear, but I did think that under the barrage of facts and arguments, it would in a generation noticeably decline. This has been true in some respects, but the decline has not been nearly as decisive and rapid as I expected, and I have come to the conclusion that we have got to regard race prejudice in the country as fairly permanent for practical purposes” (p. 87). The response by Du Bois to Streator is illustrative of Du Bois not shifting from one position to another, but responding with a different strategic tactic as the dynamics of the racial situation changes. Again, a contradiction appears between the public portrait of

Du Bois as a 'wild-eyed Communist radical' and what in actuality is a man devoted to the specific cause of racial parity utilizing multiple tools, prodding society where there appears an opening, and working behind the scenes when no opportunity presents. The multiple front strategies of Du Bois are consistent with his academic training in the philosophy of pragmatism and his desire to lead by example.

Is Du Bois a Communist? In one respect, Du Bois exhibits the characteristic thinking of a critical pragmatist or even a neo-Marxist philosophical position. Though at one point in his life Du Bois renounces his U.S. citizenship in favor of Communism, the research indicates that Du Bois utilizes the threat of becoming and promoting Communism as a tactic to bring the issue of racial parity to the public forefront. If Du Bois were alive to defend his position, he will argue this characterization is accurate only in certain situations and at certain times. Similar to Dewey, Du Bois projects an academic curiosity and intellectual understanding of Marxist theory, but intellectual understanding does not necessarily translate as unqualified agreement. Underscoring this point is his responses to Streater and an admonishment of Streater by Du Bois (1976); "Even it were true that there will be no radical change in America, except by revolution, it would be suicide for the American Negroes to lead the movement" (p. 88). In a previous passage, Du Bois (1976) explains to Streater that he believes in the philosophy of Marx and says Marx "is one of the greatest philosophers of the day" (p. 87). Du Bois (1976) does not believe that Marx implies that all solutions to society come to resolution only after a 'violent revolution' (pp. 91-92). Du Bois (1976) writes, "I believe in Karl Marx. I am an out and out opponent of modern capitalistic labor exploitation. I believe in the ultimate triumph of socialism in a reasonable time, and I mean by socialism, the ownership of

capital and machines by the state, and equality of income. But I do not believe in the verbal inspiration of the Marxism scriptures (p. 91). First of all, I do not believe Marx ever meant to say that under all circumstances and at all times, a violent revolution is necessary to overthrowing the power of capitalists. Even if he did say this, I do not believe it is true, and I am not interested in working out a perfect dogmatic system on the basis of the Marxism brand of Hegelianism. What I want is a realistic and practical approach to a democratic state in which exploitation of labor is stopped, and the political power is in the hands of the workers” (p. 92). Du Bois fears that Streater will fall into the trap of the capitalist media portrayal of the Marxist association with terrorist oriented anarchists and become essentialize into a marginalized powerless position.

The objective of the preceding section is to establish the influences of Du Bois to choose the particular academic and research path. While race does not define the character of a person, race does define the options available and the experience of race is a negating factor for many citizens. The curriculum of Capitalism promotes Capitalism as a neutral and non-racial economic system. Du Bois demonstrates his experience of an African American scholar contradicts this view. The next section compares Du Bois with Dewey, both similar in academic training, but experiencing social Capitalism from opposite spectrums. I believe the experiences (although vastly different) result in both men adopting the philosophical position of critical pragmatism as the method to analyze democratic social structures in the United States.

Are Du Bois and Dewey Critical Pragmatists?

Critical pragmatism is instructive in its commitment to building thick connections between individuals, groups, disciplines for the purpose of expanding understanding of our shared interests (Kadlec, 2007, p. 49).

Since the Frankfurt School conceives and promotes critical theory, many scholars debate how much of Marxism remains part of critical theory. Inevitably any research utilizing 'critical frameworks' with Deweyism is forced to respond to the question is Dewey an orthodox Marxist. In thinking of Du Bois, the desire to resolve the question is Du Bois an orthodox Marxist is an equally challenging but a necessary task in the analysis of Capitalism as an economic and a social structure. This section begins this task by contrasting Dewey and Du Bois utilizing biographical material in personal correspondence and other sources. In this section I will confront the conservative educator and capitalist position that Dewey, Du Bois, and most progressives are radical orthodox Marxists with the sole aim to incite revolution, undermine free societies, redistribute wealth, disband property rights, and construct a new world order. As exaggerated as this may sound conservative capitalists are effective at preventing progressive ideas leading to an equitable social structure without the malevolence of a class system segregated by race, class, and gender. The starting point is addressing the notion of class from the perspective of Dewey and Du Bois.

Novack (1975) claims that Dewey's ideal is a classless democracy, but Novack concludes that a Deweyan ideal of a classless democracy is an unrealistic ideal to promote democratic practice as history or current condition undermine the possibility of this occurring (p. 214). Novack (1975) believes that Dewey (similar to Du Bois) rejects

orthodox Marxism in favor of a social democracy more in line with a neo-Marxist position. Novack (1975) writes, “Dewey explicitly rejected this Marxist way of defending and developing democracy; he counterposed to it his liberal program of gradual reform along nonpartisan, nonclass lines” (p. 214). Novack savages the notion that Dewey’s ideal of graduated social reform eventually terminates at a classless society just as Streater found the Du Bois notion of a constructing a Negro middle class to achieve parity with whites as a way of racial equalization contemptible (Du Bois, 1976). It is significant to note that Novack positions himself as an orthodox Marxist and his criticism of Dewey is through the lens of orthodox class Marxism. The same is true of Streater who fashions himself in the image of a Communist and believes in the interpretation of what Marx means by ‘revolution’ is violent overthrow. Equally important to note, Novack’s criticism is neither enlightening nor new insight; the possibility of a classless society is theoretically achievable, but in all probability not a practical functioning ideal given the diverse state of race, class, and gender cultures across the globe.

A classless society is not the point of Dewey or Du Bois; academics operate and function in the real world of limitations to theory and pragmatist comprehend that incremental steps are progress. The point is to *move* in the direction of a socially just society, not accept the status quo as the natural order of society and therefore, unalterable. Kadlec (2007) agrees with the proposition the advantage of a pragmatic philosophical position is that it looks forward. Progress comes on many fronts and the measure of progress is by many different social metrics. Glaciers move less than a few inches a day, yet a moving glacier alters the landscape over thousands of acres of property and those changes remain in place for thousands of years. “Finally,” writes

Dewey (1994), “theories supposed to explain the course of events are used to urge and justify certain practical policies. Marxism, of course, a striking instance. But it is so far from being the only instance that a non-Marxian and anti-Marxian social theories often exemplify the principle” (p. 212). Du Bois projects a similar notion as Dewey that the explanation for various social structures requires multiple theories in order to comprehend the significance of each. Neither position is inconsistent with critical pragmatism as an analytical framework for social policies.

Dewey (1981) explains that theories justify the implementation of a particular social policy while other theories justify the results. The notion is that there are a multiplicity of theories and ideas from which to generate progressive change and from which to analyze the effects, successful or not. This position is similar to the shifting analysis of the condition of racial America and racial economics as well as application of Marxist theory by Du Bois as one component of a strategy to move racial economics and racial disparity to the forefront of the American and global consciousness. Du Bois (1988) in his autobiography writes, “When I was a young man I conceived that the foundations of world culture were laid, the way charted, the progress towards certain great goals was undoubted and inevitable. There was room for argument concerning details and methods and possible detours in the onswEEP of civilization; but the fundamental facts were clear, unquestioned, and unquestionable” (p. 154). Du Bois proposes that while history sets into motion certain activities defining a social structure or a culture, social structures are fluid not static. There is space for reflection, reevaluation, and reformation as well as taking into account the political dynamic for social change.

Criticism of Du Bois and Dewey for their relationships with white progressives and for not speaking out against white America with a larger more radicalized voice is not uncommon in contemporary research literature seeking to discredit their social theory. Conservatives do not look favorably upon Du Bois or Dewey, as conservatives believe Marxist social theory and the tide of progressivism originate during the peak of their careers. Their claim goes unsubstantiated as the progressive movement in the United States began with the Grange movement prior to 1873. Du Bois or Dewey is not the only prominent progressive social theorists in U.S. history. In either case, criticism comes in equal measure from those who agree and those who do not. Sorting through what constitutes legitimate constructive criticism from negative animosity is no easy task and as Andrews (2003) asserts, evaluating someone's position is not easily determinable either: "...how does race factor into the equation we calculate when deciding how to behave or to evaluate the behavior of others? How might the view of society through our racial 'lens' influence our behavior choices" (p. 64)? The mentoring of Du Bois and Dewey provide insight into the conception of their philosophical interests and contrast to their public styles.

The personal association with James, Du Bois, and Dewey is worth exploring in order to provide a philosophical context from which to understand how their respective work evolves, the inference to Capitalism as a social system, and the structural defect in the public education system. Pragmatism forms the philosophical framework from which Du Bois and Dewey operate. The roots of classical American style pragmatism find their base in the work of Charles Sanders Peirce, William James, and John Dewey (Prawat, 2001, pp. 668-721.). James credits Peirce with founding the principles of pragmatism and

according to James (2000), “This is the principle of Peirce, the principle of pragmatism. It lay entirely unnoticed by anyone for twenty years, until I, in an address before Professor Howison’s philosophical union at the University of California, brought it forward again and made a special application of it to religion” (p. 29). James, while acknowledging that pragmatism is not his discovery, takes credit for the special application of pragmatism to religion; hence the interest in the theory by Dewey whose work at the time involved humanitarian themes, ethical, and moral philosophical considerations.

Du Bois, while under the tutorship of James and by association with Dewey among others, does not seem to elicit the same scrutiny about a particular philosophical position as Dewey. This is due in part that Dewey calls himself a philosopher whereas Du Bois rejects philosophy for social studies. Du Bois never claims that he was other than a social scientist, although he begins his academic training in the study of philosophy. One reason that Du Bois is able to avoid the same attention as Dewey is because scholars tend to focus upon the Du Boisian conception of dual consciousness, race, and comparisons with Marxist social theory ignoring the personal relationship between Du Bois and the James’ family. Many scholars presume Du Bois is a Marxist theoretician, after all Du Bois did renounce U.S. citizenship in favor of Communism after a visit to Russia. “Was W.E.B. Du Bois a pragmatist,” asks Taylor (2004), “He subscribed or borrowed from many systems of belief and frameworks for action including Pan-Africanism, socialism (“of the path,” he would have us add), cosmopolitan universalism, Victorian elitism, and philosophic idealism, wether Hegelian or Platonic. But he also studied with William James, and the encounter clearly left an imprint on him” (p. 99).

Though Taylor calls the question complex, as is the subject Du Bois, the only person who can answer definitively remains Du Bois. Even his close friend Herbert Aptheker is unable to pin Du Bois down on the subject of a personal philosophy. If Du Bois is a pragmatist in the form of Dewey, why does he not embrace his pragmatic roots? In contrast to Dewey, Du Bois makes no mention of a personal philosophy in his autobiography and there are few references to a specific philosophical position in his correspondence. One reference vaguely implies Du Bois is a pragmatist. After completing his study with James and Santayana, Du Bois claims he found a particular philosophy that suits him. Du Bois (1997) writes, “I then found and adopted a philosophy which has served me since; thereafter I turned to the study of History and what has become Sociology” (p. 394-395). While the letter to Aptheker delves into a number of philosophical positions, Du Bois never articulates the exact philosophy he adopts. This research and other indicate that Du Bois never settles upon a specific philosophical position unless by claiming the position he can further his agenda for equitable treatment of African Americans (i.e. – Communism). Du Bois is fluid and defining a philosophical position outside of the context of the social issue Du Bois promotes is a futile exercise. Du Bois treats philosophical positions as tactical and strategic devices, not as concrete values to anchor social research.

In contrast to Du Bois, the philosophy of Dewey is much clearer as the relationship with James culminates in American or western-style pragmatism. Dewey is not shy about his claim to adhering to the foundations of pragmatism. Prawat (2001), one of a number of Dewey scholars and writers, claims that Dewey after experiencing disenchantment with the view of James pursues the philosophy of pragmatism aligned

and originated by the influence Peirce (pp. 667–668). James (2000) contradicts Pravat as James refers to Dewey affectionately as “a colleague” and insists that he and Dewey are in one accord (p. 176). James (2001) says of Dewey, “As I myself understand Dewey and Schiller, our views absolutely agree in spite of our different modes of statements; but I have enough trouble of my own in life without having to defend my friends, so I abandon them provisionally to the tender mercy of Professor Pratt’s interpretations, utterly erroneous though I deem these to be” (p. 259). James defends the philosophy of pragmatism from the attacks of scholars such as Pratt who fixate on the European philosophers as the only true philosophies.

James’ defense is critics do not comprehend the complex nature of pragmatism, nor do they comprehend that pragmatism is a fluid philosophy, more so than other philosophies if a person adheres strictly to the Jamesian position. Jamesian fluidity reflects in the work of Du Bois and clearly, the humanist influence of James is in the work of Dewey. Characterizing pragmatism as having less gravitas than other philosophies is incorrect as pragmatism seeks to incorporate the philosophical traditions from the canons of philosophy (Kadlec, 2000). Differentiating pragmatism from other philosophies is pragmatism attempts to reconcile other philosophies into a practical application, reducing them from intellectual conception of theory into comprehensible measurable instruments. Dewey (2004) references the complexity of pragmatism when he writes, “When William James called Pragmatism a New Name for an Old Way of Thinking, I do not know if he was thinking expressly of Francis Bacon, but so far as concerns the spirit and atmosphere of the pursuit of knowledge, Bacon may be taken as the prophet of pragmatic conception of knowledge. Many misconceptions of its spirit

would be avoided if his emphasis upon the social factor in both the pursuit and the end of knowledge were carefully observed” (p. 22). The unique feature that James adds is the notion that philosophy is a ‘public instrument’, not simply reserved for theoretical use in the academic world.

“Dewey (2004) believed, however, that the main problem lay, not in philosophy, but in social practice,” writes Gouinlock (p. liii) in the introduction to *The Moral Writings of John Dewey*. “The radical dislocations brought about by the developing industrial life destroyed traditional bonds and loyalties and created conditions of work which were highly impersonal and prohibitive of consummatory interaction of man and nature” (Dewey, 2004, p. liii). The course Dewey pursues emphasizes a positive and hope filled social pragmatism expressed through progressive democratic thought, inclusiveness, pluralism, and a sense of optimism. Du Bois, although his work is pungent with explicit metaphor and historical reference pertaining to the egregious treatment of African Americans, incorporates a surprising quality of optimism; at least in the early work of Du Bois. The influence of James and his optimistic view that practical pragmatism is the logical response to ethereal philosophies is evident in the writing of Du Bois and Dewey. James may be the genesis for their philosophical development, but it is other associations and the personal experience of Du Bois and Dewey that leads them to become the preeminent social theorists of their time. Sharing the same mentor is one way in which Du Bois and Dewey are similar. Are there stronger ties between the two men?

Dewey is familiar with Du Bois by their association with James and in all probability knows him on a personal level. Du Bois cites Dewey in his work though there is little reference of Du Bois by Dewey. In the volumes of correspondence written by Du

Bois and compiled by Aptheker, there is no written record of correspondence between the two men. This does not imply that written letters do not exist; simply that Aptheker did not place letters from Dewey among the massive collection he compiles. There is a record of their service on committees organized by each other. Dewey serves as one of the founding members of the NAACP (Aptheker, 1976) organized by Du Bois whereas Du Bois serves on the Executive Committee of the League for Independent Political Action (L.I.P.A.), a third party political organization founded after the stock market crash of 1929 (Ryan, 1995). L.I.P.A. forms in response to the total economic collapse of the United States as well as most of the rest of the world during the years of global depression.

Both men share mutual friendships with progressive leaders such as Jane Addams (1911) and she documents the many visitors to Hull House along with her impressions of Du Bois and Dewey who host various discussions at Hull House. These and other opportunities to meet seem to establish at minimum that these two men share common interests and since their writings have broad circulation among progressives, their positions are more than likely known to one another. It is hard to fathom these men not spending time together at some point in their careers as the organized progressive movement fluctuates geographically between Chicago and New York, and the circle of progressives is relatively small by comparison to the establishment in power. Both men have an interest in German philosophic traditions and both travel to Europe on more than one occasion. Progressives represent more than one school of thought and membership in the progressive movement is diverse. It includes women and men from the suffrage movement, Socialists, Communists, educators, organized labor, and social reformers of

every shade and hue. Social issues addressed by progressives frequently crisscross with other social crusades.

A criticism of Dewey is that for all of his rhetorical work in the field of politics, social economics, and democracy, he never directly addresses the problems of African-Americans posed by Du Bois or other prominent African-American activists; at least not publicly. It is a fallacy to presume that progressives limit themselves to one social cause and by speaking to one cause excludes a person from supporting other social changes. Dewey critics claim by not speaking publicly and directly in opposition to the treatment of African Americans Dewey implicitly supports the status-quo of the majority. Dewey's service on the NAACP does not mitigate the charge, as it appears that his support is in name only although the minutes of the meetings that are not available may show something different. Other critics of Dewey such as Westbrook (1991) portray Dewey as shy, demure, lacking social skills, and having little or no interest in political affairs outside of his academic work. Some critics claim Dewey's wife as the social activist and she uses Dewey's status to promote her causes that Dewey did not necessarily have an interest. These charges are important as conservative critics seek to discredit Dewey and portray Dewey as social liberal to further his academic career contradicting his status as a leader in the progressive movement and denigrating Dewey's work in the field of education.

Westbrook (1991) claims, "He [Dewey] also played a minor role in the founding of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and, with Alice [Dewey's wife], was more active in promoting equal education for women and woman's suffrage" (p. 167). Martin (2002) makes a similar charge with a caveat that Dewey's

wife, Alice, is politically active and encourages her husband to take an activist role in a variety of causes, but mostly those related to women's issues such as women's suffrage.

"In 1910-11, Alice was district leader of the Women's Suffrage Party for the Twenty-first Assembly District of New York City. She organized a prosuffrage society in New York, and she got John to use his position on behalf of the cause" (Martin, 2002, p. 348).

Martin also credits the influence of Alice upon Dewey's public presence and believes had Dewey not met Alice that he would have remained a shy reclusive little known academic.

Similar to contemporary times, progressives span a broad network of interests and interrelated causes. Westbrook (1991) in addressing the 'public Dewey' makes the point that many progressives and social reformers during the time maintain memberships with organizations that have diverse goals; that did not necessarily mean they invest themselves completely into a singular cause. Many progressives lend their name or invest in a cause if a particular cause furthers their particular line of work. Dewey, while lending his name to many different organizations, directs his energies to the field of education (Westbrook, 1991). It was not that Dewey lacks interest in other social causes; rather his work in philosophy and education consume his life outside of other social causes that he may have support.

Du Bois does not escape similar criticism for his work (Sundquist, 1996). In an introductory biography of Du Bois, Sundquist (1996) writes, "His [Du Bois] editorial independence made *The Crisis*¹² very successful even as it estranged him from other

¹² *The Crisis* is the journal for the NAACP. Du Bois was the first editor of the journal and appeared frequently as the chief spokesperson for the NAACP in the early years of the organization.

leaders in the NAACP, who resented his arrogance, his mixing of domestic and international affairs, and his unpredictable ideological reversals” (p. 10). Much the same as Dewey, the criticism of Du Bois comes from members of organizations in which he serves or from faculty members of the universities he teaches. There is an impression that Du Bois and Dewey are indifferent to criticism, though not apprehensive about confrontation and defending their position when the situation arises. The correspondence of Du Bois contains a number of responses to critics. Du Bois treats his opponents with deference and tact; never by attacking them on a personal level, but always defending his position by pointing to indisputable facts as well as acknowledging the critic that their position is not without merit. Dewey tends to ignore criticism or address the critics from the podium during lectures or speeches. Again, there is little evidence from his public speeches to suggest that Dewey is disrespectful of the position of a critic and among the many friendships between Du Bois and Dewey were those who publicly disagree with them. Their lives represent a different era when public discourse is civil, tolerant, and respectful unlike the public discourse today. As with many intellectuals, there is a tendency to isolate themselves from public events concentrating unimpeded on their research interests.

Though Du Bois and Dewey live their lives in the public and have generous amounts of adulation and supporters, there is an underlying theme in their work characterized by the word ‘alienation’. Alienation in the sense Du Bois and Dewey are progressives and by association with ideas that challenge existing social orders, alienate the two men from certain quarters of society that believe their ideas radical or even dangerous at the time. Alienation is one natural consequence of reform or the

introduction of unconventional ideas. Alienation is a component to unraveling the discourse of the curriculum of Capitalism. Capitalism depends upon alienation pitting laborer against laborer in a competition to reduce labor costs. Alienation in the social structure forces poor communities to accept egregious financial terms – bear the cost of infrastructure, pollution, tax-free property – in exchange for the promise of job creation. Though a white male, Dewey writes on the subject of dualism, alienation, and he with Du Bois have in common the theme of alienation. For Du Bois it is the alienation of race and for Dewey, the alienation of class by promoting what is an unconventional notion of neo-liberalism and social democracy. Allen (2003) makes a relevant observation about African American alienation; “Historically speaking, the social foundation for perhaps the most significant expressions of African American ideological ambivalence is to be found in the institutionalized as well as the everyday double consciousness and double dealings of White America. On one side lay the conceptualization and practice of egalitarian ideals which, purportedly without exception, applied to *all* persons born within its borders – a birthright; and on the other, the simultaneous conceptualization, and practice of a Herrenvolk¹³ nationalism where notions of citizenship and political equality referred to whites only” (p. 242). The concept of alienation is common in Du Bois and Dewey’s work in the area of social democracy as well as in their work in the field of education.

¹³ “German master race, or *Herrenvolk*, would rule over a hierarchy of subordinate peoples.” Herrenvolk [Herrenvolk, (2009.). In *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved October 22, 2009, from Encyclopedia Britannica Online Web site: <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/263695/Herrenvolk>].”

The theoretical identification by critical theorists with Du Bois or Dewey pragmatism supports the notion that the curriculum field may be the last refuge for scholars searching for unique perspectives from which to conduct social analysis. There is little if any evidence to support that Du Bois or Dewey is an orthodox Marxist other than associations with scholars, the labor movement, professed socialists, or by attendance at various conferences hosted by groups associated with Marxism. True, Dewey is a defender of Trotsky, but many scholars believe the defense of Trotsky by Dewey has very little to do with the politics of Trotsky. Known for his strong support of civil liberties, Dewey chooses to defend Trotsky for civil libertarian reasons; that does not imply that Dewey is a sympathizer for the political activities of Trotsky. Boydston (1987), a Deweyan scholar, in responding to the question of if Dewey is a Marxist, writes “Dewey joined the ACDLT¹⁴ in 1936, and known for his support of civil liberties, and defense of Nicola Sacco, Bartolommeo Vanzetti, was subsequently named chairman of the Commission of Inquiry” (pp. 636-637). Dewey, according to research from his personal papers writes, “T. [referring to Trotsky] said to me that I had proved Am. [American] idealism wasn’t a myth” (Boydston, 1987, p. 643), demonstrating Dewey places more emphasis on the integrity of the process than politicizing Trotsky as propaganda for defenders of Capitalism.

Du Bois has a more complex relationship with Marxism as Du Bois openly calls himself a Communist. Du Bois has an interesting connection to Trotsky as well. There are a number of sources implicating Du Bois as not just a passive sympathizer with

¹⁴ ACDLT stands for American Committee for the Defense of Leon Trotsky.

Communism, but rather some purport that Du Bois openly supports the leadership of Trotsky (Ritzer, 2005, p.481). The research disputes Du Bois is a supporter of Trotsky, and the eulogy of Stalin by Du Bois seems to settle the matter. Writing in the *Guardian*, Du Bois says of Stalin, “He early saw through the flamboyance and exhibitionism of Trotsky, who fooled the world, and especially America. The whole ill bred and insulting attitude of Liberals in the U.S. today began with our naive acceptance of Trotsky's magnificent lying propaganda, which he carried around the world. Against it, Stalin stood like a rock and moved neither right nor left, as he continued to advance toward a real socialism instead of the sham Trotsky offered” (Du Bois, 1963, p. 1). No doubt, the trip by Du Bois to Russia made a lasting impression upon Du Bois, so much so that Du Bois joins the Communist Party albeit at the age of ninety-three. Unquestionably, Du Bois looks to socialism as an advocate and for resolution of the African American racial and class problems (Lewis, 2000). Like Dewey, Du Bois is enamored by the prospect of an alternative to social Capitalism, but not deconstructing the economic system. The promotion of less dogmatic forms of Marxism is an important heritage of the contemporary progressive movement.

The prior discussion frames and answers the question if Du Bois or Dewey is a Marxist as many claim de-valuing their philosophy in the field of education as conservative educators claim. It is fair to say that Dewey in all probability is not an orthodox Marxist. There is scant documentation to support the notion that Dewey's interest in politics relates to anything beyond his work in education and philosophy. In the introduction to *John Dewey, the Political Writings*, Morris and Shapiro (Dewey, 1993) summarize Dewey's contribution and commitment to democracy as an ideal, not

necessarily as a political system. “He [Dewey] prized autonomy and individuality but resisted the standard conception of ‘negative liberty’ that is supposed to follow inexorably from them; he took socialist ideas seriously but had no time for Marx; he believed in science and technological advances as engines of human progress, but much of his writing bristles with skepticism toward arguments from authority” (p. x). The same may be said of Du Bois though Du Bois is unapologetic about his support of socialism to usher in racial parity and racial economic parity. However, the Du Boisian notion of a socialist system aligns closer to that of a neo-Marxist or critical race theorist than that of orthodox Marx.

When a neo-Marxist claims kinship with Du Bois or Dewey, they are not taking an orthodox economic position, rather they are paying tribute to the work in defining democratic practice as a social issue and illuminating the problems of the oppressed publicly. Dewey (1993) writes, “The danger at present, as I have already said, is that in order to get away from the evils of private economic collectivism we shall plunge into political economic collectivism. The danger is so great that the course that has been suggested will be regarded as an unrealistic voice crying in the wilderness. It would be unrealistic to make light of the present drive in the direction of state socialism. But it is even more unrealistic to overlook the dangers involved in taking the latter course. For the events of the recent years have demonstrated that state capitalism leads toward the totalitarian state whether Russian or Fascist variety” (p. 237).^{vii} If not a Marxist, is Du Bois or Dewey a critical pragmatist? Both men are pragmatist and both men reject orthodox Marxism for a liberalized neo-Marxist social theory. I believe the answer is yes, Du Bois and Dewey are critical pragmatists.

The significance of identifying with a specific philosophic position is critical to comprehending and applying their analysis to the current state of public education in the United States. The curriculum of Capitalism attempts to shield social reform from economic reform; social reform is a political issue and economic reform is an issue of competitiveness in a global financial market. Neo-Marxist and progressives do not make the same distinction; economic reform is a critical component to social reform and progress towards liberalizing democratic practice. The distinguishing characteristic differentiating Du Bois with Dewey is how Du Bois experiences Capitalism and defines democracy from the position of an African American. The construction of a racial identity superimposes a different experience of democracy on Du Bois than Dewey though his academic training, philosophical perspective, and social relations are similar to Dewey. The next section attempts to uncover in the curriculum of Capitalism the racial component constructing identity and exposes racial economics

Racial Identity and Capitalism: Vestiges of the Slave Economy

Diaspora is a heavily weighted term, Greek for dispersion or scattering, it has its place in the Western tradition through its occurrence in the Septuagint in Deuteronomy 28:25 (Judy, 2001, p. 213).

The analogy of a wandering race of people looking for a promised land and Africans dispersed throughout the world by force has significant symbolic significance. The end of the Jewish quest comes by taking possession of the Promised Land gives the Israelites an identity that they had not known since the time of pre-bondage and slavery days. Until the Jews take possession of the Promised Land, their captivity and nomadic wandering as they seek redemption and the promise of a new life, define them. Upon

taking possession of their homeland, they immediately gain identity by having the freedom to self-govern and in contemporary time define their identity by their resilient ability to fight off extinction. It is no surprise that dispersed Africans identify in the account of a Jewish Promised Land and find hope that someday they will become beneficiaries of a homeland from which to claim their identity.

Judy does not attempt to establish a link between the analogy of Jewish nomadic life and the African Diaspora. The purging of the remnants of a culture of bondage and servitude, culminating in the restoration of Jewish identity by taking possession of the Promised Land may very well serve as an archetype for the plight of nomadic Africans yet to reunite in a promised land of their own. There are many references in the literature to make an archetypal comparison plausible. Judy in her critique of Gilroy's (1993) term "raciology" attempts to establish that the collective consciousness or the collective experience of African Diaspora is linguistic, not genetic. Judy (2001) writes, "It is not so much the case that the work of Africa Diaspora studies I've cited here explicitly asserts that the resemblance of cultural expression can be accounted for as genetic inheritance. But it does explicitly struggle to delineate a general continuous African intelligence by mapping resemblances of cultural expression between diverse dark-skinned populations in the Atlantic basin. Because it approaches the question in this way, it presumes phenotypic resemblance indicates collective or group intelligence – in precisely the same way that Kant understood character trait to be biologically hereditary" (p. 209). Judy rejects the notion of a genetic collective intelligence in favor of a linguistic shared experience. Judy agrees with Gilroy that the African collective conscious is a hybrid mixture of diverse cultures that populate the Atlantic. While the collective experiences

share markers of commonality, the hypothesis of a genetic double-consciousness seems a less realistic proposal than that of a linguistic based double-consciousness.

The significance of this to Capitalism is that slavery is a capitalist venture and a profitable one at that. Arguably, slavery as a historic phenomenon pre-dates Romans and Greeks; but it is understood that capitalists turn slavery into a global business venture; not simply part of the spoils gained by victory in war. How much of the current economic disparity between African American and white citizens is traceable to the slave trade is a controversial subject, but one that the capitalist discourse seeks to avoid. Dewey (2004) makes an interesting reference to slavery and the rationalization of slave culture as in the interest of the state. Dewey (2004) says that, “In his day Aristotle could easily employ the logic of general concepts superior to individuals to show that the institution of slavery was in the interests both of the state and of the slave class. Even if the intention is not to justify the existing order the effect is to divert attention from special situations” (p. 110). There is no doubt that Dewey is not excusing the United States for its complicity in facilitating slavery and active orientation of the democratic social structure to accommodate slavery. The interpretation within the context of the passage is for every moral wrong there is a complementary justification by a constructed ‘superior class’ giving rise to notion that there is a constructed ‘inferior class’ from which emanates an interest of the state. Institutionalizing a class as ‘inferior’ and a class as ‘superior’ is a concrete manifestation of slave culture. The slave is powerless as the state and the superior class is in control. Returning to the original question of an African Diaspora cultural connection, then Judy is not completely right to assert there is only linguistic connection stripping of the identity of millions of Africans through slave economics.

Dewey (2005) says, “It is generally believed, for example, that slave labor was ultimately wasteful even from the purely economic point of view – that there was not sufficient stimulus to direct the energies of slaves, and that there was consequent wastage. Moreover, since slaves were confined to certain prescribed callings, much talent must have remained unavailable for the community, and hence there was a dead loss” (p. 337-338). Other scholars such as Smith (1999), Gilroy (1993), and Du Bois (1989) point to the waste of economic talent when the examination of slavery is from an economic perspective leads to the conclusion, slavery is unsustainable. This analysis logically leads to the question if slavery is an unsustainable economic practice, why did the capitalist economic system continue the practice of slave trading through the late nineteenth century and some argue, beyond? There are two answers the first economic and the second the construction of a racial identity as inferior to a dominant white culture.

Dewey is correct to assert philosophically that a person with a stake in an activity is more apt to put forth a better effort. He is wrong to believe the cost of labor was the not the prime driver for maintaining slave culture. The egregious cost to the social structure of United States remains unaccounted. Novack (1975) attributes the conclusion of economic investigation of slave culture by Dewey to Dewey’s inability to dislodge his analysis from his own position of privilege as a white-middle-class-male. Du Bois (1975) observes, “Among these you and I especially are victims of those so-called racial problems which range themselves about the history of slavery in the country, and which have left us, some twelve or more millions of people more or less of African descent, of varying cultures and different degrees of education, who stand out, not simply because of visible differences in their appearance, but because of historical differences due to their

cultural and economic inheritance” (2001, p. 172). The experience of Dewey, his personal identity, and the social construction of the identity of a white middle class male contrasts starkly with Du Bois. Although not a slave, born of free parents, educated, and living in the north Du Bois experiences slave culture, racial economics, and racist attitudes as if *slavery is his experience*. The constructed identity of Du Bois is through his experience and through the experience of African Americans, he observes. Du Bois is a slave, not of birth, but by treatment in a white dominated capitalist social structure.

Du Bois feels the pain of slavery as the cultural consciousness of the slave culture remains intact though the dismantling of the legal institutionalization of slavery is in the past. The foundation of Du Boisian double-consciousness relies on linguistic expressions of the experience of the historic accounts of slavery and the slave trade. In the example of the African-American, the collective experience of slavery is pre-Civil War with the height of the slave trade in the years leading to the Civil War. For the Afro-European, the collective experience of slavery occurs much earlier and for a longer period. Gilroy (1993) and others suggest the notion of a ‘transnational diasporic’ history of black slaves with the ‘slave ship’ as vessel of transit and as a symbolic means to knowledge. In Gilroy’s attempt to anchor ‘black modernism’ in a ‘continual proximity to the unspeakable terrors of the slave experience,’ the slave experience becomes an icon for modernity and passage becomes a metaphor anchored somewhere in vanishing history” (1993, p. 7). The common variable in American and European slavery is the passage; the metaphor of the slave ship linking slave cultures with other slave cultures in time. The discourse of the curriculum of Capitalism is to deny the identity of African American minorities by detaching African Americans from slave culture. The argument goes

something like this: slavery ended, civil rights passed, get over it. Thus the message that Du Bois eloquently terms 'double consciousness' has an economic connotation as racial economics continue to process cultural identity as a non-issue, dismissing the truth that repentance without recompense signals that the racial economic sub-culture is as strong today as it was in Du Bois's day. Artifacts of slave culture remain powerful psychological reminders of racial economy. These include references to lynching, code words, symbols such as flags, and other artifacts that are interpretable by African Americans as relating their personal identity with slave culture (Pinar, 2001).

In the collective experience of the American or Euro-African slave, certain objects retain symbolic meaning and remain in the collective conscious. Chains, ankle cuffs, whips, branding tools, ropes, and of course ships, become metaphors representing loss of freedom, loss of agency, forced labor, loss of life, and dislocation from their native homelands. From this linguistic metaphorical perspective, it becomes apparent why for example the Southern Confederate flag is an abomination to African-Americans. More than one-hundred forty years after the Civil War, the image resonates deep within the subconscious. Pinar (2001) demonstrates the power of the subconscious symbol when he catalogs in his work words such as 'lynch' and why certain symbols set off a deep reaction in the mind of African Americans and other minorities. While 'just a flag' to many white Americans, the Confederate flag is another reminder of the terror inflicted forced labor of slavery; it gouges at the double-consciousness of African-Americans and reminds them of what once was and what still is in parts of American society and the world. M'Baye (2004) writes, "Du Bois's theory of race centered on the idea that Blacks of the United States and Africa have experienced similar social predicaments under a

European oppression and tyranny that has created chaos in the lives of Blacks on both sides of the Atlantic. For Du Bois, this oppression began with the brutal trans-Atlantic slave trade, which changed the destiny of the Black forever” (p. 41). In a transnational global capitalist social structure the symbolic use of slave cultural artifacts are powerful tools for oppression and powerful tools to suppress expression.

Dickson (1992) addresses the issue of double-consciousness and Du Bois by explaining the Du Bois has in mind three sets of circumstances that form the basis of the consciousness of the African-American. The first is that Du Bois intends his reference to relate to the naïve and stereotypical view that many white people held in the post-reconstruction era. These stereotypical views form powerful psychological obstacles to African-Americans and serve as an inhibiting force to creating a new identity unfettered by the era of slavery. The power of these stereotypical views institutionalized formally into laws (Jim Crow) or informally in the form of racial discrimination that excludes many African-Americans from participating fully in the U.S. democratic society. These institutionalized regulating precepts form the second set of circumstances. Combined, the two sets of circumstances conspire to create within the African-American a sense that they are *American and not American*; the warring conscious as Du Bois (1989) refers.

Dickson (1992) suggests, “Du Bois referred most importantly to an internal conflict in the African American individual between what was ‘African’ and what was ‘American.’ The third set is the belief in a spiritual tie or a belief that the soul is connected to something larger. It was in the terms of this third set that the figurative background to ‘double consciousness’ gave the term its most obvious support, because for Du Bois the essence of distinctive African consciousness was its spirituality, a

spirituality based on Africa, but revealed among African-Americans as their folklore, their history of patient suffering, and their faith. In this sense, double consciousness related to Du Bois's efforts to privilege the spiritual in relation to the materialistic, commercial world of white America" (p. 301). Whether identity manifests in any of the ways described by Dickson or any different way, constructed identity and racial economics play a huge role in disenfranchising African Americans and others from participating in the global economic social structures. The curriculum of Capitalism and global Capitalism does little to change these real manifestations left from slave culture. It is *real*, not imagined, and relevant to the experience of democracy by people of different cultures. A culture that is socially just is unsustainable by an economic social system that utilizes racist symbols as an element of control. How does symbolism manifest in the classroom of public schools?

Beyond the obvious marginalization found in textbooks and curriculum, are subtle code words segregating minorities from others. Inside contemporary public school classrooms, the construction of identity manifests in the code word 'achievement gap' or the measure of academic progress of minorities against a culturally dominant white scale. The curriculum of Capitalism reconciles the contradiction between the achievement gap and construction of identity by shifting the blame to the pedagogical methods of educators. The gap remains not because social construction is a prevalent force in the public school system; rather achievement gap is the result of progressive education policies that fail to remedy the situation due to an erroneous assumption that standardization and standardized pedagogical practice are not answers. I contend racial social construction in the United States is a cultural remnant, unacknowledged and

accounted for, of slave culture. The collective cultural consciousness of minorities constructs a very different view of democracy from that of the dominant white cultural consciousness. In contrasting the differing constructions, the next section contrasts Du Bois notion of ‘double consciousness’ with Dewey’s notion of ‘lived experience’.

Double Consciousness: Of Souls and Lived Experiences

Gibson (Du Bois, 1989) in his introduction to an edition of *The Souls of Black Folk* writes, “This book, *The Souls of Black Folk* (1989), signals Du Bois growing awareness of the link between thought as abstract and independently existing and thought as grounded in human experience” (1989, p. x). Blackburn (1996) defines the ‘soul’ as, “The immaterial “I” that possesses conscious experience, controls passion, desire, and action, and maintains a perfect identity from birth (or before) to death (or after)” (p. 357). The constructed identity is not part of the soul; it wars with the soul. It is the notion that experience is lived in a social context, but the soul is resistant to the faux construction of identity. The soul lives in the subconscious and filters every experience through collective cultural memory. *The Lived Experience* is Dewey’s attempt to reconcile personal identity with a social structure that is negating, discouraging, and often time constructed to assure personal failure. Du Bois’s notion in *The Souls of Black Folk* is to find a way to connect marginalized people to an authentic caring democratic community free from the artificial constructs of race, class, and gender.

Individuals isolate out of fear; fear to confront controversial issues, fear stepping outside of their constructed identity, and fear from the uncertainty of the unknown. Thus, we live our lives experiencing less than we should, believing that we are deserving of something better, and paralyzed to pursue beyond years of conditioning by social

construction. This may seem a pessimistic account of modern society, but one does not have to look far to see the truth in this statement. Nor does a moment of the day go by when most of us would rather seek solace in some place other than where we are. The modern technologically advanced social structure removes private space substituting in its place a 'techno-space' where individuals communicate anonymously detaching from the necessity of face-to-face communication. "Democracy," writes Carlson (2002), "cannot be sustained from a position of detachment, by people who are no longer attuned to the world around them or engaged in real struggles going on in the world, in which real human bodies are on the line, real people are being discriminated against, real battles are being waged in local communities over commitments to human freedom and equity" (p. 177- 178). The notion of isolation shadows the educator and student in public schools.

In describing the conundrum of isolation in the world of public education, Parker (1894) says, "The fundamental method of Old World education is *isolation*; it is supported by no particular party or sect; the people educated in this method believe in it from their habit of life and the tradition of ages. Why should they understand the genius of American liberty? Why should those who have become habituated to class education believe that the stratification of American society into fixed classes means sure death to the republic and the future hopes of democracy" (p. 10)? Little is changing in public schools since eighteen ninety-four. Isolation and its companion alienation undermine the best efforts of committed progressive educators to educate youth on key elements of a democratic system. The practical reality of the public school day is that students will come to recognize forces that shape their destiny; they will have no say. The curriculum of Capitalism may promote Capitalism as the impetus for economic freedom, but isolates

(segregates) students from the reality that social construction by race, class, and gender will limit choices. The argument in public education is and will always be education is the ticket to greater economic freedom. The reality is this argument is a dubious proposition for many minority students in public schools as their daily experience contradicts the idealism of the proposition. The ambiguity of message and reality has potentially negative consequences for democracy. Du Bois (1989) describes the ambiguity as 'double consciousness.

Dewey (2005) in presenting a vision for democracy agrees with Du Bois. The problem with Dewey is the assumption race and gender does not impose a heavier burden upon minorities than the dominant white culture. Dewey laments the fact that corporeal interests devour individualism and that true freedom is on the wane. These interests include economic, social, class, and other influences that detach the individual from serving the larger interests of the community (Dewey, 1981). Dewey makes no attempt to address the racial argument of Du Bois and that is African Americans (other minorities as well) experience democracy in two ways; the democracy that promotes the ideal of full citizenship and the reality of capitalist social democracy that exploits minority labor. Social construction is a useful tool for capitalists as it preserves a class of people isolating them from becoming stable economically and on parity with the dominant power structure.

The metaphor of the 'veil' (Du Bois, 1989) describes the experience of dual consciousness of African-Americans as they confront the socially un-progressive policies of a capitalist social structure with the promise of racial equality taught in public schools as achieved. In contrast to Dewey, privilege will not protect Du Bois from the racial

economy or from a capitalist social structure that will not allow Du Bois to experience democracy as Dewey. Du Bois (1989) describes the duality this way, "... the Negro is a sort of seventh son, born with a veil, and gifted with second-sight in this American world, a world which yields him no true self-consciousness, but only lets him see himself through the revelation of the other world. It is a peculiar sensation, this double consciousness, this sense of always looking at one's self through the eyes of others, of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity" (p. 5, 1989). The poignancy of the veil symbolizes a prevailing feeling that something is pressing upon the deepest recesses of the intellect and subconscious. Its existence manifests in social situations and responses that are rationally inexplicable. The veil represents an unavailing sense of having no beneficial use or capability for contribution to society. My contention is the metaphorical veil is emblematic for the achievement gap, remediation, labeling, and describes the sorry state of public education as educators fail to grasp standardization is not the cure to a socially segregated and capitalist social system. Du Bois uses the veil to represent the conscious awareness of the difference that separates African Americans (other minorities as well) from their white counterparts, but in a way in which many of us do not have the experience to comprehend. Understanding the metaphor of the veil and personal identity as socially constructed in a capitalist social structure may be the key to unlocking the prospect of a socially progressive education system leading the path to a socially progressive democracy.

Menand (2001) captures the essence of the plight of the soul of African Americans when he writes, "Du Bois thought that African-Americans were torn by what he called 'two warring ideals,' an apparently unrealizable desire to be black and

Americans at the same time. But ‘double- consciousness’ does not refer to this tension between identities. It refers to a lack of identity” (p. 395). The denial of the identity of the African-American and the metaphor of the veil is textually comparable to the description of the *lost individual* by Dewey or to *one-dimensional man* by Marcuse. Later Menand (2001) continues this vein of thought, “. . . which is that the white-American sentiment liberty would not be the same without the black-American sentiment of oppression to set beside it” (p. 396). The remnant from the slave culture in the collective cultural consciousness of African Americans and in the collective cultural consciousness of white Americans continues to haunt the prospect for a progressive education system until there is acknowledgement, reconciliation, and recompense. The curriculum of Capitalism will need revision to include serious discourse and reflection to deconstruct social construction of personal identity as well as de-commoditize certain racial groups in the capitalist economic system. Whether Gilroy, Menand, or Du Bois, the premise is that personal identity is a type of commodity that the dominant culture establishes a value just as any other commodity in a capitalist social structure. In supporting the Du Boisian concept of duality, one conclusion in relation to public school curriculum is that social construction facilitates a peculiar type of education whereby the contributions of people more in line with that of the dominant culture are included in the curriculum whereas those who are different will be excluded just as they are in society.

No one can mistake the clarity of Du Bois on the notion of duality with Dewey’s (1981) ambivalence on the subject. Possibly, due to Dewey’s position of privilege or lack of experience with issues of race, Dewey struggles with defining duality. In attempting to resolve the idea of duality or double consciousness, Dewey (1981) seems to imply that

dualities are extreme opposites. The logic of this position reflects the Jamesian (James, 2000) orthodox notion of pragmatism and why Dewey, whose idea of pragmatism is not as dogmatic, favors the notion of duality, though the material is not definitive on this point. However, I do not believe that Dewey disagrees with Cash and Schwab's notion that duality is the presence of the feeling that a person does not belong, must choose between two very different worlds, and must deny their own personal cultural identity to successfully navigate between the two worlds (Cash & Schwab, 2004). Deweyan democracy is pluralist and it is difficult to imagine Dewey rejecting any ideal leading to a pluralist socially responsible democracy. "The human ideal is indeed comprehensive. As a standpoint from which to view existing conditions and to judge the direction change should take, it cannot be too inclusive" (Boydston, 1990, p. xxxiii). Du Boisian dual consciousness may be more comparable to Dewey's (1981) notion of the 'lost individual'.

Dewey (1981) expresses a similar to Du Bois sense of futility when Dewey describes the lost individual. The lost individual unwittingly forfeits their identity to corporate interests. Corporate interests may be government, business, or social; but all of them are authoritarian and serve to sort by race, class, or gender. Corporate interests isolate citizens from previous social, moral, ethical, and economic conventions that they once share with a larger homogenous community. The lost individual perceives the loss of freedom and control over their lives and searches in vain for something to cling. Nostalgic for the past, they tightly grasp any convenience (religion, social, or chemical dependency) that satisfies the craving for acceptance, and for a time, reclaim their personal identity. Dewey (1981) pointedly complains that while large corporate interests

pretend to have the best interest of the individual at heart, it is contradictory for them to place private gain secondary to satisfying the contentment of their constituencies. From the perspective of the public school system, students and educators feel the same sense of displacement Dewey describes as the lost individual. Dewey says of students attending school, "There can be no question, I think, that school life has lost a great deal of its meaning for children because they cannot see any relationship between it and the social life which they are carrying outside the walls" (Boydston, 1990, p. 235). For minority this feeling amplifies as the cultural identity of students is lost in an effort to conform to a standard that seems in constant flux and change.

Garrison (1997) says, "The moral dialectic between the actual and the possible is the dialectic of freedom" (p. 22). For the lost individual to reclaim their life from the pervasive interests of corporatization they will need to assert freedom. For the metaphoric Du Boisian veil to lift, the African-American or cultural minority must assert their freedom. Garrison (1997) writes, "Freedom, I want to suggest, is freedom to grow in healthy relationships with others to the greatest, most integrated expanse we can attain without despair. We are freest when bound by the greatest good that is within our unique potential to obtain" (p. 169). Garrison seizes on the notion by Du Bois and Dewey that freedom is a natural desire inherent in human beings from the time they are born. For Garrison the dialectic of freedom within Dewey's contextual framework is a reasonable claim. For Du Bois the dual nature of the veil obscures the meaning of freedom.

Reasserting and reclaiming authentic identity from the clutches of constructed identity is no easy task. McDermott (Dewey, 1981) believes reclamation is a product of asserting individuality within the larger body of the social structure. "Assured and

integrated individuality is the product of definite social relationships and publicly acknowledged functions,” writes McDermott (Dewey, p. 599, 1981). Dewey believes the aim of progressives is the defense of individual liberty and freedom (Ryan, 1995, p. 319). In his essay, *The Problem of Freedom*, Dewey (1989) begins the essay by posing a series of questions in an effort to analyze the meaning of freedom. Dewey distinguishes the word freedom from the word liberty. The definition for the word *free or freedom* is not being under the authority or power; independent from the controlling influence of others. Liberty by Dewey’s definition is synonymous with categories of freedom. Freedom is a natural right of people whereas liberty is a privilege bestowed upon an individual by a governing authority. Du Bois makes no distinction between the two words. I suspect this due to the simple fact for the African-American in *The Souls of Black Folk*; you cannot lose what you do not have. Du Bois (1989) contends that the African-American has never known freedom or the privilege of liberty, as they have no identities in society. In order to enjoy the privileges of liberty, recognition of the existence that a person has equal standing in society confers status and privileges of liberty. In the curriculum of Capitalism, the loss of freedom is the loss of economic freedom, or the freedom to produce and earn. Du Bois and Dewey define freedom in broader terms applying freedom as the key to experiencing democracy.

Du Bois and Dewey recognize that individual freedom is an intricate component of a democratic society. In *The Souls of Black Folk*, Du Bois (1903/1989) establishes the thesis that African-Americans are not free, legally or otherwise, because they remain separate from every aspect of U.S. society. In contrast with Dewey’s (McDermott, 1987) *The Lost Individual*, individuals isolate and separate from society, but not for racial

reasons as in Du Bois. Industrialization, crass commercialization, exploitation of workers by large institutions, and governing structures isolate individuals from the essential social organizations such as spiritual, education, or civic in the Dewey concept. Dewey is not wrong for many citizens, but for minorities the physical isolation that Dewey describes is in addition to the mental anguish of the loss of cultural consciousness and identity. The notion of freedom is elusive and a culturally constructed term. Clearly, many citizens experience freedom in different ways and that is the point that Du Bois and Dewey address. Isolation and alienation are as much a part of the experience of democracy as inclusion and acceptance.

Du Bois and Dewey explore the plight of the individual, the loss of freedom, and reclaiming identity. Du Bois explores race whereas Dewey explores class. For Dewey, individual freedom is under constant threat and the logical response is to change society in dramatic fashion to reclaim the natural right of individuals to live free. Du Bois hopes for a future without racial minority construction and promotes the notion of economic parity with the dominant social class as the path to social equality. Du Bois and Dewey may appear to be an odd couple with little or nothing in common. The research demonstrates otherwise. Dewey through the experience of privilege and Du Bois through experience of double consciousness come to the same conclusion concerning the capitalist social structure in America. Education may be the last hope for reconstructing the capitalist social structure into a humane and pluralist model that respects diversity as the critical element of a democratic society. The education of students without critically examining the curriculum of Capitalism threatens democracy and divides society along

racial and class lines. Reconceptualizing racial identity and collective cultural consciousness into an affirmative experience is the subject of the next section.

Praxis

Bachelard (2000) says, “A sick soul – especially one that suffers the pain of time and of despair – has to be cured by living and thinking rhythmically, by rhythmic attentiveness and rhythmic repose” (p. 21). Du Bois asserts through the metaphor of the veil and the concept of dual consciousness, the capitalist social structure consists of a regrettable sense of isolation, disenfranchisement, and most significantly de-synchronization with many citizens in society. Isolation is not a new cultural phenomenon, but the awareness of isolation in public school classroom is growing at an alarming rate. Isolation leads to dissolution, hopelessness, academic failure, school violence, and social decay in the form of rising crime, chemical dependency, homelessness, and chronic unemployment. Dewey and Du Bois comprehend how citizens experience democracy is different from the vision of democracy, a free and tolerant society of citizens committed to a common ideal. Bachelard’s (2000) notion is to cure the sick soul by restoring the rhythm, re-syncing socially, and connecting on a deeply personal level. Du Bois or Dewey might ask how you find a rhythm when you live in two disjointed realities.

Re-syncing disjointed realities is no easy task, but as with all tasks, it begins with acknowledging that you cannot alter present reality by disavowing the past. Public school students conditioned by years of the curriculum Capitalism have a void of imagination or the desire to create. The lost individual is isolated and hopelessly marks time until at some point like all mechanized systems, wear and tear take their toll sending them to a

junk pile. Serres (2004) places in context this notion repetition and interchangeability, “The working of the monitoring of intelligence can become – oh irony of ironies! – not at all unlike the slowed-down dynamism of stupidity.” How do you find a rhythm when all that you do is an anachronism? How do you find a rhythm that is owned by the self, not the corporation” (p. 104)? Du Bois and Dewey appear to present hopeless situations in which the alternative is no better than the original. The curriculum of Capitalism promotes the notion of unilateralism over cooperation, and glorifies rugged individualism, which is detrimental to democratic social structure. Rugged individualism has left us vulnerable, isolated, and alienated from social relations.

Rugged individualism, manifest destiny, or the myths of the self-made man are artifacts and representations of the curriculum of Capitalism. These quaint cultural notions have consequences that lead to de-humanization and marginalization of minorities by race and class. These myths negate democratic practice by not acknowledging the force of social construction. Ideas have consequences and the consequence of these ideas immobilize our sense of cohesion and strip from each of us the freedom to imagine, to create, and to live in new potentialities as well as create a world devoid of social conscious and social justice. Ideological cultural icons produce a feeling that we have lost our souls and replacing them with faux ideology of consumerism, non-accountability for marginalized oppressed people, and that we are better off not concerning ourselves with external issues of the social structure. Live for the moment – for the moment is all that I have is the cry of the contemporary economic epicurean. “The function of the philosopher,” writes Serres (2004), “the care and the

passion of the philosopher, is the negentropic ringing-of-the-changes of the possible” (p.23).

I believe that we are to live creative and imaginative lives transporting others and ourselves to places where they can experience the freedom of the possible. If Du Bois and Dewey leave but one idea, it is that the social structure of the modern world can be reoriented to a new social structure that emphasizes social justice, equality, and above all else, personal liberty within the context of our own social responsibility. Du Bois or Dewey is not a pessimist. Both men characterize the social structure with accuracy and though their characterizations are negative, the options for change are not. Du Bois and Dewey start by deconstructing and dismantling the negative forces of the curriculum of Capitalism and re-configuring a new social democracy. Though they cannot change the collective cultural memory, by acknowledging the errors of the past, a new collective cultural memory will replace the old. Reforming public school education requires a replacing the curriculum of Capitalism with a socially oriented curriculum that acknowledges human beings will not survive in isolation or from alienation from the social structure. Du Bois and Dewey represent the notion that every person has worth. Recognizing the contributions of marginalized peoples to the world is the first step to reconstructing personal and cultural identities, not in the image of white dominant culture; rather in the authentic image that the social structure for too long has hidden. Authentic democracy requires unraveling the capitalist social structure and reconstructing an innovative social structure whereby race, class, and gender issues become relics and artifacts of a less progressive democratic society.

CHAPTER IV – DORIS LESSING: THE CURRICULUM OF CAPITALISM AND GENDER

Biography of a Critical Pragmatist Feminist

There are times in life when the question of knowing if one can think differently than one thinks and perceive differently than one see is absolutely necessary if one is to on looking and reflecting at all (Duncker, 1996, p. 30).

The selection of Doris Lessing may seem as an unnatural or curious choice from which to approach the subject of gender economics and personal identity. While many may be familiar with her work, many may not. A major underlying premise for the framework for this research is democracy is a personal experience. To comprehend, make sense of, or interpret democracy from a personal perspective utilizing bio or auto biographical material is a prerequisite to ferreting out the relationship between individuals and social structures. Progressive curriculum theorists (reconceptualists) believe the humanities represent the cultural thinking during a specific period and are legitimate instruments for adding context to personal narratives as well as provide insight into the construction of social structures. Chapter four begins with a short biography of Doris Lessing, which is consistent with the notion by contemporary curriculum theorists that biography and autobiography is an important aspect in developing theories to comprehend social structures and relations from the perspective of race, class, or gender. Lessing is a prolific author of feminist oriented fiction satisfying the criteria by progressive curriculum theorists of utilizing works from the humanities as research tools.

Lessing's claim to the international spotlight is that she is a recipient of a Nobel Prize for Literature in 2007. After receiving the prestigious award, an interviewer wrote

under the title, *Lessing unhappy with Nobel Prize win*, “The Nobel Prize has led her on an endless stream of public appearances that have thoroughly disrupted her life. All I do now is give interviews and spend time being photographed,” said Lessing (UPI Staff Reporter, 2008). Other than an author, she is not renowned for philanthropy, social work, or charitable endeavors. Lessing is not a towering scholar in the traditional sense of the word scholar. She is not a noted political leader although she is political. Lessing is not an educator and in fact, her formal education ends at the early age of fourteen. She is simultaneously loved and reviled by feminists, capitalists, and socialists alike. Like Du Bois, her personal philosophy is fluid as is her spirituality, in constant state of shifting. So, why Lessing when there are a many credible critical feminists?

The perception of experience is that experience is personal and exclusive. Du Bois, Dewey, and others suggest experience is not as unique as human beings like to believe. There exists a shared cultural experience whereby though an individual may not have experienced a specific phenomenon they share in the experience by being members of a particular group (Gilroy, 1993). Experience has a universal aspect in time and in breadth. Reading autobiography, sharing stories or other forms of communicating experience is of interest because every human being on the planet shares experience that connects on an emotional level with other humans. Experience may not be unique; interpretation of the experience conceptualizes and contextualizes significant events. Many can vividly recall where and what they were doing the day John Kennedy is assassinated or on September 11, 2001 the attack on the World Trade Center. The interpretations of the experience of events color the perception and feelings towards issues such as military defense, relations with Muslim countries, or immigration policies.

Personalization of experience is sometimes referred to as the cognitive content, or “the sum or range of what has been perceived, discovered, and learned” (Staff Editors Visual Thesaurus, 2010). Greene (2001) adds her perspective to the definition of experience, “To deny the role of our “experience and interpretation” is to separate oneself as subject from a world made into object. It is to give up the responsibility for critical reflection, to take an absolute and one-dimensional view. Also, it is to accede to predefinition by conventional wisdom or by “official” spokesman for the culture, whether representative or not” (p. 18).^{viii}

We are the sum of our experience and in many respects, the accumulation of the experience of others by interaction. Some research concludes as a person ages and matures from teenager to elderly, that they will confuse personal experience with those of others in that separation is indiscernible. I contend it is not confusion, rather ‘infusion’ as the input of every conversation, sound, joy, moribund sadness, etc. – whether yours or someone else’s – accumulates and becomes part of a persons’ own experience and part of the cultural collective memory. Dewey (1981) and Du Bois (1989) suggest experience is the key to understanding the constructed self as part personal experience and part learned experience through social interaction. The rare individual is able to align their personal identity with constructed identity so that they are one in the same. Lessing (2008) says that, “You can be with old people, even those getting on a bit, and never suspect that whole continents of experience are there, just behind those ordinary faces” (p. 139). Lessing (1996) credits her empathy as the unique ability to connect with a diverse range of people and to incorporate their experiences into works of fiction from her years of being an author (p. 397).

Lessing is extraordinary and ordinary. She is not pretentious, judgmental, or critical without examination. Lessing's work constructs an archway between the lives of Du Bois, Dewey, Marcuse, and Feyerabend representing an experiential gateway for transition bridging multi-discourses through time. She retains a global perspective, cynicism but not necessarily a dislike for socialism, a unique observer of racial inequality, and presents a strong feminist perspective lacking in the modern feminist movement. Lessing (2008), by her own account, prefers to live an almost Spartan life among ordinary people, so much so that she often sojourns recording her impressions of people she meets for use as characters in her novels, articles, and short stories. "Living in London," Lessing (2008) writes, "I meet no one who is not vertiginously interesting, so it can't be the craving for novelty which drives me out of England. When short of a hair shirt, the puritan conscience torments itself because one is not meeting ordinary people, but it would be better occupied wondering why one has spent relentless years levering oneself out of the tedium of provincial life only to be afflicted by doubts as to the wholesome influence one must be missing" (p. 62).

To understand Lessing is to comprehend the unique biography of a woman who seems to transcend time. Her vibrant life, commitment to individuality, and biting social commentary are standing testament to the insidious but subtle effects of Capitalism upon impoverished peoples across the globe. Lessing was born in 1919 in what is now modern Iran, to British parents. Her father a disabled veteran of World War I and her mother a nurse, moved to Southern Rhodesia giving up the comfortable lifestyle of middle class banker and nurse to become maize farmers (Hanford, 2008). While the soil was infertile and produced a barely sustentative income in which to support the family, the arid heat of

the plains the Rhodesian (today, Zimbabwe) germinate the seeds for an extraordinary literary career in Doris Lessing. In the foreword of her book, *Alfred and Emily*, Lessing writes describing her parents, “My parents were remarkable, in their very different ways. What they did not have in common was their energy. The First World War did them both in. Shrapnel shattered my father’s leg, and thereafter he had to wear a wooden one. He never recovered from the trenches. He died at sixty-two, and old man. On the death certificate should have been written, as cause of death, the Great War. My mother’s great love, a doctor, drowned in the channel. She did not recover from that loss. I have tried to give them lives as might have been if there had been no World War One” (Lessing, 2008, p. vii).

Later in the foreword, Lessing describes her life in relation to the Great War, “That war, the Great War, the war that would end all war, squatted over my childhood. The trenches were as present to me as anything I actually saw around me. And here I still am, trying to get out from under that monstrous legacy, trying to get free” (2008, p. viii). In the life of Lessing is a dualism similar in many respects to Du Bois and Dewey as they describe double consciousness and the lost individual. For Lessing her autobiography and fictional characters represent a complex addition to the identity of duality making her experience a triad of conflict. These conflicts are her experience with elements of society (race, class, and gender) in a colonized part of South Africa, her affability for Communists, and later, her life in England. Differing from Du Bois, Dewey, Marcuse, and Feyerabend, Lessing chooses to publicly acknowledge, claim, and embrace her identity while simultaneously railing against forces attempting to construct Lessing in the

image of society. Lessing's life is a timeline bridging Du Bois and Dewey with Marcuse and Feyerabend.

Identity, Critical Feminism, and the Curriculum of Capitalism

When the immigration official reached me, I had written on the form: *Nationality*, British, *Race*, European: and it was the first time in my life I had to claim myself as a member of one race and disown the others (Lessing, 2007, p. 62).

The conflict for Lessing is the construction of gender in society. Lessing and the female characters in her fictional accounts do not accept the notion of male superiority and present to the world characters that are socially responsible, irrepressible, and intelligent about many matters that males believe to be their private domain. Lessing in an interview by Field (1994) describes her observation of the role of females in male dominated society prior to 1950 as, "There is a whole generation of women who had ambitions and assorted careers, and it was as if their lives came to a stop when they had children. Most of them got pretty neurotic – because I think, of the contrast between what they were taught at school they were capable of being and what actually happened to them" (p. 48). Lessing's body of work contains many examples of social construction of the expectation for females different from males and the frustration a double standard creates. There is an expression of a deep sense of a loss of identity from the abject oppression of the male dominated social structure places upon females of intellect. The character Mary in her autobiographical-fictional novel *The Grass is Singing* describes the sense of loss after overhearing some of the younger women gossiping about her age (she had recently turned 30) and her failed first marriage to a man twenty-years her senior. "At the age of thirty, this woman who had had a 'good' state education, a thoroughly

comfortable life enjoying herself in a civilized way, and access to all knowledge of her time (only she read nothing but bad novels) knew so little about herself that she was thrown completely off her balance because some gossiping women had said she ought to get married” (Lessing, 1950/2002, p. 43). Mary, educated and with a job that pays a wage greater than most, is unable to shake the sense that she was missing out. Rather than come to terms with what she is missing she allows society to define for her what the deficiency in her life is. Mary is representative of many females in society who follow the same path of education and career as males, yet are unable to break the stigma that as females they are neglecting a higher calling, family, and children. Capitalist orientation of family relations portrays the family as a married couple, the head of the family male, and the male responsible for all the financial arrangements. This portrayal of family is no longer valid as there are a number of arrangements in contemporary society redefining the word family. The curriculum of Capitalism in public schools promote the first representation of family over all others; even though many students are under the care of single mothers, single fathers, grandparents, foster care, and etc.. Male domination in feminist literature is sometimes referred to as the patriarchal society. Though Lessing is able to rise above the expectation, her fictional characters are archetypes for many females in the global economy. They remain the rule, not the exception; tragically mired in lives of someone else’s making and confined by social construction.

The contradiction for Lessing as a feminist is to acknowledge the reality of discrimination by a dominant white male culture, but due to her relation with father, Lessing does not share the belief by many feminists that the lack of progress in gender equity is primarily the result of patriarchal oppression. In many instances of feminist

oriented scholarly literature, feminists take issue with other feminists critical of patriarchal oppression as the sole reason for lack of progress in gender related social issues. Feminists no longer embrace Lessing as a leader and Lessing shares a similar criticism of Seigfried (1996) who openly challenges feminist on the issue of patriarchal oppression with her contra-orthodox feminist view of patriarchal oppression. Seigfried claims pragmatism as her personal philosophy and writes from the perspective of a feminist pragmatist. Seigfried (1996) believes orthodox feminists spend too much time assigning blame for the lack of progress in gender issues and not enough in presenting practical workable solutions that will move gender issues to the forefront of resolution. While difficult to situate Lessing as a critical feminist, it is equally difficult to align her with pragmatists as Seigfried or for that matter Addams (1911) a progressive.

In her autobiography, *Under My Skin* (1996) Lessing makes the decision to separate herself from her old life and abandon her husband and children. Why did she feel the necessity of dramatic if not radical change? Lessing (1996) answers, "It was the system I hated. But, I would keep to myself the thoughts that I had about it. The terrible provincialism and narrowness of the life? I would make virtue out of necessity" (p. 264). Lessing is marginalized by a society that believe the highest calling for females is at home performing domestic duties, and in a curious way, by her own feelings that something else is missing in her life. Lessing does not abandon her family because of any particular action of her husband or because he does not understand her need to extend herself beyond the routine duties of housekeeping. It is not that he does not care or does not get it. Lessing abandons her family because Frank, her spouse, has no need to act any differently. Frank is a cog of the 'system,' a product of the times, nothing more and

nothing less. He is the picture of middle class, a product of what society expects male figures to be with little or no ambition to move beyond his modest means he earns as a government bureaucrat. In the curriculum of Capitalism, the construction of Frank's identity and the construction of Lessing's identity are consistent with a capitalist perspective of family. Inconsistent with capitalist orientation is the decision by Lessing to abandon her family.

In describing her life altering decision, Lessing (1996) says of her husband, "Frank was uneasy because as a civil servant he could not afford contact with sedition and because my new life did not include him. I had become a Communist" (p. 259). Lessing violates the basic code of family life for females; never take any action that jeopardizes the role of the male in the family. Lessing expresses the anarchical philosophy that it is not the people but the oppressiveness of the system that drives a person to do things that a free person will not conceive rational if not driven into a mode of self-preservation. She describes the aura of disbelief surrounding her and no one believes her reasons for wanting to start a new life. The institutionalized belief system of the capitalist social structure has specific unwritten rules and foremost among the rules is a traditional family will remain united regardless of the situation. Certainly this is the example of her parents; her father physically crippled by war, her mother emotionally crippled by the loss of her first love, and both living in abject poverty in a country foreign to their own nationality. Pressed by conformity Lessing revolts in the most spectacular way she can possibly rebel; abandoning her family. "When I said I was leaving Frank," writes Lessing (1996), "because I wanted to live differently, no one believed me" (p. 265). Later she writes, "For a while before I left Frank I hated him. This was because I

was treating him badly. I understand why torturers have to hate their victims. I am not saying he behaved well, he did not, but that isn't the point" (p. 267). Readers of her autobiography are not in position to condone or excoriate Lessing for her actions, as the potentiality of radical action is evident in everyone. In order to rationalize her actions, the community that she and Frank live, rally in support of the male, siding with Frank – quick to rush to judgment – Lessing is accused of having an affair. Reacting to her critics, Lessing (1996) responds, "In fact I was having a love affair. Rather, an affair. I was not in love with him nor he with me, but it was the spirit of the times" (p. 265).

The curriculum of Capitalism promotes the nineteenth century romantic notion that marriage is an economic necessity and that women have a singular responsibility for child rearing whereas males are responsible to earn wages to support the family. Rooted deeply in the subtext of the curriculum is the value system conditioning males and females to adopt the norms of the society in which they reside without first examining the potential conflicts that arise from unequal economic arrangements as well as how to deal with people who are outliers and reject tradition by refusing to live in these arrangements. More poignantly and as the research by Rose (1990), Kozol (1991), and to some extent the more conservative scholar Fullan (2009) indicate students in single parent\guardian homes are at higher risk to dropout; the majority is students in single parent\guardian homes. A cursory review of research on the subject indicates that the dropout rate for minority students is always significantly higher than that of their white counterparts and in some studies, twice that of their white counterparts. Whether this is from a bias by educators and the education system against students who through no fault of their own find themselves in single parent\guardian homes is not clear as there is little hard

scientific research available on the specific topic. What is clear on an anecdotal basis despite massive efforts to improve the academics of at risk children, little improvement is occurring. The unanswered question is it possible the marginalization of students and failure to achieve in public school are due to social construction related to gender roles on a number of levels, parent, or child.

Inequality plays on multiple stages not the least is the social consequence of imbalance of economic power and wealth. Orthodox feminists point to numerous studies conducted by non-partisan and diverse economic groups that economic oppression of females remains a critical issue to securing gender equality nationally and abroad. Lessing, a feminist icon with the publication of *The Grass is Singing* (1950) as well as with the publication of *Golden Notebook* (1962), stuns orthodox feminists after an interview with Clark (2001) appears in international press journals. After a visit to a primary school Clark (2001) quotes Lessing saying, “I was in a class of nine and ten-year-olds, girls and boys, and this young woman was telling these kids that the reason for wars was the innately violent nature of man. You could see the little girls, fat with complacency and conceit, while the little boys sat there crumpled, apologizing for their existence, thinking this was going to be the pattern of their lives. This kind of thing is happening in schools all over the place and no one says a thing. Instead of sniping at men, women should direct their energy at winning changes in the law such as improved childcare. We have got the pay, but real equality comes when the child care is sorted out, and it hasn’t been yet – well not for those who really need it anyway” (p. 34). Lessing’s observation of a primary classroom goes to the heart of the zeal of public schools to

advance a social agenda that has little or nothing to do with the education of primary students in the fundamental curriculums of reading, arithmetic, and social sciences.

The same complaint repeats often by conservative commentators who believe the public school system is in the process of co-option by secular progressives, intent upon establishing equality at the expense of white males. An underlying current of the curriculum of Capitalism and frequently underscored by the lack of materials, references, and instructional time is the notion of the role of women in the workforce. While there are references to minorities (still too few, but a growing number) in textbooks, females remain conspicuously under-represented as role models. With some exception, females seldom receive the just accolades for their economic contribution; but are more often than not pictured (literally and figuratively) as nurses, teachers, administrative assistants, entertainers, or homemakers – not as CEO's, major political figures, engineers, scientists, or employed in physically demanding occupations such as construction. The construction of females in society disconnects with the current global economic reality as females are assuming an expanded role in the world economy (Nation Master, 2010). Lessing's autobiography is proof that the treatment of females differs from that of males as she writes the many instances whereby the treatment of her by various employers underpaying her for services and demanding since she is a single female, to work odd hours.

The role of the *economic nurturer* contrasts with the reality that many females are *economic warriors* competent to compete with males in all occupations. Not much has changed in the last two-hundred years as critics of Addams (1911) levels the same vile criticism when at Hull House she creates mini-industrial complexes where unemployed

females can learn a trade, have childcare assistance for their children, obtain an education, and compete with large textile producers in local markets. Addams (1911) believes the way out of poverty for females is childcare, education, and occupational training; all that she provides at Hull House and is similar to the notion Lessing describes as creating a social structure whereby females can pursue occupations other than that of child rearing. Though Lessing does not fit the profile of the orthodox feminist, as she does not share the view of patriarchal oppression, it is equally difficult to situate Lessing among conservative capitalist minded educators. Lessing expresses little love for U.S. economic and political policies (Vousden, 2007)^{ix}. The philosophical position of Lessing is similar to that of Du Bois who chooses not to publicly embrace any one philosophical position although many scholars will try to define Lessing and Du Bois as critical feminist pragmatist or critical race pragmatist respectively. For Lessing, it is not difficult to place her among the feminist pragmatists such as Seigfried (1996). Both share a similar notion that orthodox feminists spend far too much time on patriarch oppression and far too little time implementing pragmatic economic strategies that counter the curriculum of Capitalism and improve the economic lives for females. The attraction to Marxism and eventually Communism by Lessing is partially due to the belief by Lessing that Communism offers a structure eliminating the distinction between the economic roles for females and males, or as neo-Marxist believe, a class-less society. The assumption is in a class-less society even the basic relations of family are challenged in that no longer is one gender dominant in financial or other choices. Family is reconceptualized to include many differing arrangements that benefit however many

partners in the family cooperative. Reconceptualizing family is the ‘rub’ that Lessing has with the orthodox feminists.

It is her interpretation of the family social structure that may encourage Lessing to excoriate orthodox feminists as out of touch and oblivious to the facts. Lessing appeals to feminists to consider reconceptualizing feminism away from the dogma of female oppression by a patriarchal society towards the direction of a pragmatic if not practical improvement of the daily experience of females. Lessing and orthodox feminist have in common a similar view of the family social structure to that of Marx and Engels (1884); “As regards the legal equality of husband and wife in marriage, the position is no better. The legal inequality of the two partners, bequeathed to us from earlier social conditions, is not the cause but the effect of the economic oppression of the woman. In the old communistic household, which comprised many couples and their children, the task entrusted to the women of managing the household was as much a public and socially necessary industry as the procuring of food by the men. With the patriarchal family, and still more with the single monogamous family, a change came. Household management lost its public character. It no longer concerned society. It became a private service; the wife became the head servant, excluded from all participation in social production. Not until the coming of modern large-scale industry was the road to social production opened to her again – and then only to the proletarian wife. But, it was opened in such a manner that, if she carries out her duties in the private service of her family, she remains excluded from public production and unable to earn; and if she wants to take part in public production and earn independently, she cannot carry out family duties. And, the wife’s position in the factory is the position of women in all branches of business, right up to

medicine and the law. The modern individual family is founded on the open or concealed domestic slavery of the wife, and modern society is a mass composed of these individual families as its molecules” (para. 18).

Lessing may agree with Marx as to his observation, but his observation lacks the type of action Lessing believes resolves the problem. Marx and Engels (1884) explain a paradox in modern society, the change from a matriarchal society to a patriarchal society. Consistent with their concept of historical materialism the alteration is the result of an economic anomaly. One interpretation of this passage by Marx and Engels’ is within the family structure the male earning wages in supporting the family is the bourgeois and the wife the proletariat. Marx and Engels (1884) go so far as to name the phenomena of the proletariat lifestyle of the wife as “domestic slavery” (para. 18). The view of domestic slavery is no different from that of the orthodox feminist view of patriarchal oppression. Marx and Engels (1884) then clarify economic relation of husband and domestic slavery as, “And in the same way, the peculiar character of the supremacy of the husband over the wife in the modern family, the necessity of creating real social equality between them, and the way to do it, will only be seen in the clear light of day when both possess legally complete equality of rights” (para. 19). Probably another hyperbolic analogy by Marx, but effectively characterizes capitalist oriented social structures in relation to family. Lessing claims to be a Communist during a period of her life. She gives no indication that she is a friend of Capitalism by rejecting the capitalist notion of a ‘stay-at-home mom’ in favor of legal equality in the workforce. However, it is clear that she also has little use for any notion of patriarchal oppression as the root cause of the economic plight of females.

The role of females within the capitalist social and economic structure is evolving; at least from the perspective of females residing in the United States or Europe. If feminists who subscribe to the notion of patriarchal oppression are correct in their assessment of the construction of the role of females in society, and given current economic evidence contradictory to their position, then it follows that patriarchal oppression is eroding or bears little weight in reconstructing the economic role of females. Orthodox feminists openly reject economic evidence indicating females have more choices than in the past and posing a challenge to patriarchal oppression. Representing the opposition to Lessing is Joan Smith, a journalist who writes for *The Evening Standard* and responds to Lessing's defense of gender roles in society. Smith (2001) expresses the view that many orthodox feminist cling to the notion of patriarchal oppression and are understandably distraught when one their kin strays too far from that concept as the root for many of the social problems in the global community. Smith (2001) expresses the view, "The notion of the struggling male sex, battered by the unstoppable onslaught of feminists, is one of the most pernicious myths of our time (para. 14). The terror of female power is deep-seated, among some women as well as men, and we do not have to achieve very much to set the alarm bells ringing (para. 16). There are few sadder spectacles than watching a talented woman like Lessing lecture her own sex, without reference to the facts. And apparently without realizing she is feeding misogynist fantasies that damage all women, including herself" (para. 17). Orthodox feminists accuse Lessing of essentialism, paint her as simplistic in regards to her viewpoint, and as out of touch with contemporary feminist issues.

The criticism comes as no shock to Lessing. Unfazed by the criticism she continues to write fictional female characters that appear to parallel her personal evolution to accept a neo-progressive feminism that promotes choice and focuses on applying practical solutions to improving the experience of females. Lessing's characters consistently struggle with their feminist identity, but her fictional female characters remain independent, socially responsible, and willing to accommodate incremental change as it occurs with the times in which they are situated. Lessing's (1996) characters are consistent with her personal philosophy shared in this brief statement from her autobiography; "I was looking forward, with never a glance behind me. I was waiting for my future, my real life, to begin" (p. 418). Within the construct of feminist economics, Lessing's characters seek equality by exceeding expectations and by working harder than their male counterpart characters. Like Lessing, their creator, the female characters scoff at the unfairness and the burden bestowed upon their gender by anachronistic ideals of the curriculum of Capitalism. Taking a different path does not make them less of a feminist; rather it reinforces the notion of expanding choices for females in the global market place. In the curriculum of Capitalism, there is little or no discussion of the role of females in a global economy either from a historic perspective or from the contemporary global economics.

In other interviews, Lessing claims that males are victims of "feminist fundamentalism, modern feminism of a lazy and insidious culture which had replaces reforming zeal with hot air" (Frith, 2001, p. 4). In an interview with Clark (2001), Lessing says of contemporary feminist that they are, "nasty women who revel in humiliating males, and they [feminists] have talked their energy away" (p. 34). Feminists

critique by Lessing is part observation and part experience with feminists. In an interview by Schemo (1994), Lessing recounts one observation that is illustrative of her criticism of contemporary feminism. “There were a couple of American feminists, expertly dressed, lecturing a bunch of women who were raising kids on a level of about \$70 to \$80 a month in American money, about their sex lives, how to raise their children, how to treat their husbands, said Lessing. The feminists struck her as “latter day imperialists, liberated most of all, she says, for a sense of the ridiculous” (Schemo, 1994, Living Desk). Lessing makes these observations while visiting her home in Zimbabwe and standing in the midst of the poverty and oppressive heat. Lessing incorporates many of her observations into the characters of her fiction and her social commentary is poignant representations of real-life situations that females encounter on a daily basis. The protagonist character Alice in Lessing’s work, *The Good Terrorist*, is an example of Lessing incorporating social commentary into a fictional work that connects on an emotional basis. Alice, when a Communist recruiter urges her to take a position with his organization, recalls; “They stare at each other. Across a gulf. Not of ideology, but of temperament, of experience” (Lessing, 1985, p. 166). Alice encounters the same lack of concern from this Communist recruiter as Lessing does from her husband, Frank.

The dilemma of females in a socially constructed economic system most certainly limits choice and that in itself is the critical point of feminists that without equality within the economic system, parity is not a possibility. Addams (1911) describes economic duality in the capitalist social structure, “As I walked on, I could help but wonder in which particular we were most stupid, – to judge a man’s worth so solely by his wage-earning capacity that a good wife feels justified in leaving him, or in holding fast to that

wretched delusion that a woman can both support and nurture her children” (p. 172 -173). Lessing and Smith agree on this observation by Addams of single females with children. Addams refers to the problem among women in poverty in her time (not much different from today in many parts of the world) of having to earn an income while simultaneously providing care for young children. The duality and lack of choice require females to remain in relationships that are physically or emotionally abusive or choose poverty. Raising children and maintaining steady employment though not mutually exclusive creates unwieldy economic pressures. This is precisely the problem that Addams (1911) identifies when she writes, “Our early day nursery brought us into natural relations with the poorest women of the neighborhood, many whom were bearing the burden of dissolute and incompetent husbands in addition to support of their children” (p. 169)¹⁵. Lessing is not identifying a new problem, rather one that has a solution as demonstrated by the 1911 model of day-care at Hull House, but goes ignored by capitalists. The notion of ‘domestic slavery’ (Marx & Engels, 1884, para. 18) is a well-grounded argument and while orthodox feminists may dispute with Lessing the root cause gender economic disparity, they substantively come to the same economic position – the care of children creates a financial burden, uniquely female, by denying females the ability to compete unencumbered in the capitalist employment market.

¹⁵ Addams, 1911, *Twenty Years at Hull with Autobiographical Notes*: “Problems with Poverty” chapter describes the residents of the neighborhood and how the settlement house was dealing with the overflow of homeless women and children living in the streets as well as other issues of impoverished people.

In a contradictory twist, the curriculum of Capitalism is pro-family so long as pro-family does not involve the expense of day-care, as this increases labor costs. Again, this explains why labor in third world countries is attractive to capitalists. Locating low-tech industry such as textile or assembly in countries with high unemployment, a large number of females with children, and allowing them to work from either their home or communal sweatshops are an inexpensive alternative to the modern western style industrial manufacturing plant. Piecework labor is very seductive to impoverished people as pay is for what they produce completing much of their work in their home or in nearby workhouses. Impoverished females can tend to their children and children can provide a portion of the labor. Without regulation and without the nuisance of employee benefits or unions, large corporations can leverage to their advantage by contracting with labor subcontractors while washing their corporate hands of the complicity of poor working conditions, child labor exploitation, and brutal overseers – in short, domestic slavery. Of course the rationale for the transfer of labor to low wage countries is twofold; the first that these are jobs that U.S. citizens shun and the second, by providing jobs to the third world countries capitalists claim they are in actuality improving the lives of impoverished people by teaching them a skill and providing a steady income. There are kernels of truth to both explanations, but the larger question is that if the experience with democracy is through Capitalism and capitalists protect a system of sweatshop labor, how then can we expect non-democratic countries to evolve to democracy and social justice? How then is the experience of democracy different from the totalitarian societies impoverished people live? Moreover, because young children are potentially a part of the labor transaction, how can we expect generations that follow to act in the future? The standard by which

other citizens judge democratic practice is the experience of the sweatshop or through the eyes of poverty. Poverty becomes the common standard.

The common standard refers to the unwritten invisible rules of society such as social the rules of social construction. Though not written the social rules are visible by observing how citizens act in certain situations when societal norms press into action. Utilizing Marxist theory for analysis, the psychological social implications of social construction is that citizens perceive their societal relationships as divisions of class determined by the economic terms of production. The same critical analysis holds true for race and gender relations. Capitalists perceive their social relations through the lens of wealth and economic position forms the basis for entry into the social system. The common standard for a capitalist social structure depends upon the economic position of a citizen. Capitalists believe class is an artificial barrier easily transcended through hard work and this is the paradox of a capitalist social structure. If the pathways to entry are through economic parity, then no amount of hard work can substitute for already belonging to the privileged group by virtue of being in the dominant majority. This statement is no more apparent than when comparing urban inner city schools to suburban schools (Kozol, 2005); membership does have its privileges.

To participate in the benefits of 'belonging' to a particular community, a person surrenders their individuality to conform to the perceived standards of the community. In other words, a person will subvert their personal identity to fit the constructed identity in so that they can enter the pathway. The transaction trades individuality with conformity earning membership into particular station they have applied. Blau (1971) refers to the exchange of personal individuality for conforming to the common standard as a path to

the destruction of individuality. The notion is similar to Du Boisian duality, Dewey's notion of the lost individual, and Lessing's ideal of feminism. Lessing argues that females are not full participants in the upside of economics, wealth and financial security; but bear the risk for the downside of economics by virtue of being mothers, prospect for poverty and living an unfulfilled life. Race, class, and gender may deny a person full membership in the community as the community superstructure may perceive the new member as an 'affirmative action member,' tainting them to second-class status.

First generation membership without full rights of membership may not be preferable membership, but may have the positive influence for the next generation. First generation immigrants pave the way for an improved life in the future. The curriculum of Capitalism promotes the notion that each generation should produce sufficient wealth above the previous generation. In other words, one measure of the success of a generation is did the generation earn wealth above their parents and will their children be in a better position to increase their wealth above their parents. This exponential wealth mentality is a two-edge sword on side assisting your own family to improve their standard of living is a positive whereas the other side of the sword is if the generation fails to increase wealth to the next generation is this in reality a failure. The consequences to exponential wealth mentality to the self-worth of parents struggling to raise children and pass values that are not singularly economic related has the propensity to create unnecessarily a dual consciousness about status and class that ends in evaluating self-worth against an artificial standard of which the individual has no input. For females, the struggle is complex by the unique relationship that society places upon them for the responsibility for children. For Lessing, the solution is to physically abandon her children and relocate

as far as possible from them. Yet, abandonment and relocation does not pardon her from the burden of being a mother and it adds to her the stigma of abandoning her children.

Like many females attempting to negotiate the boundaries of this complex relationship, Lessing struggles to come to terms with the person she wants to be and the reality that earlier decisions traps her in a life that she was unwilling to continue. Blau's (1971) common standard and destruction of individuality are evident in the life of Lessing. The character Alice in Lessing's *The Good Terrorist* is in similar conflicts as Lessing about many of the relationships and experiences she encounters as a product of a middle class family, she rejects in favor of living the life of a radical nomad, bouncing from one communal home to another. Lessing (1996) describes the character Alice and the conflicts, "My novel *The Good Terrorist* has a central character, Alice, who is quite mad. A lot of people have not noticed that she is mad. What a nice girl, they say. That is because she is in a political context. If she were portrayed in an ordinary life, it would at once be obvious she is mad" (p. 274). The imposition of the duality of identity as mother-nurturer and as sentient individual clashes universally manifest by the economic struggles by females. Duality is not apolitical as found in identity politics, but politically volatile embodied as *identity economics*. Identity economics may manifest as a denial of an employment opportunity due to race, housing and education being substandard due to class, and for many females (in particular those of color) a cocktail of these and more. Lessing (1996) expresses the duality of female identities, "Which brings me back to; why do we expect so much? Why are we so bitterly surprised when we – our country – the world – lurches into yet another muddle or catastrophe? Who promised us better? When were we promised better? Why is it that so many people in our time have felt all the

emotions of betrayed children” (p.312)? Whether orthodox feminist or unorthodox Lessing, the curriculum of Capitalism as well as any curriculum promoting one economic system as superior, is anti-female, distorts the identity of women, and promotes gender inequality.

Countering the provincial and narrow-minded perceptions of the constructs of the identity of women, Lessing chooses to revolt by embracing anarchical philosophy towards society. Possibly the precise point she is making is for her to free herself from a life of provinciality and parochial living, she initiates a personal revolution. Lessing must detach emotionally from her previous existence, including children and husband that bind her to a life that she abhors and a life of conformity that she did not choose. Her expression of anarchism is the rejection of oppressive structures such as patriarchal, economic, identity, and others restricting her personal freedom. She shakes free of these chains through personal revolution that manifests by abandoning children and husband for an unclear future, but a future that she believes she is in control. In the process of a personal socio-revolution, Lessing turns to politics and chooses Communism over Capitalism because it is the most radical rejection of the status-quo of the economic treatment of females. Lessing (1996) explains her choice, “I explained to them that they would understand later why I had left. I was going to change this ugly world; they would live in a beautiful and perfect world where there would be no race hatred, injustice, and so forth” (p. 262). Ironically, she finds her choice of Communism is not an improvement to the capitalist social system. For Lessing, her conversion to Communism is too structured, too organized, and too much like the routine of spouse and mother for her to make a lifetime commitment. Lessing does not recant her choice of Communism, but the

fulfillment in social system she seeks is not in the ideology. Neither Lessing nor her fictional characters ever embrace any politics that is not socially oriented and personally liberating. Lessing runs contrary to the belief system of her parents and to that of the mainstream of her own generation; she purges her soul from the exponential wealth mentality to refashion herself in the image of an 'exponent' for social justice.

“What did we believe (Lessing, 1996), what were the ideas that fueled us” (p. 280)? The Communists believed that the entire world would one day validate their philosophy by joining them. “There would be no race prejudice, oppression of women, and exploitation of labor – no snobbishness or contempt for others” (p. 280). Communists were openly hostile to anyone who held disbelief in revolution and did not envision the superiority of the philosophy. Lessing ascribes to Communism moral superiority and describes members as demonstrating what is comparable to a religious fervor over their activities. Lessing (1996) describes the Communists she is in contact; “We were united with each other by superiority of character, because we were revolutionaries and good. Our opponents were bad. People who did not believe in socialism were not credited with good intentions: a set of mind that continues today” (p. 281). Lessing finds the same exclusionary practices of capitalists within the progressive Socialists and Communists she associates. With a sense of nostalgia, Lessing (1996) gives an account of the personal relationships she initiates. “Within the organization,” Lessing (1996) writes, “and the individual communes,¹⁶ members would find familial relationships and deeply rooted kinship, distinct from the estrangement many experienced outside of the commune.^x The

¹⁶ The modern term is 'cell.'

fourth reason for accepting Communism is that similar to Capitalism and the Puritan work ethic, there is a similar work ethic for Communists. "...a Communist should always be better than everyone else, work harder, study more, and look after people, always be ready to do the dirty work, both as human responsibility and to attract people into the Communist party, which embodied now, and would embody in the future, all the best qualities of humankind" (p. 281-282). Lessing (1996) calls the most powerful idea of her commitment was the belief that Socialism would end need for all wars. "The frightful war was the creation of Capitalism: Capitalism spelled war, socialism was inherently peaceful. Capitalism had created the last war, and the great Depressions in Britain, Europe, in America – the Depression had formed most of the people who came to the Left Club" (p. 282).

The pivotal events in Lessing's autobiography and fiction involve conflict and war. The curriculum of Capitalism subdivides American History into conflicts corresponding with a particular generation; generations that define their patriotic contribution to the American narrative by war(s). War is an integral part of the life of Lessing just as it is for every generation. World war serves as the backdrop for her to hash out her personal struggles and her relationships with members of the left. Countering the notion that the only way to serve one's country is to participate in war, Lessing demonstrates why more than one voice needs to be heard to hold accountable those who send soldiers to fight in war. Lessing claims that the 'left', though many are in opposition to war, are the first to recognize the violence perpetrated on Jews by Hitler. Lessing (1996) claims, "We – the Left – prided ourselves that we had been for years pressuring our government (British) and governments generally to tell the truth about

Hitler's treatment of the Jews" (pp. 326-327). Lessing expresses what many citizens believe today and that is the notion that governments including democracies are not responsive or accountable to citizens. "Since then," writes Lessing (1996), "I've seen the same phenomenon many times and in many contexts: people in power, in authority, never seem to know how the people they govern are living and feeling. It is as if there is some mechanism in the brain that separates them – by the mere fact of being put into power, or position of responsibility – from the ruled, from an imaginative understanding" (p. 395). The curriculum of Capitalism counters this argument by arguing that government operates with transparency, elected officials change every few years, and the system of checks/balances favors no one branch of government. This of course is a partial truth as corporate shadow governments run much of the global economy. Citizens may vote, but that does not necessarily translate in a voice as public policy is formulated behind closed doors.

Global citizens just as in Lessing's pre-1950 time are beginning to sense that the promise of democracy is an empty promise; somehow, we have not been misled, but rather betrayed by our own faith in Capitalism as being the route to change the world to be socially just. For Lessing, Communism is no better than Capitalism when it came to infidelity. The world, which includes Socialist leaning countries, democracies and Communism ignore the truth of the massacre of Jews, Communists, Socialists, Catholics, Protestants, or those not favored by Hitler. The same world, only in our time, goes about the business of globe as if governments were all like absent minded professors, clueless as to their surroundings or what students(citizens) are actually doing. In virtually any corner of the global citizens are under siege by war, famine, disease, death, slavery,

torture, rape, labor camps, and religious persecution without interruption. Lessing (1996) summarizes the theme of betrayal as she writes about Nazi death camps; “The reality of death camps had not begun to ‘sink in’. The point is, if our mind is not ‘set’ to take something in, facts are rejected. Our view – the Left’s – was in fact as conventional as the general view” (p. 327). The core beliefs that lead Lessing to become Communist are not borne out by the actions of the Communists. “It took me four or five years from my first falling in love with Communism, or rather, ideal Communism, in 1942 to become critical enough to discuss my ‘doubts’ with people still inside the Communist fold...By 1954, I was no longer a Communist, but it was not until the early 1960s I ceased to feel residual tugs of loyalty, was really free” (Lessing, 1996, p. 397).

It is difficult for generations that have long passed the generation that fought in world wars to appreciate the honesty of Lessing. Equally difficult is for students to comprehend the repugnance of the Nazi movement. The imprint of the horror remains in the few left alive to continue to recount from personal experience the horrors inflicted upon human beings by another human being. The rest of us are left to pictorial records, autobiographies, or recorded video for us to get a sense of what life was like. The life of Lessing is indicative of how easy it is to be betrayed by government and ideology if we remain passive, cynical, or refuse belief because our experience will not let us to admit that such evil can exist. Lessing (1996) is able to abandon her life of parochialism and to put into perspective – “I was able to be freer than most because I am a writer, with the psychological make-up or a writer that sets you at a distance from what you are writing about” (p. 397). Lessing disengages from the reality of war through the unreality of fiction. She defines her personal identity through fictional characters and in the process is

able to reconceptualize the notion of feminism within a capitalist social structure. Lessing engages the inequitable treatment of females within the capitalist social structure by engaging others in the conversation through fiction; she defies social construction.

Putnam (2006) accentuates how re-engaging people in the conversation changes people's lives for the positive and by remaining socially isolated are damaging. "Social isolation," says Putnam (2006) "has many well-documented side effects. Kids fail to thrive. Crime rises. Politics coarsens. Generosity shrivels. Death comes sooner (social isolation is as big a risk factor for premature death as smoking). Well-connected people live longer, happier lives..." (p. 36). The research inside of public schools by Kozol (1991), Apple (1996), Rose (1990), and many other educators validate Putnam's (2006) assertion as to the damage of isolation. Webber (2003) in completing research on violence in public schools shares a similar view regarding the danger isolation creates in the social structure. Progressive educators seek a refuge that isolates outside intrusion and criticism, but on the inside engages students on their level. Progressive educators seek to identify with students and connect in meaningful ways; but constructed identities are too strong and wrench the focus from creating socially defined environments and promoting social justice as critical to democracy. Doll, Wear, and Whitaker (2006) propose the notion that while educators are not in control of the many of the operational aspects or curriculum of the school, educators can create intellectually stimulating environments. Carlson (2002) urges progressive educators to return to their roots of cultural politics. Carlson (2002) says, "...education should redirect the conversation back toward fundamental issues in democratic public life and the role of education in forging a new democratic culture (p. 21)." Educators are quick to teach to the status-quo, not

challenging the anti-race, class, and gender association of the curriculum of Capitalism, preferring to assume the identity of the absent-minded professor – complicit with the betrayers – ineffectual unresponsive government and conservative protectors of the status quo of global Capitalism. Lessing says, “The point is, if our mind is not ‘set’ to take something in, facts are rejected” (p. 327). For Lessing and females across the globe, social Capitalism offers little hope for progress for as long as constructed social identities are part of the Capitalist curriculum.

Colonialism, Feminist Identity, and the Curriculum of Capitalism

The crises of individuals, like the crises of nations, are not realized until they are over (Lessing, 1950/2002, p.148 - 149).

One aspect of personal identity as an economic construct is how colonialism impinges upon the personal identity of the oppressor and the oppressed. True of slavery as well, the curriculum of Capitalism omits colonialism or reconstructs colonialism as a form of foreign aid. In this section, the research explores the construction of the self from the perspective of colonialism of the British occupation of Africa. The economic domination of one constructed racial minority is vividly illustrated in Africa where the majority is black and the minority is white. Power vests in the white economic majority and denied to the black native population minority. Lessing observes and records the racial phenomena of her experience while living in Africa and Great Britain through her own eyes and then activates her fictional characters to respond. Lessing (1997), “Of course this attempt on my part assumed that the filter which is a woman’s way looking at life has the same validity as the filter which is a man’s way... ” (p. xi). The microcosm of her experience in Africa and Britain increases in magnitude to represent the macrocosm

of the experience of citizens pressed by global economic systems and geopolitical manipulation by corporations\governments. Plummer, Lauren, and Horne (2003) provide context to the transitional period shortly after World War II and to the nineteen sixties; “Major powers with racial-ethnic minorities or colonial territories inhabited by people of different race were thus engaged in containment and holding operations of various kinds after the war ended. Their efforts to bridge the past and present were complicated by new roles the postwar order imposed on them. The United States, for example, effected a transition from isolationism to globalism” (p. 4).

One of the remarkable ideas that come out of the reconfiguration of the geopolitical relationships from the end of World War II and entering into the Cold War period is the notion of colonialism and racism as propaganda tools. The irony is that as the Communists press Western democracies for control of large parts of Europe, Asia, and Africa, the Communists utilize race, class, and gender as recruiting tools to find disaffected minorities who desire radical revolutionary change. Communist countries manipulate the racial misdeeds of the United States, Great Britain, and Europe as proof that Capitalism is inherently anti race, gender, and class. The alternative, Socialism or Communism, leads to a racially, gender, and class neutral society as Capitalism creates the inequity and the need for economic imperialism in order to maintain the lifestyles of wealthy capitalists. Lessing (1962) a resident of Africa describes the sentiment of many citizens as, “There was another reason for cynicism – because people began to be cynical, when they are tired of being ashamed, as they were, to start with. This war was presented to us as a crusade against the evil doctrines of Hitler, against racialism, etc., yet the whole of that enormous land-mass, about half the total area of Africa, was conducted on

precisely Hitler's assumption – that some human beings are better than others because of their race” (p. 56).

In the book *The Grass is Singing*, Lessing describes an encounter between the central character Mary Turner and her African servant, Moses. As many things that authors write that are fictional, the basis for characters is a real experience or encounter that incorporates into the fictional account. In this instance, Lessing recalls that she wrote the specific scene that eventually made it into her book from a conversation she overheard. The scene is about a white woman who allows her African servant to button up her dress at the back and brush her hair (Lessing, 1997, p. 8). Lessing (1997) opens the scene with this description, “This was – correctly, I think – described by my father as the ultimate in contempt for the man: like aristocrats permitting themselves every kind of intimate and filthy behavior in front of servants, because they weren't really human beings ” (p. 9). The semi-fictional portrait of a black male (the character Moses) buttoning the dress of a white woman and the reaction by her father portrays a not so uncommonly held view of African males as well as impoverished people residing in colonies.^{xi} The immorality of slavery, human bondage; was only possible if human beings are commodities – bought, sold, and traded without consideration – with the exception of value. Slavery may be illegal and Moses has no value as a human being, but is valuable as long as he is considered property and as long as he is capable of production. Lessing observes racial economics in reality, though fictional portrayal is of a character in a book.

The portrayal of impoverished people as something less than human is an identity that Du Bois calls “double consciousness” (Du Bois, 1989, p. 5) which an earlier chapter documents the perniciousness of a racial economy. If constructed in the image of poverty,

then a person will know nothing of a life other than poverty. The constructed image of poverty generates impoverished people desperate for a wage so much so that they are willing to commoditize their lives and accept the invisible shadows of society as their home. There is an unwritten code that rationalizes the degrading treatment of impoverished people not as racist, rather as deserving. The only discernable difference between slave culture and servant culture is that the servant is paid a wage for their work. The image and self-worth never change. Lessing (197) says that, “The whole point of *The Grass is Singing* was the unspoken, devious codes of behavior of whites, nothing ever said, everything understood, and the relationship between Mary Turner, the white woman, and Moses, the black man was described so that nothing was explicit” (p. 8).

Implicit or explicit, there is language code propping up the negative imaging of Africans. The code is historic, global, trans-generational, and sophisticated to the extent the language is as much verbal, as it is observable by action (Pinar, 2001). Pre-nineteen seventy when racial slurs are spoken virtually without shame or rebuke in any place on the globe, the common term in the colonial territories of Great Britain for servants is ‘kaffirs’, a slang word that loosely translates as something akin to the American ‘n-word’ to a black African. The act of depriving a racial minority an existence by racial slur is a global act of linguistic terrorism. The deprivation of education specifically the teaching of literary skills is also a universal technique for impoverishing a workforce. During a confrontation with a white African state official and Lessing (1997), “The kaffirs aren’t going to read your little book. They can’t read, and that’s how we like it’, a high placed minister from South African government tells Lessing” (p. 27). The connection between language, literacy, and social deprivation of an economic minority is

abundantly clear and this image of impoverished people does not confine itself to one construct of race, but extends to class, gender, and sexual orientation among other categories of personal identity. Lessing (1997) notes that, “When we talk about the ‘shared language’ – English – as a barrier, because of some differing (though not very many) word usages, that is surely itself another barrier, obscuring the truth, which is that the barrier is national temperaments, or dispositions” (p. 166).

The underlying theme of Lessing’s novels is the dehumanizing effect of race, class, and gender economics not only upon the victim, but also upon perpetrators. Her autobiographical work and her fictional work are trans-generational in that they examine life as a continuum from one generation to the next. The transference of particular code words, semantic phrases, or linguistic habits are evident from one generation to the next. One example is the characters in *The Good Terrorist*; attempt to mask their middle class upbringing in Great Britain by dialectically speaking with a Cockney accent and slang. Their notion is that language situates them among the working class of London, repudiates their middle-class upbringing, and places them in a favorable light with their Communist (comrades) counterparts. The linguistic code may be less overt or manifest in a different format, setting, and reaction to the experience of a character. Lessing (1997) explains this phenomena, “When I first arrived, my Rhodesian accent enabled me to talk with the natives – that is the working class – for I was seen as someone outside their taboos, but this became impossible as soon as I began talking middle-class standard English: this was not a choice; I cannot help absorbing accents wherever I am. A curtain came down – slam. I am talking about being treated as an equal, not of the matey, rather paternal ‘niceness’ of the upper classes” (p. 60). The implication is that people

subconsciously imitate the station in life that they believe they are situated and that the subconscious repressed ideas of how they are to interact with differing races, classes, and genders can become conscious without thought. Human beings have a historical conscious framing their interaction with others. Giroux (1992) alludes to this notion of language as an element of race, class, or gender in the curriculum. There is a different language in the classroom than out, and language relates to the social station of a person.

Cash and Schwab (2004) propose that language is cross generational as well as cultural. In restructuring society to be socially tolerant, Cash and Schwab (2004) put forward the proposition, “Violent histories are reflected not only in the psychic trauma of victims and their children but also in the deformations that are equally transmitted across generations. Decolonizing and de-racializing the mind therefore requires psychic, political, and rhetorical work that reaches across cultures and colonial and racial divides” (p. 136). The curriculum of Capitalism does not contain a capacity for restoration as the view of history of race, class, and gender relations are not in need of reconciliation. Proponents of the curriculum of Capitalism believe progressive educators are attempting to revise history through linguistic manipulation and shade the truth of the progress of correcting social problems. In an odd sort of way, a historical consciousness of Capitalism is not far from that of the Marxist ideal of consciousness, leading to the conclusion in the existence of economic determinism; where you begin in life is where you will in all probability, end – in an economic sense – if race, class, and gender are determinants. Upward mobility or social mobility is in practice latitudinal than longitudinal as promoted by theory.

The curriculum of Capitalism posits the economic positions of race, class, and gender relations are improving as compared with other points in history. Improvement vindicates Capitalism and colonialism or imperialism from having to accept responsibility for past actions and being accountable for the consequences. Lessing (1992) disputes this notion from her personal experience; “Before independence the whites were all convinced that Southern Rhodesia was the best place on earth, and their administration better than any other white-dominated country. During my trip in 1989, I kept hearing so and so had said (notably President Chissano to President Mugabe): ‘You were lucky to have had the British; at least they leave behind a decent infrastructure’” (p. 10). The idea is that reconciliation is not a function of a conscious change in the mentality of accepting the equal identity of a person, but rather reconciliation is a form of reparation in the sense that the economic condition is better today than it once was. The human condition is the same; the only change is in the terms of the negotiation of the economics of the relationship. Capitalism frames the historic consciousness in the curriculum. Personal experiences with the capitalist social structure are less reliable gauges to assess accurately the position of identity of another. Economic identity or a collective economic consciousness of a specific race, class, or culture has dire impacts upon the personal identity of the individual; socially constructed identity undermines the ability to transcend race, class, or gender. Lessing (1997) says, “The working classes, the lower classes, have ‘internalized’ their station in life” (p. 60). Social construction and the dismissal of the capitalist curriculum to accept the notion of a personal identity undermined by social construction the notion by capitalists that through hard work a person can rise to the next class, the next station in life.

Plummer (et. al., 2003) illustrates the principle of social construction and personal identity with this short story, “Africans and Asians heard, and then repeated, the story that when then Vice President Richard Nixon attended the independence celebrations in Ghana, he turned to his black neighbor at the dinner table to ask, “How does it feel to be free?” The reply came: “I wouldn’t know. I am from Alabama” (p. 32). The second highest-ranking government official in the United States presumes that because someone is black he must belong to the African nation. The disposition of slavery, colonialism, and exploitation never seem to dissipate from the national consciousness or from the international consciousness. The struggle for racial identity in one part of the world is not different from other parts. The commonality they share if not common experience is the color of their skin. The unconscious idea may be how does this happen that a majority can be relegated to a status as second-class citizens in their own country? Cash and Schwab (2004) say that, “Any work between indigenous and non-indigenous people that addresses reconciliation at the psychological level therefore needs to be supplemented by a change in the discursive regimes that constitute us as political and psychological subjects” (p. 135). The critical element for this reconciliation is the recognition that exploitation of the indigenous population occurs and reparations beyond economic cannot replace the traumatic damage of being treated as lacking of personal identity. The curriculum of Capitalism promotes the notion that financial reparations are not feasible because of the difficulty in determining who is eligible and they are ‘largely symbolic’ gestures – in fact, pointless. The point made by Cash, Schwab, and others is that symbolic gestures begin the dialogue and have a point. In Lessing’s (1992) observation of Africa, dialogue begins when symbolic gestures establish relations on good faith. When

an African American views the Confederate flag flying over the capital of a state, it is difficult for them not to be cynical of the intention of the state regarding racial policy.

In a free society, political speech is protected including the most offensive and vile speech or symbolic images. Free speech is not the same as intentionally utilizing coded language to continually marginalize and disenfranchise citizens. Governments can dispel notions of institutionalized racism, classism, and genderism by removing the symbolism that implies government support. Lessing (1997) describes an example, “It was – is? – part of the structure of our minds and not of our thinking. Take South Africa. When I became aware of South Africa politically, I was twenty or so, and it was taken for granted by us that there had to be a bloodbath, a ‘night of the long knives’. Again, this was not so much part of how everybody concerned saw things that it needed no explanation. When in 1992, Mandela and de Klerk agreed and the “inevitable bloodbath” was no longer on the agenda, decades of political belief simply evaporated” (p. 194). The reconciliation begins with symbolic gestures of a black African leader meeting with his white counterpart on equal footing and equal terms.

Symbolism is seldom pointless even if the symbolic meaning is short lived. Symbolism communicates the necessity of extending one’s self beyond the boundary of those who look, think, and act the same. The 1992 meeting was a culmination of more than fifty years of boundaries breached and as Culverson (Plummer et al., 2003) suggests, “...the African American constituency involved with southern Africa has evolved considerably over the past fifty years. The evolution is a product of the dynamic relationship between the black community’s economic and political viability, the volatility of the domestic interest articulation structure, and official public interpretations

of the salience of southern Africa problems to U.S. global interests” (p. 235). This seemingly glacial pace for advancement may represent exactly the type of reconciliation that Cash (2004) argues is necessary for change in order to produce a higher level of cognizance that social justice is a realizable goal and as by way of extension economic benefits are useful tools as social agents for change. The first step is to re-orient social construction to recognize marginalized citizens and to reconstruct their identities as equal participants in the democratic process.

Identity is one path by which a person articulates their experience and draws meaning from life. We live in a global society that essentializes identity to a singular component although in truth we are a multiplicity of identities. Capitalists construct identity through the lens of wealth, status, class, and social position. Socialists construct identity through the lens of class, social action, revolutionary praxis, and communal consensus of political action. Global citizens operate in a world of conflict between personal identity and constructed identity. Pinar (et. al., 2002) describes the conflict, “The assumed unity of the subject is replaced with multiple identities and differences, for example, a specific gender, race, class, sexual orientation, physical ability, with various lifestyles, and with a variety of consumer options. At the same time, we are bombarded by the media with various and ever-changing representations of ‘ourselves’” (472). Lessing promotes the notion the world comprises of a multiplicity of identities. She is feminist, social activist, author, educator, mother, wife, Socialist, Communist, and yet, the core of her identity remains grounded in the search for an improving social justice system firmly anchored to self-improvement.

In an age of a dominant Capitalist social structure demanding conformity in exchange for participation, Lessing remains iconic for the struggle to retain personal identity. The curriculum of Capitalism abhors non-conformity and promotes the notion of the value from not straying from the common standard. Lessing (1997) responds to her reason for not following the path of conformity: “But we are bearing witness. Why? This can only be because we felt representative of others. This has been my experience and that of many people” (p. 220). For Lessing and many others, the lesson is that citizens clamor for role models from which to change their own position in life. “We bear witness,” writes Lessing (1997). “I used to think this, not I think this. As if ideas were anchors” (p. 221).

Praxis

Lessing (1992) in recalling her family life, “My brother did not read, as a boy, and later spent his life among people who did not read. This was partly because some books have ideas in them, and most whites in the Southern Rhodesia lager could not afford to consider ideas that might upset their idea of themselves as the noble and misunderstood defenders of civilization” (p. 32). It comes as no surprise that an author and Nobel Literature award recipient favors literacy. Lessing’s novels and short stories contain numerous references to the number of books, type of literature on the shelf, and details of the libraries of individuals or townships. The notion that books contain ideas and ideas are powerful is a consistent theme in much of her work. In some of her fictional work, her characters ridicule other characters that are not well read and ill informed. Consistent with some the philosophy of curriculum theorists, Lessing promotes the idea books contain the collective experience, the collective consciousness of a society, and form an

aesthetic identity of the culture. This idea of a literary narrative is consistent with the Marxists' conception of history, a metahistory or metanarrative (Ritzer, 2005). As the metahistory unfolds, social standards are unpacked revealing the peculiar character of the national consciousness. Individuals contribute to the metahistory through their personal meta-narratives, which when unpacked, reveals a 'personal identity.'

The curriculum of Capitalism for the most part encourages literacy and that is a positive element of the curriculum. Democracy is a complicated process separate from day to day governance, but as a practical matter, rather a messy way to conduct social policy. Literacy skill is paramount to comprehending the subtle differences between electors, elections, and execution of social policy that flows out from the democratic processes. History and books about history record the metanarratives of a society. The curriculum of Capitalism too often makes the mistaken notion that a regime change automatically will prefer democratic republic style governance. As so often happens in history this may not be the case. In some instances, the regime changes to electoral republic democracy, but the elected officials are holdovers from repressive regimes affectively negating democratic gains. Such is the case when terrorist organizations such as Hamas win majorities in their parliaments, but are unable to obtain the status of official recognition outside of Arab states and their allies as legitimate governing bodies. This leads to the idea of the existence of a type of sub-culture of literature that promotes Western style republic form of democracy that constructs governing to develop into a specific structural pattern. The opposite is true as well as there exists a body of literature that presents the other view point and that literature while not restricted in a free society such as ours, probably never makes it to the summer reading lists for students.

For students in public schools in the United States to learn anything other than the capitalist version of history is rare. Lessing (1962) describes the politicizing of education, “As in the political sphere, the child is taught that he is free, a democrat, with a free will and a free mind, lives in a free country, and makes his own decisions. At the same time he is a prisoner of the assumptions and dogmas of his time, which he does not question, because he has never been told they exist” (1962, p. xv). The dilemma is keeping the truth hidden long enough to fix the cultural myths into the identity of the student\citizen until they transform into the ultra-consumer\citizen – mired in debt from over consumption – unable to think beyond the next paycheck, the next bill due, and the next payday. Too consumed by consumption the consumer\citizen is too distracted to challenge the economic assumptions underlying his\her education or to comprehend that the education system bartered his intellectual freedom in exchange for an occupation, possibly not of his\her own choosing. “He does not know that he is already molded by a system; he does not know that the choice itself is the result of a false dichotomy rooted in the heart of our culture, writes Lessing” (1962, p. xv).

Alternatively, there are those who escape the common standard to find a calling that is fulfilling. Lessing (1962) describes them as, “Those who do sense this, and who don’t wish to subject themselves to further molding, tend to leave, in a half-conscious, instinctive attempt to find work where they won’t be divided against themselves” (1962, p. xv). In a capitalist social structure, though they may be free from the common standard, their freedom and personal identity will continue to be an economic and socially constructed. The citizen\consumer will contend with the rigors of the competitive capitalist system, but as non-conformist discover, they may lack in the prerequisite skills.

Nothing in their schooling prepares them for the dichotomy as citizen\consumer and producer\consumer. It is in an endless cycle of work, consume, work some more, and consume some more. Lessing calls this repetitious cycle the “package” (1997, p. 346) which is culmination of their Western education experience. The package is economic materialism (endless financial prosperity), philosophical materialism (belief in God), and scientific materialism (God is dead replaced by science.), (p. 346-347). The curriculum of Capitalism promotes the package as the path to personal liberty and to democratic praxis. This idea has become a cultural icon of Western culture, but has not basis in reality.

In her criticism of western style education systems, Lessing exposes the myth of the educator as an idealist. Educators begin as idealists, to change the world, and to create a socially just society. Nevertheless, somewhere between idealism and the school day is the commoditizing of education. Lessing (1962) deconstructs the curriculum from its idealism to its reality. “The other thing, writes Lessing (1962), taught from the start is to distrust one’s own judgment. Children are taught submission to authority, how to search for other people’s opinions and decisions, and to quote and comply” (p. xv). This systemic de-personalization of the student and reconstructing the students into the compliant mode of the ideal democratic capitalist robs students of their identity, keeps them from seeking novel solutions to vexing social problems, and isolates citizens from others who may share similar values by keeping them concealed in order to maintain their position within their particular social structure. Lessing’s position is consistent with Dewey and Du Bois in analyzing education. Lessing (1962) describes the process in this way; “What you are being taught here is an amalgam of current prejudice and the choices of this particular culture. The slightest look at history will show how impermanent these

must be. You are being taught by people who have been able to accommodate themselves to a regime of thought laid down by their predecessors. It is a self-perpetuating system.

Those of you who are more robust and individual than others will be encouraged to leave and find ways of educating yourself – educating your own judgment. Those who stay must remember, always and all the time, that they are being molded and patterned to fit into the narrow and particular needs of this particular society” (p. xvi).

It is easy to be cynic, critic, and naysayer without offering a solution. In her speech to the Nobel Peace Prize Committee in Literature, Lessing (1962) offers these solutions to the depersonalizing and marginalization of people across the globe. “Please send us books when you get back to London. One man said, “They taught us to read but we have no books. Everybody I met, everyone, begged for books” (p. 59). While seemingly simplistic, Lessing has identifies the single most overlooked obstacle to students developing a global view, breaking free of uncritical Capitalism, and obtaining a less parochial view of the world. Literature is the key to understanding the world, identify, race, class, and gender. We are experiential beings and as previously written, experience is a culmination of the physical interaction of the world and the intellectual interaction with various forms of media. Lessing describes a pre-internet, a pre-media driven technological period, when generations read, discuss, and share their cultures through literature. Lessing is not nostalgic, nor is she suggesting we return to a pre-techno society. Lessing suggests that the decline in civility, the decline in the social aspects of living such as conversation, and the decline in the general quality of life for many global citizens begins with a de-emphasis upon literature.

Lessing (February 2008) goes on to say; “Very recently, anyone even mildly educated would respect learning education, and owe respect to our great store of literature. Of course we all know that when this happy state was with us, people would pretend to read, would pretend to respect learning, but it is on record that working men and women longed for books, and this is evidenced by the working men’s libraries, institutes, and colleges of the 18th and 19th centuries. Reading, books used to be part of a general education” (p. 59). For Lessing talent or leadership is born of readers. Even in American culture the founders were readers, collectors of literary works, and by extension, educated to design a model of democracy that borrows from the best traditions of a multiplicity of cultural experiences. It is a power that cannot be underestimated and a tradition that cannot be wrested from the modern world regardless of technology or the travesty of a government that bans literature as subversive, dangerous, and revolutionary. Literature connects people with their past, grounds their identity in the present, and forges a path for the next generation into the future. Race, class, or gender does not limit literature. It has the power to expand the intellect to construct and de-construct. Lessing writes (February 2008), “We are a jaded lot, we in our world – our threatened world. We are good for irony and even cynicism. Some words and ideas we hardly use, so worn out have they become. But we may want to restore some words that have lost their potency” (p. 63). If I may suggest a word – *democracy*.

In the previous chapters, the research traces the influence of the curriculum of Capitalism upon the issues of racial, class, and gender equality. Using the tools of progressive educators the journey is seen through the eyes of Du Bois, Dewey, and Lessing – each providing insight from differing perspectives – all representative of

critical pragmatist. The research suggests the curriculum of Capitalism is a negating force in reorienting the capitalist social structure to be post racial, in deconstructing class, and promoting gender neutrality. The research demonstrates the role public schools have in perpetuating cultural myths of democratic Capitalism. Capitalists have a stake in isolating and alienating populations for manipulating competitive wage wars. The next chapter focuses on re-situating democracy through technology and science. Technology and science are interchangeable words although some believe technology is the creation of science. This semantic disposition is more of a chicken and egg first debate distracting readers from the point of the chapter. Technology and science will fundamentally re-shape the definition of democracy in the future.

CHAPTER V – MARCUSE AND FEYERABEND: THE RISE OF THE TECHNO-CLASS AND THE CURRICULUM OF CAPITALISM

Marcuse and Feyerabend: The Influence of Heidegger

The works we present you are merely a testimony that we wanted to follow your leadership, not proof that we succeeded in becoming your disciples (Sheehan & Palmer, 1997, p. 476).^{xii}

Heidegger is unquestionably the philosophical mentor of Marcuse until their relationship dissolves sometime prior to 1950 (Marcuse, 1998). Blackburn (1996) says of Heidegger that, “Heidegger is probably the most divisive philosopher of the 20th century, being an acknowledged leader and central figure to many (‘continental’) philosophers, an either a convenient example of meaningless metaphysics, or else an apologist for Nazism, to other (‘analytical’) thinkers” (p. 169). In his early career, Marcuse reveres Heidegger, but over time, their relationship changes from student and mentor, to critic and Nazi apologist. Marcuse is a student of Heidegger and remains in contact with him through written correspondence and personal visits until 1948, but irreconcilable differences surface resulting in the discontinuation of an earlier collaborative mentorship. There are two possible explanations for the split between Marcuse and Heidegger. The first explanation by the Benhabib (Marcuse, 1987) is that according to a number of reliable sources, “Heidegger rejected the work [The western version of a dissertation by Marcuse or publication for tenure.] on the basis of political differences” (p. x). The second explanation for the rift between the two and posited by Jay (1973), Kellner (Marcuse, 1998), and Benhabib (Marcuse, 1987) is that Marcuse considers the changing political climate of Germany as well as recognizes the opportunity for academic freedom under

Nazi rule was at best a dicey proposition. After reviewing his options to remain in Germany or move, Marcuse chose to remove himself from consideration for employment by the university and seek opportunities outside of Germany.

Most Marcusean scholars tend to believe the latter explanation as the most plausible. In either regard, the prospect of being of Jewish descent living amongst the hostility of an anti-Semitic Fascist regime provides enough incentive for Marcuse to relocate to a safer political and academic haven. Jay (1973) in recounting the history of the Frankfurt School relocating to the United States verifies that Marcuse and most of the members of the Frankfurt School are seeking both political and academic asylum. The recruitment of Frankfurt School scholars by universities in the United States offers the members a financial incentive as well as the opportunity to establish within academic institutions a base from which to conduct research somewhat unhindered by the bureaucracy of the European academic institutions and their traditional approach to scholarship (Wheatland, Fall & Winter 2004).

The primary issue for the fracture of the relationship between student and teacher is recorded in a number of written correspondences between Marcuse and Heidegger. In these letters, Marcuse challenges Heidegger for vague and wraithlike explanation as to why he chooses to embrace National Socialism as well as his actions during the rise and occupation of the Nazi fascist regime (Marcuse, 1998, p. 36). In this letter Marcuse (1998) writes to Heidegger, "Common sense (also among intellectuals), which bears witness to such resistance, refuses to view you as philosopher, because philosophy and Nazism are irreconcilable. In this conviction common sense is justified. Once again: you (and we) can only combat the identification of your person and your work with Nazism

(and thereby the dissolution of your philosophy) if you make a public avowal of your changed views” (p. 264).¹⁷

Heidegger responds to Marcuse with a bullet point letter that never denies complicity with Nazis nor apologizes, and in some respects, is a condescending response to his student who often defends the work of his former mentor. From the initial exchange, it appears as if Marcuse seeks reconciliation with his mentor, but is unable to rationalize the actions of Heidegger during and after the war. The letter by Marcuse of reconciliation is receives a curt response in which Heidegger denies ambiguity in his position and accuses Marcuse as well as others as not appreciating the delicate position of German intellectuals who chose to remain in Germany during and after the war. In the opening paragraph of the response Heidegger (Marcuse, 1988) writes, “If I may infer from your letter that you are seriously concerned with [reaching] a correct judgment about my work and person, they your letter shows me precisely how difficult it is to converse with persons who have not been living in Germany since 1933 and who judge the beginning of the National Socialist movement from its end” (p. 265). Heidegger’s follows this part of the response by enumerating different explanations for his complicity with Nazis. His second explanation is that for propaganda purposes, the Nazis use him and much of what the world heard that is attributed to him during this time filters through Nazi propaganda by the Nazi regime. Heidegger fearing for his life and that of his family chooses to remain silent and not correct the propaganda.

¹⁷ Letter to Heidegger from Marcuse dated August 28, 1947.

Heidegger refers Marcuse to students that participate in lectures by Heidegger as a part of his defense. Heidegger responds to Marcuse (1998), “In my lectures and courses from 1933 – 44 I incorporated a standpoint that was so unequivocal that among those who were my students, none fell victim to Nazi ideology” (p. 265).^{xiii} In the final point number 6, Heidegger attempts to excuse his Nazi collusion by rationalizing that other deaths occur during wars that are equally as repugnant referring to the actions of some of the allies committing equally horrifying atrocities. Heidegger’s response to Marcuse (1998) is, “To the charges of dubious validity that you express “about a regime that murdered millions of Jews, that made terror into everyday phenomenon, and that turned everything that pertains to the ideas of spirit, freedom, and truth into the bloody opposite, I can merely add that if instead of “Jews” you had written East Germans [i.e., Germans of the eastern territories], then the same holds true of the allies, with the difference that everything that has occurred since 1945 has become public knowledge, while the bloody terror of the Nazis in point of fact had been kept a secret from the German people” (p. 266). Marcuse (1998) writes to Heidegger on May 12, 1948 dismissing Heidegger’s arguments as less than truthful. “This is not a political problem but instead an intellectual problem – I am tempted to say: a problem of cognition, of truth” (p. 266).

While Marcuse vehemently disagrees with Heidegger, Jay (1973) believes that regardless of the long-standing tension between Heidegger and Marcuse concerning political views, Heidegger’s influence is evident in Marcuse’s work in the area of technology. “Similar sentiments,” writes Jay (1973) flowed from the pens of another antagonist, Martin Heidegger, whose early influence on Marcuse has often been cited as responsible for the antitechnological bias allegedly to be found in his former student’s

work” (p. 272). Kellner (Marcuse, 1998) in the introduction to *Technology, War, and Fascism*, writes that “...the Frankfurt School tendency to posit technology primarily as an instrument of domination and industrial society as apparatus of social control and standardization...”, is consistent with an Heideggerian philosophical position and is prominent in Marcuse’s *One-dimensional Man*” (p. 5). Marcuse physically breaks his relationship with Heidegger, the material effects of tutorship under Heidegger’s philosophical instruction never severe fully as fragments of Heidegger resurface in the work of Marcuse.

Feyerabend’s relationship with Heidegger is neither personal nor as a source of scholarly material to work from as that of Marcuse. Feyerabend is in his twenties during the time that Marcuse and Heidegger correspond. (Marcuse is nine years junior to Heidegger.) The connection between Feyerabend and Heidegger is not a direct connection. Although Feyerabend is a relatively prodigious author, he seldom attributes by direct quote any single idea that appears in his work to other philosophers. One indirect connection may be through Husserl who Feyerabend does sporadically reference in some of his written work and recorded lectures. Heidegger was a student of Husserl (Blackburn, 1996) and while their relationship was contentious, Heidegger remains on speaking terms with Husserl until 1929, marked by Heidegger speaking at Husserl’s seventieth birthday party (Sheehan & Palmer, 1997). There is one recollection by Feyerabend of Heidegger in his autobiography quoting a comment that Heidegger remarks about Hitler after observing a speech by Hitler, “The only face among faceless men” (p. 37). There is no indication that Feyerabend physically observes Heidegger at the rally (probably not) and the recollection by Feyerabend has no source for documentation

and may be hearsay. Beyond the sparse direct quotes, there is little evidence to believe that Feyerabend has any other association with Heidegger other than that he may have been familiar with his work, possibly from Feyerabend's own debates with other intellectuals or possibly out of his research of some of the ideas presented by Heidegger's mentor, Husserl.

It is conceivable that Heidegger has some minor influence on the work of Feyerabend through his contacts with other intellectuals. Feyerabend is no Heideggerian. Ideas, philosophical positions, and analyses synthesize throughout much of Feyerabend with little or no references to the sources of origination for information. The pace at which Feyerabend moves from one point to the next is frenetic, yet is readable is the organization is logical even though much of his work is theoretical. Feyerabend is a philosophical sieve, shaking out particles he does not find beneficial to his point, retaining and re-shaking until the logic of the mix coalesces. The only consistent strand in his autobiography is consistent indifference to scientific conformity, conforming theories, and his anarchical attitude. Feyerabend (1995) explains his style in this way, "Yet I concluded an essay on Goethe (a school assignment) by linking him to Hitler. There was no insight behind this maneuver, no deeply felt conviction; the desire for a good grade certainly played no role; nor had I fallen for Hitler's "charisma" as had artists, philosophers, scientists, and millions of ordinary men and women. So what made me do it? I assume it was the tendency (still with me) to pick up strange views and push them to the extreme" (p. 38-39).

While there is no direct connection to Heidegger, there is a hint in his autobiography *Killing Time*, of a perception of Heidegger that Feyerabend may

inadvertently expressed. Feyerabend is recalling a trip late to Freiburg Germany^{xiv} sometime in the early 1970s where Feyerabend receives an invitation for lunch with Heidegger. Feyerabend (1995) says the invitation is through a friend of both men; “Jung^{xv} also wanted me to meet Heidegger, who occasionally came over for lunch. “ However,” he said, “you must put a brake on your sarcasm” – or words to that effect. I declined” (p. 137). If Feyerabend has any relationship with Heidegger, then the assumption is that lunch with an old friend or person Feyerabend may have been curious is not out of the question. The lack of specific references or recollections of encounters between Feyerabend and Heidegger probably indicate they have no formal collegial relationships. Nevertheless, beyond the fact there is no specific reference to Heidegger, other clues as to Heideggerian influence have been interpreted by some scholars such as Cristin (1998) and Megill (1985) as they attempt to reconstruct Heidegger and connect to written work and recorded speeches left by Feyerabend as well as others.^{xvi}

Critics call the attempt to resurrect Heidegger through contemporary philosophers of science as historic revisionism. References attributed to Heidegger from contemporary philosophers are scarce partially due to Heidegger having been personally discredited because of his Nazi connection and partly because of the Frankfurt School in the United States reinvigorates political discussion among intellectuals by reconceptualizing Marxist social theory (Jay, 1973). It is fair to say there is similarity of ideas expressed by Marcuse with Feyerabend and there is no doubt that Heidegger influences Marcuse until their relationship ends. Circumstantial evidence seems to indicate and point in the direction that Feyerabend is probably familiar with the philosophical work of Heidegger by way of Husserl. There is no satisfactory answer as to if anything other than ‘coincidental similar

notions' are of Heidegger origin in the work of Feyerabend and Heideggerian interpretations are best left for other scholars to make a determination.

This research while inconclusive tends to lean in the direction for believing there is no Heidegger found in Feyerabend. Feyerabend's (2002) *Against Method* and other pieces he authors is structurally different in the format of the theoretical inquiry that Heidegger utilizes in his work. The method of theoretical inquiry Feyerabend utilizes is as unstructured and uncomplicated by detail as his autobiography. This is not to say it is not a complex book replete with equally recurring complex ideas. After all Feyerabend remains a scientist, just a scientist who believes his mission is to demonstrate that the scientific method is no better of a method of discovery than chance. That may be an over simplification, but ultimately Feyerabend when he writes about the process of discovery and compares the scientific method to organized anarchy, is saying science is far less neat in process than scientists like to let on.

Feyerabend is the exception to classically trained philosophers who follow a sequential argument to its end and Heidegger (Marcuse as well.) is very methodical. Fishman (1999) describes Heidegger's writing style and it is representative of many of scholars; "In addition Heidegger a central figure in Continental philosophy, was ridiculed for his exceedingly dense and awkward style of writing and attacked for his conversion to Hitler's national socialism" (p. 105). Feyerabend is not dogmatic. Feyerabend may start at the end and work backwards or he may bounce off one point to another. His style of inquiry is neither Heideggerian nor Popperian, and no doubt, he vexes many of his peers and professors with his style of query. It is difficult to pin down which philosophical line he is thinking as Feyerabend utilizes the tools from the humanities such as Greek

literature almost as much as he quotes from philosophers and scientists (when he bothers to attribute a source to quote) to make his point. Some scholars place Feyerabend closer to pragmatism than existentialism, and claim Husserl may be his only true connection to Heidegger. Feyerabend is structurally different from Marcuse, but similar in that both utilize humanities to accentuate a point even those that are extraordinarily theoretical and conceptual.

There is a direct contrast to how Marcuse and Feyerabend approach their experience during war. This contrast becomes very apparent in Chapter 4 of Feyerabend's autobiography, *Killing Time*. A summary of Chapter 4 is a description of how Feyerabend copes with the Nazi occupation and his own wartime experience as a reluctant inductee during the war. Unlike Marcuse where war is a deeply personal political and humanitarian problem, Feyerabend is lackadaisical about Germany, occupation, Nazi extremists during the occupation of Vienna, and for most of his career as a soldier. "For me," writes Feyerabend (1995), "the German occupation and the war was that followed were an inconvenience, not a moral problem, and my reactions came from accidental moods and circumstances, not from a well-defined outlook" (p. 38). His autobiography indicates that while Feyerabend did not shirk his responsibility (ironically he was a decorated veteran earning the Iron Cross, page 39) he makes little or no effort to contribute as a soldier to the war effort. Feyerabend finds his superior officers to be less than intelligent, boorish, and bureaucratic. He becomes an officer not by promotion for valor, but rather out of attrition as his superiors are wounded or killed by the enemy (p. 51) leaving him in charge of the troops. One comedic incident bears repeating if only to illustrate the ineptness of Feyerabend as an army officer. Feyerabend (1995) recalls the

incident; “There [Poland] I was put in command of a bicycle company. I was hardly thrilled – I had never ridden a bicycle, and I fell off when I tried. The soldiers stood around looking puzzled: this is supposed to be our leader? The problem was solved by the Russians; in one day the bicycles were already in their hands” (p. 51). One can almost imagine Feyerabend playing the role of Sergeant Shultz, the bumbling but affable prison guard in the 1965 television show, *Hogan’s Heroes*.^{xvii}

Like many of his generation and ethnic background Feyerabend attempts to construct an explanation as to why he was not more publicly actively opposed to the Nazi occupation of Austria and why rather than take arms against Germany, he carries arms as a German officer. Feyerabend has little inclination for religion so a person’s religious affiliation never occurs to Feyerabend to be justification for the cruelty of the Nazis. The family of Marcuse is Jewish as well as German, (Marcuse spends some time in the German army in World War I.), and the atrocities the Nazis commit has special meaning. The duality of being German and Jewish is not lost on Feyerabend (1995) when he writes, “Years later I had many Jewish friends, in the United States, in England, on the European Continent; as a matter of fact, almost all the friends I have made in my profession are Jews, according to the Nazi definition” (p. 53). Later he adds with some regret – not the regret that he did not do more to undermine Fascism – rather the regret of not paying closer attention to the Nazi hate campaign. Unlike Heidegger who conspires with the Nazis and Marcuse who flees Germany, Feyerabend remains in Germany/Austria and recalls his war experience as disassociated from the events going on around him. “During the Nazi period I paid little attention to the general talk about Jews, communism, the Bolshevik threat; I did not accept it, I did not oppose it; the words came and went,

apparently without effect” (Feyerabend, 1995, p. 53). Years later Feyerabend reflects upon the regret that he did not do more to oppose Hitler and the Nazis, a wistful acknowledgement that had he chose opposition in place of conformity, he may have avoided the uncomfortable encounters with Jewish intellectuals in his later academic life. Feyerabend (1995) in speaking of a colleague, “He is a Jew and a good friend of mine” – it was like eating forbidden fruit. The feeling remained for a few years; it has since gone away now. In a way, I regret it. Feeling differently about different faces, groups, communities seems to be more humane than humanitarian that eves our all individual and group idiosyncrasies” (p. 53). In one sense, his philosophical position on the matter of resistance is consistent with many philosophers that believe that philosophers should remain as passive observers, social critics, but not actively engage in the political fray. This distinction is evident in comparing Marcuse and Du Bois with Feyerabend and Dewey, with the latter pair representative of this notion of ‘philosophical pacifism’.

Marcuse, after Hitler’s rise in power, leaves Germany for Geneva, and then in 1934 immigrates to the United States (Marcuse, 1998). The same year, Columbia University invites the Frankfurt School to locate on their campus and Marcuse with other members of the Frankfurt School organizes the Institute for Social Research (Wheatland, 2004). Wheatland (2004) explains the motivation for the move, “There was really only one motive behind Horkheimer's desire to move the institute from Europe to America: the threat of fascism's spread throughout the continent” (p. 11). Jay (1973) and Kellner (Marcuse, 1998) agree that without the assistance of Horkheimer the survival of the Institute in Geneva and the United States is in doubt. While in the United States, Marcuse during the war finds employment in the Office of War Information as a senior analyst for

the division of the Bureau of Intelligence. The position allows Marcuse to access volumes of military intelligence and Marcuse suggests in various reports how to counter the spread of Fascism outside of Europe (Marcuse, 1998, p. 18). Unlike Feyerabend who experiences combat firsthand, Marcuse spends the war behind a desk combating Fascism assisting the United States government.

Marcuse's contribution to the war effort bears mentioning for two reasons. The first is that his work provides invaluable information as to the psychology behind Fascism, and the second Marcuse attempts to disassociate Nazism from the common German citizen making the reconstruction of Germany more palatable to the American public. Kellner (Marcuse, 1998) writes, "Marcuse argues that the terms "Nazi" and "Nazism" present the most vivid image of a threatening German enemy, but stresses also the need to present a more differentiated image of the German public, based on factual analysis of the social and economic structure of Nazi Germany and a delineation of the differing groups and organizations, highlighting which groups, big business and the Nazi inner circles, are most directly implicated in the German war crimes and thus the main "enemy" of the allies" (p. 19). This notion of attributing the responsibility for the crimes committed by Nazi enterprises, holding those enterprises accountable to an international tribunal, and disassociating the common citizen from the consequences of the despicable leadership class is a significant point when one considers the global situation of profiling specific cultures as terrorists.

Marcuse is German and there is no supporting evidence he is of Fascist or pro-Nazi sentiments. Yet, in the mid to late 1940s, Marcuse comes under attack for his pro-Marxist and Socialist views that by the time of the Cold War link to Soviet style

Communism. Kellner (Marcuse, 1998) writes, “With the spread of anti-communist witch-hunts, Marcuse’s position became increasingly perilous (p. 27).” Letters to Horkheimer in the latter part of 1945 to 1949 indicate increasing frustration from Marcus with his role with United States government and contain a number of references to returning to the Institute as early as the financial picture of the Institute for Social Research allows (Marcuse, 1998, pp. 228-260).

This is not to say that Fascists did not try to infiltrate the United States and the need for due vigilance became unnecessary to counter the movement. Carlson (1943) describes his investigation into infiltration of the United States by Fascists; “In the course of my investigations, I found that many otherwise fine Americans were propagating the lies and the ‘party line’ originally advanced by Hitler’s agents and doing it sincerely in what they believed to be good Americanism” (p. 9). In his book *Under Cover* (1943), Carlson describes his role as an investigator into the American Fascist and the American Nazi movement. Carlson (1943) describes the hate campaign against immigrants and minorities living in America at one meeting he attends; “In such a room as this the Boston Tea party met. Wake up, Christians. Look around you. See what is happening to American. The whole country is overrun with foreigners, n _____s, Jews. Is this the white America of our fathers? Is this the land of Christian patriots or blood-sucking Communists” (p. 39)? Invoking racial and immigrant prejudice is the tactic Fascists attempt to use to recruit members to their side. Carlson recounts numerous incidents with this meeting emblematic of the campaign in the United States and abroad.

Paradoxically, one chapter that illustrates the hypocrisy of the U.S. Fascist and Nazi movement and in light of the previous paragraph seems incredulous and

unbelievable is a chapter entitled ‘Hitler and Hirohito in Harlem’. “Fantastic as it seems,” says Carlson (1943), Hitler’s agents invaded Harlem – New York’s Negro section.

Despite its garishly lighted avenues and multitudinous taverns which are the scenes of noisy revelry until dawn, more than 350,000 Negroes live in tenements foul beyond description, and I regard Harlem as one of the most tragic ‘cities’ in the United States; a blot on our Democracy” (p. 154). In this chapter, Carlson describes how Nazi party and Japanese agents use destitute African Americans in an effort to evoke a racial civil war. Japan and Germany promise to liberate African Americans from the oppression of white America and to return Africa back into an African nation instead of colonies of Europe. According to Carlson and even more fascinating is that the Japanese convince followers that Japan is a friend of the African American. “What side [Carlson asks] will Negroes take in such event?¹⁸ “Japan’s,” Jordan declared, “Japan is the black man’s friend. Racially, Japan is the same as the Negroes. At one time all Japanese people were black people” (Carlson, 1943, p. 159). Later Jordan explains, “Japan’s mission is to save the darker races of the world from Communism, just as Hitler’s job is to save the white races in the west from Communism” (p. 159). Marcuse’s mission is to counter the psychological and propaganda of the Fascist regimes. His work in behalf of the U.S. government while regarded by many scholars as an interruption in his theoretical work has gone largely unnoticed. Nonetheless, applying the same rigor and methodology of

¹⁸ Jordan is alluding to a prospective Japanese invasion. What is particularly fascinating about this account is that this conversation occurred at the end of 1940. Robert Jordan, an African American, apparently was aware of a pending plan to attack the U.S. approximately 1 year before the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Marcuse to the contemporary environment of global geo-politics and terrorism might provide some significant insight as to how to conduct a war on terror.

The second reason Marcuse's contribution to the war effort bears mentioning is Marcuse is able to access an incredible assortment of documents, correspondence, transcripts, and materials that even the best universities in the world do not have available. For a scholar, primary source material is better than gold and the United States intelligence agencies are some of the best gatherers of information gold in the world. In some of his correspondence with Horkheimer, Marcuse indicates that he has permission to share material with the Institute in return for any analysis they can provide to the intelligence community regarding Fascism or the Nazis. Further, the department which Marcuse completes his assignments are staffed by scholars much like himself, that are personally committed to defeating Fascism from an intellectual perspective. Kellner (Marcuse, 1988) believes that the time spent in government work is beneficial to Marcuse's later theoretical work with the Institute. "Although Marcuse's 1940s work with the government has generally been considered an interruption of his theoretical work' says Kellner (Marcuse 1988), "this view needs some revision. To some extent, the working conditions from his government service were not all that different from Institute activity" (p. 24). The stability of guaranteed employment in conjunction with the staff collaboration of like-minded individuals and the unhindered access to a diverse set of materials provides Marcuse with a knowledge base to draw upon for his later works. These resources resurface in his later works and his government service provides Marcuse a level of credibility in and outside of the regular academic circles as the next section demonstrates.

Technology and the Curriculum of Capitalism

Moreover, both historical experience and democratic principles suggest that science be kept under public control. Scientific institutions are not “objective”; neither they nor their products confront people like a rock, or a star (Feyerabend, 1995, p. 143).

The curriculum of Capitalism and its companion hyper-consumerism, cannot survive if not for the science or technology. The innovation of the global computer network is less than five decades since the first transmission of internet code occurs between levels of the Department of Defense. The World Wide Web becomes the dominant medium for communication in less than twenty years. The unprecedented spread of global Capitalism rides the wave of the exponential growth of secure computer networks. Succinct lines of demarcation do not limit the science of technology and the associated fields of science as they once were pre-Cold War. This is to say that fields overlap so much it is difficult to distinguish a biological discovery from the invention of a piece of bioengineering equipment utilized to report the discovery. In a global capitalist market the manipulation of swings in the value of currency, changes in production, and instability in commodities happens with the single keystroke of computer analysts in nanoseconds of real time. Capitalism and Marxism as economic phenomena pre-Cold War are economic theories attempting to explain labor-production processes. The anachronism of labor-production Capitalism and Marxism have little relevance to the manipulation of currencies, commodities, and community resources by high-speed global networks. Technology makes the wangling of commodities such as oil, natural gas, and coal as well as currency an occupation; an extraordinarily lucrative occupation. The

mercantile trading of hard goods is far less profitable than speculating on shortages and surpluses of commodities.

In technologically developed nations, production from manufacturing continues a steep decline shifting to offshore third world countries where labor is cheap and environmental regulations non-existent. The trading of the value of a commodity and speculative bartering of inflated or deflated value of currency is all that remains when production abandons the shores of a nation. The global financial crisis of 2008-2011 is evidence of the consequence of unregulated commodity trades and the reconstruction of Capitalism as techno-wealth. The foundation of the free enterprise system is in process of radical reconfiguration in response to the new global economy. Reksulak (2009) questions the conventional notion that profits are an accurate measure of the free-enterprise system. In this article, Reksulak (2009) points to recent reports indicating that the financial investment firm Goldman Sachs earns an average of \$400,000 per employee. Though Reksulak (2009) is writing about financial firms, it is not too difficult of a leap to apply his analysis to other forms of free-enterprise endeavors. Reksulak's (2009) research indicates, "Almost everybody in the U.S. and many more abroad have been impacted by the economic downturn that was caused by 'systemic failures' in the financial markets. This means that many financial institutions followed a "damn the consequences" approach. Almost all of them had found it impossible to forgo the opportunities that were, at some point, headed toward calamity. In that sense, profits were not a true measure of the cost and benefits of their business models. In economics, that is called externality – a scenario in which one's actions impact the livelihood of others, but

one does not have to pay for those externally imposed costs” (p. 5b).¹⁹ Reksulak (2009) makes an important point that is lost in the mind numbing size of government global bailouts; “Consequently, it is important for proponents of free enterprise to also emphasize the responsibilities that come with the privilege to operate in a free (market) society” (2009, p. 5b). While it is easy to blame lack of government oversight, ultimately the collapse of the financial system is indicative of a system that covets profits over personal responsibility and favors private over public concerns. Governments are complicit to the extent they provide a convenient backstop for irresponsible behavior.

Wexler (1981) and McLaren (2008), utilizing a Marxist theoretical framework, derive similar conclusion as the free market approach of Reksulak. Pinar (2002) summarizes the aspect of their work that acknowledges the link between science\technology and Capitalism. “History,” writes Pinar (et al. ,2002), “indeed the world now appear as cultural commodities in the forms of information and images, in the consumption of which is said to now constitute our freedom, ideas we have seen in the works of Philip Wexler and Peter McLaren (p. 473).” Capitalism shreds the social fabric that protects global citizens faster than it is reparable. The rapid pace reflects technology

¹⁹ A term commonly used by the financial services industry that describes the risk associated with reward assumed by individuals, but the consequences of failure unequally distributed to innocent bystanders is ‘moral hazard’. This term is more accurate as it implies that investors have a moral obligation to society to balance the needs of profitability (risk\reward) with the potential harm allocated to members of society; most who do directly benefit from the profitability of a successful enterprise.

and the application of the scientific method to resolving social problems, such the failure of Capitalism to produce a socially just world and the failure of public education to produce global citizens willing to invest in social structures outside of those that are self-gratifying. Wexler (1981) describes the global social condition in the context of global economics; “The present national and international industrial agglomeration heightens economic, social, and informational interdependence. It produces the social conditions that might serve as the occasion for awareness of a human community. But, this awareness currently remains partialised and fragmented according to private interest and socially outmoded parochialisms” (p. 257). Wexler believes that the decline in the quality of life for many Americans applicable to many global citizens is traceable to a deepening economic crisis (p. 247). The capitalist notion of individualism, hard work, accumulation, and consumption assume a religious or spiritual place in the lives of many citizens and this economic fundamentalism displaces an emphasis on simplicity, family life, and community. Wexler (1981) describes the disruption of social structures, “At their extremes, each of these tendencies represents, theoretically, the current popular caricatured separation of work as careerism and values as fundamentalism. Against the automatic laws of motion of capital are placed noble cultural aspirations. Production is raised against belief, necessity against freedom. The relative merits of materiality and spirituality are debated, but now in the language of social science” (p. 249).

Wexler’s notion of spirituality or by interpretation spirituality is framed by a belief in the fairness of a democratic society, public space, free expression, a non-combative discourse leading to tolerance, and civility. The experience of democracy is a spiritual experience. This concept of spirituality flows contrary to the current global

social situation. In comparison to Wexler is Feyerabend's (1999) idea of 'simplicity' as the outward expression of a spiritual and aspirational belief countering the idea that somehow, life has become too complex, social problems too intransigent, and society too fragmented for solutions other than retreat. Science, it seems, is the only rational hope to resolving social problems in an objective and reasonably equitable fashion. Feyerabend (2002) rejects the notion of scientific method as the singular solution, believes that the scientific method provides but one avenue for discovery, and agrees with the idea that a certain degree of spirituality, faith, or belief is fundamental to conceptualizing a scientific theory. Feyerabend (2002) believes, "To sum up; there is no 'scientific world-view' just as there is no uniform enterprise 'science' – except in the minds of the metaphysicians, schoolmasters, and politicians trying to make their nation competitive. Still, there are many things we can learn from sciences. But, we can also learn from the humanities, from religion and from the remnant of ancient traditions that survived the onslaught of Western Civilization" (p. 249). There is a Marcusean (1964/1991) thread in Feyerabend's perspective on the modern world. The Greek words *theoria* and *praxis* are compatible with this perspective and it is compatible with a neo-Marxist or a critical pragmatist conception of discovery. The notion by Pinar (et al., 2002) of *theoria* and *praxis* as a method to reconceptualize curriculum applies to his observation of science; "Science finds its truth in the production and legitimation by technology" (p. 474). The idea is technology is advancing more rapidly than the global social structures can keep pace and integrate in a socially responsible non-economic way.

There is a similar notion found in articles written by McLaren, an ardent Marxist educator and critical theorist. McLaren's (2008) approach is through the promotion of a

critical pedagogy that in theory frees the discourse from the chains of “capitalist exploitation, postmodernism, and transnational capital” (p. 474). McLaren criticizes academic colleagues searching for a position that is non-political and some respects, non-committal. McLaren (2008) writes, “Establishment academics under the thrall of technocratic rationality act as if the future might one day produce a model capitalistic utopia in the form of an orrery of brass and oiled mahogany whose inset spheres and gear wheels, humming and whirring like some ancient clavichord melody, will reveal without a hint the dissimulation the concepts and practices necessary to keep the world of politics synchronized in an irenic harmony” (p. 475). Fusing science with Capitalism creates a technocracy; the inequitable treatment of global citizens exacerbates techno-poverty (the lack of the ability to obtain technology) as well as poverty by lack of wealth. Techno-Capitalism undermines a rational discourse for re-distribution of wealth of technology as a means for encouraging socially oriented democracies.

Limiting the potential for rational discourse is the belief by the United States, China, Russia, and the European Union that many countries lack techno-sophistication. Super powers deny developing nations access to critical components of technology infrastructure. The proponents for limiting technology claim there is a niche for nations vested in pre-technology or orthodox labor-production oriented Capitalism or Marxism. These countries remain niche production markets because labor costs are nominal, technological infrastructure is non-existent, and these countries do not compete with the super powers. The second major proponent for limiting technology is transnational private/public partnerships. These partnerships hoard technology to maintain monopolies, protect the power structure, and maintain control over critical components of

infrastructure as a tactic to influence other nations into supporting policies of the owners of transnational corporate investment. The characterization of a third group of proponents for limiting technology associates a moralist position that some nations are not stable or are irresponsible in the use and sharing of technology. Limiting technology until the nation meets a standard of 'techno-maturity' is a responsible method to make sure technology does not fall into the wrong hands or is misappropriated. The current state of irrational discourse underscores the point though Capitalism is evolving through technology, the belief system and paradigms of Capitalism have not. Technology is the new iteration for economic colonialism. To claim the world is a socially better place to live is stretching the truth as the social structure remains under assault by rabid promotion of techno-Capitalism. Scatamburlo-D and McLaren (2004) characterize the human costs, "Global Capitalism has paved the way for obscene concentration of wealth in fewer hands, and created a world increasingly divided between those who enjoy opulent affluence and those who languish in dehumanizing conditions and economic misery. In every corner of the globe, we are witnessing social disintegration as revealed by the rise in abject poverty and inequality" (p. 194). The curriculum of Capitalism continues to fail in reconceptualizing social Capitalism to address the needs of marginalized people around the globe and to utilize techno-Capitalism as a paradigm for facilitating positive democratic social structures. Capitalism is going high-tech; social Capitalism remains a relic of the twentieth century production mentality.

Varied sources of information, private and public, demonstrate how close the relationship between global Capitalism and supportive technologies such as internet infrastructure is becoming. The Economist Intelligence Unit, a division of The Economist

magazine, produces a global assessment that is sporadically available to the public, but assessments such as these are ongoing more frequently than published reports would lead the public to believe. The report measures one element of technology, the infrastructure required to move sophisticated data transmissions through the intra-country network and to connect into the global network. Communication infrastructure is one measure of scientific and technological competence. The report ranks nations as to their abilities to operate, fund, and support sophisticated data transmission networks. Three findings by this group support the notion that techno-wealth is the new capital in the global economy. “It is no accident that 18 of the top 20 countries in e-readiness overall also figure in the top 20 in social and cultural environment” (Economist, 2007, p. 11). It is also no accident that when comparing this list to various sources measuring the relative gross national product, that the wealthiest countries also have sophisticated data transmission networks; but not necessarily govern as traditional democracies; for example China. The top twenty are major players in the global capitalist market and while there are a number of statistical methodologies to analyze this type of information, one conclusion that is consistent in many different research formats is that technological superiority translates into accumulation of capital. Wealth accumulates although not necessarily in the hands of citizens. For example in the case of China, the per capita income of citizens is low in comparison to other countries on the list though China ranks high in developing technical infrastructure. Arguably, there are many statistical methods useful for interpreting this type of information and per capita income may not be the best comparison. Similar analyses using other methods validate techno-superiority leads to techno-wealth.

Two other notable quotations in this report further illustrate the role technology plays in global Capitalism is, “We hold that stable governments with a commitment to wide-ranging competition, fair and transparent taxation frameworks, and a willingness to foster borderless trade and investment all contribute to a business-friendly platform without which attempts to digitize the economy cannot take hold” (Economist, 2007, p. 10). The report does not distinguish between authentic democracies and forms of totalitarian governments that claim they are functional democracies. The criteria for participation is not how citizens are treated, but rather how stable (how much control) does the government have. The next statement is stock and trade of the curriculum of Capitalism; by incorporating non-democratic nations into the global network and providing access to capitalist markets, Capitalism influences nations to abandon totalitarianism in favor of democratic reform. “An e-ready government uses digital channels to communicate with its constituents. It provides citizens and businesses with Internet-based services that are more efficient than traditional channels. It leverages technology to create efficiencies in its own operations. And, most importantly, it uses all these processes to engender more transparent, more democratic societies (Economist, 2007, p. 17).”^{xviii} This notion is theoretically conceivable, but yet to come to fruition in reality.

The theoretical proposition remains viable, Capitalism co-opts science and technology, and that science and technology are a disassociating social force, McLaren (2008) brings this discussion full circle when he writes, “This implies building a new social culture, control of work by the associated producers, and also the very transformation of the nature of work itself. We need to transform the social relations of

production, including those extra-territorial economic powers that exceed the control of nation states. And we don't need a social state as much as a socialist one. We need to do more to counter the damage wreaked by Capitalism; we need to create a society outside of capital's value form" (p. 477). McLaren's article advocates for a pedagogical resistance movement to counter the influence of the curriculum of Capitalism. His analysis is applicable and substantive to the discussion of the monopoly of technology, as the accumulation of the wealth of the world is in the treasuries of a few nations. McLaren's notion is that the rush to science to resolve global social problems is futile as Capitalism co-opts technology. The real point of Marxist voices such as McLaren are to provide a different perspective to the debate about who benefits from technology.

Numerous scholars write about the phenomena of how technology and Capitalism tend to disassociate productive citizens from many different aspects of their lives. The principle of dualism, personal identity, and double consciousness are expressions of disassociation both in terms of psychological and from community. To use the vernacular of technology, Wexler, McLaren, and others are describing logic gates;²⁰ sociological logic gates, where the convergence of global Capitalism, transnational corporate governments, technology, failing social policies, and issues of race, class, and gender are the inputs whereas the output is a degradation of human dignity. Wexler (1981) and McLaren (2008) describe two very different inputs, the loss of spirituality for Wexler and for McLaren, the loss of the freedom of dissent in public spaces. The conclusions they

²⁰ "Logic gates are computer circuits that contain several inputs, but have only one output that can be activated by a particular combination of inputs. Source; Visual Thesaurus (<http://www.visualthesaurus.com>, June 15, 2009).

draw are the same. Techno-Capitalism wreaks havoc upon social structures and colors the ideal of democracy as an economic concept, not a social concept. The social concept is of the most concern of progressive educators; how does public education develop critically thinking democratically oriented citizens when so much of the concern of curriculum is economic?

In the introduction to *One-Dimensional Man*, Kellner (Marcuse, 1991) writes, "...Marcuse develops a conception of a technological world, similar in some respects to that developed by Heidegger, and like Husserl and Heidegger, see technological rationality colonizing everyday life, robbing individuals of freedom and individuality by imposing technological imperatives, rules, and structures upon their thought and behavior" (p. xiv). A technocratic world combines the worst elements of Capitalism – racial, class, and gender economics – with the worst elements of technology and science – dehumanization of the labor force, exacerbated class distinctions and a loss of freedom as technology accelerates the intrusive force of government. "The main trends are familiar," writes Marcuse (1991); "concentration of the national economy on the needs of the big corporations, with the government as stimulating, supporting, and sometimes even controlling force; hitching of this economy to a world-wide system of military alliances, monetary arrangements, technical assistance and development schemes; gradual assimilation of blue-collar and white-collar population, of leadership types in business and labor, of leisure activities and aspirations in different social classes; fostering a pre-established harmony between scholarship and the national purpose; invasion of the private household by the togetherness of public opinion; opening of the bedroom to the media mass of communication" (p. 19). Marcuse argues that a technocracy is worse than

totalitarianism as on its face, technocracy gives the impression that science and technology are not political, advance the noble ideals of humanity, are objective and rational, as well as lead to a greater awareness of the need for improving the social welfare of global citizens (1991). Evidence seems to support the opposite conclusion.

Technocracies subjugate and commoditize global citizens. Commoditization, conquest, and control are the ultimate goals of the reconceptualization of Capitalism fusing with advanced science and technology. Governments seeking new political propagandizing tools in which to observe, monitor, and control their national populations neutralize the freeing capabilities of internet technology and social network. Technodemocracy, the belief by many that technology will lead the next wave for global democratic reform is evolving into a sophisticated complex system of monitoring. With a flick of a global switch, shutting off democratic movements in nations that are not in good standing with the democratic Capitalist notion of free enterprise is a conceivable reality. Apparently, 'free enterprise' is not really free; or applicable to social movements, social awareness, and social justice much as academic freedom is only applicable if scholarly views are in agreement with corporate policies of the university.

Amazingly, individuals continue to place their belief in science as objective, rational, and equitable. The promise of science and technology is and will be to free humankind from the dreariness of repetitiveness of industrial factory life and replacing it with an environment free of the normal stresses and negative aspects of the physical toils of labor by computerizing machines. These machines liberate human beings from the disconsolate life of a production line worker and open new possibilities for creativity and creation. Marcuse (1964) and Feyerabend (2002) dispute this notion and state flatly that

while advances in science/technology increase substantively the quality of life and in many cases the economic living conditions for many global citizens, it comes with a steep price; the further deterioration of personal liberty, freedoms, and prospect for totalitarianism replacing democracy. The technocracy is no more democratic than Capitalism, and if we accept the proposition of Marcuse and Feyerabend, even less democratic than many totalitarian governments due to the ability to surveil, collect personal information, and control by electronic means.

The technocracy is the modern version of the Fascist state; the difference between 1940 and today is that the integration with technology and science legitimizes technocratic behavior – almost without objection. The curriculum of Capitalism promotes the notion that to be a global citizen; students must grasp the integral concepts of technology and globalization. Globalization and technology link with a universal concept that states without post-secondary education a citizen remains in a manual labor economy. An economy that offers little prospective mobility, few benefits, and uncertainty as to if a job will exist. Public education promotes the idea that higher education is the pathway for greater mobility within the classes and incentivizes the idea with the promotion of an increasing wage potential linking to higher levels of education. The difficulty with this argument is that global Capitalism exerts pressure on nations to maintain the lowest wage to maximize profits. When Western and European economies were the dominant manufacturing onshore enterprises, depressing wages was a limited strategy until global competition for production capability shifts manufacturing to lower cost producers. The shift accelerates the global technology revolution reconfiguring the nature of work and the skill level of the workforce.

The major global manufacturers located on the continental shores of Europe and the United States shift from the trade of real goods produced by real labor, to ‘transactional labor’ – trading oil futures or other commodities, short selling, complex mortgage transactions, currency swaps – all sight unseen by the traders and by electronic transaction. It is no longer necessary to balance production, labor, and consumption as these e-traders trade real dollars on the assumption of the scarcity of a product, create scarcity\surplus, or trade on the prospect of the delivery of a product at a particular time when the demand curve is on the rise. A basic understanding of public school students about the free market system and Capitalism is competition and consumer demand regulates pricing. If this is a fundamental irrefutable truth of Capitalism then why does the model for price control not function in the global market? The example of oil serves to demonstrate the orthodox capitalist perspective of the free market system is not applicable in the world of techno-Capitalism.

Oil futures sold for an average of \$27 per barrel in 1985, spiking to approximately \$145 per barrel in 2008, and predictions are oil will settle at just under \$100 per barrel in the coming years (U.S. Government –Energy Information Administration, 2009). This is despite the fact that *demand for oil continues to fall* for much of the world.²¹ With less demand, oil reserve capacity is at surplus levels resulting in a number of large refineries reducing production capability, which under normal conditions signals a reduction in price to balance demand with production. Oil prices are not falling. Prices remain at

²¹ This is not true for China, India, Pakistan, and other developing nations where demand for oil as an inexpensive fuel is rising, but not at a rate fast enough to reduce the global oversupply of oil.

historically high price levels even when factoring in adjustments for inflation. The explanation for the contradiction of supply, demand, and pricing is that pricing oil futures does not relate to traditional Capitalist rational economic models. Commodity traders manipulate the market to capitalize on an artificially created 'prospective demand'. E-traders discover they have the technological ability to manipulate the market by speculating on the demand curve and not have to deliver a product to make a profit. Techno-Capitalism replaces the traditional model of market pricing with a new version of artificially manipulated markets backed by complex financial instruments, subsidized by governments with tax dollars, and owned by transnational corporations.

Marx is partially right in predicting the implosion of Capitalism and in its stead stands Socialism. The part unforeseen by Marx is the new iteration of Capitalism is techno-Capitalism. Marxists have no counter to techno-Capitalism. Unforeseen and virtually unpredictable is what shape a new social structure will take once techno-Capitalism fully implements. The current global economic situation is that Capitalism is in an evolutionary state and the window for reform is growing progressively narrower. What are the possibilities for a progressive social structure within the framework of techno-Capitalism? Marcuse and Feyerabend provide two possible scenarios. The first by Marcuse (1998), "Political domination will be replaced by the self-government of the "productive classes" and by technical and scientific administration. Revolution and anarchy will be abolished, for these disturbances resulted only from the immaturity of the productive process and its subjection to external and obsolete forms of government" (pp. 127-128). Marcuse sees a more humane civil society replacing the civil strife characterizing global relations today. Feyerabend (2002) presents a different scenario.

“Professional anarchists oppose any kind of restriction and they demand the individual be permitted to develop freely, unhampered by laws, duties, or obligations. And yet they swallow without protest all the severe standards which scientists and logicians impose upon research and upon any kind of knowledge-creating and knowledge-changing activity” (p. 12). Feyerabend’s model is similar to the current state of global affairs where passive resistance leads to little change. What is unclear is whose vision is correct. Now clear is the new socio-economic revolution, techno-Capitalism. Will the evolution be a humane democratically oriented global social structure? How does the curriculum of Capitalism evolve to techno-Capitalism and what are the ramifications of the evolution to the public school system? The next section will attempt to answer these questions.

Marcuse and Feyerabend: The Curriculum of Techno-Capitalism and Education

Any government, however well intentioned, is bound to be a disservice to human freedom, for every attempt at governing tries to pattern all life on a common standard and thus destroys individuality (Blau, 1971, p. 246).

Hegemonic cultures dominating one sphere of society neither is a new concept nor is the concept that science and technology are synchronistic ideas. A totalitarian world of robots and supercomputers in control is the stuff of science fiction novels and never a serious possibility. Orwell’s book, *1984* (1949), John Naisbitt’s *Megatrends* (1982), or Alvin Toffler’s book, *Future Shock* (1970), describe a future where previously fictional depictions of society become a reality. Modern world events, the speed at which they become public, and the reactive pace of response to global financial markets underscore the themes of these works. The theme is the age for the potentiality of scientific and technological totalitarianism is more real than fiction. Marcuse echoes a

similar theme in his work, *One-Dimensional Man* (1964) and Feyerabend's *Against Method* (2002) contains numerous references to a scientific rationality dominating both the political and the realm of common sense. The notion of a techno-totalitarianism funded by capitalists who prefer rational order to the chaos of democracy – an order in which they are free to profit on the production of others, free to create faux wealth by manipulating currencies and commodities electronically – is considerably closer to realization. Techno-totalitarianism is possible through the capitulation of third world governments to superpowers to maintain low wage labor. The curriculum of Capitalism promotes the notion that in a global society as long as Capitalism succeeds to maintain dominance, inequity the result of race, class, or gender does not exist as the competitive market place effectively eliminates barriers that inhibit access to social mobility. As this research demonstrates, Capitalism isolates and alienates labor by race, class, and gender to facilitate cost concessions. Capitalism succeeds when there is 'control' and 'management' of an alienated labor.

The reconceptualization of the new form of democracy does not link to the traditional sources of social activism such as street protests, work stoppages; get out the vote campaigns, other electioneering practices. Rather the conception for the new democracy is electronic in chat rooms, internet, and e-mail, social e-networks as Face Book, Twitter, and You Tube. E-ventures are corporate enterprises courting access to control and power outside of the traditional channels that are monitored and regulated, making it difficult if not impossible to expose them to public scrutiny. The new corridors of power are satellites, digitalized images, and the powerful ability to mobilize critical constituencies to action while simultaneously negating the response of constituencies

opposed to the particular mobilization. Mobilizing by discriminating between constituencies that are favorable or not favorable to a particular activity is an ‘apolitical act’ in the sense that the organizations performing the mobilization will profit from either pro or con mobilization. It is akin to an arms dealer selling weapons to one country while shipping weapons to sell to the opposition party. Originally, these corridors begin as public spaces, free of government interference. They are corridors of absolute freedom and democracy where ideas even the most outlandish, claim equal footing in the electronic public space.

Free exchange much like free enterprise is free to the extent it is a noninvasive non-democratizing process. Evidence today suggests that e-democracy is manipulated, corrupt, surveiled, observed, corporate, and subject to the same totalitarian monitoring and collection of personal transactional information as traditional forms of government. Recent events such as when Iranian government officials monitor e-trafficking of democratic protests to locate and prosecute Iranian pro-Western democracy protesters, demonstrate electronic surveillance is a real threat. Corporate agreements between Google and the Chinese government to turn over names of dissident activity, and repeated e-attacks initiated by North Korea at various targets critical of their regime demonstrate that e-space is neither public nor free from the manipulation of political interests. Surveillance is not limited to non-democratic regimes as in the U.S. published reports detail government efforts to infiltrate social networks to locate citizens who are behind in their taxes as well monitor conversations that may indicate criminal intent. “Since the September 11 terrorist attacks,” reports Epstein and Scott (2008), “tracking money movements has become a priority. In response, law enforcement and banks have

started to share more information about possible tax evaders. Governments also realize they have a lot to gain from stiffer penalties that return more money to under filled coffers” (para. 4, p. 1). The balance between protecting the public from potential catastrophic terror attacks and freedom of expression creates a society that has to choose between democracies that government monitor or choose living in an unmonitored democracy and potentially less safe. The argument for unmonitored democracy is that citizens will live in a democracy couched by the fear that at any time an innocent person will shed blood for the cause of a radical terrorist making a political point. Where is the rationality of either view? “Like the rulers in Orwell’s *1984* they declared less to be more, and more to be nonexistent,” writes Feyerabend (1999, pp. 14-15) in describing a society of technocrats.

E-Capitalism differs from orthodox Capitalism only in that production in e-Capitalism is transactional and knowledge based. Traditional manufacturing is production by repetitive organizational of labor, raw materials, and once implemented, requires little or no knowledge outside of the immediate task to manufacture the product. E-Capitalism differs, as measurable transactions substitute as modes for units of production and the product is the transaction. The modernized version of the curriculum of Capitalism reflects the new reality of the contemporary global economic picture; manufacturing occupations in non-third world countries are archaic remnants of a rust belt social past of Western style economics such as in the United States. Manufacturing production is still necessary to produce goods that consumers demand, but are relics when contrasted with postindustrial societies. An e-based intelligentsia controls the modern global Capitalism. Though the original myths of the curriculum of Capitalism continue to have utilitarian

purposes, inserting new myths into the curriculum are sure to present the modernist view that only third world countries engage in manufacturing.

The reconceptualization of the curriculum of Capitalism and transition to the curriculum of techno-Capitalism begins by introducing into the educational establishment and the public domain the notion that the United States is falling behind other nations in terms of national technical proficiency. By creating a crisis, the education establishment consisting of transnational quasi government corporate administrators, can oversee the revision of state curriculums to include national standards based upon corporate philosophies of standardization. The accountability movement disguises the desire by capitalists to gain greater control of educational resources to foster the new labor force by revising curriculum to fit their current labor needs as the response to this pseudo crisis. Blanke, Browne, and Hanouz (2009) representing a pro-business perspective promotes the idea, "Quality higher education and training is crucial for economies that want to move up the value chain beyond simple production processes and products. In particular, today's globalizing economy requires economies to nurture pools of well-educated workers who are able to adapt rapidly to their changing environment" (World Economic Forum, p. 5). The report discusses various methods of global standardization of processes and measurements as a method to promote progress in nations that are not yet technically proficient as other nations.

The genesis of creating a faux education crisis resulting in radical revisions of curriculum and a movement towards national standardization is not without historical

precedent. Tyler²² is who curriculum theorists credit with spawning the standardization movement towards standardizing curriculums and the transfer of the power to decide curriculums away from local authorities to state and federal officials. Tyler (December 1986/January 1987) links curriculum changes to the work of early educational theorists such as Thorndike who applies behavioral social theory from research in production problems in industrial plants to those in public education. Tyler also credits Bobbitt connecting curriculum to processes first articulated by Taylor, father of scientific management as well as connecting with Charters known for his functional theory of curriculum where curriculum is organized and presented in a structural format.

Complementing the theories of Taylor, Bobbitt, and Charters is Dale whose main contribution to curriculum theory is a ‘cone of learning’ whereby Dale attempts to apply a numerical ranking of student learning (Tyler, December 1986/January 1987).^{xix} Tyler’s curriculum philosophy is in stark contrast to more modern curriculum theorists.

Contemporary theorists focus attention on demographic shifts of white majorities to diverse ethnic majorities. What will demographic shifts mean to future curriculum remains unclear. These theorists do not ignore behavioral aspects of learning as significant to reconfiguring curriculum; they simply pose the less than radical notion that experience and history contextualize cognitive process – behavior is not a distinct activity from events, or vice versa. Historical events taken out of context comprise much of the

²² Tyler is credited (fair or unfair) by contemporary curriculum theorists as spawning the standardization movement.

However, in the absence of Tyler, standardization probably would have occurred as a natural result of the corporatization of many public government activities.

cries for revisions in curriculum, restructure of public schools, creation of public\private investor owned charter schools, the dismantling of local school boards, corporatization of education at every level, and standardization. Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, Taubman, and others (2002) decry the disparities in public school education; “We live in a different time. True, in science and mathematics education, traditional curriculum development still occurs, as these privileged areas still receive significant amounts of federal and private grant monies. [In the 1960s, it was the space/military race with the Soviet Union that fed the irrational idea that mathematics and science are keys to national supremacy; now it is international competition.] ” (p. 6). The shrill hype of the techno-capitalists continues to ignore the root of the problems of the lack of competitiveness (If a standard for fair comparison exists or ever were created.) between U.S. students and those of comparable economic wealth. Race, class, and gender, already marginalized by traditional Capitalism, are further removed from fundamentals of power, as technology is the second currency. Race, class, and gender are economic and techno-nomic obstructions to obtaining parity with other groups. The achievement gap is two-pronged, economic, and techno-nomic, requiring an investment in both to bring into parity-disadvantaged groups with advantaged groups.

Marcuse (1964) suggests that techno-Capitalism contains many of the same myths as Capitalism except that the traps become more subtle and more difficult to detect. “Its supreme promise,” writes Marcuse (1964), “is an ever-more-comfortable life for an ever-growing number of people who, in a strict sense, cannot imagine a qualitatively different universe of discourse and action, for the capacity to contain and manipulate subversive imagination and effort is an integral part of the given society. Those whose life is hell of

the Affluent Society are kept in line by a brutality, which revives medieval and early modern practices. For the other, less underprivileged people, society takes care of the need for liberation by satisfying the needs which make servitude palatable and perhaps even unnoticeable, and it accomplishes this fact in the process of production itself” (pp. 23-24). The implication is that the artisan, the educator, and the laborer are de-valued in the techno-economy and to survive with a different fate than that of the rust belt factory line worker citizens will need enhanced e-skills. E-skills have the potential for less freedom and less individualism. Marcuse (1964) compares life in a technocracy as a type of e-proletariat in an administered society.

Feyerabend (2002) is less optimistic than Marcuse is. Feyerabend separates the world into two worlds (p. 198). The first Feyerabend terms cosmology A described as “archaic cosmology that contains things, events, their parts (para. 1)” and the second is “cosmology B, or ‘True World’ (para. 2) that is simple and coherent, and it can be described in a uniform way” (p. 198). Transition from world-A to world-B leads to Feyerabend (1964) stating, “From now on there is only one important type of information, and that is: *knowledge* (p. 198). The conceptual totalitarianism that arises as a result of the slow arrival of world B has interesting consequences, not all of them desirable” (p. 199). Scientific application aside, the social implication is that control of knowledge is control of currency and as Marcuse (1964) elegantly states, “A kind of mastery enslavement” (p. 25). An enhanced notion of Marcuse and Feyerabend is to think of a reconceptualized, enhanced, and more pernicious version of colonialism, only with e-colonialism. Physical occupation by the oppressor is not necessary to tyrannize and control the population. Modern colonialism and imperialism is achievable without ever

having to physically invade and reside in the colonized territory. This possibility is not as far-fetched as the public may believe when you consider drones now carry out the attack role of soldiers within the borders of many sovereign nations. These drones operate from other countries or in the safety of international waters offshore from their point of attack, global cyber imperialism.

Methods and techniques of cyber administration cannot be effective without the cooperation of the citizens. The most frightening aspect of cyber administration is that the population consents to participate by not protesting actively the invasive nature of cameras, internet traffic, social network, and financial transaction monitoring that occurs every time an electronic communication transmits. To create a passive society requires a massive commitment and organization from which to re-orient citizens to accept a panoptic structure of administration. The structure combines government and corporate participation; the government providing the funding and legal directives to command citizens to relinquish control while corporations market and sell the technology facilitating the administered society.^{xx} “Independence of thought,” according to Marcuse (1998), “autonomy, and the right to political opposition are being deprived of their basic critical function in a society which seems increasingly capable of satisfying the needs of the individuals through the way in which it is organized. Such a society may demand acceptance of its principles and institutions, and reduce opposition to the discussion and promotion of alternative policies *within* the status quo” (pp. 1-2). As Marcuse correctly surmises, prior to institutionalizing a curriculum that promotes the notion that increased cyber monitoring is indispensable to protecting democratic liberties, will require the acquiescence of citizens. Exactly whom citizens are *being protected from* is unclear. Pre-

cold war it was anarchists, Marxists, Communists, Fascists, and Socialists. Post-cold war it is anarchists, Marxists, Communists, religious Fascists, and rogue nation states that fund terrorism. The term anarchist generically covers any citizen dissenting from any form of administration and is not easily essentialized to fit into the other 'ists' or 'isms'. This begs the question, are the paradigms of the curriculum of techno-Capitalism different from those of Capitalism?

The first paradigm is to 'probe experientially how a citizen interacts within an environment of democracy'. The experience of e-democracy (techno-democracy) is different on three fronts. The first is that citizens can choose to participate in a global discourse anonymously. With the exception of voting, orthodox democracy is a public act. Secondly, a citizen is able to retrieve, discern, and disseminate large amounts of information from which to make decisions on issues of interest. In orthodox democracy, information is parsed to fit the particular perspective of the constituent base. True, factual information on e-democracy is parsed, but greater access to differing discourses, at least theoretically, should lead to greater discernment and a more informed democratic base. The third, but nonetheless troubling difference is that while e-democracy is not as public as orthodox democracy, it is more monitored and administered. The nature of technology is to create data information space that can be transmitted with or without the permission of the originating source. The integrity of the system is compromised as corporate interests 'mine' data for other purposes anonymous from the originating source. Mining of data leads to the next paradigm, hyper-consumerism.

The second paradigm is 'hyper-consumerism' wrapped in the shroud of 'consumerism as a patriotic act'. It is a mild understatement to say that the internet is a

corporate enterprise. Every e-transaction is paid by corporate investment and the residual of every e-transaction is a corporate profit. Democracy to some extent is a highly regulated process and at least in the U.S., corporate investment in the political process has limits imposed by legislative restriction. Regulation tends to complicate and discourage political activity, and regulation is an economic deterrent. Enforcing regulation has a cost and cost discourages consumerism by making products more expensive or more difficult to obtain. The same cost benefit analysis used by consumers in a financial transaction is similar to that used by citizens in determining to what extent they participate in a democratic activity. E-commerce, techno-Capitalism encourages hyper-consumerism just as hyper-consumerism is a component of Capitalism, and may amplify the 'hyper' element by the ease of access and the simplicity of the transaction. Certainly the traffic of products that continue to hold social stigma (pornography, pharmaceuticals, etc.) have a greater advantage in e-commerce and burgeoning growth of thus avoiding the potential ostracizing of the consumer by a conservative public.

The third paradigm is the 'standardization of curriculum'. The promise of the new world of education is that public schools will be free of the constraints of out dated textbooks, archaic modes of instruction, and will be able to freely interact with students across the globe with similar interests. The days of the traditional classroom of neatly aligned rows, a white board, and the dreariness of lecture after lecture without reprieve, will end with the World Wide Web. Students are free from the mundane tasks and invited into a global discourse where they interact with students across the globe – sharing their personal narratives, debating critical issues, and enjoying unlimited access to the free flow of information. The unhindered access to young people sharing dreams, ambitions,

and stories will result in a greater understanding that the problems of one nation are no different from those in remote corners of the globe. The difference is that the collective global intelligence of students around the world can meet in one place, at one time, and in unity to resolve them. Instead, students suffer from the same staid curriculum, in place of textbooks they have computer workstations and in place of the white board sit an e-board. The classroom setting is modern, but nothing has substantially changed as the curriculum is not enhanced nor is the discourse global. What e-curriculum is that e-curriculum is less expensive. There is no evidence to support it is an improvement over the standardized curriculum utilized by most public schools in the United States. If anything e-curriculum may be less flexible as by relying on computer-based curriculum the element of direct instruction by an educator is bypassed thereby eliminating the potential for providing context to the curriculum for a student outside of the computer screen. Proponents argue that technology frees students from classrooms and that they are now free to educate themselves at their own convenience and incorporating education into their lifestyle choices. The supposition is true for adult learners seeking advanced training for their occupation. It is not true of most public school students. E-curriculum has not liberated them from the tyranny of the public school, curriculum, or fixed days and times. This paradigm remains substantively unaltered by techno-Capitalism.

Has 'techno-democracy reconceptualized the meaning of democracy and Marxism' to reconcile with the current global economic narrative? The assumption is global citizens have equal access to the same tools of technology. Two reports cited earlier are samples of a large body of independent research that disputes the notion of

equitable distribution and equal access.²³The inequitable distribution of technology and infrastructure prevents the majority of global citizens from participating in a global democratic discourse. Many nations monitor the origination source for content and for end destination to harass and disrupt the potentiality of the discovery of a democracy beyond that of their home country. For as long as democratic Capitalists need production capabilities anchored by cheap labor and for as long as non-democratic nations fear the potential of liberation of their citizens by knowledge of the democracy (Much like the forbidden fruit story of Adam and Eve found in Genesis.) of cyber space, the techno-democracy will not substantively alter the course of global relations between governments and their citizens. The relative prospect of a global society void of race, class, and gender will not come to fruition as long as motives of profit, economic hegemony, and hyper-consumerism continue to be the driving force behind the democratic capitalist global movement. The curriculum of techno-Capitalism does little modify the resistance to global social justice and towards them moral or ethical argument for uniting the globe to place the social welfare concerns of citizens as priority.

²³ Blanke, J., Browne, C., Hanouz, M., & et. al. World Economic Forum. (2009). The global competitiveness report 2009-2010. In K. Schwab & et.al (Eds.), *Global Economic Report: Committed to improving the state of the world* (2009 World Economic Forum Brief & Report). Cologny/Geneva, Switzerland: The World Economic Forum.

and Epstein, K., & Scott, M. (2008, May 23). The new global hunt for tax cheats. *Business Week*, 1-2. Retrieved September 10, 2009, from Business Week Web site: <http://www.businessweek.com/globalbiz/content/may2008/>

The last of the five paradigms posits Capitalism as a moral system; ‘Capitalism is of higher moral authority than Socialism’ and by association, democracies that practice Capitalism are morally superior to other less democratic or non-democratic nations. Techno-Capitalism does little to foster any reconceptualized notion that offers a differing perspective than Capitalism in this regard. Science and its companion technology problematically are amoral concepts until politicized. By that, objectivity is clear until the findings pose a threat to a pre-conceived notion that conflict with either a real ethical concern or a politicized ethical debate. Stem cell research by most accounts offers an incredible prospective number of cures for significantly debilitating diseases; few reputable scientists are in dispute of the prospective curative and therapeutic benefit for pursuing this line of scientific inquiry. It is not the research, the science, or the technology that has created an ‘ethical angst’ with the public. Where the stem cells originate is the dilemma, not the prospective for the cure.

Techno-Capitalism is not an apolitical concept, but much of governing, is characteristically an amoral activity until adjudged by public examination to be an issue of morality or ethics. Ethics and morality in the context of public policy are political concepts having absolutely no bearing upon the efficacy of the science or technology. Techno-Capitalism is motivated by profit, power, and redistribution of techno-wealth, limiting technological advantages to a select few nations while promoting the benefits of orthodox Capitalism to emerging third world countries. Rationing protects the nations with technological advantage, preserves hegemonic relationships, impedes progress towards social justice, and exacerbates the perception of colonialism and imperialism thereby fostering instability directed at pro-western democracies. By most accounts, these

are negative aspects of the Capitalist model; that perception depends on if you sit on the top of the heap looking down, or the crushed by the heap looking up.

“Progress of ‘knowledge and civilization’,” writes Feyerabend (2002), “as the process of pushing Western ways and values into all corners of the globe is being called – destroyed these wonderful products of human ingenuity and compassion without a single glance in their direction” (p. 3). The humanitarian is de-valued, cultures dismantled, and the consolidation of knowledge is concentrated in too few hands. Marcuse (1964) adds the dimensions of administration, mastery, and control; “Today political power asserts itself through its power over the machine process and over the technical organization of the apparatus. The government of advanced and advancing industrial societies can maintain and secure itself only when it succeeds in mobilizing, organizing, and exploiting the technical, scientific, and mechanical productivity available to industrial civilization (p. 3).” The control of the apparatus of knowledge concentrates in too few hands as well. If critical theory has met with any success, it is the recognition that the Capitalist economic and social structure is in the process of dramatic revision. From the perspective of a public school educator, the challenge is to educate students from the e-generation and that curriculum will need an equally dramatic revision.

Praxis

The most effective and enduring form of warfare against liberation is the implanting of material and intellectual needs that perpetuate obsolete forms of the struggle for existence (Marcuse, 1964, p. 4).

The curriculum of Capitalism is evolving; the delivery system, public education, is not. The new Capitalism differs from orthodox Capitalism by the addition of a science

and technology component. These new components, unimaginable by Marx, reconceptualize the definition of labor creating a two tier dynamic of a bottom class of manual laborers, a secondary class – though in the hierarchy of class, marginally higher than the bottom – of techno workers performing routine repetitive administrative functions.^{xxi} The members being of low socio-economic standard, immigrant, native racial minority, or impoverished female characterize the composite make-up of both of these evolving groups. The promise of technology equally disbursed throughout society and equally accessible by any citizen regardless of social status is a myth. Public schools as sources for access to critical components of a technologically advanced society are languishing, mired by under-funding and misallocation of hardware infrastructure to implement a global techno-revolution in education. Capitalism in the form of hard currency rewards or punishes public school systems for artificial measures of academic performance. Today access to technology, techno-Capitalism replaces the hard currency of orthodox Capitalism. Inner city and rural schools are at a double disadvantage; denied funding for not meeting performance standards, but required to utilize components of technology that they are unable to afford or have access that can dramatically improve performance. It is no coincidence; schools with the highest reported scores on standardized assessments are the schools where funding flows freely and technology is current as well as accessible.^{xxii} The curriculum of techno-Capitalism is a new age version of orthodox Capitalism; trumpeting a new age for healing relations of race, erasing the economic lines demarcating class differences, and terminating the frivolous archaic economic notions of gender. Like its orthodox origins a promise is not reality.

The commodization of the public education system manifests through the new curriculum of techno-Capitalism. Marcuse (1964) describes the evolutionary process in de-evolutionary terms. In place of science and technology as liberating forces from the constructed tyrannies that continue to seek conquer by maintaining divisional issues of race, class, and gender as polarizing influence, techno-Capitalism produces what Marcuse (1964) terms “one-dimensional thought and behavior” (p. 12), a backwards progression to pre-Cold War reasoning. Within this framework is the capacity of the social classes to be indoctrinated by onslaught of information and intellectually passive to the subtle changes slowly engulfing the individual, individualism, and by association, liberties. The system of public education is the factory of indoctrination, or as Marcuse (1964) describes how social control is manifest by individuals; “The prevailing forms of social control are technological in a new sense. To be sure, the technical structure and efficacy of the productive and destructive apparatus has been a major instrumentality for subjecting the population to the established social division of labor throughout modern period. Moreover, more obvious forms of compulsion have always accompanied such integration: loss of livelihood, the administration of justice, the police, and the armed forces. It still is. Nevertheless, in the contemporary period, the technological controls appear to be the embodiment of reason for the benefit of all social groups and interests – to such an extent that all contradiction seems irrational and all counteraction impossible. No wonder then that, in the most advanced areas of civilization; the social controls have been introjected to the point where even individual protest is affected at its roots. The intellectual and emotional refusal “to go along” appears neurotic and impotent” (p. 9).

Marcuse describes the dulling of the intellect, the pattern for compliance, and the assembly line practice of the education system. Technology is not changing the model of education from that of the warehouse and assembly line. Technology adds new elements of greater administration of the individual to the point that the student who does not think in the prescribed manner earns no credit for originality and creativity. Creativity ostracizes students as behavioral or psychological outliers from the system. Technology does not free students from labels, but adds the stigma of being psychologically imbalanced. The curriculum of techno-Capitalism is a system of prima-bourgeois promoting the dream of social mobility while steadily indoctrinating students to accept less freedom as the norm. Marcuse believes that as the product of curriculum is sold to students, reinforced by entertainment media, and perpetuated unchallenged by educators, that a critical complacency replaces democratic urgency. Marcuse (1964) describes the complacency in this passage: “Thus emerges a pattern of one-dimensional thought and behavior in which ideas, aspirations, and objectives that, by their content, transcend the established universe of discourse and action are either repelled or reduced to terms of this universe” (p. 18).

The universe that Marcuse speaks is the universe in which science and technology are priorities and humanism relegates to philanthropic endeavors, separate from the rationalism of science. By philanthropic endeavors, this means to encompass any political or social activity that directly benefits the social welfare of society, not just a select few. By definition and extension, humanistic activities are not rational as they are not empirically satisfactory in resolution of questions; which is unlike science or technology that begins with a question and terminates with a provable conclusion. “The trend may be

related to the development in scientific method: operationalism in the physical, behaviorism in the social sciences,” says Marcuse (1964, p. 18). Marcuse explains that if the tools of the rational empirical scientist are provable through operational modes, then the tools that are similar in the social sciences are not operationally provable given that human nature is less predictable than a controlled experiment. One interpretation of this comparison is observable phenomenon without proven operational tools provided by scientists and technologies are without standing. Although as Marcuse (1964) points, “The reign of one-dimensional reality does not mean that materialism rules, and that spiritual, metaphysical, and bohemian occupations are petering out. They are rather ceremonial part of the practical behaviorism, its harmless negation, and are quickly digested by the status quo as part of its healthy diet” (p. 14). The key concept is individualism is not reality though the social behaviorists would like to believe differently, advancing the notion that technology, at least in the curriculum of techno-Capitalism is concerned, is not liberating.

Feyerabend wrecks the notion of a scientific rationality as an operative tool that is an empirical perfection. Feyerabend calls (2002), “A theory of science that devises standards and structural elements for *all* scientific activities and authorizes them by reference to ‘Reason’ or ‘Rationality’ may impress outsiders – but it is much too crude of an instrument for the people on the spot, that is, for scientists facing some concrete research project” (p. 1). Feyerabend the scientist and Marcuse the social scientist come to a similar conclusion; science, technology, and the methods scientists employ are one of many tools that yield answers to vexing questions that historically have solutions eluding researchers. Similar to Marcuse, Feyerabend attempts to place science and technology in

perspective, “But not every discovery can be accounted for in the same manner, and procedures that paid off in the past may create havoc when imposed on the future (p. 1),” says Feyerabend” (2002). *Against Method* and *One-Dimensional Man* although very different treatise of the same subject are remarkably synchronous in the respective theses which is that science and technology are one of a multiplicity of operative tools to resolve issues that pertain to the social welfare of global citizens. The curriculum of techno-Capitalism promotes the opposite; only hard science with advanced technology can yield results that are useful and applicable.

The curriculum of techno-Capitalism has a hidden agenda and that is to maintain the status quo of relationships between the post-industrial nations who are ever vigilant guardians and hoarders of science and technology, while maintaining a sufficient labor force in marginalized impoverished third world countries that supply critical low-tech manufacturing. Public school systems, educators, and curriculum designers promote the notion that technology will free humankind from repetitive labor, open corridors for global discourse free from government interference, and improve democratic treatment (i.e. social justice) for citizens who live under repressive regimes. This question begs for an answer: if this supposition is accurate, then why even in the most democratized nations on the planet has this ideal not come to fruition? The short answer is the same corporate\government interests that made a similar promise to post-Cold War citizens in regards to orthodox Capitalism, control techno-Capitalism and the supporting infrastructure. It is not in the interest of the power structure to relinquish control over the economic livelihood of global citizens. Techno-Capitalism is not different in this regard. Partitioning citizens by race, class, and gender is an easier task when technology is the

tool employed. Keeping populations in a state of agitation prevents a negotiated discourse that might yield solutions to the obstacles that race, class, and gender present to citizens of the world. Discourse opening the possibility for honest discussion will not happen in a public education system funded by corporate interests and political interests' intent upon re-focusing the population by provoking race, class, and gender intra-squabbles or blaming foreigners for the social problems facing democratic societies.

The lesson for educators is technical proficiency is not the same as utilizing technology to broaden social discourse. The first is the occupational definition describing proficiency as the ability to utilize physically the components of technology much as a carpenter utilizes tools to build. The second aspect that educators need to develop greater understanding is the conceptual application of technology; establishing technology as an empowering and liberating experience for students. This aspect is similar to vision of the architect. For educators to progress to the second aspect requires them to consider seriously the ramifications of technology in the curriculum and to construct new modes for advancing the democratic opportunities e-technology presents. The new mode of operation is presented in the next chapter.

CHAPTER VI – RECLAIMING PUBLIC SCHOOL CURRICULUM

Current State of Public Education

Seven suppositions form the basis for this research.

- 1) The organizational hierarchy and curriculum of public school system in the United States is inherently flawed and un-democratic in structure and pedagogy.
- 2) The organizational hierarchy and curriculum (curriculum of Capitalism) contradicts the notions of democracy as a philosophical position that promotes individual liberty and the collective will of **all** citizens to construct and operate social systems as equitable institutions irrespective of race, class, and gender.
- 3) The organizational hierarchy and curriculum promote the notion that global Capitalism as an economic system fosters democratic behavior, even amongst nations that are authoritarian in political structure, and that global Capitalism produces a social structure that is socially just for the majority of world citizens. There is little or no evidence in the contemporary world to support this notion.
- 4) Global Capitalism produces a safer world as nations become closely aligned with another economically and are deterred from militaristic or imperialistic ventures that would ultimately disrupt the global economic system and create the prospect for global anarchy. By analogy, economic deterrence is similar to the notion of nuclear deterrence by mutually assured destruction originating

from the Cold War era. This supports the notion that American curriculum is mired in an anachronistic pre-Cold War curriculum.

- 5) All citizens irrespective of nation of origin are global citizens. The objective of education is to prepare citizens to be responsible dual citizens; aligned with the national goals of their respective nation of residence and aware of their global responsibility as a global citizen. The notion of global competitiveness, a key component of capitalist social structure, undermines global social justice.
- 6) There are two systems of global Capitalism. The first is orthodox manufacturing and production utilizing unskilled or semi-skilled labor as a means to produce inexpensive consumable goods as well as fundamentally restructuring labor costs to be at or just below the minimum to sustain low cost production of inexpensive consumer products. The second is techno-Capitalism utilizing highly skilled or technologically advanced labor as a means to produce intellectual capital and is measured by the type of complex financial transactions that are essentially unsupervised by governments, not transparent to citizens, but nonetheless when exposed have potential negative consequential results to global social structures. The first structure, though pre-dating the second, is administered by the second structure.
- 7) The evolution of the curriculum of Capitalism is the curriculum of techno-Capitalism. The social structure resulting from the promotion of orthodox Capitalism is far less pernicious than that of techno-Capitalism as the implications of monitoring and administering democratic activities such as

peaceful demonstrations, freedom of dissent through speech, and other basic human rights are potentially greater in jeopardy. Electronic surveillance has the capability of providing streams of real-time monitoring of citizens engaged in democratic activities. The perceived threat of monitoring deters open dissent and provides authorities with the potential for electronic surveillance; contradicts Constitutional and natural rights of free expression.

Progressive educators hold the view that democratic changes begin with the education and training of students to become democratic citizens (Pinar, 2000). The position of the progressive is not different from orthodox conservative educators who think the same, but believe in a much narrower worldview incorporating the belief that the primary objective of education is to ‘prepare students to compete’ in the job market (Bennett et al., 1999). Orthodox conservative educators believe that a ‘broadened curriculum’ inclusive of a global component related to social justice (global citizenship) as promoted by progressive educators’ leads to a curriculum that inadequately prepares students for employment. Both progressive and orthodox conservative educators believe that the other has a worldview that is flawed. The battle for the soul of the public education system mires in campaigns to convince the public adopting the position of one rather than the other will yield to the collapse of the U.S. economic system. Both agree that system for education is need of more than a makeover, more than a remodel job, but a complete reconstruction from foundation to framework. Citing aging infrastructure, falling tax revenues, politicization of curriculum, and lack of commitment to rethink education from the theoretical conception, progressives and conservatives view public education as the next institution for the next major public policy debate. Within this

debate and under the backdrop of the rise of investment in foreign countries by transnational corporations in education is the debate that will occur regarding the fundamental role of global Capitalism as an economic and a social system. These issues ferment the perception that American public education is a decrepit relic of past American idealism – by extension, American power to re-fashion the world as democratic and empowering to global citizens is lost.

Global citizens enter into a new age where traditional sources for information, curriculum, and pedagogy are substantively no longer effective as tools for knowledge. Just as primitive man advances from stone to metal weaponry, the globe has advanced beyond paper, pencil, and text to the flow and ebb of digital images fusing a multiplicity of media into a conglomeration of data-information. To unravel gnarly strands of information requires an advanced skill set, one that places critical thinking and authentic democracy on top of the hierarchy of priorities. Just as the first and second World Wars realign traditional ideals of democracy, contemporary global citizens realize that the world pre-9/11 is no longer functional, not relative to the majority of citizens, and a part of an anachronistic ideal past. Citizens of the United States are nostalgic and western value centric, but nonetheless need to come to terms with the decline of influence of the super-powers and face a future of geopolitical tactical maneuvers challenging the status quo. American idealism and the ideal of authentic democratic behavior envisioned by historical figures pre-dating the discovery of the new world are not dead. Rather it lies in a state of flux, awaiting the next reformation and renaissance. It is not that desire for democracy is failing; rather democracy is corrupt from too close of an association with Capitalism as an anchor for social policy and social structure.

Contemporary entrepreneurs of democracy twist the notion of individual liberty and social responsibility into a crass global economic venture. Purveyors of democratic practice succeed in expanding Capitalism, but orthodox Capitalism or its reincarnate techno-Capitalism, has yet to yield social reform or a socially just global society. Transnational corporations in collusion with politicians continue to convey the same message; ‘trust us; we know what is best for you’. Institutions once thought of as somewhat quaint and harmlessly inefficient, but nonetheless reliable firewalls between the public and behemoth corporate or government have lost the public trust – the belief they have foremost the interest of the citizen as the primary objective for their existence. Obscuring the truth is blurring media analysis, revisionist history, and fear mongering posturing by governments. Personal liberty and social justice are not political creations given status by benevolent governments. Rather they are personal if not genetically humanistic values that birth governments. The institutions founded as protectors of the inalienable rights of individuals are at war with citizens they supposedly represent.

Science, believed by many to be the ultimate arbiter of truth and a rational voice in chaotic world is now indistinguishable from the political and corporate monsters eschewing authentic democratic practice by promoting social Capitalism. Reason, rationalism, and empirical evidence is less than reliable as citizens observe the disparity between technologically sufficient societies and societies that are industrial prostitutes mired in a class system accentuated by cheap labor. The promise of technology has always been to free all of humankind from the drudgery and the mind-numbing assembly line. Technology touts its superior ability to transcend race, class, gender, and to penetrate even into the darkest corner of the totalitarian governed corner of the globe;

freeing citizens and liberating citizens to fulfill their dream of a better quality of life for themselves and generations of that succeed them. Technology is to be the great liberator, the freer of captive minds and intellectual energy chained to mindless labor and a struggle to survive economically. The presumption is the boundaries of science and technology is limitless as is the assumption that all of the social problems of the globe are social problems awaiting a scientific solution. Simply apply the correct scientific analysis with the appropriate tool of technology and the globe will rid itself of poverty, racism, classism, genderism, and all other 'isms' that enslave global citizens. This has not proven true. Even the casual observer of the contemporary global condition of the world's population will not deny the observation the wealth of nations is not only capital, but also technology. In many corners of the globe, technology is greedily hoarded much like gold bullion in the world's banks, concentrated in the hands of the privileged few. The 'haves' and 'have-nots' are distinguishable by economic poverty and deprivation of technological resources that clearly have the potential to enhance the quality of life for citizens. Technology is another form of administration and control, not impetus for democratic reform as often touted.

Is the world witnessing the last gasps of democracy and can democracy be reborn not in theoria, but in global praxis? Alternatively, will humankind in a few short centuries look upon the history of the world with ridicule and disdain, chiding those who put forth the notion that absent of a specific economic social structure, democracy is a personal right granted at birth, protected by representative government, and implemented by authentic election of representatives. Will future societies ponder democracy as at best an

experiment and at worse, a false premise from which to build a global community?

Where then lays the hope and aspirations for a globally socially just world?

Bureaucratic Totalitarianism: The Curriculum for Conformity

It is astonishing that so few critics challenge the system. In an absolute sense, the learning exhibited by even a “successful student” after over twelve thousand hours in classrooms is strikingly limited. When one considers the energy, commitment, and quality of so many of the people working in the schools, one must place the blame elsewhere. The people are better than the structure.

Therefore, the structure must be at fault (Sizer, 2004, p. 209).

The one constant in the universe may be bureaucracy. Death and taxes may be inevitable, but unrestrained intrusion into the personal decisions of global citizens by bureaucracies often times far removed from the circumstance of the intruded, is the bane of social democratic reform. Sizer (2004) writes, “Going to school is an important democratic ritual, and graduation is a sort of secular bar mitzvah. All societies, even the most “modern,” need their folkways, social signposts to mark citizens’ progress through life” (p. 209). Sizer’s point is consistent with many curriculum reconceptualists and theorists – the public school system and education in general, is failing to produce an educated citizenry – educated in the sense that rudimentary issues of global democracy are ignored in favor of provincial mythical ideals of Capitalism. The fault according to Sizer lay not with the foundation of the hierarchy of education, educators, but with the layer upon layer upon layer of bureaucracy and rules that distract educators from performing their craft. “While there are obvious advantages to hierarchical bureaucracy,” writes Sizer (2004), “it has its costs, and these are today paralyzing American education.

The structure is getting in the way of children's learning" (p. 206). Not only is the curriculum a burden, but so is the administration of curricular issues that do not mirror democratic practice.

The flaw in the curriculum is not that the curriculum is necessarily un-democratic. The flaw is that the curriculum promotes the aspiration of democratic practice not as a personal journey. Rather, democratic practice is a function of a super structure as Marx envisions or as a limited form of the citizenry government as Jefferson as well as many of the founders of American democracy envision. Either position assumes democratic practice is a function of a dominant authority filtering democracy through layers of interpretative bureaucrats (top-down) utilizing a peculiar set of standards – a knowledge domain for democracy – that is monitored and held accountable to the preceding level. This concept is totally opposite of the Greek etymology of the word, democracy, as from "demos or *common people* and kratos or *rule*, translating to rule by the common people (Harper, 2010)."

Public school curriculum is a function of a standardized integrated course of study fused with the monolithic hierarchical method for delivery replete with standards, measures, systems for control, reporting, timelines, and sequenced activities. The rationale for standards is that a level cannot monitor the level directly below and be accountable to the level above without a common tool of measurement. The hierarchical structure monitors progress against an artificial set of objectives with little or no regard for student progress unless the measure of progress is within the narrow scope of the pre-set objectives within the monitoring system. Control or the more common term, 'accountability,' is monitored and reported. Educators, being on the bottom of the

hierarchy, are responsible for the entirety of achievement while each layer above the educator insulates from accountability or control. It is no mystery as to why talented and socially responsible people choose other career paths than education, and as national statistics from numerous studies verify, it is no mystery why so many talented people leave the field of education in less than five years (NEA Research, 2009). Public education is no better than an education politburo.

There are few better descriptions of the contemporary school system than that Hailmann provides. He is a twenty-five year veteran educator and education activist. Hailmann (1910) describes the organization of the public school system in these terms. “In many ways compulsion and restraint still rule supreme. The children are more or less arbitrarily commanded what, when, and how to do. Initiative and originality, self-expression, and individuality are taboo. It is deemed possible and important that all should be interested in the same things, in the same sequence, and at the same time. The worship of the idol of uniformity continues more or less openly. And, to make doubly sure that there shall be no heterodox interference, school supervision frequently dictates every step and even the manner and mode of it, so that disturbing initiative or originality and the rest may not enter by way of the teacher. We still hear overmuch of “order,” of “method,” of “system,” of “discipline,” in the death dealing sense of long ago; and these aim at repression rather than at the liberation of life with its rich and varied spontaneous interests and initiatives, its marvelous epiphanies of beauty and truth and good will” (p. 233). The astounding feature of Hailmann is not the accuracy of his observation; rather the date of the article is 1910.

Little if anything transpires since 1910 altering the overbearing bureaucracy separating the professional educator from the student. From the same era is Goldman underscoring the point of Hailmann. Goldman (1910) says, “It is for the child what the prison is for the convict and the barracks for the soldier--a place where everything is being used to break the will of the child, and then to pound, knead, and shape it into a being utterly foreign to itself. I do not mean to say that this process is carried on consciously; it is but a part of a system which can maintain itself only through absolute discipline and uniformity; therein, I think, lies the greatest crime of present-day society” (p. 1, para. 2-3). There is an element of Foucault (1995) in the analysis by Goldman as well as Hailmann. ‘Panopticism’ is the strategic arrangement of all the elements of an individual so that at no time is the individual free from observation or administration by the oppressor (Foucault, 1995, pp. 195-231). Within the environment of the panoptic educational bureaucracy, there is little hope for escape. Students and educators are doomed to live, learn, and experience life, as the bureaucrat-jailer imposes, not aspirational as educators and students desire.

Foucault (1975/1995) contextualizes the power of the bureaucrat as not originated from personal ethos, rather its power generates from the bureaucrats’ authority to discipline. It is not the power of mutually agreed upon and consensual power sharing arrangements, mutually agreeable and cooperative or collaborative, that individuals exercise upon other individuals, rather it is the power of the impersonalized institution (The school system, prison system, political system, etc.) exercising authority through discipline or punishment. By dehumanizing the exercise of power by assigning organizations as the facilitators of power, in a curious sense, power is dehumanized and

somehow appears more humane, enforced equitably across the bureaucratic hierarchy. When an individual exercises power, a person observes the physical manifestation of the exercise of power and view with skepticism the motive of the individual. While many are likely to hold a skeptical view of an organization or system, most are less likely to question the organization than question an individual. Educators and students alike comprehend power and agency as enforceable by the unseen, yet nonetheless omnipresent bureaucracy. Locke (1996) writes, “We are not to entrench upon the truth in any conversation, but least of all with children; since if we play false with them, we not only deceive their expectation and hinder their knowledge, but we corrupt their innocence and teach them the worst of vices. They (children) are travelers newly arrived in a strange country, of which they know nothing: we should therefore make conscience not to mislead them” (p. 94). Does the inauthentic democratic environment skew the perception of democratic practice from the earliest experience of children with the organizational bureaucracy and the curriculum of Capitalism? It appears so as critical thinking is absent from most of the classrooms in public schools; a direct reflection of the educational bureaucracy successfully squashing dissent, enforcing codes of conformity, and producing a controlled predictable environment.

The systemic exercise of power by the organized educational bureaucracy seems far more palatable to the individual. Educators and students consent either because the individual is powerless to effect change, consent because they are in agreement with the organization, or consent because they are unaware that the exercise of systemic power is aiming in their direction. Authentic democracy is the ability to challenge assumptions, re-define power-sharing arrangements, and to act in a fashion that the power of bureaucracy

is not necessary to re-direct the behavior of individuals to be responsible citizens. Foucault's (1995) notion of power is not different from that of Goldman (1910) or Hailmann (1910), both who pose the supposition (as does Foucault), is the power of incarceration in prison or the power to control education any more detrimental to the individual than the power of denying a person's existence and their right to exist. How much of the capitalist social structure depends upon denying personal identity may never be known. The education system protects the critical analysis of the social structures of Capitalism. If the experience of global citizens with Capitalism defines democracy then it is no wonder there is so much confusion about how to implement democratic practice on a global scale.

Democracy is not a feature of the standardized curriculum or the panoptic structure of the educational environment. The student and educator experience a twisted form of democracy where the desire of bureaucrats to retain control defines democratic practice. Individual liberty is lost, conformity is prized, and social systems outside of the classroom send conflicting messages to students. Inside the classroom the repetition of rhetorical myths: 'equal opportunity,' 'post racial,' 'gender equity,' or 'class mobility' indoctrinate students to believe in the democratic Capitalist myth of equality. The lived experience inside of the classroom is contrived and false to that of the lived experience outside of the classroom where racism, classism, and genderism are substantive obstacles to authentic democracy here and globally. The negation of the lived experience is demeaning, degrading, and decidedly anti-democratic. Cannella (2002) writes, "Truths inscribed as if within those who are young have been and are created through the science of psychology, art, literature, and religion, as well as cultural politics, public policy, and

legislation, judiciary decisions, pedagogical methods, and historical accounts.” Later she says, “Rather than benefiting from human beings who are younger, these constructions often place them in positions in which they are labeled and treated as abnormal, lacking agency and competence, without knowledge, and disqualified, especially when representing non-dominant diverse backgrounds and cultural values. Connected to the cultural construction of “child,” these “others” have been further reified through theories of biology, development, experience, and learning with surveillance and control over them legitimated” (p. 3).

The reconstruction of authentic democracy begins with the demolition of the educational bureaucracy and its replacement with cooperative coalitions of local citizens, students, and educators re-engineering schools to be accountable to the public, not the state. Illich (1971) argues reform falls short and what needs to happen is the total demolition of the public school system, replacing it with educational cooperatives of citizens, educators, parents, interested parties, and students. The charter school movement, vouchers,^{xxiii} and home-schools are by in large too small to make a significant dent in the educational establishment. Viewed as anti-public school, these modern systems of delivery are reincarnates of the anarchy schools that sporadically appear in the nineteenth century Europe, Britain, and American colonies. Anarchy schools of the nineteenth and early twentieth century were a reaction to the monopolization of knowledge by the organized church and the monopolization of resources by governments of Europe (Thomas, 1999). Common schools in early American history produce a number of graduates with training in the humanities and with preparation for the challenging of constructing a new nation founded upon individual liberty (Parker, 1894).

Though the view is that common schools are associated with rigid curriculum, strict headmasters, and teaching the bare minimum of reading, writing, and mathematics needed to either apprentice to a local trade or become capable of managing agricultural enterprises of the family, many of these schools operated with liberal curriculums developed by local folks interested in education. These schools are relatively free from bureaucratic interference allowing educators and the community to decide collectively on what knowledge was important for students to learn.

Some of these schools are often progressive for the time in which they operate, managed by collaborative board consisting of local citizens, and considering the class system that dominates the American colonial system, reflect the enlightened attitude of the citizens forming the school. The curriculum (though more oriented towards occupational then academic) of these schools offers choice in the subject matter taught and flexibility in instructional methodology to accommodate the varying regional lifestyles of colonists as well as reflected the social structure; what the community in consensus believes to be important components of an education; not far from the vision of Illich. The Boston Latin School as example, one if not the oldest school in America, teaches anarchical philosophy of “dissent with responsibility and persistently encouraged such civil dissent²⁴.” The philosophy is a core value for the school since its inception.

²⁴ *Source:* Website for the Boston Latin School: (Boston Latin School: History 375 years, <http://www.bls.org>,

Accessed January 3, 2010).

Within the current framework of the public school system, the curriculum of Capitalism reigns sovereign and supreme. The model of the bureaucracy is increasingly upon the corporate business as a financial model, but remains hopelessly mired in the government model of organization. Two very different models that are antithesis of one another compete for space inside the hallways of the contemporary classroom. Both models can afford to give ground, so they coexist much as symbiotic beings live together with varying degrees of success when it is beneficial to do so and clash when the benefits are at odds with one another. The cliché of business, ‘think outside of the box’ is not a conceivable notion for the progressive educator as the space in the box is occupied, filled with bureaucratic busy work in place of authentic teaching, or is reserved for whatever purpose the educational bureaucracy deems it for. Ironically, public space in public schools does not exist. It is counterintuitive to believe that democratic praxis can ferment without public space. The progressive educator under repression and force either conforms to the allocated space of the box, or rather than think outside of the box, re-configures the box to allow for greater freedom and democratic praxis. The student, guided by the model of the educator, emulates the same behavior as the educator. Both are in the mode of defense hunkering down in a bunker of conformity.

How can a nation that promotes democracy as the guiding vision for its existence create an antiquated educational system differing little from a totalitarian theocracy, a military dictatorship, or a fascist regime? Measuring time in hours per day and days per

academic calendar²⁵ limit the exposure of educator and student to the toxic environment created by a bureaucracy focusing upon reporting and assigning blame than encouraging young people to think critically, to become better citizens through active participants in the global society, and to challenge prevailing notions of the nature of power structures. Given the stranglehold of the entrenched bureaucracy, is it conceivable that the chains can be broken and democratic practice substitute for the administered and monitored classroom? How will educators restore 'personal democracy' in their classrooms and their professional practice?

Reclaiming Education – Restoring Democracy

The intellectual is always engaged in symbolic actions, which involves the externalization of his thought in any number of ways (Jay, 1973, p. xxviii).

The works of Marcuse and Feyerabend contain significant references applicable to the current state of public education and the curriculum of Capitalism\techno-Capitalism. The contrast is especially appealing as Marcuse and Feyerabend approach the argument of building authentic democracy from different perspectives. The Marcuse approach is as a social scientist and within the framework of critical theory. Feyerabend is a scientist\philosopher and though his schooling is to utilize an orthodox scientific method, Feyerabend suggests the scientific method is not without significant flaws. They

²⁵ Research studies comparing American students to international students indicate American students spend fewer days per year in school than their international rivals (178 days on average in U.S. schools to 215 days for schools ranked academically higher than the United States).

are not unlike Du Bois and Dewey in their political and apolitical contextualization of current state of events. Their approaches are though different; remarkably, Marcuse and Feyerabend arrive at very similar conclusions. Bridging the difference between Du Bois\Dewey and Marcuse\Feyerabend is Lessing. Lessing is a contemporary of the four and frames their perspectives with boundaries of common sense outside of purely intellectual arguments. Lessing translates intellectual arguments to a common language without losing the critical academic and scholarly components of Du Bois, Dewey, Marcuse, and Feyerabend. Lessing is an avid promoter of humanities as an integral part of education as the intellectual bridge between philosophers, scientists, and global citizens.

Feyerabend (2002) makes the case for increasing humanitarian studies, “The second reason is that scientific education as described above (and as practiced in our schools) cannot be reconciled with humanitarian attitude. It is in conflict ‘with the cultivation of individuality which alone produces, or can produce, well developed human beings’; it ‘maims by compression, like a Chinese lady’s foot, every part of human nature which stands out prominently, and tends to make a person markedly different in outline’ from the ideals of rationality that happen to be fashionable in science, or in the philosophy of science”²⁶ (p. 12). Feyerabend’s reference expands science to include virtually any aspect of the public school day and the experience of contemporary

²⁶ The first reason that Feyerabend refers deals with discovery – scientific or otherwise – is not a set of discrete facts, rather an interrelated and interconnected realities and theories, not so easily categorized by a methodology such as the scientific method (2002, p. 12).

students, or as Marcuse (1964) refers “the universe” (p. 18). Standardization, the trademark of contemporary school systems and certainly consistent with viewpoint of the curriculum of techno-Capitalism, de-humanizes students and as Marcuse (1964) believes reduces society to “one-dimensional thought” resulting in a loss of liberty. The objective of techno-Capitalism education is to create a climate of conformity and quell the anarchy of critical thinking. Feyerabend (2002) though not referring to educators or students makes a valid applicable point that transfers to public education. Feyerabend (2002) believes within the scientific community is a reliance on too much conformity. Substitute educators for scientific community and the meaning of this section becomes clear; the people most affected by the standardization movement perpetuated by the curriculum of techno-Capitalism are the least likely to protest and oppose encroachment into the classroom. Educators stand idly by while knowingly complicit in the immoral act of stripping students of their creativity and liberty. Students not aware of the manipulation or conditioned to repress anarchical sentiments follow the lead of the educator. It is little wonder the attrition rate for educators is so high when one considers the personal negation of self to the techno-super structure that administers public education. Conversely, students leave secondary education in droves from lack of interest, tedium of rote learning, lack of self-affirmation, and the desire to be free from negative spaces. Negation is a prominent if not persistent problem with public school education.

Negation begins with the notion that a proposition can only be true if and only if another proposition is false, logic for a lack of a better term. If logic applies to a system of education, it is difficult to imagine public education as not being a negating experience for students when the expenditure of so much time is on institutionalizing the myths of

techno-Capitalism and in negating activities such as rote learning or standardized assessments. “Nobody,” writes Feyerabend (2002) “would claim that the teaching of *small children* is exclusively a matter of argument (though argument may enter into it, and should enter into it to a larger extent than is customary), and almost everyone now agrees that what looks like a result of reason – the mastery of language, the existence of a richly articulated perceptual world, logical ability – is due partly to indoctrination and partly to a process of *growth* that proceeds with the force of natural law. And where arguments do seem to have an effect, this more often due to their *physical repletion* than to their *semantic content*” (p. 15). The design for public school education and curriculum is to indoctrinate, not affirm curiosity as a natural process for growth and learning. The logical reasoning of standardized testing, curriculum standards, and standardization in all phases of public education does not serve the student. Standardization creates a contradiction of identities. The world outside of the classroom becomes a place where adaptive behavior is necessary for survival and inside the classroom becomes a place where students learn conformity. Public education is a process of disaffirmation and negation.

The consequence to democratic society born of a lifetime spent in disaffirmation is described by Marcuse (1964); “The new technological work-world thus enforces a weakening of the negative position of the working class; the latter no longer appears to be the living contradiction to the established society” (31). Why does a student indoctrinated by a system of standardized curriculum and texts expect life outside the academic world to be different? The genius of the curriculum of techno-Capitalism is the finished product of the factory education system is a laborer ready for assimilation into an industrial

society or into a technologically advanced industrial society; automatons of techno-Capitalism, administered human beings: “This is the pure form of servitude; to exist as an instrument, as a thing,” writes Marcuse (1964, p. 53).

Marcuse (1964) elevates the argument to the next level, comparing administered humans to slaves. The analogy is particularly pertinent when he uses the term ‘preconditioned’ (p. 40). Marcuse posits the argument that to live in a democratic society the prerequisites – material in the sense they are artifacts of wealth – have to be created and distributed equitably (p. 40). This notion is perfectly compatible with a neo-Marxist position, but contradictory to an orthodox Marxist in that class is the singular determinant of a measure of the equitability of society. To create conditions for a new social order requires a catastrophic failure of Capitalism with a coinciding political revolution led by the disenfranchised re-distributing property equally. Neo-Marxism is not fixated only on the condition of class and the term ‘equitably’ implies that re-distribution of wealth is based upon the needs of the individual as differentiated from the collective needs of society. The desire to bring parity between two different individuals may require one individual receive more assistance than another, equitable as they are both treated the same, but not equal as one may potentially need a greater benefit than another for both to be in parity. Marcuse, considered by a number of scholars to have been the father of the modern liberal movement in the United States, does not embrace orthodox Marxism as a political movement, but rather as theoretical framework from which to perform social analysis. Jay (1973) describes the position of Marcuse, “All cultural phenomena must be seen as mediated through the social totality, not merely as the reflections of class

interests” (p. 54). Critical theory as Marcuse proposes does not exclude the possibility of other philosophical frameworks and theoretical frameworks.

This distinction is important to understanding the proposition that Marcuse was trying to put forward and that is Capitalism does not necessarily have to completely collapse and become extinct for a society to progress to Socialism and that Socialism is not the obvious benefactor if Capitalism implodes (Jay, 1973, p. 79). The slow progression to equitability (i.e. social justice) is that preconditioning or indoctrination is institutionalized to the point that it is virtually impossible to determine when democracy is manipulated to reflect the continuation of the survival of the power structures or super structure as Marx postulates. Indoctrination is a political term where preconditioning is a behavioral term more in line with Marcuse and his disinterest in overtly political subjects. Preconditioning allows administered humans to accept the condition of their lives for what it is and not question why it is not different. Indoctrination is the political force that reinforces the preconditioning. The curriculum of techno-Capitalism utilizes and expands the notion of hyper-consumerism beyond that of the orthodox curriculum of Capitalism preconditioning individuals to believe that every want is a need that a consumer purchase satisfies and it is socially acceptable to live beyond one’s financial means.

The complementary aspect to preconditioning is the aspect of indoctrination that asserts it is a political right and a patriotic responsibility to participate in over-consumption or hyper-consumerism. Favorable tax treatments of certain goods, investments, or purchases are examples of government enticing consumers to purchase items and are a form of indoctrination. War Bonds for example encourage consumers to support war through patriotic purchases of government instruments of debt. Consumer

credit, complex variable rate mortgages, pricey brand name purchases, and the influence of advertising by celebrities are examples of preconditioning. Preconditioning and indoctrination are prominent in public school curriculums and classroom instruction making the transition from informed consumer to hyper-consumer easier. Public policy encourages citizens to believe in the proposition that citizens can enhance their station in life by the act of consumerism and rewards consumerism. Tax credits for home purchases or purchases of automobiles and hard goods are an example of the cross politicization of government with consumerism. While these purchases may stimulate economic growth the question is how far will the government go to support a political agenda utilizing the tax code and is this an appropriate public policy?

Consumerism does not come without strings attached. In techno-Capitalism, the caveat is citizens must attain a level of technical proficiency prior to achieving a pass to the next station upward. What exactly technical proficiency means or how it is exactly determined is a nebulous proposition, constantly in the state of change. One thing is for certain, the standard can never be obtained as it never remains fixed long enough to be reached. Marcuse (1964) depicts the structure as administered by the 'educational dictatorship' (p. 40), responsible for both the pre-conditioning and setting standards. It is a cruel irony that the bastions of democratic praxis is administered by a counterinsurgent educational dictatorship whose real agenda is not global democratizing, but creating the next generation of automatons for assimilation in the techno-factories of the future. "But with all its truth," writes Marcuse (1964), "the argument cannot answer the time-honored question: who educates the educators, and where is the proof that they are in possession of 'the good'?" writes Marcuse (p. 40). Where indeed is the evidence?

Feyerabend (2002) responds to this question, “Progressive educators have always tried to develop the individuality of their pupils and to bring to fruition the particular, and sometimes quite unique, talents and beliefs of a child. Such an education, however, has very often seemed to be a futile exercise in daydreaming. For is it not necessary to prepare the young for life as it actually is” (p. 38)? How the progressive educator reconciles inspiring young learners to achieve their individual goals with the cold, stark, dank environment of negation created by the standardization movement in of itself is remarkable. Marcuse (1964) calls this environment as “the closing of the universe of discourse” (pp. 84-120). Marcuse believes within the techno-administration’s universe is the desire to re-route intellectual discourse to accept and to embrace the rationality of the administered universe. The discourse creates a language signifying the acceptance and ratification of the conditioning of the mind to conform. “Hammered and rehammered,” writes Marcuse (1964), “into the recipient’s mind, they produce the effect of enclosing it within the circle of the conditions prescribed by the formula” (p. 88). In the west, the curriculum (language) of techno-Capitalism utilizes words such as “... ‘freedom’, ‘equality’, ‘democracy’, ‘free enterprise’, to frame concepts as attributes of a political system that is superior. Capitalism has a different linguistic interpretation in the West than in non-democratized nations who frame their own political system as superior and pro-western democracies as inferior. The unmanageable part of this concept is in a global economic market the medium of exchange – currency, oil, cheap labor, or other commodities – negate the political. Apparently, the accumulation of wealth is an apolitical activity on a global scale as any nation has an open invitation to barter items of

value on the open market without criticism, backlash, or fear although they may be brutal oppressive regimes.

The curriculum of techno-Capitalism expands the boundaries of what is acceptable by passively or outright ignoring human rights violations, non-adherence to international laws\ treaties, and other international violations if a nation has something of global value (oil as example) that other countries need. The underlying notion to this hypocritical economic transaction is that once nations taste Capitalism they will be unable to barricade citizens from rushing to reconstitute their governments in the mold of a Capitalist social structure. Marx (2004) held the same position for Socialism though the rush to either condition is questionable in present day reality. Technology allows citizens to have a 'virtual taste' and experience democracy through the experience of others by social networking or internet communication sites. To use a crude analogy, the virtual experience of democracy is not much better than the virtual experience of pornography; the experience may be stimulating, it is voyeurism at best, but nonetheless it is a false experience and another form of negation.

Although the curriculum of techno-Capitalism may promote a moralist or ethical view of the superiority of Capitalism, it clearly violates the standard of morality or ethicality by hyperbolizing the ridiculous notion that nations who desire to acquire wealth modify their oppressive behavior to participate in the global economic market. As reiterated both by practical example and by common sense reality, these perspectives are at best hypocritical and at worst a disingenuous representation of the reality of the experience of but a handful of global citizens. Rhetorical representations seldom manifest in reality and Marcuse (1964) explains the rhetorical manipulation in this way; "The

closed language does not demonstrate and explain – it communicates decision, dictum, and command. Where it defines, the definition becomes “separation of good from evil”; it establishes rights and wrongs, and one value as justification of another value” (p. 101). The educator is pinched between two lies. The first is the moral-ethical position of Capitalism and the second is that Capitalism is a liberating force for individuals. Both are predicated on the hidden curriculum, which pre-conditions students in the classroom to accept the infallibility of Capitalism and upon indoctrination, by corporations, governments, and media to accept the infallibility of the political position that Capitalism is synonymous with authentic democracy. The alternative to techno-rationality of pre-conditioning and indoctrination is the irrationality represented by anarchists and terrorists; at least that is what the curriculum of Capitalism teaches. In Capitalist engineered education system, educators begin with the conclusion and build the lessons to support the conclusion. Students demonstrate by standardized assessment the objectives they learn leading to the conclusion.^{xxiv} Suppose the conclusion is wrong or a new theory alters the original proposition in a new direction leading to alternative conclusions.

Feyerabend’s (2002) observation related to learning and the role that injecting theoretical methodology plays in a classroom is interesting. Feyerabend distinguishes between theoretical methodologies of "what should be done" and what he terms as “tendencies and laws” (p. 149) that explain possible outcomes and impossible outcomes given circumstances. The key point is the recognition that circumstances do not alter the theory, but circumstances may require an alternate theory. “Again,” writes Feyerabend (2002), “progress can be made only if the distinction between the *ought* and the *is* - is

regarded as temporary device rather than as a fundamental boundary line” (p. 149). Standardization is both *ought* and *is* in a system characterized by an emphasis on standardization. The ends are pre-determined and permanent, leaving no space from which to intellectually challenge or revise the pre-determined conclusions given *tendencies and laws* as they are constitute as permanent fundamental boundary lines that cannot be transverse. The *ought* is a permanent device manifesting as the *is*, the objective students ‘will know’, and neither methodology nor conclusion is subject to critical analysis. Alternate possibilities are not in consideration as the outcome dictates the possibilities. Preforming a conclusion negates experience that may produce an alternate solution to a problem or the possibility for an alternate conclusion. Feyerabend (2002) says, “Finally we have discovered that learning does not go from observation to theory, but always involves both elements” (p. 149). In other words, learning fuses theory with praxis, which is the position, Marcuse has in mind for critical theory as a framework (Jay, 1973).

Feyerabend (2002) says that standards of criticism have become dogmatic to the point that behavioral standards and scientific standards are separate distinguishable entities with the latter no longer subject to critical analysis as it is accepted as fact without contention (pp. 149 – 154). The philosophical implications and efficacy of applying this double standard within the daily experience of an educator is the training for educators is to adhere to the prescriptive method for instruction and that the skill of critical thinking cannot be taught outside of a prescriptive scientific methodology. Educators cannot criticize standards based curriculum such as that promoted by the curriculum of techno-Capitalism, as it is science based whereas progressive curriculum

that utilizes a Deweyan approach that is experiential and observable, is open to criticism. Why? Because the outcomes of a Deweyan humanities filled classroom are not predictable or the conclusions may not be replicable using a scientific formula; circumstances alter the conclusion and in standard oriented school system, educators train to ignore circumstances. Feyerabend challenges this notion with his idea that new scientific theory (for that matter any theory) is the anarchical response and challenge to accepting current circumstances as unassailable, unchallengeable, and unchangeable. Feyerabend (2002) says, “The change of perspective makes it clear that there are many ways of ordering the world that surrounds us, that the hated constraints of one set of standards may be broken by freely accepting standards of a different kind, and that there is no need to reject all order and to allow oneself to be reduced to a whining stream of consciousness” (p. 162).

The progressive educator looks to the possibility that the conclusion is neither right nor wrong; simply given the circumstances of the time in which it is the prevalent operational idea, it is only operational if identical circumstances exist. Verification is by critical examination and generating new theory or applying a new theory. Feyerabend (2002) writes, “Finally, we have discovered that *learning* does not go from observation to theory but always involves both elements. Experience arises *together* with theoretical assumptions not before them, and an experience without theory is just as incomprehensible as is (allegedly) a theory without experience: eliminate part of the theoretical knowledge of a sensing subject and you have a person who is completely disoriented and incapable of carrying out the simplest action” (p. 149). The complaint by Western corporations that students do not have the pre-requisite skills of critical thinking

to compete with other global students who have these skills is not without merit.

However, it is the insistence on pressuring governments to adopt standardization in the education system and the coercion of educators to conform to structuring instruction to pre-designed conclusions that yields 'one-dimensional' citizens.

Techno-Capitalism fails to produce a socially responsible world and for all of its promise of new age of enlightenment science\technology tilt the balance of power in favor of the owners of knowledge and away from citizens who need intellectual capital to function as productive democratic citizens in a world dominated by techno-despotic corporations. The experience for many citizens is techno-wealth yields enormous influence and power upon them. Public school systems continue to disown the problem and squelch dissent by claiming neutrality; but there is nothing remotely neutral about pre-conditioning, indoctrination, and the dismantling of the human enterprise of creativity. The negation of the psyche of the public school systems threatens Western democracy, as fundamental to democratic praxis is intellectual power applied to resolving the most vexing situations resulting from the ignorance of the efficacy of race, class, and gender as disempowering institutionalized elements of Western style Capitalism. Science and technology makes oppression profitable with the public school system providing free labor making oppression unobjectionable, the norm for society. Feyerabend (2002) uses the term 'chimera' (p. 160) to describe the perversion and misallocation of science and technology as well as the prospective catastrophic results that follow when

science\technology are free from critical analysis.²⁷ Feyerabend (2002) proposes to restore the balance between the state and science, in the same vein as the church is separate from the state (p. 160). “The *theoretical* authority of science is much smaller than it is supposed to be,” says Feyerabend (2002). “Its *social* authority, on the other hand, has by now become so overpowering *that political interference is necessary to restore a balanced development*” (p. 160). Is restoration possible without revolution and are the remnants of progressive educators sufficiently primed to the task of restoration?

Marcuse and Feyerabend draw from the progressive movement and Dewey to make the case for reformation, not restoration. Marcuse makes a direct reference to Dewey (1929), *The Quest for Certainty*, when he reinforces Feyerabend’s earlier statements on the idea of the *is* and the *ought* as metaphysical representations for (in the case of the *is*) identity and existence; and *ought* as a metaphysical representation for obligation or responsibility. Feyerabend claims that there is no difference between the *is* and the *ought*, at least in the long term whereas Marcuse does not make the distinction preferring to maintain the classical definition without reference a time. In either regard, it makes little difference as Marcuse is making the same argument as Feyerabend when Marcuse uses an example from nature. “Nature,” writes Marcuse (1964), “scientifically comprehended and mastered, reappears in the technical apparatus of production, and destruction which sustains and improves the life of the individuals while subordinating

²⁷ A chimera comes from Greek mythology. It is a mythical fire-breathing creature with a lion’s head, goat body, and a serpent tail. In contemporary times, a chimera describes a grotesque product of the imagination (Blackburn, 1996, p. 62).

them to the masters of the apparatus. Thus, the rational hierarchy merges with the social one. If this is the case, then the change in the direction of progress, which might sever this fatal link, would also affect the very structure of science – the scientific character” (p. 166). Marcuse seems to propose is a scientific rationality that is infallible, unerring, and universally controllable, is a hypothetical reality. Scientific rationality dismisses the suppositional nature of hypotheses and presents scientific theory as absolute truth, validated or invalidated in reality. “In the construction of technological reality, there is no such thing as purely rational scientific order; the process of technological rationality is a political process,” writes Marcuse (1964, p. 168).

The proponents of the curriculum of techno-Capitalism are able to convince the public and key political constituencies that standardization in the classroom is the only methodology to remain competitive in a global financial market and to preserve Western style democratic practice. The science that supports this conjecture is the same science designed by the proponents and absent of the criticism and analysis of opposing views. The character of the science supporting rampant irrational standardization assumes unassailable even though the constituents in support have a specific agenda that contradicts the need for society to develop alternate methodologies of education that foster creativity and individualism. Marcuse (1964) asks a pertinent, but a dire question, “Thus the question once again must be faced; how can the administered individuals – who have made their mutilation into their own liberties and satisfactions, and thus reproduce it on an enlarged scale – liberate themselves from themselves as well as from their masters? How is it even thinkable that the vicious circle be broken” (p. 251)?

Marcuse believes the techno-society is sufficiently advanced, efficiently administered, and fortified by years of pre-conditioning. The techno-institution well financed by capitalists and buttressed by Capitalism as a myth, is virtually unassailable. Marcuse (1964) describes the struggle to re-balance the social structure back in favor of citizens; “But the struggle for the solution has outgrown the traditional forces. The totalitarian tendencies of the one-dimensional society render the traditional ways and means of protest ineffective – perhaps even dangerous because they preserve the illusion of popular sovereignty” (p. 256). From this analysis, Marcuse believes springs a new society; but not a society that is unbigoted, less intolerant, or more liberal and charitable to the underclass defined by race, class, and gender. Marcuse believes modern society is advanced because of science and technology, but remains remarkably barbaric and archaic in its attitude towards the underclass, underprivileged, and the under-served. In his mind, there is no way to reconcile these differences. Public education captive to techno-Capitalism offers little promise of creating an equitable social structure. “The critical theory,” writes Marcuse (1964), “of society possesses no concepts which could bridge the gap between the present and its future; holding no promise and showing no success, it remains negative” (p. 257).

Feyerabend (2002) proposes a solution to the pessimism of Marcuse. “All this means, of course, that we must stop the scientists from taking over education and from teaching as ‘fact’ and as ‘the one true method’ whatever the myth of the day happens to be” (p. 162). Though Feyerabend is referring to science, the thought is no less transferable to other curriculums and other institutions outside of the realm of science. Feyerabend’s point is that education propagates a false notion of science; science is

rational, without error, and without bias. The perception of science as an immaculate institution has the potential for catastrophic results. Feyerabend's notion of the fallibility of science applies to standardization movement of curriculum; standardizing curriculum does little to free it of politicization, polarization, or promoting myths. Feyerabend (2002) says an "Agreement with science, decision to work in accordance with the canons of science should be the result of examination and choice and *not* of a particular way of bringing up children" (p. 162). The same hold true for standardization of curriculum.

Feyerabend's anarchical attitude is problematic as it applies to science or education in that taken to the extreme, the learning environment without structure becomes dysfunctional. The same holds true of science without safeguards. Feyerabend is not promoting absolute chaos and throwing out every rule of science, theory, or methodology (Tsou, 2003). Feyerabend believes creativity stifles under heavy-handed pressure and heavy-handedness discourages spontaneity, creativity, humor, and relief from rote methodical standardized curriculum. Feyerabend (2002) implies that much of what is attributed to human endeavor functions in two realms (pp. 161-163). The first is the realms of self-discovery through practice of a disciplined methodology and the second occurs in the realm of self-discovery through natural processes that are anarchical in the sense that they are accidental discovery. "Feyerabend (2002) writes, "A society that is based on a set of well-defined and restrictive rules, forces the dissenter into no-man's-land of no rules at all and thus robs him of his reason and his humanity" (p. 162). The implication is total anarchy is unnecessary to revolutionizing the school system, but reform in the form of a 'structured anarchy' fosters the type of critical thinking needed to reconstruct democratic practice. However, not in the image of a social structure of

Capitalism. This is consistent with Marcuse, critical theorists, and neo-Marxist that believe reconstructing democracy does not necessarily include total dismantling of Capitalism and replacing it with Socialism. A line of thought such as this is contrary to the curriculum of techno-Capitalism as reification interchanges for humanism. To the orthodox capitalist, this is an irrational and unremunerative transaction. To a progressive educator, this transaction is a moral imperative.

“General education should prepare citizens to choose between the standards,” writes Feyerabend (2002), “or to find their way in a society that contains groups committed to various standards, but it must under no condition bend their minds so that they conform to the standards of one particular group” (p. 161). This is the precise point that Marcuse is attempting to make public. The administered society creates a one-dimensionality that is singularly detrimental to individual liberty and in plurality viral to societies. Feyerabend (2002) utilizes an interesting term in reference to a different topic; however the term ‘conceptual totalitarianism’ (p. 199) is apt definition for the current state of global democracy. The seeming contradiction between totalitarianism and democracy is lost in the conceptual translation or as Feyerabend (2002) says, “we have a chaos of appearances” (p. 199). In a sense, the appearance of global techno-Capitalism creates a ‘conceptual democracy’, a virtual world where democracy is immaterial. In reality global strife, oppression, and totalitarianism operates in the ‘material reality’ from the virtual. Technology and techno-administration blurs the lines between free societies and societies that limit individual freedom, specifically freedoms ascribing power to the citizenry, not corporations, or governments. The curriculum of techno-Capitalism advances a peculiar notion that is contradictory to democracy and social change.

The notion is that corporations and governing authorities act in the best interest of citizens and strengthens democracy through transacting commercial activity. Feyerabend makes the argument this statement is not entirely a truthful one as corporate interests funding scientific and technological advances withhold innovative discoveries from public consumers or market discoveries to market to government agencies such as the military first. The implication is government withholds technology from public scrutiny and from public consumption until approval for distribution by governing authorities. These types of transactions are ‘filtered’, ‘altered’, or ‘coded’ in a manner that allows the transaction and utilization of the innovation to be tracked, monitored, or rendered ineffective in certain situations providing a monopoly to corporations who produce technology and administration for governments who approve of the sale. Corporations and governments are not subject to public examination, public debate, and transact literally millions of un-scrutinized dealings without public input daily. Feyerabend is correct when he verifies the complicity of corporations and governments in withholding science and technology until all of the cost is recouped. Feyerabend (2002) provides concrete examples of the inner working of transfers of technology; “Increasing amounts of theoretical and engineering information are kept secret for military reasons and are thereby cut off from international exchange. Commercial interests have the same restrictive tendency. Thus, the discovery of superconductivity in ceramics (relatively) high temperatures which was the result of international collaboration soon led to protective measures by the American government. Financial arrangements can make or break a research programme and an entire profession. There are many ways to silence people apart from forbidding them to speak – and all of them are being used today. The

process of knowledge production and knowledge distribution was never the free ‘objective’, and purely intellectual exchange rationalists make it out to be” (126-127).

The notion that Feyerabend expresses and relevant to public schools is science is not free of financial chicanery in the form of manipulation of funding to produce results that are incentivized by profit. The uninitiated may ask of what relevance is this to the typical public school classroom in America. What profit is gained by manipulating science (outside of the billion dollar industry-marketing textbooks, standardized tests, and test practice materials) so that standardization of curriculum becomes the norm? Material goods are of little interest to the standard-bearers for standardization. It is about creating a labor force that is sufficiently paralyzed to not question, sufficiently stupefied not to recognize the condition in which they are in, but sufficiently mobile to produce. Feyerabend (2004) says of this notion of the negation of the idea of sufficiency, “That interests, forces, propaganda and brainwashing techniques play a much greater role than is commonly believed in the growth of our knowledge and in the growth of science, can also be seen from an analysis of the relation between idea and action” (p. 17). If the ideal of preserving democracy is at the forefront of the education system – preserving democracy through economic strength, free enterprise, and Capitalism – then does the action of transnational pro-democratic nations square with the reality of the current global situation.

The curriculum of techno-Capitalism fails to produce one society that is incrementally better and more democratic, even though conservative protectors of Capitalism claim the opposite. In the United States, techno-Capitalism fails to produce a social structure that is more sympathetic to the plight of the marginalized due to the

institutionalized negation of a person's worth from archaic notions of race, class, and gender. The role of education is to perpetuate myths, preserve the status quo, and do as little as possible to support fledgling shoots of democracy in nations where human rights abuses are the norm. Techno-Capitalism and techno-democracy fares worse than orthodox Capitalism, and if Marcuse or Feyerabend are harbingers of the days ahead, the globe will be plunged into a techno-fascism underwritten by Capitalists. Feyerabend (2002) summarizes what many are beginning to conclude, "What about the practical advantages? The answer is that 'science' sometimes works and sometimes doesn't. Some sciences (economic theory, for example) are in pretty, sorry shape" (p. 247). The same may be said of an education system bereft of humanitarian and progressive roots; relying on science and standardization to pull it from the brink of disaster and imperiling democracy as many now enjoy.

Altering Priorities: Reconceptualizing Education as System for Reform

If our education is to have any meaning for life, it must pass through an equally complete transformation (Dewey, 1980, p. 19).

Radical change in the contemporary world is only possible when priorities are re-configured. Contemporary society does not evaluate human activities in terms of strategic long-term humanistic investment designed to produce an equitable and balanced global community. Too much emphasis of the curriculum of Capitalism is placed upon economics as the science of producing wealth and too little emphasis is upon economics as a social science, one that examines the impact of over-emphasizing accumulation over the general needs of the social system. As example, the global warming debate rarely is from the perspective of the negative impact of dramatic climate changes upon global

communities and most always from the perspective of economics in terms of job losses, carbon credits, or financial costs to reorganize resources to slow or counteract invasive problems associated with environmental damage. This perspective is not completely unexpected as many contemporary economists define 'economics' contextualized in the terms of labor, capital, materials, and technology, which in the mind of the economists, are inseparable components of the global capitalist system. Since the industrial revolution and the current technology revolution, social welfare concerns, those affecting the quality of life of global citizens, are of lower priority than economic concerns. The curriculum of Capitalism and its successor techno-Capitalism succeeds by indoctrinating the global population in the notion global Capitalism (i.e. wealth accumulation and excessive consumption) essentially is an economic transaction with little or no social costs. Remarkably, capitalists elevate Capitalism to a religious and nearly moral imperative. To point out the disparities or suggest alternatives to Capitalism is to risk an economic jihad directed at citizens who may have a different experience with Capitalism; for example a person working in a U.S. car manufacturing plant who has their job moved to Mexico because labor costs are lower.

By contextualizing economics as an impersonal financial transaction, many responsible citizens see no ethical contradiction to measure the success of a society by consumption, debt, or accumulation. They do not see the human face attaching to the bodies of the laborer producing goods and services at less than a living wage to satisfy the narcissistic needs of wealthy foreigners. The same justification forms the basis for the rationale for slave cultures; the difference being the speed at which economic wealth is created or economic wealth demolishes. Economics is a term that has a broader meaning

than simply that which deals with wealth and financial transactions. Robbins (1945) defines, “Economics is the science which studies human behavior as a relationship between ends and scarce means which have alternative uses” (p. 16). Broadening the definition of economics as Robbins suggests has the potential to reprioritize the capitalist mentality and possibly placing human social welfare costs as the primary consideration in economic transactions. Suppose if the curriculum of Capitalism reorients in a similar direction. Conceivably the result is a complete reconfiguration of the global capitalist system whereby social welfare issues take precedence and social justice is no longer seen as an unachievable ideal. A new organizational structure forms to transmit these new ‘values’, a reconstructing social ethos as Aristotle imagines in the *Politics* or as envisioned by Plato’s *Republic*, for a socially just and equitable global society. These new values trump the orthodox values promoted by the bureaucracy. The hierarchy loses authority and thereby the ‘values’ in which the bureaucracy is vested along with its ability to discipline and punish is pushed aside in favor of an authentic democratic structure.

Robbins (1945) expresses a similar notion; “But when time and the means for achieving ends are limited *and* capable of alternative application, *and* the ends are capable of being distinguished in order of importance, then behavior necessarily assumes the form of choice” (p. 14). The ‘form of choice’ situates in the system of education that invariably must arise to reproduce democracy and to model in the classroom democratic praxis. Once modeled in the classroom, surely the transfer outside of the classroom will take place, reconstructing society in the new image of an authentic democratically just global social system. The reconstructed democratic capitalist system bases participation

in the global society upon the equitable treatment of citizens within the national boundaries of the participant and deny access to nations who exploit their population as cheap sources for labor. Reshaping and reprioritizing the world's social commitments, as the priory consideration is the first step to building a cooperative economic framework. The framework is not novel, but the road map to reconstruction differs in that social systems underpin the framework of economics; however, there is delineation between economic analysis as purely financial and economic analysis from the perspective of 'allocating scarce resources' in a social system. This of course is one hope of progressive educators long prior to the establishment of a Western democracy (i.e. anarchist schools) and long derailed by tying Capitalism to social democracy.

The supposition does not require that socialist economic policy replace capitalist economic policy. History suggests the success of Socialism to eradicate administered societies by bureaucrats is no better than that of Capitalist. The suggestion is to detach education from all economic social structures. This notion suggests that to reform education requires a fundamental shift from nationalizing education through standards and bureaucracy and return the decision of education to consensual and collaborative communities organized by local citizens. Funds for collaborative schooling may require collection by a government authority and a mechanism for establishing a system of fees that are equitable managed by a government fiduciary. How the funds are spent, the curriculum chosen, and the daily operational decisions are under the authority of parents, educators, and children attending the school. Robbins' (1945) expanded notion of economics is consistent with curriculum theorists who expand the notion of curriculum beyond the orthodox methods for pedagogy and education and has implications for

restructuring education to model authentically socially responsible democratic practice. “The propositions of economic theory,” says Robbins (1945), like all scientific theory, are obviously deductions from a series of postulates. And the chief of these postulates are all assumptions involving in some way simple and indisputable facts of experience relating to the way in which the scarcity of goods which is the subject matter of our science actually shows itself in the world of reality. The main postulate of the theory of value is the fact that individuals can arrange their preferences in an order, and in fact do so” (p. 79). No longer will one type of school system exist, but a multiplicity of school choice is born enhancing both the community and the experience of the student. Robbins underscores the point that all science including that of social science and democracy grounds into a series of related postulates. Are not one of the many postulates grounding democracy ‘choice’ and one of the many postulates of Capitalism ‘consumer choice’? Realigning the vision for the curriculum of Capitalism is no longer in contradiction to the box that frames the classroom experience of public school students.

Dewey describes a similar model in *The School and Society* and attempts to implement the model (with some success for a short period) in the experimental school located in Chicago (Dykhuizen, 1973). Dewey (1980) captures the spirit of the experimental school and the aspiration of hope; “What the best and wisest parent wants for his own child that must the community want for all its children. Any other ideal for our schools is narrow and unlovely; acted upon, it destroys our democracy. All that society has accomplished for itself is put, through the agency of the school, at the disposal of its future members” (p. 5). Dewey places in perspective what is lacking in contemporary public schools and frames the discussion from the perspective of the most

affected constituencies, the parent, and child. The intrusion of bureaucracy does little to foster a democratic environment and by extension hinders the movement towards authentic democracy. Reclaiming public education from the current education establishment and its rule minded bureaucracy will do little to foster the type of change necessary to operate as global citizens if a replicated re-branded form of the status quo replaces the current system. Innovation is the result of radical change in mindset, not repackaging. The precise reason for the failure of improvement in public school education, the demise in the emphasis upon democracy, and much of the global instability is the failure of education systems, locally and abroad, to fulfill the mission of a broader view – one without border or without need of constant administration and bureaucratic control. Dewey (1980) writes, “Whenever we have in mind the discussion of a new movement in education, it is especially necessary to take the broader, or social view. Otherwise, changes in the school institution and tradition will be looked at as the arbitrary inventions of particular teachers; at worst transitory fads, and at the best merely improvements in certain details – and that is the plane upon which it is too customary to consider school changes (p. 5).” Conceptualizing education differently requires an equally challenging reconceptualization of the mindset of educators to reconsider their role as leaders in society, not as passive transfers for official knowledge as Apple (1993/2000) terms.

Praxis: A Personal Reflection & Conclusion

...concern over the product seems somehow to obscure the fact that the world the educator creates through the curriculum is a world inhabited by actual children as well as potential results (Pinar, 2000, p. 46-47).”

At the conclusion of the third through fifth chapters is a *Praxis* section whereby the theoretical aspects of the chapter condense into an actionable framework. This being the conclusion it seems only appropriate the praxis section reflect the professional experience of my years as a primary school educator in a public school system. One theme developing from this research and an unexpected aspect of this research is how educators at any level deal with isolation and alienation. The few opportunities afforded by the education system to have coherent discourse without fear of reprisal curiously detach educators from the normal adult interaction and separates them from the community. When commentators say ‘educators are out of touch with society’, to some extent the professional practice of educators tends to verify this statement. Being out of touch is not altogether without merit. The public school system and the curriculum of Capitalism intentionally isolate educators from the democratic system and from participating in efforts to restructure education.

The expectation for educators is that they will teach children skills that are useful outside of the classroom and in a wider sense, promote the notion of a peculiar set of skill sets needed to participate in a global economy.^{xxv} The paradox is educators isolate themselves from the personal conflicts of children. Contradictorily, the professional practices of educators attempts to connect the curriculum to a personal experience of the children. Yet, educators hear all the time, they are to have empathy for the condition of the lives of children under their care, but empathy should not cloud professional judgment or professional practice. Contradiction may well be the only consistency in the daily life of a public school educator. It is not too difficult to imagine why educators are isolated and alienated from much of life outside of the classroom.

Doll (2006) writes, “We live in an increasingly boundary-conscious world, despite this being the next millennium, despite the discourse on otherness and difference, despite the best teaching in the field of curriculum studies to the contrary” (p. 5). Clear boundaries mark the limits of influence educators can exert on children. My classroom is exemplary of ‘boundarizing’; elementary children are arranged into neat columns and rows designed for observation, not conversation. Administration requires the arrangement to functionally maximize student awareness of the teacher (the technical term is ‘proximity control’) and efficiently allow the teacher to transverse the space in minimal time. Private space and public space geometrically co-aligns, parallel and perpendicular cordoned into neat little blocks on artificial grids of seating charts, publicly displayed student work, and the innumerable standards that are required to be present on the walls at all time. Distance between points precisely maintained. Every item has a place and every item is placed within a specifically planned defined space, usually not of the children’s’ or my own choosing. The administered world includes a plan-o-gram that dictates how the arrangement of space and the specific order of teaching aids. Non-standard items such as personal items like pictures or other materials are prohibited. Every square centimeter is posted with the state mandated and local mandated materials. Periodically a visitor will appear with a clipboard and check for compliance and conformity. They will sometimes photograph bulletin boards to document for others to replicate in different schools and to model for other teachers the expectation of how something should look. A great amount of time and energy is expended to reproduce bulletin boards that conform with to the standard and keep educators from appearing on the list of non-compliance.

The classroom is part of a larger complex, interconnected by walkways with bright yellow stripes to remind the children not to step out of line, walk quietly, keep to the right side of the hall, eyes forward, hands to your side, and maintain personal space. Again, designed to maximize observation, minimize the potential jay walking child anarchist who chooses to walk slightly off line. A group of educators met every Monday for two months until they came to a consensus about the color, yellow. Other colors were mentioned such as red (too harsh and negative), green (meant go, counterproductive), and after many hours of meetings, the color yellow (caution, slow down) was sent to approval by our administrator. Once approved, we set about painting the lines on the sidewalk, which created another controversy as some wanted to use a chalk line to insure every line was perfectly straight while others like me used a free hand method. The chalk liners eventually won the battle. The chalk liners are winning the national battle.

I once joked with colleagues the only difference between elementary school and prison is that the guards do not carry weapons in elementary school. It was humorous at the time. The humor since has passed with the awful reality of being closer to true than not. Most educators, and I am no different, are quarantined in the classroom, surrounded by children all day who know less about me than if we have never met. Isolation means keeping things in. It will not do to let things out. Ideas corrupt youth in so much as those ideas are not part of the neat little prescribed curriculum. Inside it is secure; outside lurks the prospect for violence, danger, and disorder of every kind. Webber (2003) describes the situation, "All of the school policies developed to anticipate school violence endure that student behavior is in conformity with the rules and procedures that ensure that education takes place only in the classroom (e.g., what can be measured by achievement

tests). The rest of the educational process is circumvented (in the extracurricular spaces) so that the amount of interaction between students' personalities and school officials is lessened considerably" (p. 151). I guess you can say everything in the school uses the chalk line.

The day begins with the ritual or routine. Each child programmed to do so, systematically enters in a single-file line making their way to their assigned space amongst the grid. On cue, students stand to recite the pledge, recite the school rules, recite class routines, and then complete a brief meaningless assignment. The door to the outside remains locked for security. Seldom does an adult come to visit or to find out what is going on inside. The shades on the small windows are drawn tight as if a tiny stream of sunlight might distract the children away from their assignments and into daydreaming. The children and I are alone, isolated from the other children of the school, isolated from the beauty of the day outside, and isolated from the promise of something new, different, or exciting. The school campus is sequestered from the outside world. Except for the sign on the outside of the property boundary lines conspicuously painted yellow, a person new to the area might believe that the school is a warehouse. I am not so sure that the sign marking the location as an elementary school would not read better, *Warehouse*.

Educators are monitored constantly by assessments and performance evaluations. The same is true for the children who even at the lowest level of elementary school are reminded daily to earn less than the minimum criterion score is to fail and risk repeating one-hundred-eighty days of the same the following year. I am amazed by the large number of students identified with attention deficit disorder until I ask myself, why you

would not daydream given the opportunity so that you can cope with the tedium of repetitious standardized test practice. Equally confounding are the people who are amazed as to why today's youth seems so disconnected from the world. I cannot fathom why anyone wonders why young people isolate themselves, retreating into their own world of electronic games, video music, and internet. Can we really blame them? The school curriculum is isolated or is the school curriculum isolating? It does not matter. Eventually, our time together will end by the clanking of the bell for dismissal. At three-thirty, they will go their way, and I will go mine. The isolation ends for the day only to have the scenario repeated again the next day.

Weekly, the curriculum plan requires the children to write personal narratives. I did this activity long before it became a required writing assessment, for two reasons. The first is that I learn something new about my children every time I read one. The second is that the children learn something new about themselves. The day the personal narrative became a requirement, I began to notice the authenticity and sincerity of expression of emotion, passion, exhilaration, or sadness disappeared. There is a distinct care in the words the children use, hiding their true natures and feelings. These mini-autobiographies are placed in writing portfolios, checked by administrators, and placed in the permanent records. Can you imagine if someone asked you to write the most intimate details of your life (from your diary, journal, and medical records) and then place them in a file that at any time will be made public? The last time the class was to write I told my children to write whatever they thought important and that the copies will not be placed in the portfolios, but shredded. One of the children, an African American male with a reading

disability wrote this. *“I need money. I am angry. My momma has no job. I am angry.”*²⁸

This student reminds me of a student that I taught a few years earlier. He was a male student, a little overactive (It is the nice way educators label a behavior problem.) at times, but in my mind, a decent kid although a little troublesome; he was engaging and entertaining. One Thursday night, he and some older friends thought that robbing a liquor store was a good idea. After successfully completing the task of threatening the owner with a gun, the three of them after having obtained a small amount of cash, escaped in a car to return to the neighborhood. Due to the age of my student (he was eleven) the older boys thought that his share of the cash should be less. After angrily debating the amount, one of the older boys placed a twenty two-caliber gun to my student’s head and pulled the trigger twice. The body of the child was dumped in the driveway of his grandmother to make a point to the other youngsters in the neighborhood. I still have his picture on the side of a file cabinet in my classroom. Isolation, alienation, and a world gone awry. *“I need money. I am angry. My momma has no job. I am angry.”*

Though the classroom contains twenty-five children and there are more than seven hundred attending school, being in a larger group does not mitigate the isolation many of these children must be experiencing. How does a child deal with being homeless, abandoned by a parent, the child of drug dependent parent, impoverished, or ostensibly experiencing a life of an uncertain future? Alone in a crowd is one of many paradoxes of isolation. Educators train to disassociate (isolate) ourselves from being too intimate and too personal in the details of the lives of children. Isolation is a defense

²⁸ The student consented to use of his work as long as I did not share his name and shredded the writing sample.

mechanism that protects us from the harsh reality that while we are sincere in the effort to make a positive difference in the lives of children, far too many times we do not have the resources or the capacity or the desire to alter significantly the lives of children entrusted in our care. The work of educators goes unnoticed, unappreciated, and unrewarded.

Seldom except in the briefest moments, does an educator see tangible evidence that they have made a difference in the life of a child. Educators live for these moments.

An administrator during one of the many observations of the class wrote on the observation form that I was too personally involved with the children. When asked why such of thing should be included in the formal observation and entered into the personnel file, she replied, "I could not change the condition of their life outside of school; therefore, I should not waste valuable instruction time and it should not be part of the conversation within the school." Her notion is to pretend that what happens away from the campus is not relevant to what happens in the classroom; that by shutting out (pretending) that the other life of a child has no power over the child's ability to learn. By denying the world outside of school can be cruel for children, she explained that she was acting in the best interest of a child. At least for a time, that teacher/child could conduct the business of education in a space that was pure from interruption from poverty, race, class, loss of family members, or drug abuse.

Today's educators have a linear orientation towards education. Many believe if they apply this method or this assessment then they will achieve a predictable result. I believe the notions of self-reflection, democracy, and love as an important part of the conversation of education. These ideals are not easily drawn in straight lines. At some point in the current assessment climate, many educators succumb to the easier decision of

compromise and give away the high ground that humanity, performing a social service for the good is a superior position from which to educate children. Educators need disregard straight lines and re-draw boundaries into overlapping circles forming a union of community and school. Addressing race, class, and gender through any dialogue that is neither partisan nor shrill does far less damage to children than to pretend that these experiences are imagined obstacles to personal fulfillment. Educators must turn to revolutionary praxis, broadening the dialogue for exchange to include a wide spectrum of theorists, community leaders, laborers, and spiritual leaders if we are to de-isolate the schools into a renewed spirit of working together in harmony. “Yet the only way through this morass is by having more faith – more faith in each other to work through problems and more faith in each other that we are mostly driven by good intentions, even if we live in an imperfect world,” writes Houston (2005, p. 62).

The analogy of the circle has ecological implications as an example ecosystems overlapping with habitats. Interdependence and interrelationships are one element of a healthy ecological system. This same idea is applicable to the school environment. An ecologically balanced curriculum implies there is a balance between educator and child expressed by bi-lateral mutual respect, mutual understanding, and mutual belief in democratic ideals. The key component of an ecological curriculum is that no organism (educator or child) is independent, but interdependent. In class, we try to demonstrate to children the result of what happens when an organism is removed from the environmental web. We ask students to consider how removing the specific talents, beauty, or function from the environmental hierarchy affects organisms that depend upon it. Children are

astute and correctly reach the same conclusion; eliminating one organism has cataclysmic results on the remaining organisms.

Invariably during the discussion, a child will present the argument that biologists preserve organisms by removing them from their natural environment and artificially re-create the conditions allowing the organism to survive. True enough in order to conserve endangered species, biologists capture them and place the species in zoos, labs, or research facilities. I ask the children to compare two organisms, for example, bears (children love bears) in the wild to domesticated bears in a zoo. A bear in the wild learns to cope with the harshest of environments, foraging for food, and reproducing by finding an available mate. That is far different from the zoo bear whose environment is artificially controlled, hunks of nutritionally balanced meat provided at regular intervals, and zoos provide matchmaking services. Can we really say that wild bear and zoo bear are the same? Many children conclude the real bear lives in the wild; the zoo bear is artificial. It once was a wild bear, but now something less. Zoo bear lives in a fake, artificial, and bogus environment. If zoo bear escapes to the wild, it will not survive. Is the public school classroom much different from the environment of a zoo?

More astonishing is how quickly children transfer the wild/zoo bear example to their own circumstances. Involving no risk and no threat, children easily identify with animals and certain animal stories allow children to explore their own identity and feelings about who they are. "Identity," writes Sumara (2002) "is not some essential quality of the individual human subject. Identity emerges from relationships, including relationships people have with books and other communicative technologies based on language" (p. 97). I found this to be true with my children, regardless of the genre of the

literature, there is always at least one child who shares the experience of one of the characters in the book. As human beings, emotions and feelings are universal; expression of those feelings is cultural, but ‘feeling the feeling’ is human. These moments of insight and community in the classroom are rare. Sadly, we isolate children from talking about their feelings and emotional connections. Literature engages children at the source of the child – imagination. I have yet to meet a child that cannot relate literature to some aspect of their personal circumstances and to the environment in which they are coping, adapting, and reconfiguring in an effort to make sense of the world.

Schools are not isolated from environments; they are irrevocably locked into the web of society. To suggest otherwise is to deny that experience, race, class, and gender in the classroom are powerful toxins to democratic processes when filtered through the curriculum of Capitalism and modeled by the lack of democratic behavior exhibited in the classroom environment. Believing the classroom is isolated from society and the classroom is a “unique environment unattached to society,” is to suggest (thank goodness as my children do not) that wild bear and zoo bear are identical. Artificial environments do not shield children from the real environment and the reality that someday they will escape released back into the wilds of society hopefully with the tools to cope with the dangers. Houston (2005) advocates, “The irony is that we cannot save or protect ourselves through isolation. We cannot help our children by shielding them from a dangerous and difficult world. We have to give them the tools they need to engage successfully” (p. 62). Childhood is fraught with danger. Though our instinct is to protect children by denying the danger exists, children are better served when adults help children engage their environment safely and avoid isolationism.

What do schools and democracy have that is common? Much less than the public likes to believe. Uniforms, constant surveillance, monitoring of activities, limited contact with others, aesthetically similar buildings, emphasis on behavior management, random drug/weapon searches, visitation hours, loss of identity, little freedom of choice, and de-emphasis on global issues are a few of the more obvious dissimilarities. “Students in schools are protocitizens” (p. 2), says Webber (2001), suggesting that children are not developing critical skills enabling them to function as democratic citizens. How can public school and educators reclaim democratic praxis? Garrison (1997) suggests the cure for isolation; “Freedom, I want to suggest, is freedom to grow in healthy relationships with others to the greatest most integrated expanse we can attain without despair” (p. 169). Educators must engage children on the deepest emotional level and bring sense to the chaos of the world outside of the classroom. Boundaries, much like the fence surrounding the animals of the zoo, are artificial and isolate on many levels. Freedom is to transverse boundaries literally dis-isolating and re-engaging children, adults, back into the conversation; the essence of democratic behavior is dialogue, discourse, and dissent. Children need to learn all three of the elements if they are to participate as citizens locally and as global citizens. Putnam (2006) accentuates how re-engaging people in the conversation changes people’s lives for the positive. “Social isolation has many well-documented side effects. Kids fail to thrive. Crime rises. Politics coarsens. Generosity shrivels. Death comes sooner (social isolation is as big a risk factor for premature death as smoking). Well-connected people live longer, happier lives...” (p. 36). The critical element missing in the public school system is the ‘connection’; the belief no human being is alone or isolated.

In the course of a historical research for a different project, I discovered an article addressing the same issue faced by educators in our present day. Parker (1894) writes, “The fundamental method of Old World education is *isolation*; it is supported by no particular party or sect; the people educated in this method believe in it from their habit of life and the tradition of ages. Why should they understand the genius of American liberty? Why should those who have become habituated to class education believe that the stratification of American society into fixed classes means sure death to the republic and the future hopes of democracy” (p. 10)? The curriculum of Capitalism serves to isolate and to mold all unique identities into a singular social unit based upon an antiquated notions of race, class, and gender. It is a sad state of affairs in public education in the United States to read an article over one hundred years in age and the fundamental problem of isolation remains unresolved. In this article, Parker (1894) laments the introduction of ‘quantity teaching’ (standardization) which Parker describes as “the most effective method in keeping children from anything like a search for the truth, and the realization of their own liberty – the method of textbooks, page learning, percent examinations, with all the countless devices and means which serve to make quantity learning the end an aim of education” (p. 8). The school should be a place of dignity, equity, community, unity (not isolation), and where the hallmark of the system is the promotion of democracy. When society gazes into a mirror, what reflection will they see? “Democracy,” writes Carlson (2002), “cannot be sustained from a position of detachment, by people who are no longer attuned to the world around them or engaged in real struggles going on in the world, in which real human bodies are on the line, real

people are being discriminated against, real battles are being waged in local communities over commitments to human freedom and equity” (p. 177- 178).

The plight of public school education is not singularly the blame of a capitalist social structure or orthodox conservative educators, or even parents and children. Education is a social responsibility that requires all constituencies to engage, not to isolate. We are all to blame. As a society, we have become more polarized, less trusting, cynical, and afraid to approach others. Afraid of what or whom, I am not certain. Globalization presents a unique challenge in which isolationism is not a solution. Our society has allowed public education to become a hostile enterprise. By that, I mean to say that on a daily basis it is difficult to etch out personal times of reflection (isolation) where we are free to wander aimlessly and create for the sake of creating (for fun), not to meet some deadline or standard or meaningless expectation. We have all become zoo bears and probably do not realize it. While this analysis may seem pessimistic, I am not. I believe in what I do and what other educators are doing as the most important act in a democratic society. I challenge my colleagues and peers to cross the boundaries from isolation to join in a new dialogue of hope, social justice, and care.

Transitioning to a conclusion is sometimes a less difficult task than to discover a beginning. In my view, education has no boundaries; no terminal lines. Every breathing moment is the opportunity for discovery, renewal, and reshaping the world into a socially responsible community. That in itself is a worthy goal and one that progressive educators ought to pursue. One of my prior students writes:

“What if words have no meaning? What if people have no voice to speak their mind? What if we have no peace? Will there be more violence? What if there was

*no me? What if there was no you? What if there was no two to create you and me? What if life has no purpose? Will life be another boring song? What if every day is Earth Day? Will Mother Nature be satisfied? What people had no names? Will we all be the same? What if people had no decisions? Will things be based upon religions? What if...? What if...? We ask this question every day. What if there were **no what ifs?**”²⁹*

These are deeply perplexing if not personal questions that children when given the freedom to express do so. The question is can democracy survive when questions like these are left unanswered by educators?

²⁹ The poem, *What If*, is reprinted with the permission of a fifth grade female African American student in Mr. Carroll’s elementary class, 2009. The student prefers to remain anonymous and out of respect for her request, no citation appears in the bibliography.

References

- Abromeit, H., & Auberger, T. (2006, Feb). The German left and democracy: A difficult relationship. *Democratization*, 13(1), 116-134.
- Addams, J. (1911). *Twenty Years at Hull House: With autobiographical notes*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Allen, E., Jr. (2003, Summer). Du Boisian double consciousness: The unsustainable argument. *The Black Scholar*, 33(2), 217-242.
- Amberrackelly, A. (2002, Jan./Feb). Raising our kids in the anarchist community. *Off Our Backs*, 32(1-2), 22-25.
- Andrews, V. (2003). Self-reflection and the reflected self: African American double consciousness and the social (psychological) mirror. *Journal of African American Studies*, 7(3), 59-79.
- Apple, M. (1996). *Cultural politics and education*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.
- Apple, M. (2000). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge. (Original work published 1993)
- Aptheker, H. (1973). *Annotated bibliography of the published writings of W.E.B. Du Bois*. Millwood, NY: Kraus-Thomson Organization.
- Aptheker, H. (2001). *The Nature of Democracy, Freedom, and Revolution*. New York: International Publishers.
- Arato, A., & Gebhardt, E. (1982). *The Essential Frankfurt School Reader*. New York: Continuum Publishing.

- Aristotle. (2005). *Rhetoric Aristotle* (R. Roberts, Trans.). Stillwell, KS: Digireads.com Publishing.
- Avrich, Pl. (1984). *The Haymarket tragedy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bachelard, G. (2000). *The Dialectic of Duration* (M. Jones, Trans.). Manchester, MI: Clinamen Press.
- Bachelard, G. (2002). *Air and dreams* (14th ed.) [Farrell, R. & Farrell, C]. Dallas, TX: The Dallas Institute Publications.
- Baumrind, D. (1998). From ought to is: A neo-Marxist perspective on the use and misuse of the culture construct. *Human Development*, 41, 145-165.
- Becker, P., Jipson, A., & Katz R. (Fall 2001). A timeline of the racist movement in the United States. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 12(2), 427-456.
- Bennett, W., Cribb, J., & Finn, C. (1999). *The educated child: A parent's guide from preschool through eighth grade*. New York: Free Press.
- Bennett, W., Cribb, J., & Finn, C. (1999). *The educated child: A parent's guide from preschool through eighth grade*. New York: Free Press.
- Berlant, L. (Winter, 2004). Critical inquiry, affirmative culture. *Critical Inquiry*, 445-451.
- Bertolo, A. (1999). Democracy and beyond. *Democracy and Nature*, 5(2), 311-323.
- Bieler, A., & Morton, A. (2004, Spring). A critical theory route to hegemony, world order, and historical change: Non-Gramscian perspectives in international relations. *Capital and Class*, 82, 85-113.
- Blackburn, S. (1996). *Oxford dictionary of philosophy* (S. Blackburn, Ed.). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1994)

- Blanke, J., Browne, C., Hanouz, M., & et. al. World Economic Forum. (2009). The global competitiveness report 2009-2010. In K. Schwab & et.al (Eds.), *Global Economic Report: Committed to improving the state of the world* (2009 World Economic Forum Brief & Report). Cologny/Geneva, Switzerland: The World Economic Forum.
- Blau, J. (1971, Fall). Unfettered freedom. *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, 7(4), 242-252.
- Blau, J. (1987). Government or anarchy? In the debates of the Constitution. *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, 23(4), 507-519.
- Bloom, A. (1987). *The closing of the American mind*. New York: Simon and Schuster Publishing.
- Boldt, G., & Salvio, P. (2006). *Love's return: Psychoanalytic essays on childhood, teaching, and learning*. New York: Routledge.
- Borgatti, S. (1999, September 7). *Elements of a Theoretical Framework*. [Http://analytictech.com](http://analytictech.com) August 1, 2008, <http://analytictech.com/mb313/elements.htm>
- Boston Latin School Association. (2007, January 1). *The Boston Latin School*. Retrieved November 20, 2008, from About BLS: History (375 years) Web site: <https://www.bls.org/podium/default.aspx?t=113760&rc=1>
- Boutte, G. (2008, July\august). Beyond the illusion of diversity: How early childhood teachers can promote social justice. *The Social Studies*, 165-173.
- Bowie, A. (2000). The romantic connection to Neurath, the Frankfurt School and the Heidegger, Part 2. *British Journal for History of Philosophy*, 8(3), 460-483.

- Boydston, J. (Ed.). (1987). *John Dewey: Essays, reviews, Trotsky inquiry, Miscellany* (Vol. 11) (J. Boydston, Ed.). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University.
- Boydston, J. (Ed.). (1990). *John Dewey: Volume 17, 1885-1953, Miscellaneous writings*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University.
- Boyle, K., & Sheen, J. (Eds.). (1997). *Freedom of religion and belief: A world report*. New York: Routledge.
- Broderick, F. (1959). *W.E.B. Du Bois: Negro leader in a time of crisis*. Stanford: University of California Press.
- Brown, P., & Lauder, H. (2006). Globalisation, knowledge and the myth of the magnet economy. *Globalisation, Societies, and Education*, 4(1), 25-57.
- Burke, B. (2000). Karl Marx and informal education. In *Encyclopedia of Informal Education*. Retrieved July 25, 2008, from The Encyclopedia of Informal Education Web site: <http://www.infed.org/thinker/et-marx.htm>
- Burt, E. (1939). *The English Philosophers from Bacon to Mill*. New York: Random House, Inc.
- Campbell, J. (2007). One hundred years of pragmatism. *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, 43(1), 1-15.
- Cannella, G., & Kincheloe, J. (2002). *Kidworld*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Carlson, D. (2002). *Leaving safe harbors. Towards a new progressiveness in American education and public life*. New York: Routledge.
- Carlson, J. R. (1943). *Under Cover* (1st ed.). Philadelphia: The Blakiston Company.
- Carroll, D. (2004). *Emma Hart Willard – A biography*. Unpublished manuscript, Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA.

- Carroll, D. (2005). *Isolation: Curriculum, education, and autobiography*. Unpublished manuscript, Georgia Southern University, Savannah, GA.
- Carroll, D. (2009). *A discourse of distrust*. Unpublished manuscript, Armstrong Atlantic State University, Savannah, GA.
- Cash, J., & Schwab, G. (2004). When they say that your people do not exist, how does that make you feel? *Postcolonial Studies*, 7(2), 133-137.
- Chomsky, N. (1999). Domestic terrorism: Notes of the state system of oppression. *New Political Science*, 21(3), 303-324.
- Clakins, M. (2000). Recovering religion's voice in business ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 23(4), 339-352.
- Clark, J. (Sept. 2008). Social justice, education, and schooling: Some philosophical issues. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 54(3), 272-287.
- Clark, L. (2001, August 15). Time for men to hit back says Lessing the arch feminist: Novelist attacks women who 'rubbish' the opposite sex. *The Daily Mail*, p. 34. Retrieved June 3, 2009, from <http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/BioRC> The Daily Mail (London, England) Web site: <http://galenet.galegroup.com>
- Cole, M. Hill., D., & Rikowski, G. (1997, June). Between postmodernism and nowhere: The predicament of the postmodernist. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 45(2), 187-200.
- Coulson, A. (1999). *Market education*. Rutgers, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Cristin, R. (1998). *Heidegger and Leibnitz: Reason and path*. AH Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Press.

- Crossley, M. (1999). Reconceptualizing comparative and international education. *Compare*, 29(3), 249-267.
- Darwin, C. (2004). *The origin of the species*. London: CRC Publishing Limited. (Original work published 1859)
- Davies, L. (February 2006). Global citizenship: Abstraction or action? *Educational Review*, 58(1), 5-25.
- Dayan, J. (1996, Winter). Paul Gilroy's slaves, ships, and routes: The middle passage as metaphor. *Researching African Literature*, 27(4), 8-15.
- De Lissovoy, N., & McLaren, P. (2003). Educational accountability and the violence of capital: A Marxian reading. *Journal of Education Policy*, 18(2), 131-143.
- De Tocqueville, A. (2004). *First Book. Influence of Democracy on the Progress of Opinion in the United States: Philosophical Method Among the Americans* (4th ed., Vol. 2, H. Reeve, Trans.). New York: J. & H.G. Langley. (Original work published 1841)
- Department of the Treasury/Federal Reserve Board. (October 16, 2009). *Major foreign holders of treasury securities* [Report of federal treasury bond holdings]. Available October 16, 2009, from Department of the Treasury/Federal Reserve Board Web site: <http://www.treas.gov/tic/mfh.txt>
- Dept. of Public Information. (2010, February 10). *The United Nations Member States*. Retrieved February 10, 2010, from <http://www.un.org/en/index.shtml> Welcome to the United Nations Web site: <http://www.un.org/en/members/>

- Descartes, R. (2004). *Descartes: Discourse on Method, Meditations on the First Philosophy, & The Principles of Philosophy*. Great Britain: CRW Publishing Limited.
- Dewey, J. (1915). *German Philosophy and Politics*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Dewey, J. (1929). *The quest for certainty*. New York: Minton, Balch, and Co. Publishing.
- Dewey, J. (1971). *John Dewey: Early Essay and the Study of Ethics: The early works 1882-1898* (J. Boydston, Ed.). Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, Feffer & Simons, Inc.
- Dewey, J. (1980). *The School and Society* (J. Boydston, Ed.). Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1981). *The Philosophy of John Dewey* (J. McDermott, Ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. (1981). *The Philosophy of John Dewey: The structure of experience and the lived experience* (J. McDermott, Ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1971)
- Dewey, J. (1981). *The philosophy of John Dewey: Two volumes in one - The structure of experience and the lived experience* (J. McDermott, Ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. (1985). *John Dewey: The later works, 1925-1953: Volume 6, 1931-1932, essays, reviews, and miscellany* (Vol. 6) (A. Boydston, Ed.). Carbondale & Edwardsville, IL: Southern University Press.

- Dewey, J. (1989). *John Dewey: The later works, 1925-1953* (J. Boydston & B. Levine, Eds.). Carbondale and Edwardsville, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1991). *John Dewey, The Collected Works, 1882-1853* (J. Boydston, A. Sharpe, A. Simon, & B. Levine, Eds.). Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1993). *John Dewey: The political writings* (D. Morris & I. Shapiro, Eds.). Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing, Inc.
- Dewey, J. (1994). *The moral writings of John Dewey* (Rev. ed.) (J. Gouinlock, Ed.). Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Dewey, J. (2004). *German philosophy and politics*. New York: Henry Holt and Company. (Original work published 1915)
- Dewey, J. (2004). *Reconstruction in Philosophy*. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, Inc. (Original work published 1920)
- Dewey, J. (2005). *Democracy and education*. New York: Barnes and Noble Books. (Original work published 1916)
- Dickson, D. (1992, June). W.E.B. Du Bois and the idea of double consciousness. *American Literature*, 64(2), 300-309.
- Doll, M., Wear, D., & Whitaker, M. (2006). *Triple takes on curricular worlds*. Albany, NY: State University Press of New York Press.
- Donaldson, T. (2001). The ethical wealth of nations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 31(1), 25-36.
- D'Souza, D. (2005). *Letters to a young conservative*. New York: Basic Books. (Original work published 2002)

- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1963, March 16). *On Stalin* [Reprint of Journal Article]. Retrieved August 20, 2010, from Marxist-Leninist Translations and Reprints Web site: [http://www.mltranslations.org/Miscellaneous/Du BoisJVS.htm](http://www.mltranslations.org/Miscellaneous/Du%20BoisJVS.htm)
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1976). *The correspondence of W.E.B. Du Bois: Volume 2 selections, 1934-1944* (H. Aptheker, Ed.). Cambridge: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1988). *Against Racism: Unpublished essays, papers, addresses, 1871-1961* (2nd ed.) (H. Aptheker, Ed.). Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1988). *The autobiography of W.E.B. Du Bois: A soliloquy on viewing my life from the last decade of its first century* (10th ed.). NA, United States of America: International Publishers Co., Inc. (Original work published 1968)
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1989). *The souls of black folk*. (D. Gibson, Ed.). New York: Penguin Press. (Original work published 1903)
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1989). *The souls of black folk*. New York: Penguin Press. (Original work published 1903)
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1997). *The correspondence of W.E.B. Du Bois: Volume 3, selections 1944-1963* (H. Aptheker, Ed.). Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press. (Original work published 1978)
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1997). *The correspondence of W.E.B. Du Bois: Volume 1, selections 1877-1934* (H. Aptheker, Ed.). Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press. (Original work published 1973)
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (2001). *The Education of Black People: Ten critiques, 1906-1960* (H. Aptheker, Ed.). New York: Monthly Review Press.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (2003, November Originally printed 1920). The souls of white folks.

Monthly Review, 55(6), 44-58.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (2005). *W.E.B. Du Bois on Asia: Crossing the color line* (B. Mullen & C. Watson, Eds.). Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (2010, November 22). In N. Bond (Ed.), *Why I won't vote*. Retrieved November 22, 2010, from Black Economic Development Web site: <http://blackeconomicdevelopment.com/why-i-wont-vote-by-web-du-bois-the-nation-20-october-1956/>

Duncker, P. (1996). *Hallucinating Foucault*. Hopewell, NJ: The Ecco Press.

Dykhuisen, G. (1973). *The life and mind of John Dewey*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois Univ. Press.

Economist Intelligence Unit. (2007). *The 2007 e-readiness rankings: A white paper from the Economist Intelligence Unit* (The Economist Intelligence Unit ranking of information and communication technology). New York: The Economist Intelligence Unit Ltd. in conjunction with IBM Institute for Business Readiness

Einstein, A. (2004, May). Why socialism. *Monthly Review*, 56(1), 44-51.

Eldridge, M. (2005, Winter). What a pragmatist may be a pluralist. *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, 91(1), 119-122.

Epstein, B. (2001, Sept). Anarchism and the anti-globalization movement. *Monthly Review*, 1(14), 1-14.

Epstein, K., & Scott, M. (2008, May 23). The new global hunt for tax cheats. *Business Week*, 1-2. Retrieved September 10, 2009, from Business Week Web site: <http://>

www.businessweek.com/globalbiz/content/may2008/
gb20080523_754004_page_2.htm

Experience. (2010). In *Visual Thesaurus*. Retrieved March 25, 2010, from Visual Thesaurus Web site: <http://www.visualthesaurus.com/>

Eyerman, R. (1981). False consciousness and ideology in Marxist theory. *Acta Sociologica*, 1/2(24), 43-56.

Fadiman, C. (Ed.). (1939). *I believe: The personal philosophies of certain eminent men and women of our time*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Feldman, D. (1999). Twenty-five years of the erosion in curriculum: The committee of ten to the cardinal principles. *Research for Educational Reform*, 10(2), 41-50.

Feyerabend, P. (1966, Sep). Dialectical materialism and the quantum theory. *Slavic Review*, 25(3), 414-417.

Feyerabend, P. (1969, Nov 20). Science without experience. *Journal of Philosophy*, 66(22), 791-794.

Feyerabend, P. (1987, Summer). Critical inquiry. *Critical Theory*, 13(4), 700-711.

Feyerabend, P. (1989, Aug). Realism and the historicity of knowledge. *Journal of Philosophy*, 86(8), 393-406.

Feyerabend, P. (1995). *Killing time: The autobiography of Paul Feyerabend*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Feyerabend, P. (1999). *Conquest of abundance: A tale of abstraction versus the richness of being*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Feyerabend, P. (2002). *Against method*. New York: Verso [A division of New Left Books]. (Original work published 1975)

- Field, M. (1994, September 19). Doris Lessing: Why do we remember? *Publishers Weekly*, pp. 47-49. Retrieved August 5, 2009, from Publishers Weekly Web site: <http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/BioRC>
- Finn, C., Jr. (Fall, 2001). In *Schools of education: Toward pluralism in education* (4th ed., Vol. 14, pp. 63-69). Princeton, NJ: Academic Questions.
- Finn, C., Jr., Steiner, D., & Stotsky, S. (Fall, 2001). Schools of education: Reforms or alternatives? An apologia for ed schools. In *Academic Questions* (4th ed., Vol. 14, pp. 49-54). Princeton, NJ: Academic Questions.
- Fishman, D. (1999). *The case for pragmatic psychology*. New York: New York University.
- Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punishment* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books - Division of Random House, Inc. (Original work published 1975)
- Franklin, B. (2000). *The autobiography of Benjamin Franklin* (F. Pine, Ed.). New York: Henry Holt and Company. (Original work published 1916)
- Freire, P. (2006). *Pedagogy of the oppressed: Thirtieth anniversary editions* (M. Ramos, Trans.). New York: Continuum International Publishing. (Original work published 1970)
- Friedman, G. (1981). *The Political Philosophy of the Frankfurt School*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Frith, M. (2001, August 14). Fight the feminists, Lessing tells men. *The Evening Standard London, England*), p. 4. Retrieved June 10, 2009, from <http://galenet.galegroup.com> The Evening Standard (London, England) Web site: <http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/BioRC>

- Fullan, M. (Ed.). (2009). *The challenge of change: Start school improvement now!* (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Garrison, J. (1997). *Dewey and eros: Wisdom and the desire in the art of teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Garrison, J. (200, Spring). Curriculum, critical common-sensism, scholasticism, and the growth of democratic character. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 24, 179-211.
- Gay, P. (1998). *My German Question: Growing up in Nazi Germany*. New Haven, CT: Yale Press.
- Gilroy, Pl. (1993). *Black Atlantic: Modernity and double consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gilroy, Pl. (1993). *Black Atlantic: Modernity and double consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Giroux, H. (1992, Summer). Language, difference, and curriculum theory. *Theory Into Practice*, 31(3), 2219-227.
- Giroux, H. (2000). Racial politics, pedagogy, and the crisis of representation in academic multiculturalism. *Social Identities*, 6(4), 493-510.
- Giroux, H. (2004). Cultural studies and the politics of public pedagogy: Making the political pedagogical. *Parallax*, 10(2), 73-89.
- Goldman, E. (1910). The social importance of the modern school. *Emma Goldman Papers, manuscripts, and Archives Division*, 5(1), 2-3. [Http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/anarchist_archives/goldman/socimportms.html](http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/anarchist_archives/goldman/socimportms.html) December 15, 2009, Anarchy Archives: An online research center on the history and theory

of anarchism Web site: The New York Public Library: <http://>

dwardmac.pitzer.edu:16080/Anarchist_archives

Greene, M. (1993, Winter). Diversity and inclusion: Toward a curriculum for human beings. *Teachers College Record*, 95(2), 211-221.

Greene, M. (2000). Imagining futures. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 32(2), 267-280.

Greene, M. (2001). An approach to the constitution of democracy. *Theory Into Practice*, 15(1), 15-22.

Grelle, B. (1987 Fall). Christian political ethics and western Marxism. *The Journal of Religious Ethics*, 15(2), 173-199.

Griesman, H., & Ritzer, G. (1981, Spring). Max Weber, critical theory, and the administered world. *Qualitative Sociology*, 4(1), 34-55.

Guevara, E. (1962). *Che Guevara and Guerrilla Warfare* (H. Peterson, Ed.). New York: Praeger. (Original work published 1961)

Guevara, E. (1987). *Che Guevara and the Cuban Revolution: Writings and speeches of Ernesto Che Guevara* (J. Marit', Trans.) (D. Deutschmann, Ed.). Sydney, Australia: Pathfinder/Pacific and Asia.

Guevara, E. (1996). *Episodes of the Cuban Revolutionary War 1956-1958* (M. Watson, Ed.). New York: Pathfinder/Pacific and Asia.

Guevara, E. C. (1987). *Che Guevara and the Cuban Revolution: Writings and speeches of Ernesto Che Guevara* (J. Marit', Trans.) (D. Deutschmann, Ed.). Sydney, Australia: Pathfinder/Pacific and Asia.

Gunning, T. (2008). *Creating literacy instruction for all students* (Six ed.). Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Gur-Ze'ev, I. (1998). Walter Benjamin and Max Horkheimer: From utopia to redemption.

The Journal of Jewish Thought, 8, 119-155.

Hailman, W. (1910, Sept 10). The school and life. *Mother Earth*, 5(1), 231-234.

Hanford, J. (Ed.). (2008). *Doris Lessing: A retrospective*. [Http://dorislessing.org/biography.html](http://dorislessing.org/biography.html)

May 1, 2009, Doris Lessing - Biography Web site: [http://](http://dorislessing.org/index.html)

dorislessing.org/index.html

Harper, D. (2010). Democracy. In *Online etymology dictionary*. Retrieved May 15, 2010,

from Online Etymology Dictionary Web site: <http://www.etymonline.com>

He, M. F. (2002). A narrative inquiry of cross-cultural lives: Lives in China. *Journal of*

Curriculum Studies, 34(3), 301-321.

Held, D. (1980). *Introduction to Critical Theory: From Horkheimer to Habermas*. Los

Angeles: University of California Press.

Henderson, D. (1993). Thorstein Veblen. In *Library of Economics and Liberty*. Retrieved

July 5, 2009, from The Concise Encyclopedia of Economics Web site: [http://](http://www.econlib.org/library/Enc1/bios/Veblen.html)

www.econlib.org/library/Enc1/bios/Veblen.html

Henderson-Fleck, A. (1998, May/June). The family as moral community: A social work

perspective. *Families in Society*, 79(3), 233-240.

Henry, D. (2003, Fall). Intellectual integrity in the Christian scholar's life. *Christian*

Scholar's Review, 33(1), 55-74.

Herf, J. (1999, Spring). Striking a balance: Remembering 1968 and after. *Partisan*

Review, 66(2), 280-289.

- Herrenvolk. (n.d.). In *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved October 22, 2009, from
Encyclopedia Britannica Online Web site: [http://www.britannica.com/
EBchecked/topic/263695/Herrenvolk](http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/263695/Herrenvolk)
- Herring, M. (Summer, 1983). The curriculum of capitalism. *Contemporary Education*,
54(4), 250-256.
- Heyneman, S. (2004). On the international dimension of education and social justice.
Journal of Education, 89(3), 83-102.
- Hirsch, E. D. (2006). *The knowledge deficit: Closing the shocking education gap*. New
York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Hollander, P. (2000, Jan./Feb). Marxism and western intellectuals in the post-communist
period. *Society*, 22-28.
- Horowitz, R. (1995, Nov./Dec). A 75-year legacy on assessment: Reflections from an
interview with Ralph Tyler. *Journal of Education Research*, 89(21), 68-76.
- Houston, P. (2005). Faith and fear. *School Administrator*, 62(8), 62.
- Huebner, D. (1999). *The lure of the transcendent: Collected works by Dwayne E.*
Huebner (V. Hillis & W. Pinar, Eds.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
Associates, Inc. Publishers.
- Hughes, J. (2004). Unspeakable utopia: Art and the return to the theological in the
Marxism of Adorno and Horkheimer. *Cross Currents*, 53(4), 475-492.
- Hui, W. (1998, Summer). Contemporary Chinese thought and question of modernity: The
end of history? *Social Text*, 16(2), 9-44.
- Illich, I. (1970). *Deschooling society*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, Inc.
(Original work published 1971)

- James, H. (1907). *The American Scene*. London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd.
- James, W. (1948). *Essays in pragmatism*. New York: Hafner Publishing.
- James, W. (2000). *Pragmatism and the meaning of truth* (10th ed.) (A. Ayers, Ed.).
Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Jay, M. (1973). *The dialectical imagination: A history of the Frankfurt School and the
Institute for Social Research, 1923-1950*. Los Angeles: University of California
Press.
- Jay, M. (2003). Critical race theory, multicultural education, and the hidden curriculum
of hegemony. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 5(4), 3-9.
- Jensen, D., & Dodge, C. (2001). You may be an anarchist and not even know it. *The Utne
Reader*, 10(105), 48-56.
- Jensen, R. (2004, Spring). Daggers, rifles, and dynamite: Anarchist terrorism in
nineteenth century Europe. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 16(1), 116-153.
- Johnson, S. (2001, Winter). Cornel West, African American, critical thought and the
quest for social justice. *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 32(4), 547-572.
- Jowett, B., & Butcher, S. (1964). *Politics and Poetics / Aristotle* (B. Jowett & S. Butcher,
Trans.). New York: Heritage Press.
- Judy, R. (2001, Fall). Beside two camps: Paul Gilroy and the critique of raciology.
Boundary, 2(28:3), 207-216.
- Kadlec, A. (2007). *Dewey's critical pragmatism*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, a
Division of Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Kadlec, D. (2000). *Mosaic of modernism: Anarchy, pragmatism, culture*. Baltimore: John
Hopkins University Press.

- Kim, P., & Marshall, J. (2005). Synoptic curriculum texts: representation of contemporary curriculum scholarship. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 37(3), 292-311.
- Kliebard, H. (2004). *The struggle for an American curriculum: 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge.
- Koopman, C. (2007). Language as a form of experience: Reconciling classical pragmatism and neopragmatism. *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, 43(4), 694-726.
- Kournay, J. (2006, Dec). Getting philosophy of science socially connected. *Philosophy of Science*, 79(na), 991-1002.
- Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities: Children in America's public schools*. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc.
- Kozol, J. (2005). *The shame of a nation: The restoration of apartheid schooling in America*. New York: Three Rivers Publishing Group (a division of Random House)
- Kravchenko, V. (1946). *I Chose Freedom: The personal and political life of a Soviet official*. Garden City, NY: Garden City Publishing Co., Inc.
- Leonard, T. (2005). Retrospectives: Eugenics and economics in the progressive age. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 19(4), 207-224.
- Leopold, D. (2003). A left Helgian anarchism. *The European Legacy*, 8(6), 777-786.
- Lessing unhappy with Nobel Prize win. (2008, May 11). *UPI News Track*, p.p. NA.
- Lessing, D. (1949). *Doris Lessing: Under my skin - volume one of my autobiography to 1949*. New York: Harper Collins Publishing.

- Lessing, D. (1962). *The Golden Notebook*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Lessing, D. (1985). *The Good Terrorist*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.
- Lessing, D. (1992). *African Laughter: Four visits to Zimbabwe*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Lessing, D. (1997). *Walking in the Shade: Volume two of my autobiography 1949-1962*. New York: Harpers Perennial.
- Lessing, D. (2002). *The Grass is singing*. New York: First Perennial Classics. (Original work published 1950)
- Lessing, D. (2007). Being prohibited. *New Statesman*, *Original publication year April 21, 1956*(October), 62. Retrieved May 5, 2009, from www.newstatesman.com/from-our-archive
- Lessing, D. (2008). *Alfred and Emily* (1st ed.). New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Lessing, D. (2008, September 15). Ordinary People. *The New Statesman*. Retrieved February 1, 2009, from New Statesman Web site: <http://www.newstatesman.com/from-our-archive>
- Lessing, D. (February, 2008). Not winning the Nobel prize: It is the story teller that will create us [Lecture to Nobel Peace Prize Committee; December 7, 2007]. *Vital Speeches of the Day*, 58-63.
- Levine, B. (Ed.). (1996). *Works about John Dewey*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Lewis, D. (2000). W.E.B. Du Bois: The fight for equality and the American century 1919-1963. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Liaise. (2009). In *Visual Thesaurus*. Retrieved February 15, 2009, from Thinkmap Visual

Thesaurus Web site: <http://www.visualthesaurus.com>

Likona, T. (2001, Winter). What is good character? And how can we develop it in our children. *Reclaiming Children and Youth*, 9(4), 239-251.

Lipset, S. (2001). *It didn't happen here: Why socialism failed in the United States*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company Publishing.

Lipset, S. (April, 2001). The Americanization of the European Left. *Journal of Democracy*, 12(2), 74-87.

Lloyd, B. (1997). *Left out: Pragmatism, exceptionalism, and the poverty of American Marxism, 1890-1922*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Locke, J. (1996). *John Locke: An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (Abridged ed.) (K. Winkler, Ed.). Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company. (Original work published 1689)

Locke, J. (1996). *John Locke: Some Thoughts Concerning Education and of the Conduct of the Understanding* (Abridged ed.) (R. Grant & N. Tarcov, Eds.). Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company. (Original work published 1693)

Loewen, J. (1996). *Lies my history teacher told me*. New York: Touchstone Press.

Maddock, T. (1999). Critical theory in education. *Philosophy of Education Society of Australasia*, 43-61.

Marcuse, H. (1966). *Eros and civilization: A philosophical inquiry into Freud*. Boston: Beacon Press. (Original work published 1955)

Marcuse, H. (1980). *Reason and revolution* (8th ed.). Boston: Beacon Press - Division of Humanities Press, Inc. (Original work published 1941)

- Marcuse, H. (1987). *Hegel's ontology and the theory of historicity* (2nd ed., S. Benhabib, Trans.) . Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. (Original work published 1932)
- Marcuse, H. (1991). *One Dimensional Man: Studies in the ideology of advanced industrial society* (2nd ed., D. Kellner, Trans.) . Boston: Beacon Press. (Original work published 1964)
- Marcuse, H. (1991). *One-dimensional man: Studies in the ideology of advanced industrial society* (2nd ed., D. Kellner, Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press. (Original work published 1964)
- Marcuse, H. (1998). *Technology, war, and fascism: Collected papers of Herbert Marcuse* (Vol. 1) (D. Kellner, Ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Margonis, F. (2007). Reconstructing pragmatism to address racial injustice. *Journal of Philosophy of Educations*, 41(1), 141-149.
- Marroquin, A. (Ed.). (2002). *The invisible hand: The wealth of Adam Smith*. Honolulu, HI: University Press of the Pacific.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (2006). *Designing Qualitative Research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Martin, J. (2002). *The education of John Dewey: a biography*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Marx, K. (1906). *Capital, a critique of political economy* (S. Moore & E. Aveling, Trans.) (F. Engels, Ed.). New York: Modern Library.
- Marx, K. (1999). *Capital: An abridged edition* (D. McLellan, Ed.). Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Marx, K. (2009, May 1). In R. Rojas (Ed.), *A contribution to the critique of political economy*. Retrieved May 1, 2009, from <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1859/critique-pol-economy/preface.htm>
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1970). *The German ideology* (C. Arthur, Ed.). New York: International Publishers Company. (Original work published 1947)
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2001). In A. West (Ed.), *Marx/Engels Selected Works, Volume Three: The origin of the family, private property and the state*. Retrieved June 2, 2009, from [http://www.marxists.org/archive Marx/Engels Internet Archive \(marxists.org\) 1993, 1999, 2000. Web site: http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1884/origin-family/index.htm](http://www.marxists.org/archive/Marx/Engels%20Internet%20Archive%20(marxists.org)%201993,%201999,%202000.%20Web%20site:%20http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1884/origin-family/index.htm)
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2004). *Communist manifesto: Wages, price, and profit capital* (H. Griffith, Ed.). Great Britain: CRW Publishing Limited. (Original work published 1848)
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2008). *Articles by Marx in the New York Daily Tribune*. Retrieved June 15, 2009, from Press Articles by Marx and Engels Web site: <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/subject/newspapers/new-york-tribune.htm>
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2009, May 10). In A. Blunden (Ed.), *Marx and Engels internet archive*. Retrieved June 9, 2009, from Marx and Engels Internet Archive Web site: <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/index.htm>
- M'Baye, B. (2004, August). Africa, race, and culture in the narratives of W.E.B. Du Bois. *Philadelphia Africana*, 7(2), 33-46.
- McCann, C. (Ed.). (1992). *Martin Heidegger: Critical assessments* (Vol. 3). London: Routledge.

- McDermott, J. (Ed.). (1981). *The Philosophy of John Dewey: Two volumes in one - The structure of experience and The lived experience*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- McLaren, P. (1999). Revolutionary leadership and pedagogical praxis: Revisiting the legacy of Che Guevara. *International Journal of Leadership*, 2(3), 269-292.
- McLaren, P. (2000). *Che Guevara, Paulo Freire and the pedagogy of revolution*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- McLaren, P. (2008). This fist called my heart: Public pedagogy in the belly of the beast. *Antipode*, 40(3), 472-481.
- McLaughlin, N. (1998). How to become a forgotten intellectual: Intellectual movements and the rise and fall of Erich Fromm. *Sociological Forum*, 131(2), 215-246.
- McLaughlin, N. (1999). Origin myths in the social sciences: Fromm, the Frankfurt School, and the emergence of critical theory. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 24(1), 109-139.
- McNeal, K. (2005). The influence of multicultural teacher education program on teachers' multicultural practice. *Intercultural Education*, 16(4), 404-419.
- Megill, A. (1985). *Prophets of extremity: Nietzsche, Heidegger, Foucault, Derrida*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Menand, L. (2001). *Metaphysical club: A story of ideas in American*. New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux.
- Meriwether, C. (1907). *Our colonial curriculum 1607-1776*. Washington, DC: Capital Publishing Company.

- Meyenn, R., & Parker, J. (1999). Necessary but not sufficient: Reconceptualizing primary teacher education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 27(3), 173-182.
- Misak, C. (2005, Winter). Pragmatism and Pluralism. *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, 91(1), 1129-135.
- Moore, J. (2003). Booker T. Washington and W.E.B, Du Bois, and the struggle for racial uplift. Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources Inc.
- Morgan, J. (2004). Contemporary China, anachronistic or Marxism? The continued explanatory power of Marxism. *Critical Asian Studies*, 36(1), 65-90.
- Morris, M. (2002). Ecological consciousness and curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 34(5), 571-587.
- Morris, M. (2003). Archiving Derrida. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 35(3), 297-312.
- Murray, C., & Herrnstein, R. (1994). *The bell curve: Intelligence and class structure in American life*. New York: Simon and Schuster Publishing.
- Nash, L. (2000, Jan.- Feb). The brave new world. *Sojourner's Magazine*, 29(1), 20-23.
- Nation Master. (2010, May). *Labor Statistics: Female economic activity growth by country* [Data base of various statistics]. Available May 5, 2010, from NationMaster.com Web site: http://www.nationmaster.com/graph/lab_fem_eco_act_gro-labor-female-economic-activity-growth
- National Institute for Mental Health. (October 22, 2009). *Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD)* [Information on the subject of post-traumatic stress disorders]. Available October 25, 2009, from <http://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/topics/post-traumatic-stress-disorder-ptsd/index.shtml>

- NEA Research. (2009, December). NEA Rankings and Estimates 2009. In National Education Association (Ed.), *Rankings and Estimates 2009* (Compilation of financing of education by state, pp. 24-50). Retrieved February 15, 2010, from NEA-National Education Association Web site: <http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/010rankings.pdf>
- Nicholls, J. (1989). *The competitive ethos and democratic education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Noonan, J. (2004). One-dimensional criticism: A Marcusean reflection on Habermas's critical theory. *The European Legacy*, 9(4), 469-480.
- Novack, G. (1975). *Pragmatism versus Marxism: An appraisal of John Dewey's philosophy* (1st ed.). New York: Pathfinder Press, Inc.
- Nowakowski, J. (2003, May). On educational evaluation: A conversation with Ralph Tyler. *Educational Leadership*, 24-29.
- Paeth, S. (2005). Jurgen Moltmann's public theology. *Political Theology*, 6(2), 215-234.
- Paine, T. (1988). *The age of reason* (P. Foner, Ed.). New York: Kensington Publishing Company.
- Paine, T. (2008). *The Age of Reason*. New York: Forgotten Books. (Original work published 1796)
- Papastehpanou, M. (2006). Postmodernism and the revival of socialism as critique. *The European Legacy*, 11(3), 242-258.
- Papastephanou, M. (2006). Postmodernism and the revival of socialism as critique. *The European Legacy*, 11(3), 241-258.

- Parker, F. (1894). Democracy and the common school. In *Encyclopedia Britannica* (pp. 420-451). Retrieved March 20, 2009, from EBSCO / Annals of American History Web site: <http://america.eb.com/america/print>
- Peirce, C. (1997). *Pragmatism as a principle and method of right thinking* (P. Turrisi, Ed.). Albany: State University of New York Press. (Original work published 1903)
- Peters, M. (2004). Editorial: Critical race matters. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 36(2), 113-114.
- Pettinger, A. (1998, Winter). Enduring fortresses: A review of the Black Atlantic. *Research in African American Literature*, 100(1), 142-147.
- Pettinger, A. (2001, Winter). Enduring fortresses: A review of the Black Atlantic. *Research in African American Literature*, 100(1), 142-147.
- Pew Hispanic Center. (April 15, 2009). Mexican immigrants in the United States 2008. In *Pew Research Center Project* (Hispanic immigrants living in the U.S, pp. 1-5). Retrieved May 25, 2009, from Pewhispanic.org Web site: <http://pewhispanic.org/files/factsheets/47.pdf>
- Pinar, W. (1992, Summer). Dreamt into existence. *Theory Into Practice*, 31(3), 228-235.
- Pinar, W. (1999). Not burdens - breakthroughs. *The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education*, 29(3), 365-367.
- Pinar, W. (2000). *Curriculum studies: The reconceptualization* (W. Pinar, Ed.). Troy, NY: Educators International Press, Inc.
- Pinar, W. (2001). *The gender of racial politics and violence in America: Lynching, prison rape, and the crisis of masculinity*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

- Pinar, W., Kincheloe, J., & Steinberg, S. (Eds.). (1999). *Contemporary Curriculum Discourses: Twenty years of JCT*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
- Pinar, W., Reynolds, W., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. (2002). *Understanding curriculum: An introduction to the study of historical and contemporary discourses* (Vol. 17). New York: Peter Lang Publishing. (Original work published 1995)
- Pippin, R. (2004, Winter). Critical inquiry and critical theory. *Critical Inquiry*, 30(2), 424-428.
- Plummer, G., Lauren, P., Horne, E., & Et. al. (2003). *Window on freedom: Race, civil rights, and foreign affairs 1945-1988* (G. Plummer, Ed.). Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Porter, B. (2003). 9/11....1910. *History Today*, 53(45), 54-55.
- Prawat, R. (2001, August). Dewey and Peirce, the philosopher's philosopher. *Teachers College Record*, 10(4), 668-721.
- Putnam, R. (2006). You gotta have friends. *Time*, 168(1), 36.
- R.M. (2010, March 29). Seven questions for Diane Ravitch [Web Blog]. Available March 29, 2010, from The Economist - Democracy in America: <http://www.economist.com/blogs/democracyinamerica>
- Ramberg, B. (2009). *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy: Richard Rorty* (Spring ed.). Retrieved February 15, 2009, from The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy Web site: <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2009/entries/rorty/>
- Ravitch, D. (2001). *Left back: A century of battles over school reform*. New York: Touchstone.

Reid, W. (2001, Fall). Rethinking Schwab: Curriculum theorizing as visionary activity.

Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 17(1), 29-41.

Reksulak, M. (2009, July 18). Profits as potential measures of failure. *Savannah Morning*

News, p. 1B and 5B.

Resnick, M. (1970). *The Black Beret*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Reynolds, W. (2003). Debate, nostalgia, and resentment. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*,

33(4), 445-451.

Ritzer, G. (Ed.). (2005). *Encyclopedia of Social Theory* (Vol. 1). Thousand Oaks, CA:

Sage Publishers.

Robbins, L. (1945). *An essay on the nature and significance of economic science* (4th

ed.). Retrieved December 19, 2009, from <http://mises.org/> Ludwig von Mises

Institute Web site: <http://mises.org/books/robbinessay2.pdf>

Rose, M. (1990). *Lives on the boundary*. New York: Penguin Books. (Original work

published 1989)

Rose, M. (1995). *Possible lives: The promise of public education in America*. New York:

Houghton Mifflin Company.

Rose, M. (2009). *Why school: Reclaiming education for all of us*. New York: The New

Press.

Ryan, A. (1995). *John Dewey: And the high tide of American liberalism*. New York: W.

W. Norton & Company.

Ryder, J. (Winter, 1999). Review - Left out: Pragmatism, exceptionalism, and the poverty

of American Marxism, 1890-1922. *Transactions of the Charles Peirce Society*,

35(1), 197-203.

- Scatamburlo-D, V., & McLaren, P. (2004). Class dismissed: Historical materialism and the politics of difference. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 36(2), 183-199.
- Schemo, D. (1994, Nov 2). At the Guggenheim with Doris Lessing: A portrait unwinds, as in life. *The New York Times*, p. Living Desk.
- Schofield, P. (2006). *Utility and democracy: The political thought of Jeremy Bentham*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schubert, W., Schubert A., Thomas., T., & Carroll, W. (2002). *Curriculum Books: The first hundred years* (2nd ed., Vol. 175). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Schweiker, W. (1995, July). Power and agency of God. *Theology Today*, 52(2), 204-224.
- Seigfried, C. (1996). *Pragmatism and Feminism: Reweaving the social fabric*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Serres, M. (2004). *Genesis* (J. Genevieve & J. Nielson, Trans.). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Sharp, M. (2002, Summer). Do universals have a reference? On the critical theory of Herbert Marcuse. *Philosophy of Today*, 46(2), 193-208.
- Shaw, T. (2004, Summer-fall). Two warring ideals. Double consciousness, dialogue, and African American patriotism post 9/11. *Journal of African American Studies*, 8(1 & 2), 20-37.
- Sheehan, T., & Palmer, R. (1997). *Edmund Husserl: Psychological and transcendental phenomenology and the confrontation with Heidegger (1927-1931)* (T. Sheehan & R. Palmer, Eds.). Accord Station, Hingham, MA: Kluwer Academic Press.
- Simich, J., & Tilman, R. (Sept., 1980). Critical theory and institutional economics: Frankfurt's encounter with Veblen. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 14(3), 631-648.

- Simonelli, D. (2003, Summer). Anarchy, pop, and violence: Punk rock subculture and the rhetoric of class 1976-1978. *Contemporary British History*, 16(2), 121-144.
- Sirota, A. (2001, Spring). Neo-Marxism: An attempt at reformation. *Russian Studies in Philosophy*, 39(4), 32-53.
- Sizer, T. (2004). *Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. (Original work published 1984)
- Skelton, J. (2000). A reconceptualization of how we study racial prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4(4), 374-390.
- Smith, A. (1999). *The wealth of nations*. New York: Penguin Publishers. (Original work published 1776)
- Smith, A. (2002). *The invisible hand: The wealth of Adam Smith* (A. Marroquin, Ed.). Honolulu, HI: University Press of the Pacific.
- Smith, J. (2001, August 14). Don't start feeling sorry for men: The novelist Doris Lessing claims that men are being humiliated. *The Evening Standard*, p. 24. Retrieved June 5, 2009, from <http://galenet.galenetgroup.com> The Evening Standard (London, England) Web site: <http://galenet.galenetgroup.com/servlet/BioRC>
- Smith, N. (2005). Hope and critical theory. *Critical Horizons*, 6(1), 45-61.
- Soltis, J. (1990, Spring). A reconceptualization of educational foundations. *Teachers College Record*, 9(3), 311-321.
- Sowell, T. (1993). *Inside American Education: The decline, the deception, the dogmas*. New York: Free Press.
- Spencer, H. (1954). *Social Statics*. New York: Robert Schalkenbach Foundation.

Staff Editors Visual Thesaurus. (2010). Experience. In *Think Map Visual Thesaurus* (p.

1). Retrieved March 25, 2010, from Visual Thesaurus Web site: <http://www.visualthesaurus.com/>

Staff Editors, & Reports. (Eds.). (n.d.). *The World Bank*. Retrieved February 15, 2010,

from The World Bank Web site: <http://go.worldbank.org/EROS2XNAG0>

Staff Reporters. (2009, December 9). America's Best High Schools: Top International

Baccalaureate Schools. *U.S. News and World Reports*. <Http://www.usnews.com/>

sections/education/high-schools U.S. News and World Report: [http://](http://www.usnews.com/articles/education/high-schools/2009/12/09/americas-best-high-schools-gold-medal-list.html)

www.usnews.com/articles/education/high-schools/2009/12/09/americas-best-high-schools-gold-medal-list.html

Staley, K. (1999). Logic, liberty, and anarchy: Mill and Feyerabend on scientific method.

The Social Science Journal, 36(4), 603-614.

Stanfield, J. (1989). Veblenian and neo-Marxism perspectives on the cultural crisis of late

Capitalism. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 23(3), 717-734.

Stern, S. (2009). E. D. Hirsch's curriculum for democracy. *City Journal*, 19(4), 1.

Retrieved March 10, 2010, from City Journal - Manhattan Institute Web site:

http://www.city-journal.org/2009/19_4_hirsch.html

Sumara, D. (2002). *Why reading literature in school still matters: Imagination,*

interpretation, insight. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Press.

Sundquist, E. (Ed.). (1996). *Oxford reader; W.E.B. Du Bois*. New York: Oxford Press.

Swett, J. (1900). *American public school: History and pedagogics*. New York: American

Book Company.

- Talisse, R. (2004, Winter). Towards a Peircean politics of inquiry. *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, 11(1), 21-38.
- Tarver, E. (2007). Particulars, practices, and pragmatic feminism: Breaking rules and rulings with William James. *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, 21(4), 275-290.
- Taylor, F. (1998). *Principles of Scientific Management*. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications. (Original work published 1911)
- Taylor, P. (2004, Jan). What's the use of calling Du Bois a pragmatist? *Metaphilosophy*, 35(1/2), 99-114.
- Thomas, M. (1999, Oct). No one is telling us what to do: Anarchists schools in Britain, 1890-1961. *Historical Research*, 77(97), 406-436.
- Thomas, T., & Schubert, W. (1997). Recent curriculum theory: Proposals for understanding critical praxis, inquiry, and expansion. *Educational Theory*, 47(2), 262-283.
- Tsou, J. (2003). Reconsidering Feyerabend's anarchism. *Perspective on Science*, 11(2), 208-232.
- Tyler, R. (December 1986/January 1987). The five most significant curriculum events in the twentieth century. *Educational Leadership*, 36-38.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2009, October). *Census bureau statistics and facts*. Retrieved March 25, 2010, from U.S. Census Bureau Web site: <http://www.census.gov/>
- U.S. Government - Energy Information Administration. (September 1, 2009). Cushing, OK Crude Oil Future Contract. In *Official energy statistics from the U.S. Government* (Petroleum Navigator). Retrieved September 1, 2009, from Energy

Information Administration Web site: <http://tonto.eia.doe.gov/dnav/pet/hist/rclcl1d.htm>

United Nations Dept. of Public Information. (2010, February 10). *The United Nations Member States*. Retrieved February 10, 2010, from <http://www.un.org/en/index.shtml> Welcome to the United Nations Web site: <http://www.un.org/en/members/>

United States Central Intelligence Agency. (2009, August). CIA World Fact Book. In *World Fact Book* (Number of cell phone and subscribers in the U.S. and the world). Retrieved January 5, 2009, from CIA World Fact Book Web site: <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/>

Vallance, E. (1982, Winter). The practical uses of curriculum theory. *Theory Into Practice*, 2(1), 4-11.

Van Dover, J. (1989). The design of anarchy. *Early American Literature* (24), 237-242.

Van Loon, H. (2009). Hendrik Willem van Loon quotes [Bibliography]. Retrieved June 1, 2009, from ThinkExist.com Web site: <http://thinkexist.com/quotation>

Veblen, T. (1915). *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: Macmillan and Company.

Veblen, T. (1920). *The vested interests and the common man* (2nd ed.). New York: B.W. Huebsch, Inc. (Original work published 1919)

Veblen, T. (1957). *The higher learning in America: A memorandum on the conduct of universities by business men*. New York: Sagamore Press. (Original work published 1918)

- Veblen, T. (2003). *The Place of Science in Modern Civilization and Other Essays* (3rd ed.) (W. Samuels, Ed.). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers. (Original work published 1919)
- Von-Kuehnelt-Leddihn, E. (1978). The growth of anarchy from the continent. *National Review*, 30(21), 656.
- Vousden, P. (2007, Oct 24). Attacks on 9/11 no big deal says Nobel winner; Lessing. *The Daily Mail (London, England)*, p. 12.
- Walker, D. (1982, Winter). Curriculum theory is many things to many people. *Theory Into Practice*, 21(1), 62-66.
- Ward, R. (2000, Spring). Experience as religious discovery in Edwards and Peirce. *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, 36(2), 297-309.
- Watson, K. (1999). Comparative educational research: The need for reconceptualization and fresh insights. *Compare*, 29(3), 233-248.
- Watson, P. (2000, Summer). Globalism, gender, and class. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 2(2), 185-213.
- Webber, J. (2001). Why can't we be Deweyan citizens? *Educational Theory*, 51(2), 171-190.
- Webber, J. (2003). *Failure to hold: The politics of school violence*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Webmaster. (2009, June 4). Heidegger's Children: Hannah Arendt, Karl Löwith, Hans Jonas, and Herbert Marcuse [Review of the book *Hannah Arendt, Karl Löwith, Hans Jonas, and Herbert Marcuse*]. *Princeton University Press*, all. Retrieved

August 9, 2009, from Princeton University Press Web site: <http://press.princeton.edu/titles/7136.html>

- Weltman, B. (2002, March). Praxis imperfect. John Goodlad and the social reconstructionist tradition. *Educational Studies*, 33(1), 61-84.
- Westbrook, R. (1991). *John Dewey and American democracy*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Westbrook, R. (2005). *Democratic hope: Pragmatism and the politics of truth*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Westbury, I. (1999). The burdens and excitement of the new curriculum research: A response to Heibowitsh's "The Burden of the New Curriculists". *Curriculum Inquiry*, 29(3), 355-364.
- Westbury, I. (1999). The burdens and excitement of the new curriculum research: A response to Hiebowitsh's "The Burden of the New Curriculists". *Curriculum Inquiry*, 29(3), 355-364.
- Wexler, P. (1981). Body and soul: Sources of social change and strategies of education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 2(3), 247-263.
- Wheatland, T. (2004, Fall). The Frankfurt School's invitation from Columbia University: How the Horkheimer Circle settled on the Morningside Heights. *German Politics and Society*, 77(22), 1-31.
- Wheatland, T. (2004, Winter). Critical theory on Morningside Heights: From Frankfurt mandarins to Columbia sociologists. *German Politics and Society*, 73(22), 57-87.
- White, R., Bloch, E., Frosch, R., & et. al. (1985). Education for the manufacturing world of the future [Review of the symposium presentations *Series on technology and*

- social priorities*]. *National Academy of Engineering*, 1-135. Retrieved March 15, 2009, from Google Books Web site: <http://www.google.com/search>
- Widmaier, W. (2001). Theory as a factor and the theorist as an actor: The pragmatist constructivist lessons of John Dewey and John Kenneth Galbraith. *International Studies Review*(6), 127-145.
- Willard, E. (1987). *A Plan for Improving Female Education: And Mrs. Emma Willard's life and work in Middlebury* (2nd ed.) (E. Brainerd, Ed.). Marietta, GA: Larlin Corporation. (Original work published 1918)
- Wisneski, M. [webmaster]. (Ed.). (2009). *Brown Foundation*. Retrieved January 1, 2009, from Brown Foundation Web site: <http://brownvboard.org/foundation/index.php>
- Woodbridge, R. (1907). *American philosophy, the early schools*. New York: Dodd Mead Publisher.
- Wraga, W. (1999). The progressive vision of general education and the American common school ideal: Implications for curriculum policy, practice, and theory. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 31(5), 523-544.
- Wright, H. (2003). Cultural studies as practice: Making an autobiographical case. *Cultural Studies*, 12(6), 805-822.
- Zahavi, G. (2003, October). The trial of Lee Benson: Communism, white chauvinism, and the foundations of the new political in the United States. *History and Theory*, 42, 332-362.
- Zuss, M. (1997). Strategies of representation: Autobiographical metissage and critical pragmatism. *Educational Theory*, 47(2), 163-179.

Author Note

ⁱⁱ Bennett is a former head of the Federal Department of Education, co-director of Empower America, a Distinguished Fellow in Cultural Policy Studies at the Heritage Foundation, active in Republican Party politics, and is well known for promoting conservative positions on a wide range of issues including immigration reform, terrorism, economic policy, and education.

ⁱⁱ Sowell holds a Ph.D. in Economics, University of Chicago and currently holds the position of Senior Fellow, Hoover Institution. At one time, Sowell claimed to be a Marxist. Though many consider him an African American conservative, Sowell disavows his conservative roots claiming his view aligns with a libertarian position. Sowell's economic writings are generally in support of fiscal conservative policies, but Sowell has been quoted as being in favor of legalization of drugs that seems to validate a libertarian view.

ⁱⁱⁱ Dussel is a Latin American professor who specializes in the area of Latin American liberation philosophy.

^{iv} States fund approximately 80% of the cost of education with the remaining share paid by local school districts. Most states use a complex formula of income tax and property taxes (NEA Research, 2009). For more information, see: NEA Research. (2009, December). NEA Rankings and Estimates 2009. In National Education Association (Ed.), Rankings and Estimates 2009 (Compilation of financing of education by state, pp. 24-50). Retrieved February 15, 2010, from NEA-National Education Association Web site: <http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/010rankings.pdf>

^v As of October 31, 2009 the total federal debt was @12 trillion dollars and climbing. The share of this debt is @\$40,000 per citizen in the United States (Source: http://www.brillig.com/debt_clock/ , *U.S. National Debt Clock*. Retrieved on 10/31/2009.). This does not include what states owe in debt service. Consumer debt as of October 7, 2009 is @\$2.5 trillion dollars and though showed some decline during the recession, is expected to increase once the recession ends (Source: <http://www.federalreserve.gov/releases/g19/Current/>, *Federal Reserve Statistical Release: Consumer Debt*. Retrieved on 10/31/2009.)

^{vi} Some scholars believe H. James is a racist. Some of this belief is that in his observations of African Americans in *The American Scene* (1907), James records scenes that are unflattering portrayals of African Americans. The language stereotypes African Americans as without ambition or without motivation to integrate into society. Henry James is best known for his portrayals of females (early pre-feminist movement characters) and class relations rather than race. There is little in *The American Scene* that differentiates James from other novelists during his time in regards to race and race relations to substantiate the claim. There is enough correspondence between James and Du Bois to believe that James is not hostile to Du Bois. There is little evidence they actually meet though Du Bois made frequent attempts to contact James in person.

^{vii} First published by: Fadiman, C. (Ed.). (1939). *I believe: The personal philosophies of certain eminent men and women of our time*. New York: Simon and Schuster. [Book no longer in print]

^{viii} Greene credits Alfred Schultz for the term “experience and interpretation” from the following source: Schultz, A., *Studies in Social Theory*. Collected Papers II, ed. Arvid Brondersen. The Hague; Martinus Nijhoff, 1964, p. 9

^{ix} In this interview, Lessing compares the Trade Center attacks on 9/11 with the IRA attacks in London during the period of 1969 – 2001; calculating that there are fewer casualties resulting from the 9/11 attacks. She also categorizes Americans as “naïve,” President Bush as a... “world calamity, a member of the social class which has profited from war, and this man as either very stupid or very clever.” To be fair in the same article she claims, “she always hated Tony Blair.”

^x Lessing makes an interesting comparison between her Communist friends and a Moslem [Muslim] friend concerning the familial relationship that members sincerely felt with each other and their vision for a new global society. In this passage she describes a conversation with her Muslim friend; “A Muslim can go anywhere in the world and at once be with people who think exactly the same: don’t forget, the Koran is the mental and moral framework for every Muslim, and the stories and sacred and historical figures in it are shared by the Sheikh of Kuwait and the poor labourer digging the ditch in Indonesia” (Lessing, 1996, p. 281). The passage is interesting in the context of how the construction of contemporary Muslims is similar to that of Marxists, Communists, and Socialists. The worse actions of radical elements of Islam essentialize and identify Muslims as enemies. In an earlier section, Lessing describes a world without capitalists as “paradise.” “Paradise, then, was on the world’s agenda, and soon. Who would lead the world thither? Why, we would, people like us, Communists, the vanguard of the working

class, destined by History for the role. Exactly the same mind-set as my parents, who believed the represented God's will, working by agency of the British Empire, for the good of the world. Or like the framers of the Atlantic Charter (Lessing, 1996, p. 281).” The notion of religious superiority is not confined to Capitalism as she writes on page 282, “This set of mind is religious. In the West, Christianity has shaped our thinking for 2000 years. Poor humanity lives in a vale of tears and suffering (Capitalism), but is saved by a Redeemer (Christ, Lenin, Stalin, Mao etc.), and after a period of pain and confusion (purgatory) there will be a Heaven where all conflict will cease (The State will wither away, Justice will reign.) (Lessing, 1996, p. 282).” The prophetic view is remarkably similar to Christian and Islamic belief related to end of the present world and the rise of a socially just world void of oppression by race, class, and gender.

^{xi} Lessing describes the book cover – “I was soon to have a sharp little lesson in the realities of publishing. The first paperback edition of *The Grass is Singing* had on its front a lurid picture of a blonde cowering terrified while a big buck n_____ [I redacted this word from her original quote as it is too offensive to appear in my dissertation.] (the only way to describe him) stood over her, threatening her with a panga. My protests, on the lines of ‘But Moses the black man was not a great stupid murderous thug,’ were ignored with: “you don’t understand anything about selling books (1997, p. 9).” Lessing also claims that the publisher asked her to change the book to include an “explicit rape scene, in accordance with the mores of the country (1997, p. 8).” I refer to a similar reference on page 98 in discussing the subtle messages of the curriculum of Capitalism

and how the stereotyping of racial groups perpetuates racial economics to the benefit of the wealthy.

^{xii} I have obtained a copy of the original speech by Heidegger at the birthday of Husserl, translated by Thomas Sheehan, Ph.D., Stanford University. There are no dates or other reference notes provided by Sheehan as to when the translation occurs. The original quote from the translated material appears on page 1, paragraph 5.

^{xiii} The validity of this statement is debatable. One resource that sheds some light upon Heidegger's argument that 'none [his students] fell victim to Nazi ideology' is a book by Richard Wolin (2001), *Heidegger's Children: Hannah Arendt, Karl Lowith, Hans Jonas, and Herbert Marcuse*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. The review by the publisher says, "In 1933, Heidegger cast his lot with National Socialism. He squelched the careers of Jewish students and denounced fellow professors whom he considered insufficiently radical. For years, he signed letters and opened lectures with "Heil Hitler!" He paid dues to the Nazi party until the bitter end. Equally problematic for his former students were his sordid efforts to make existential thought serviceable to Nazi ends and his failure to ever renounce these actions (Webmaster / Princeton University Press, para. 2, 2009)." I did not pursue the line of reasoning by Heidegger beyond this point, as the contentiousness between him and Marcuse are only relevant to origination of the notion of a technocracy that is believed to be a metaphor for Fascism – i.e. Nazi Germany.

^{xiv} Freiburg Germany is the home of the University of Freiburg where Heidegger served as Rector of the University. Feyerabend had an interest in a job in Freiburg in the

1960s (p. 127) so he would have been familiar with the history of the University and undoubtedly through association with some of the material of Heidegger.

^{xv} Jung was a neurophysiologist, not to be confused with Carl Jung, the Swiss psychiatrist. In the passage, there is no reference as to the first name of Jung. There are vague details concerning his occupation and where Jung resides (Feyerabend, 1995, p. 137).

^{xvi} I have included these sources as examples of Heideggerian influence on Feyerabend. These books are included as a resource for a wide range of Heidegger material and there are a numerous other sources as well. I reiterate my position that there is no direct connection between Heidegger and Feyerabend; a few scholars and publications have attempted to connect the two.

Cristin, R. (1998). *Heidegger and Leibniz: Reason and the path*. AH Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

McCann, C. (Ed.). (1992). *Martin Heidegger: Critical assessments* (Vol. 3). London: Routledge.

Megill, A. (1985). *Prophets of extremity: Nietzsche, Heidegger, Foucault, Derrida*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

^{xvii} For my readers too young to know this reference, I have included a website for the Hogan's Heroes Show (<http://www.tvland.com/fullepisodes/hogansheroes/>).

^{xviii} The argument that by allowing rogue nations access to the global democratic capitalist marketplace will result in a change towards a more democratic society within their own nation is a persistent theme that crops up in international geo-political

discourses. Why would a nation change when it has all of the benefits and perks of Capitalism, but is unregulated without consequence for repression? Iran, North Korea, Cuba, Saudi Arabia, and a number of African nations are current examples. Sanctions are ineffective because there are geopolitical considerations that undermine sanctions. The power structure of North Korea is unlikely to change, as their quality of life is not affected by sanctions even though their citizens suffer. Another aspect of this report is the assessment of education. “Having access to ICT (information communication technology) counts for little if people do not know how to use it. Literacy and basic education are preconditions for being able to utilize Internet services, but we also consider a population’s “e-literacy”—its experience and comfort with using the Internet—and the extent to which the workforce possesses technical skills. Companies, often start-ups, utilize such skills to develop new, Internet-based business models, creating a virtuous circle that ultimately has a tangible impact on a country’s economic growth. A culture of risk-taking and innovation is critical for this to develop (Economist, 2007, p. 11).” This precisely the type of activity that Capitalism discourages as it increases the likelihood of an increase in the cost of labor and threatens the ability to shift labor cost to less expensive countries by having fewer impoverished countries to competitively battle for industrial manufacturing.

^{xix} Tyler’s article did not contain specific information about the contributions to curriculum of Bobbitt, Charters, and Dale. These brief curriculum bios were obtained from ERIC – Educational Resources Information Center (www.eric.ed.gov/about and www.eric.ed.gov/collection, September 1, 2009).

^{xx} These compromises to freedom are usually promoted as in the interest of national security or in the interests of citizens to protect them. In a democracy, citizens voluntarily concede to the government some of their natural libertarian rights to facilitate order and provide a source for peaceful arbitration of disputes. When libertarian concessions to authority concede too great of advantage to the authoritarian powers, the consequence is fascism. In an authentic democracy the government concedes greater authority to citizens and it is citizens who are responsible for ‘maintaining the balance’ of power. The government is a tool by which citizens restore equilibrium.

^{xxi} There may actually be a third tier that combines both manual labor and technology. Cashiers in retail or fast food workers are required to perform routine manual labor and learn to operate computerized technology. The differentiation of class₁ from class₂ is manual labor is defined by occupations such as farming where physical labor is present whereas techno-labor is defined by call center operations providing technical assistance for computer problems. Regardless, occupations that pay less than a living wage comprise both categories.

^{xxii} State and local governing boards for education often dispute claims of inequitable funding. States claim that state governments return to local governing boards the same ‘per-pupil’ funding allotment and local boards supplement above the state allotment. Local boards claim they supplement the state allotment with an equal amount of funding to each school based upon a per-pupil census. Local and state governments add to this that federal dollars flow to the most impoverished schools so that in fact schools in need achieve a greater level of funding than schools not having as large of an

eligible population for federal funding. I concede their argument is correct if the calculation is based upon the average of actual dollars based upon a per-pupil stipend. However, once a school becomes eligible for additional federal funding, local administrators manipulate their budgets to re-allocate funding so that dollars flow away from instruction and towards other administrative purposes that do not positively affect student achievement. I argue that private donations from corporations, individuals, and from parent organizations comprise a significant amount of funding that is unaccounted for in the comparison. A large corporation is more likely to fund a project in the neighborhood school residing in a demographic area that is more likely to produce paying consumers for their products. In this instance, Capitalism is neither good nor bad; it simply serves the best interest of the corporation from which a philanthropic benefit accrues to the students. To this argument I would also add that many rural and inner city schools are so far behind suburban schools in technological resources, infrastructure, and physical plant improvements that it will require a commitment of greater funding above the per-pupil allotment to bring them to parity with their suburban counterparts. Equal funding does not necessarily translate to equitable access to technology or instructional resources. Finally, tax funding does not ameliorate the difference between upper class parents and impoverished parents who cannot afford to provide resources outside of the school that interface with the electronic capabilities of the school.

^{xxiii} Vouchers are not popular with educators, as they believe the system will lose funding to private schools. However, I argue to break the bureaucratic stranglehold on education requires a radical departure from orthodox thinking by educators. Competition

is not the answer, but choice is. Currently the education system is a government owned monopoly. Without alternatives, monopolies are unassailable. Charter schools offer a partial answer, but they tether financially to taxpayer funding and as such, subject to many of the same restrictive covenants of public schools. Educators should be open to choice whether charter school, private education, or home school. *U.S. News and World Reports* ranks the top one hundred public high schools in academic performance in the United States. A quick review of the type of high school – charter, magnet, public, or specialty – indicates that the majority of the schools ranked in the top categories fall into the classification of charter or magnet. *Source:* Staff Reporters. (2009, December 9). *America's Best High Schools: Top International Baccalaureate Schools*. U.S. News and World Reports. [Http://www.usnews.com/sections/education/high-schools](http://www.usnews.com/sections/education/high-schools) U.S. News and World Report:

^{xxiv} Standardized education begins with the statement, *the student will*, and then lists every conclusion that the student will demonstrate they have learned by selecting the conclusion that is found as an answer on a standardized assessment. This presumes that for every question there is one correct answer predicated upon on path for discovery. Educators sometimes refer to these pathways as ‘learning objectives’ or ‘essential questions’, but regardless of the terminology, the element of discovery or creativity is eliminated. If a person is traveling to a new city, they may have many different alternate routes, periods, and sites they may want to schedule while traveling to their destination. A person may prefer a direct route saving time, a less direct route to enjoy the scenery, or a combination of the two. The *student will* eliminates the possibility of different routes

and assumes one route to the destination point, the *student will....*, is the only route to the destination. It also implies that the destination, the conclusion, is the same destination\conclusion for everyone. The fallacy with this argument is that while it is true that there are foundational skills that every student should master, to develop critical thinking skills do not necessitate students follow the same path or even come to the same conclusion. The irony is that employers are always demanding that educators produce citizens capable of thinking, but insist on standardized curriculum as the path to achieve critical thinking.

^{xxv} The irony of this observation is that the majority of educators have never themselves been entrepreneurs or have been employed outside of the field of education. They are expected and being asked to teach the fundamentals of Capitalism, and yet they have not personally experienced market realities.